99204

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

99204

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

54-55 VICTORIÆ, 1891.

VOL. XXXII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE.

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

1891.

House of Commons Debates.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of correcting a misstatement in a report contained in a very respectable journal indeed, the Toronto *Mail*, and I have no doubt the misreport was in consequence of an accident or misapprehension. The report is as follows:—

"Mr. BOWELL. That statement is made for a purpose. May I tell the hon. gentleman it is just as false——

"Mr. CHARLTON. As false as hell? (Laughter)."

I did not use that language, and I do not wish to take from the Minister of Customs the laurels that belong to him in that regard.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd instant, be read a second time:" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on a subject which has engaged its attention for the last few days, I must claim the indulgence of members on both sides. There has been an exhaustive debate on questions of particular interest to this country, on questions on which hon. members on both sides of the House do not see eye to eye. Probably we have been brought up in different atmospheres and under different political circumstances, and while the members of each party are endeavouring to do what they believe to be right and in the interest of the country we cannot agree, it is therefore important that a full, complete and ample discussion should take place on all these important questions. We have heard during the last few days many eloquent speeches from the other side of the House lauding the financial policy of the Government, and particularly lauding the fiscal policy of the Government. We on this side of the House are opposed both to the financial and fiscal policy of the Government, believing they are both contrary to the best interests of this country. We believe that the financial administration of public affairs by the Government now in power, has not been in the interests of the country. We were told yesterday by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) that the policy of the Government deserved the endorsation of every individual in the country, that, when compared with the financial policy of the Liberal Government, under the able leadership of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the Conservatives had a right to be proud of their policy. The hon. gentleman proceeded to show that during the Liberal Administration there was a succession of deficits, and he quoted from the Public Accounts to show that, during four years out of the five years the Liberals were in power, there was no less than $6,500,000 of deficit incurred. In connection with that statement he said that during that time the taxation of the people did not decrease. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the Public Accounts, on page 30, Roman numerals, he will find he was mistaken in that statement, and I am astonished that he did not notice that the taxation of the people during those four years of deficit did decrease. The hon. gentleman has said that we had $6,500,000 of deficits during the years 1874-75, 1875-76, 1876-77, 1877-78, and 1878-79, while the taxation remained fully as high as before. The taxation during the first year of the Liberal Administration was $20,644,878, and the average taxation of the other four years during which there were deficits was only $18,159,000, or more than $2,500,000 less than during the first year of the Administration of the Liberal party. But the hon. member did not tell the House that there were deficits during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. He

did not tell the House that during four years of their Administration deficits occurred, not of $6,500,000, but of $10,500,000, an average deficit of $2,500,000, as compared with one of $1,600,000 during the Administration of the Liberal party. But the hon. gentleman did not tell the House that the taxation of the people increased largely when the Conservatives had the deficits. The average taxation during the Liberal regime was $18,195,000, but under the Tory Administration during the years of their deficits the taxation of the people was $24,317,000, or an increase of over $6,000,000, with a deficit of $10,500,000. I ask the hon. gentleman to compare the statement in that light, and he has the figures before him, and I am sure he will conclude that I am giving a fair statement of the facts of the case. But the hon. gentleman, passing away from the deficit, sought to prove that the debt of this country did not bear more heavily on the people of Canada than did the debt of the United States on the American people. When we consider the cause of the debt of the United States to be the great war which was commenced in 1861, and raged with tremendous force for four long years, and increased the public debt of that country to $2,700,000,000 odd, and when we remember that during the last thirty years they have reduced that extraordinary debt down to $924,000,000, as it was on the 30th June, 1890, we must see that this reduction is indeed remarkable. If the hon. gentleman divides that debt amongst the population of the United States, he will find there is only an average of $14.60 *per capita*, or, if he divides it as to families, he will find there are only $73 for each family in the United States; and if he takes the interest upon that debt, which amounts to $36,000,000 at the present time, he will find that the *per capita* rate is only 57 cents, or $2.85 per family. Now, Sir, I will throw in the State debt, in order to show you the extraordinary difference between the rate *per capita* in this country and in the United States. This State debt of the United States amounts to $229,000,000, the country debt amounts to $200,000,000 and adding thereto the $924,000,000 national debt, it makes a total of $1,353,000,000. But, Sir, if we divide that by the population of the United States, we will find that the *per capita* tax upon the people of the United States is only $21.50, whereas the *per capita* tax on our debt in Canada amounts to $46 per head, $230 per family, and the interest amounts to $1.85 per head, or $9.25 per family, as compared with $2.85 per family in the United States. The hon. gentleman made another comparison. He stated that the expenditure last year in the United States was something like $346,000,000, but he must remember that he included in that $346,000,000, $48,000,000 which was credited to the sinking fund, so that if he subtracts $48,000,000 from $346,000,000 he will find that in all the other departments of the Government there were only expended $297,000,000 by the United States. But he told the House that we had a great many payments in Canada which they had no corresponding payments for in the United States, and, therefore, the comparison between the two countries, without throwing out these extra expenditures, would not be a fair and just one. Well, that is true. Let us throw out from both accounts the expenditure which one bears, and which the other does not. The hon. gentleman spoke in regard to the subsidies to the provinces amounting last year to $3,905,000, and we will throw that out of the $36,000,000 of our expenditure. He spoke of the administration of justice, which was $700,000; but here I must put into possession of the hon. gentleman this fact: That if the Canadian Government spends this sum for the administration of justice, the United States Central Government spends a very large sum for that same purpose. He will bear in mind that the Supreme Court of the United States, sustained by the Central Government, has eight judges; the Circuit Courts of Claims have five judges; the Superior Court of the District of Columbia has six judges; the District Courts, fifty-eight judges; and the Circuit Courts, nine judges; making eight-six judges, at a cost of about $500,000 to the United States, as compared with the $700,000 it costs for the administration of justice in Canada. The hon. gentleman told us also that the Canadian Government sustained the penitentiaries, an item which did not appear in the expenditure of the United States; we will throw out that item amounting to $404,000. We will also throw out, our expenditure on the Militia amounting to $1,200,000, an expenditure which the Central Government of the United States does not have, because, as we know, the different States support their own militia. And as I have thrown out the sinking fund from the American expenditure, it is right that I should also throw out the amount of the Canadian sinking fund which amounted to $1,888,000 last year. That makes a total of about $8,000,000, and subtracting that $8,000,000 from the $36,000,000 of expenditure in Canada, the expenditure of our Government outside those expenditures I have mentioned would be $28,000,000. I think that is the sum which the hon. gentleman stated we really possessed. The hon. gentleman must remember, however, that, on the other hand, the Government of the United States have large payments for which we have no similar payments, and if it is right and just that I should throw out those payments that they have not, it is but right and just that we should throw out of their expenditure the payments which we have not. The United States pay for their navy $22,000,000; we have no navy to support; their military establishments cost them $44,000,000, for which we have no similar expenditure; their pensions cost them $107,000,000; their diplomatic and consular service in different parts of the world cost $3,000,000, and the District of Columbia costs them $2,900,000 over receipts. Now, Sir, adding these altogether we have a total of $178,900,000 paid by the United States on expenditures, for which we have nothing similar in Canada, or, in other words, we take away from their total expenditure of $297,000,000 60 per cent., and we take away from Canadian expenditure 22½ per cent., so that in Canada we have 78 per cent. of the total income to spend upon departments similar to those in the United States, and the United States have only 40 per cent. to spend. Therefore, we can conclude upon this basis that the *per capita* expenditure in Canada would be $5.44, and the *per capita* expenditure in the United States would be $1.89, or a difference of $3.55 *per capita* in the United States, according to this equitable basis which I have drawn up, and the principle of which has been admitted by the hon. gentleman who discussed these questions yesterday. Now, Mr. Speaker, in passing from that particular line of thought, it will not be expected that I should follow the member for

L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), who spoke for such a long time yesterday, on the various ways in which he presented his conclusions. It is not likely that I will read to you from Mr. Gladstone's answer to Mr. Blaine's letter, from which the hon. gentleman read very copious extracts yesterday. It is not very likely, or is it expected from me, that I will follow him into the relations of the continental powers and spend half an hour talking on that subject, as he did yesterday. We are not here for the purpose of discussing the questions arising in foreign countries, but we are here as practical men for the purpose of considering the questions before us, in reference to the interests of our own country, and in reference to its advancement; and in order to be practical we must come down to practical things. We were told yesterday that the National Policy had accomplished a great deal. We were told that it had raised this country from a period of depression to a period of progression. We were told that it brought us from a condition of despondency to a condition of hopefulness. We were told that it brought us from a condition of financial stringency to a period of cash in abundance; from a period of declining foreign trade to a period of enlarged commerce; from a period of emigration to a period of immigration, and from a period of dependence on the United States markets to an independence of the United States markets. Sir, we were told yesterday that we were brought from a period of a desire for reciprocity, to a period of repudiation of reciprocity even in natural products. But, Sir, I want to examine this National Policy in some of its details, and ascertain, if possible, if the benefits attributed to the National Policy have been realized by the people of Canada. We have been told frequently in eloquent language by the hon. Minister of Finance, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, by the hon. Minister of Justice, and by their followers in this House and in different parts of the country, that our foreign trade was being increased; that although the protective policy had tended to prevent us realizing the markets of the United States to the extent we desired, yet in their absence there were markets beyond the sea and in other parts of the world which were being opened up to the export trade of Canada. Let me read to you some remarks made by Sir John Macdonald in 1882 in reference to this particular question. He was pointing out the great efforts being made under the National Policy to extend our trade with foreign countries. He made reference to the efforts made by the Liberal party, and in asserting their failure, he proceeded to express himself in these words:

"I am not aware—my memory may be at fault—that those gentlemen opposite ever made a single advance to any foreign nation, or sought to develop the trade of Canada in any port of the civilized or uncivilized world. I believe it was in our time that the development and extension of our trade was commenced, and I am proud to say that our mother country is truly a mother country in the best sense of the word, always assisting us, especially of late, in any attempt or any expressed desire of Canada for the development of her trade with any and every country in the world. * * * We commenced at once to extend our trade. In the first place we went to a nation on this side of the Atlantic, and we have got the official, the not ostentatious, but, to a great extent, the expressed assistance of Her Majesty's representative at the Court of Brazil, and we have now a line running monthly between Canada and Brazil, and although that trade is in its infancy, I think the indications are clear that one of our best markets in the future will be Brazil. The commodities of the two countries are of such diverse nature that we can profitably send our productions to Brazil and receive hers in exchange."

Now, Sir, that was a very plausible speech. His Government attempted to establish a trade with Brazil, and what assistance had they in that attempt? First, they had the assistance of the mother country; secondly, they had the assistance of the British Minister at the Court of Brazil; thirdly, they had a diversity of products to exchange with that country, one product being the complement of the other; fourthly, they had a line of steamers running between the ports of the Maritime Provinces and Brazil at that time; and fifthly, they had the advantage of the National Policy. Not a single word could be said against that speech in 1882 when Sir John Macdonald delivered it; it appeared plausible from the first line to the last. But eight years have since passed; and the course of that trade will show what hon. gentlemen opposite have accomplished during that time under the National Policy and by all the favourable circumstances to which Sir John Macdonald referred. Let us see. In 1882, when Sir John Macdonald spoke, our export trade with Brazil was $493,000. This was the trade which he expected to enlarge almost beyond bounds. Now, let us see what all this assistance has brought to the Government during these eight years. Our trade last year with the same country was $352,200, or $141,000 less than it was when Sir John Macdonald made this speech, and our average annual trade with Brazil for these eight years was only $352,700. I ask the members of the Conservative party if they are satisfied with the condition of this export trade, which has depreciated 30 per cent. during those eight years? But, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance has been particularly eloquent also in pointing out the prospects and possibilities of trade in other directions. Hear what he has said in regard to our trade with the West Indies. On that subject he has spoken eloquently in every Budget speech which he has delivered, and I think I have heard them all. He says that the West Indies produce a great many things which we require in this country, and that we produce a great many things which they require. That is true. They want flour, but they go to the United States for it; they want pork, but they go to the United States for it; they want to sell sugar, but they sell it principally in the United States; and so on through all the lines of trade. But, Sir, the hon. Minister said:

"I have had something to do with steamship lines to the West Indies, and I am able to state that a very profitable market stands open in that direction for nearly every product."

Now, what has been the result? When the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Government, it was said by Sir John Macdonald that he was doing nothing at all in the direction of extending our foreign trade. Now, Sir, I find that in 1878 we sent to the West Indies $3,765,000 worth of goods. But in order to consider this question in a fair way, I have divided the years from 1873 to 1890, inclusive, into three periods of six years each. The first period extends from 1873 to 1878, inclusive, the second from 1879 to 1884, inclusive, and the third from 1885 to 1890, inclusive; and when I speak of the first, second and third respectively, hon. gentlemen will know to what divisions of time I refer. In the

first period our annual average exports to the West Indies were $3,765,000—that was under the Liberal Administration; in the second they were $3,239,000; and in the third period, $2,469,000; or a decrease under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite and the regime of the National Policy, and with the advantages of two steamship lines, one from St. John and the other from Halifax to the ports of the West Indies, of 34 per cent. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with such fruits of the National Policy. Then, Sir, we have been told that our trade is largely extending with Australia, that country far across the seas. Now, Sir, in the first period our trade with Australia amounted to $160,000, not a very large trade; in the second period it amounted to $268,000, showing an increase for which I give the Government credit; and in the third period it amounted to $420,000. But, between the year before last and last year, there was a decrease of $190,000 in our export trade with Australia. And you must bear in mind, Sir, that this export trade is largely from one of the western provinces. $170,000 of the total went from British Columbia, and not one single dollar's worth of farm products was shipped from this country to the markets of Australia; so that these markets have not been opened to our farmers and do not furnish an outlet for our agricultural products, which can only find an embargoed market in the United States. How often have you heard, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite speak eloquently of the trade established, or about to be established, with China and Japan. We were told, last year, and the year before that, and then it was reiterated this year again by the hon. Finance Minister, that there are great possibilities of establishing a permanent and profitable trade with those countries across the Pacific Ocean. Well, we find in the first period to which I referred, that our average trade with those countries was $46,000 annually, and that was the period during which we had not the facilities of to-day. We had not at that time the Canadian Pacific Railway spanning the continent, and the Canadian Pacific Railway steamships crossing the Pacific Ocean; and, consequently, we could not reasonably expect our trade to be, ten or twelve years ago, anything like what it should be now. But what is the result? In the second period to which I referred, our trade with China and Japan was $64,500, or an increase of about $22,000. In the third period, our trade amounted to $73,500; an increase over the first period of only $27,500; but under the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when we had no communication with the western route at all, we sent, in 1878, from this country $102,500 worth, although we had not the Canadian Pacific Railway or a line of steamers on the Pacific Ocean. This does not show that the foreign trade policy of the Government has been a success to the country, considering the advantages they had at their disposal, which the Liberal Administration had not. But, again, look at the efforts made to establish a trade with France. France is a country with which we should have a large foreign trade. She is a country whose language, customs and manners are the same, and who worship at the same shrine as one-third of our people, and, therefore, it would be reasonable to expect that we would send to France a large portion of the articles they consume, and import from that country much of the goods we consume. But what has been the result of the Government's policy in regard to France? In the first period, our exports to France amounted to $389,000, and in the third period to $365,000, or a decrease of $20,000; and in 1878, when the Mackenzie Administration was in office, our exports to France were $369,400, whereas in 1890, the last year of the present Administration, they only amounted to $278,500, a decrease of $90,900.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

Mr. SPEAKER,—

His Honour, Chief Justice Sir William J. Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber. And having returned, Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.

An Act respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.

An Act respecting the settlement of Accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said Provinces.

An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian Lands.

An Act with respect to certain matters affecting the Administration of Justice.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act to enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a Ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company (Limited).

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Canadian Power Company.

An Act to authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited) to issue Debenture Stock.

An Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.

An Act respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change the name to "The E. B. Eddy Company."

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway, Coal and Iron Company.

An Act respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the South-Western Railway Company.

An Act further to amend "The Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889."

An Act respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.

An Act to confirm a lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

An Act to incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to grant further powers to the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.

An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter sixty-one, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1891, and the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I next come to deal with our export trade with our sister colony of Newfoundland. During the first period, our average export to the Province of Newfoundland was $2,064,000; during the second period it fell to $1,795,000; and during the last period of six years, under the influence of the National Policy, it fell to $1,523,000, showing a decrease from the first period to the third period of 26 per cent. But it may be said by some of the supporters of the National Policy that it increased our trade relations with Great Britain, the country with which we are so intimately connected, and with which I hope we shall continue to be intimately connected. But even with Great Britain the National Policy has failed to extend our trade. Let me draw your attention to the following facts, which are at the disposal of any one who will examine the record placed at our disposal by the Government. During the first period, under the administration of the Liberal party of Canada, our total average trade with Great Britain amounted to $93,617,000, in the second period it was $84,526,000, and in the last period it was $84,419,000, or a decrease of our trade with Great Britain from the first period to the third period of $9,198,000, or about 10 per cent. Now we will take the exports to Great Britain and see how they stand. In the first period the average export amounted to $42,003,000, in the second period to $45,312,000, and in the third period to $42,426,000, or an increase between the first and the third period of $423,000, or only 1 per cent. Then take the imports from Great Britain, and you find that during the first period they amounted to $51,633,000, during the second period to $42,516,000, and during the third period to $41,996,000, or a decrease from the first to the third period of $9,637,000, or about 19 per cent. What was our trade with the United States during the same periods? Our total trade with the United States in the first period amounted to $81,670,000, in the second period to $81,770,000, and in the third period to $88,172,000, so that the increase of our trade with the United States from the first to the third period was $6,502,000, or 8 per cent. Then take our export trade. We exported to the United States in the first period $31,863,000, in the second period $37,639,000, and in the third period $40,102,000, or an increase from the first to the third period of $8,239,000, or 25 per cent. Then, if we take the imports from the United States, we find that in the first period they amounted to $49,823,000, in the second period to $44,434,000, and in the third period to $48,072,000, or a decrease between the first and the third period of $1,751,000, or about 3½ per cent. Now let us compare the condition of our trade with the United States with the condition of our trade with England by percentages. I have shown that the decrease in our total trade with Great Britain has amounted to about 10 per cent., while our total trade with the United States has increased by 8 per cent. I have shown that the exports to Great Britain have only increased by 1 per cent., while there is an increase in our exports to the United States of 25 per cent. Further, I have pointed out that the imports from Great Britain have decreased by 19 per cent., while the decrease in our imports from the United States only amounts to 3½ per cent. The English markets are free. There is no barrier to keep us out. The markets of the United States are barred against the introduction of many of the products of Canada, and yet in spite of the National Policy our trade with the United States is growing, while our trade with free trade England is decreasing, proving, beyond a doubt, that the United States market is the natural market for Canada. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) spoke the other night in these words:

"The National Policy is calculated to develop foreign trade."

If it has been calculated to develop foreign trade, it has certainly come very far short of the calculation. Further, the hon. gentleman said:

"Its aim and purpose is to develop foreign trade."

If that is so, it has come far short of its aims and purposes. In view of the figures I have quoted, and in view of the returns which have been laid on the Table of the House, I will ask the hon. member for Albert if he believes that the foreign trade of our country is being developed. The hon. member for Albert tells us what his impression is as to the English markets. He says:

"The English market for our farmers, as every one knows who will study our statistical tables, has been a growing market. We sell twice the bulk of agricultural products in the British Islands than we did forty years ago, and during the same interval the American market has shown no growth whatever."

I do not think it is a very extraordinary development of our foreign trade that it should be doubled with Great Britain in forty years, but, when the hon. gentleman says that our market with the United States has been at a standstill ever since, it is clear that he has not understood the statistical tables which show that our whole trade with the United States derived from the fisheries, the forests, the minerals and every other source of export amounted to only $8,931,000 forty years ago, while now in agricultural products alone our export trade with them amounts to nearly $14,000,000. Yet, the hon. gentleman tells us that our trade with the United States was practically at a standstill. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that, and he thought he might hold out some hope for the future. He says:

"Further, I am proud to say, there is on the English horizon a cloud the size of a man's hand, indicating a change of policy to our advantage."

I suppose he took this idea from what the prophet of old saw after three years of drought. He goes on :

"That may not afford our hon. friends opposite as much pleasure as it does us, but it excites in some of us the hope that, before we are many years older, we may, by means of new political adjustments, find in the old country, for the products of our farms, a larger market than we have hitherto found. A very small difference of duty, a duty of 5 or 7 per cent. in the English market in favour of our wheat, and our barley, and our beef, and our mutton, and our poultry, and our eggs, and our lumber, would guarantee the very rapid building up of this country."

Sir, he believes that the English people are going to come to the rescue of Canada, because Canada, under its own fiscal policy, has failed to extend its trade. But, Sir, do you believe that such an event will ever transpire in Britain? Does the hon. member believe for a moment that from that cloud will come a party actuated by the protective spirit of fossil Tories of fifty years ago, and roll back the wheels of British progress fifty years? No, Sir, rain will come from that cloud that will drown out every one of those protectionists, and the English free trade sky will be clear again, and a rainbow will appear which will indicate that no such fossil Tories will ever appear again. And what does that policy mean? Supposing that England adopted a policy giving a preference to colonial goods in the British market. It would mean an addition of £40,000,000 sterling to the price of the food supply of the English people, or $200,000,000, $5 for every man, woman and child in England, $25 additional expenditure every year for each family in England. Sir, what would be the consequence? They say the English farmers would be benefited by an increased price of farm products, and if there were an increased price in England the colonies sending in their products would receive the same price in the English markets, and an increased price in the colonies means an increased price to every man, woman and child who consumes food in Great Britain. Sir, what would be the consequence if the English farmers were more prosperous than they are now? The landlords would raise the rents, the farm labourers would ask for additional wages. The labourers, mechanics and factory hands of England, on account of this additional expense of living, would demand from their employers additional wages, and the manufacturers would have to put on an increased price upon manufactured goods throughout England, and then that would handicap the manufacturers of England in the oreign markets in competition with the other nations of the world. Do you suppose that England would ever consent for a moment to consider a policy that, from first to last, would injure every class of the people, and not only injure the classes of people living in the country, but would injure to a great extent that renowned position which England occupies in the various markets of the world But, Sir, that policy of Imperial federation is not entertained in England by the leading statesmen of that country. A few days ago a deputation from the Federation League called upon the Premier of England, Lord Salisbury, in reference to this policy, and he answered them in the following words :—

"The league, however, said the Premier, must work hard to convert their countrymen to the league's way of thinking, for it was impossible for England to give preferential treatment to the colonies at the expense of the rest of the world. The league must first ascertain how far the country would support the policy of which, he imagined, a prominent feature was a preferential tax on grain, wool and meat. Englishmen, in his opinion, would never consent to legislation of a vague or indefinite kind, especially where their dearest daily interests were concerned."

Still further, he says :

"The difficulties have been often stated, but I will just refer to them again. If you give preferential treatment to your colonies it must be, of course, as Sir John Macdonald said, that you tax the similar goods of the rest of the world. If you give a preferential treatment—that is, a better price—to your colonies, it must be a better price than that which, with unrestricted competition, is obtaining now. A better price to the producer means a more disagreeable price to the consumer."

Sir, I do not see much hope for the hon. gentleman in the cloud, and if he puts his hope and his aspirations in a cloud that is rising over Britain, as a means of improving the prosperity of the people of this country, it is time that the party he is supporting on the Government benches should be placed on the Opposition side of the House, and allow abler and better men who can grasp the necessities of the country, to formulate a policy better calculated to further the interests and the prosperity and advantage of this great country. Now, I think I have demonstrated that the National Policy has not been successful in establishing a foreign trade, and I will next consider it from another standpoint. The question may be asked, why the Liberal party is opposed to the National Policy. Well, the first reason is the one I gave, namely, that the National Policy has not been successful in establishing a foreign trade ; in the next place the National Policy has been a failure because it has not given to the farmers of this country what was promised them in 1878. The National Policy, it was promised, would benefit and foster the agricultural industries of this country. Now, I ask, in presence of facts and figures which cannot be disputed, if it has accomplished the ends which it had in view? Mr. Speaker, there are only three ways in which the agricultural interests of this country can be benefited. The first, if the fertility of the soil can be increased, the farmers of the country will be benefited, and I do not suppose the most ardent supporter of the National Policy will say that it has ever increased the fertility of the Canadian soil. The second way in which the farming industries will be benefitted and fostered, is by giving the agriculturists a better price for what they produce. Now, has the National Policy given a better price for what they have produced?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend from West Assiniboia says "yes." Now, I think I can prove in a very few moments, from facts and figures which cannot be disputed, that the prices given to the farmers since the National Policy was adopted have been far less than the prices they have obtained under the tariff of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I have gone to considerable trouble in getting figures upon this matter ; I have examined fyles of the papers for the last fifteen years; and I have taken the same date, namely, the 5th day of March each year. I have examined fyles of the *Globe*, I have examined fyles of the *Mail*, I have examined fyles of the *Monetary Times*, so that I might have correct statements from the farmers' markets in the city of Toronto on the 5th of March of each of these

years. I have taken the average price from 1874 to 1878 for five years, and I have taken the average price from 1878 to 1889, ten years, and I will now give to my hon. friend the results of my hard work in the following table :—

Article.	Old Tariff.	National Policy.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Wheat	1 11	0 96
Barley	0 55	0 65
Oats	0 42	0 38
Peas	0 71	0 66
Dressed hogs, per cwt	7 04	6 80
Butter	0 23	0 20
Apples, per barrel	2 69	2 30
Hay, per ton	18 00	11 00
Wool	0 34	0 22

In the face of these figures, and I guarantee their correctness, I ask if under the National Policy there has been an increase in the prices of those principal agricultural products? On an average crop each farmer of the Dominion will lose, from the reduction in prices, about $90. Has the National Policy, in the face of these facts, brought prosperity and advancement to the farmers of this country? But I object to the National Policy, next, on the ground that it does not keep our people at home. I will be told by the hon. gentlemen opposite that I am commencing the old tirade against my country. Tirade against my country! How could I do that? There is no country under the face of Heaven so dear to me as Canada, and if I am constrained to show that our country is in a depressed condition, it is because I feel that I have a duty to perform to Canada, the condition of our people commercially and financially, and suggest a plan for the improvement of their circumstances, and it is the present duty of the Government to discard the present policy and give the country one more suited and beneficial to the interests of the people. How often have we heard from the Treasury benches that we are disloyal to our country, that we are unpatriotic, that we declare that our people remove to a foreign country to add to its strength, dignity and advancement; and that, when these statements of ours go before the world and are read in Britain, Germany and other countries, the people no longer propose to come to Canada, but turn their faces to Africa, Australia, or elsewhere. Then, we are told that we have sent more people into the United States, by our speeches and arguments, than have been sent there by American agents; that those agents have taken our speeches and printed them and circulated them to people passing across the continent, many of whom, instead of settling in Manitoba, have become settlers in Northern and Southern Dakota, or other parts of the Western States. If it is unpatriotic, on our part, to thus speak of our country, was it not equally unpatriotic on the part of the late leader of the Government, who, in 1877-78, travelled from one end of the country to the other, making statements of a similar nature when the necessity for them was not so urgent as at the present time? He told the people from every public platform, and from his place in Parliament, that the country was going to the dogs, and that hundreds and thousands of people were flocking to the American States. I am not overdrawing the picture, and in order to prove that the Conservative party can be charged with disloyalty and unpatriotic conduct if the Liberal party can, I will read some extracts from speeches delivered by Sir John Macdonald during that period.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman does not want me to read them because they will not be palatable to him. Sir John A. Macdonald delivered a speech in Montreal on 7th July, 1877, to which I desire to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance. I do not suppose there is an hon. gentleman opposite who is more ready to point out that we are decrying our country, belittling our country, telling the world that our people are going away, than is the Minister of Finance, and I ask him to listen to what his late leader said so frequently. In that speech as reported in the *Mail*, which at the time was a good Conservative paper, Sir John Macdonald said :

"Our credit was good in England, in the United States and all the world over, but, gentlemen, what do we see now? Instead of confidence there is distrust. Instead of solvency, look at the official *Gazettes*, and every Saturday they show a long string of insolvencies."

I might remark there were one thousand more insolvencies in Canada during the last six months than there were during the first six months of the preceding year. He continued :

"Look around you, and you see the horny hands of toil asking leave to labour. They are now beggars. They do not desire to have silver spoons placed in their mouths, but they desire to have a fair day's wages for a fair day's work."

The poor Canadian people at that time were beggars. What a splendid speech this would have been to send to Germany and England to induce immigrants to come here. He proceeded :

"But what do we see? We see them drifting off to the United States. We see the skilled artizans, the strong-handed young men and the active young women of Lower Canada drifting off to Lowell, to New Hampshire, to Maine, to Connecticut, adding to the wealth, to the power and the strength of a foreign nation, and depleting poor Canada."

Great tears no doubt dropped from the old man's eyes when he had pronounced the words "poor Canada." There was the patriotism of the great man who has lately, I am sorry to say, left us; there was the patriotism and spirit of loyalty that permeated the breast of the man who built up and led the Conservative party for 40 years. Was he acting as a disloyal man? And was he the only disloyal man among them? I do not think so. There was another great man, who filled the position of Minister of Finance several years, and from whom great things were expected, Sir Leonard Tilley, and it could scarcely be thought that he, too, would be unpatriotic and decry his country as he did. It is said that history repeats itself, and after reading an extract from that gentleman's speech, I will show how history repeats itself. Sir Leonard, in his Budget speech delivered on March 14, 1879, referring to what he had said in his Budget speech of 1873, spoke as follows :—

"I could point with pride and satisfaction to the increased capital of our banks and the large dividend they paid to-day I regret to say that we must point to depreciated values and to small dividends. Then I could point to the general prosperity of the country. To-day we must all admit that it is greatly depressed. * * *

"Then we could point to the agricultural interest as most prosperous, with a satisfactory home market and satisfactory prices abroad. To-day they have a limited market with low prices, anything but satisfactory market abroad. * * * *

"Then everything appeared to be prosperous. To-day, although it looks gloomy, I think there is a silver lining to the cloud that we may yet see illuminating the whole of the Dominion and changing our present position to one of happiness and prosperity."

If that were true in 1879, how true is it now in the light of the experience of the last ten years. It possesses greater truthfulness and fairness to-day, when we have this picture: Now, depressed values; 1879, greater prosperity. Now, depressed agricultural condition; then, a satisfactory home market. His silver lining was the great National Policy which has absolutely failed to benefit the people. Our gold lining is brighter; it is that of broader trade relations with the greatest market in the world. Before long the Liberal party will change seats in this House with those who occupy the Treasury benches, because the people of the country are commencing to see the golden lining, and are stretching forth their hands to grasp it, and they will put into power the party which they know is capable of carrying out to full completion the arrangements which will place at our disposal larger and better markets, upon an equitable basis, with the great nation to the south of us. We were told the other night by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that although our people were removing from the country, it was on account of their nomadic tendencies. He says: They were born so; they were born in one part of the east and they were sure to wander westward. Do we not belong to the same class of people now that we belonged to ten years ago? If that argument is good now, it was equally good ten years ago, when Sir John Macdonald charged the exodus upon the shoulders of what he called the insane Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Now matters have changed around, and we are told by gentlemen upon the other side that the exodus is owing to our peculiar nature; we are told that it is the nature of the white people to go westward, and that they are now taking the advice of Horace Greeley when he said: "Young man, go west." It appears to me that a large portion of the people of Canada are taking that advice and going west. But the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) says, that although the people are moving westward, they have gone to Manitoba, to the Canadian North-West or to British Columbia. Is that the case? Do all our people go to the far West; do they take up their habitation in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and in British Columbia? Why, Sir, there are not over 200,000 in the whole of the North-West provinces, and for the last twenty-one years the efforts of the Government have been directed towards populating those territories, and they have spent over $3,000,000 in bringing immigrants from the old country to Canada and the North-West. Where have those people gone?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are like the blue bonnets—over the border.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Sir, during the last few years the Government would insist that these people were all in the North-West Territories, but it was shown by the last census that no less than 123,000 people were lacking in the North-West Territories who were counted as being there by the Government. Where have those people gone? We were told by W. C. B. Graham, immigration agent of the Government in Winnipeg, that no less than 10,000 of those, whom we put there at a great expenditure of money, had gone from British Columbia to the cities in the United States: to Seattle, San Francisco, Sacramento, Tacoma and other cities on the Pacific. The people have gone into the North-West, but they have gone again into the United States; because they find it a cheaper country to live in, and because those young men and young women who leave us find better prospects there for the future. Sir John Macdonald told us that the National Policy, or, as he called it, "a just and equitable adjustment of the tariff," would stop this movement. Has the exodus ceased since the National Policy came into force? I call upon any hon. gentleman in this House to say if it has ceased. It is no use giving us learned disquisitions upon political economy, but let hon. gentlemen opposite come down to solid facts in connection with our own country, and let them show us that the National Policy has been beneficial on the whole to the varied interests of the country. How many of our people left our country during the years of the Liberal Administration? The highest estimate given by the Conservatives of that day was 22,000 each year. No person was more sorry than I was to see our able-bodied men and women, the flower of our population, leaving us to find a home in a foreign land. But, Sir, since the time of the Liberal Administration there have been nearly four times 22,000 leaving this country every year and going to the United States. These figures may be denied, but it is the simplest thing in the world to make a calculation to show as nearly as possible the exact number of people who have left Canada for the United States since 1882. We know that in 1881, the year of the last official census, we had a population in Canada of 4,345,293. The natural increase in any country should be nearly two per cent. of births over deaths, but I only estimated one and a-half per cent., so as to be under rather than over the number, and one and a-half per cent. of natural increase would give us 651,784 persons of an increase since 1881. Now, by turning up the report of the Minister of Agriculture, I find that 917,977 immigrants came to Canada who stated their intention of remaining here. If we add these numbers together we should have a population of 5,913,054, but the estimated population to-day by the Government is 5,150,000. If you subtract 5,150,000 from the population which we should have of 5,913,054, we find that there are 763,054 of our population unaccounted for. Where are these people gone? They have left our country, they are not here, and, therefore, we have an exodus of 76,300 every year under the influence of the National Policy, whereas we had only an exodus of 22,000 under the policy of the Liberal Administration, led so ably and so honestly by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Father Hamon lately placed a book on the French Canadians before the public, and in that book he states that not less than 400,000 French Canadians are in the Eastern States, and that there are no less than 200,000 in the Western States, making a total of 600,000 French Canadians who are now in the United States and who ought to be with us here. But, Sir, when you find that the corner-stones of our

whole national fabric have been leaving us to become the foundation stones of a foreign country, need we wonder that there is a depression in this country, and that the policy which has been inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite has been a complete failure in keeping our people at home. In fact, Sir, the lines of "Fidelis" addressed to the Old party, are particularly applicable here:

"Ye send our best and brightest forth, our nation's hope and pride—
More precious to our country's weal than all her wealth beside—
To be the strength of alien states, of empire not our own,
And all to 'build the nation up' without its corner-stone!"

Yes, Sir, the corner-stones of our national fabric are moving away from us. There is no expense so great as the education of the young men and women in this country. We give them an education in our colleges and universities to prepare them for the period of manhood and womanhood, and when they arrive at that period when their influence should be of vast importance to our country, they move to a foreign state to add to the dignity, power, wealth and moral character of a foreign power, instead of using their influence to advance their native country.

Mr. DAVIN. They were drawn away before.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Not in such numbers. They are drawn away more now; the moving power is stronger now. But, Sir, the National Policy has not only failed in this respect, but it also discriminates against the poor man in favour of the rich man. When I say that the National Policy discriminates against the poor man, I mean this: that the prime necessities of the people are the articles on which the Government has placed the highest tariff rates. But I know what argument will meet me here. I know that my hon. friend from the far West, who is looking so intently at me, would suggest, if he spoke his mind, that these articles of prime necessity are manufactured in our country, and that, therefore, not a single dollar of duty is paid upon them by the consumer. I do not say that a single dollar of duty is paid on them; it would be better if duty were paid upon them, because it would go into the public treasury to meet the expenses of the country. Instead of that the amount goes into the pockets of the manufacturers in increased prices; but all the same it comes out of the pockets of the consumers. And, Sir, the greatest authority on finance whom the Conservative party ever had in this country, is one of my authorities for this statement. Sir A. T. Galt, than whom the Liberal-Conservative party never had an abler man sitting on the Treasury benches, stated that whenever a tariff was levied, it increased the price of every article upon which a duty was imposed, whether imported from abroad or manufactured in the country. I place on one side his authority, and on the other side I place that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I ask the country to choose between them.

Mr. DAVIN. I have got a letter from Sir Alexander Galt saying that the prices have been lower.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, let me give you a few specimens of tariff discrimination against the poor man. If a poor man requires a few common pictures to put on the wall of his room, he has to pay 20 per cent. duty on them; but if my hon. friend from West Assiniboia wants to import from abroad a picture of high art, he gets that picture free of duty. If I want a cheap coat in which to go into the country to see my patients, I take Canadian tweed, on which I have to pay 45 per cent., but if my hon. friend, dressing as well and stylishly as he generally does, and as popular among the ladies as he generally is, chooses to put on better clothing than I can afford, and, consequently, buys broadcloth, he gets it at a duty of 25 per cent. I need a heavy overcoat because I have to drive out in inclement weather, and I get Canadian tweed, on which I have to pay 45 per cent.; but the hon. gentleman, who walks about the streets of the great city of Regina, buys a finer coat, on which he has to pay only 25 per cent. Now, Sir, he being a rich man and I a poor man, does not this prove that the tariff discriminates against the poor? Then, the labouring man who works on the farm, in the lumber woods, or on the public works of Canada, needs strong shirting, on which he has to pay 65 per cent., while my hon. friend gets the fancy shirting which he puts on during the summer at 24 per cent. My musical friends, if they cannot afford to buy grand pianos like the rich people, but who nevertheless are fond of music—because musical taste is not confined to the rich—they have to buy a cheap organ on which they pay from 50 to 70 per cent.; but if my hon. friend who is rich wants to buy a grand piano to adorn his parlour and to afford amusement to his daughters, he gets it at a duty of from 35 to 50 per cent. Now, he may be rich in daughters and rich in many things, but the tariff discriminates in his favour and against the poor man. The poor men who go into the lumber districts want heavy, grey shoddy blankets to keep them warm in the shanties; they have to pay upon them a duty of from 80 to 100 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. They do nothing of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I beg pardon. Take one of these shoddy blankets which the retailer buys for a dollar, it weighs 8 pounds. The duty would be 10 cents for each pound in weight and 20 per cent. on its value. Now, 8 times 10 are 80, so that upon that blanket the poor man has to pay 80 cents along with 20 cents on the dollar, which amounts to 100 per cent. There it is proved to you. But if my hon. friend wants a fine, soft French blanket of great value but very little weight, for his delicate skin, he pays on it from 60 to 70 per cent., whereas the poor man who has to lie on a board in the wilderness covers himself with a shoddy blanket on which he has to pay 100 per cent. You cannot get over it, because it is the truth, and the man who gets over the truth has to do it in a dishonest way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He gets under the blanket.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then, Sir, take earthenware. I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not sit down to a breakfast table on which there is common earthenware. I have no doubt he sits down to a table furnished with China cups and saucers and dishes, which he gets for 30 per cent.; but the poor man has to pay 35 per cent. upon his common crockery. I might go on almost *ad in-*

finitum, giving item after item in which the National Policy discriminates against the poor and in favour of the rich man. Therefore it is a policy not adapted to this country. But, Sir, passing on, I am opposed to the National Policy on the ground that it increases the prices of the prime necessities of the Canadian people, which I can prove, and I have the figures here to prove it. I have quotations of prices which I have obtained from independent parties who did not know for what purpose I wanted to use them. I got a quotation from the city of Detroit and one from the town of Windsor on the same day, on the 5th of December last, showing the price in the two places of a clothes-wringer, an article very largely used among the poor people of this country to save manual labour; and the article which was $3.75 in Windsor was selling on the same day in Detroit for $2.50, a difference of $1.25 on this single article of general utility; and if you estimate the number of wringers used in this country at 200,000, you have $250,000 that the users of clothes-wringers in this country pay more than a similar number pay in the American Union. Now take the article of solid steel spades. I have a quotation from Jones, of Gananoque, in December, and I have an independent quotation from Busy, Binns & Co., of Pittsburg, on the same day. According to the quotation from Gananoque, spades are sold there for $10.65 to the retailer per dozen, and according to the quotation from Pittsburg they are sold in that city at $7.80 per dozen to the retailer. Add 30 per cent. for the profit of the retailer, and a spade sells in this country for $1.16 which, with the same profit to the retailer, sells in the American Union for 85 cents, or a difference of 31 cents in favour of the American article. When we consider the number of steel spades used in this country upon our public works and canals and by every farmer in the community, we will find that no less than one million are used, which, multiplied by 31 cents, makes no less than $310,000 which our people pay for solid steel spades more than the same number of people pay for for a like number of these implements in the United States. Yet, in the face of those facts, we are told that prices have not increased under the National Policy. Again, take the article of coal oil. I have independent quotations of that, too. I have quotations from Canada in the month of January, showing that coal oil sold in this country, No. 1 white Canadian oil, to the retailer for 13½ cents per imperial gallon; and I have a quotation from the United States, showing that, at the same date, a better article was sold there at 7½ cents per wine gallon. Add one-fifth, being the difference between the two measures, and you have 9 cents for the imperial gallon in the United States, as against 13½ cents in Canada. Give the retailer 50 per cent. profit, and you can obtain in the American market a much better oil at 13½ cents than that for which you have to pay 20 cents in Canada. We consume no less than 20,000,000 gallons of oil per year. Multiplying that by 6½ cents, and you have no less than $1,300,000 which the people of this country pay more for an inferior article of coal oil than the same number of people in the United States pay for a superior article. Yet we are told by those hon. gentlemen who give us learned essays on protection, without coming down to solid facts, that the National Policy lowers prices. But that is not all. Take the article of barb wire, which is manufactured in this country and in the United States. On the 5th of December I had a quotation from the town of Windsor, giving the price of barb wire at retail, at $4.80 per hundred pounds, and I have also a quotation from the city of Detroit on the same date, a city only a quarter of a mile across the river, showing the price there to be $3.30 per hundred pounds. What made the difference? It was the $1.50 per hundred pounds of duty placed upon it by the Canadian Government. Let me give you the experience of two farmers in connection with barb wire, which will show the great difference between living on this side and the other side of the line—the great difference between having free trade and a protective policy. Farmer A left his house, in the neighbourhood of Windsor, on the 5th of December, 1890. He wanted to buy 500 pounds of wire to build a fence 80 rods long. He had no ready money, so he put 50 bushels of barley into his waggon and went to the market. He sold his barley at the market price in the town of Windsor, on the 5th of December, at 50 cents per bushel, realizing $25. He went then to a hardware store and bought the 500 pounds of wire he required, and for which he had to pay $4.80 per hundred pounds, making $24, and leaving him $1 to pay his expenses and take him home. That was his experience. Farmer B, on the same day, required 500 pounds of barb wire for the same purpose, and on the same day left his farm in the vicinity of Detroit with 50 bushels of barley, as he had no ready cash. That 50 bushels he sold in the market at Detroit at 80 cents per bushel, or $40, and he then went to a hardware store and bought his 500 pounds of wire at $3.30 per hundred pounds, making $16.50 for the wire, and leaving him with a balance of $23.50 in pocket. He purchased a suit of clothes for himself at $12, bought stuff for a dress for his wife at $5, bought 40 pounds of sugar at 5 cents per pound, 20 pounds of rice at 5 cents per pound, 2 pounds of tea at 50 cents per pound, and 3 pairs of shoes at 50 cents per pair, and he still had $1 left to pay his expenses. There is a practical fact. How did that come to be known? Farmer A and Farmer B happened to be brothers, and they corresponded, and each gave the other his experience. I would ask the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) who he thinks now, in view of these facts, became the "nomad." I would ask the hon. gentleman which of those men took up stakes and moved westward. Was it the Canadian farmer or the Michigan farmer? I need hardly say it was the Canadian farmer who pulled up his stakes and went to the country where he could sell at the highest price and buy at the lowest. Take the article of salt. The hon. Finance Minister proposes to reduce the duty on salt. There has been a combination among the salt men, not from any dishonest motives, let me tell you, Sir, for I know every one of them, but with the motive of saving their own property and investments. Now, how does the National Policy destroy the salt interests? I come from a county which is the centre of the salt interest. The Government have two policies with regard to salt—a free trade policy in the east and a restrictive policy in the west. The manufacturers of Ontario are prevented sending salt to the American market on account of the duties imposed by the United States, and are prevented sending their salt to the Eastern Provinces on account of the free trade

policy of the Canadian Government in allowing salt from England and her colonies into this country free of duty. Not only that, but they admitted from other countries last year no less than 40,000 barrels free of duty, not from England and her colonies, but from Italy, Spain, Portugal, St. Pierre and other places, and no less than 600 barrels came from the United States, free of duty, to the eastern market. How is it possible, our salt industries being shut out of the western and eastern markets by the policy of the Government, they can be successful? More than that, out of the consumption of 800,000 barrels last year in the Dominion, 532,000 were admitted free into the markets of Canada, and those 532,000 barrels carried westward largely by the Intercolonial Railway at reduced prices. No less than 224,000 barrels came free into Quebec, and 210,000 barrels into Nova Scotia, thus supplying the markets in the east at the expense of the markets in the west. But that is not all. The Nova Scotia coal mines are protected in order to enable them to send their coal as far west as possible. They never have sent their coal as far west as the salt pits of the County of Huron, or even as far as the city of Toronto, and still the amount of 60 cents a ton duty is placed on the importation of coal, and consequently the salt interests are to that extent embargoed, for the benefit, it is said, of the maritime coal interests, although no coal comes from Nova Scotia to western Ontario. The salt works would use about 20,000 tons of coal each year, and have to pay a duty of 60 cents a ton on that, which means $12,000 a year and which gives protection to the coal interests of Nova Scotia, but, at the same time, burdens the coal user in Ontario. The fisherman's interests, and the coal interests, and other interests in the east are protected, while the interests in the west are allowed to languish under the policy which now exists. Now, if we are to have protection, let it be just. Let it protect all interests equally, for, in the words of Sir John Macdonald: "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Another matter to be considered in connection with the salt manufacturers is that they have frequently to replace the evaporating pans, and each time at considerable expense, which are composed of boiler plate which is not manufactured in Canada, but is imported from Germany, Scotland and the United States, and on which they have to pay a heavy duty. I think the Minister should take off the duty on that article, and place at the disposal of the manufacturers of salt what is a raw material and that they cannot obtain in this country. The cost of that duty comes to about $3,000 a year, and the duties they have to pay on rivets and matters of that kind make up the total to over $16,000, which they have to pay, practically, on the raw material. Is there any fairness in such a policy as this, which discriminates against the western salt interests in favour of the people down by the sea, and, at the same time, while we are paying 60 cents a ton duty on soft coal we cannot get that coal from Nova Scotia so far west? The National Policy has brought the salt industry into financial difficulty, in the first place; into an undesirable combination, in the second place; and the consumers into an increased price of many thousands of dollars, in the third place. For a time, in consequence of the great competition, the price of salt was very much reduced. It was sold two years ago for 50 cents a barrel, and everyone was selling it at a loss. The producers then said: Let us come together and let us reason. They came together and they reasoned thus. They said: If the farmers and the labourers and others who use salt in this country are such confounded fools as to support a National Policy which is killing us, we will combine and put up the price and make these men pay, as we are dissipating our capital at those ruinous rates at which we have been selling in our limited market. We cannot sell salt for 10 cents less than it costs us. They, therefore, agreed together, and the fifteen salt wells went into an arrangement. This causes a difference of 30 cents a barrel on the salt which was used, which amounted to 30 cents a barrel on 232,000 barrels, or $69,600, which the farmers had to pay last year which they would not have had to pay if the National Policy did not exist. They are nearly all Tories who are engaged in the salt industry, but, being embargoed in this way, being able to work only about five months in the year, being shut off from their natural markets, they say they must make reasonable profit for a year in the five months, and the result is that the National Policy has brought the salt interest to the condition in which it is now. Let me read what is said by one of the principal manufacturers. No doubt it will be said that I am speaking for the salt men, but I will give the House a statement made by Dr. Coleman, who was a supporter of the National Policy and is a member of the Conservative party. What does he say?

"To recapitulate—Our capital is sunk or gone. Our industry is tottering. It is unjustly discriminated against by our tariff. Our labourers are leaving the country for want of employment. English salt is coming into this country free of duty, or almost free, at the rate of 200,000,000 pounds a year, while all other goods, or nearly all, are taxed to our detriment. The loyalty cry will not stop the movement of the people across the line, and there must be a halt or else there may be a smash."

I think the halt is not likely to come, but the smash is not far in the future. Speaking in regard to the people who are leaving the country, he says:

"It is a sad sight for every thinking Canadian to witness, as we did a few days ago in this town, the exodus of a large batch of artizans, and mechanics to Alabama, Dakota, and other states, for the want of employment at home, and to see the town band at the station cheering them on their journey. There were no tears or lamentations such as I witnessed in other lands where men are expatriating themselves. I venture to add that where the young go some of the aged will soon follow. And why should it be otherwise? They cannot purchase a stove, a pound of soap, a pound of sugar, a pair of boots, a yard of cotton, or a pound of oatmeal, that is not subject to a combine."

This was said before he went into a combine himself.—

"I am, and have been, a faithful believer in the National Policy, but I want to see it work equitably for all. When it leads up to an attack on the rights and liberties of the masses, it brings itself into contempt."

That is the expression of one of the largest salt dealers in the country, and I might go further, but I will not delay the House. I suppose I have given a sufficient number of articles to the House to convince the member for Assiniboia that articles are dearer under the National Policy than they were before. It was announced the other day that sugar was higher on account of the National Policy. It was acknowledged last year, when duties were imposed upon pork, that the duties would increase the price to the New Brunswickers, but that there was a compensation given by reducing the duty on molasses and allowing corn brought in to be ground to come in free for the people of

those provinces. The price of pork was increased on the one hand, and the price of corn and molasses was reduced on the other. I have an objection to the National Policy on the ground that it places a very heavy embargo upon the exports of the farm products of this country. Now, the farmers of this country export a large number of potatoes, no less than 1,054,000 bushels. There is a duty imposed upon potatoes of 25 cents a bushel. I am not going to argue that the Canadian farmer loses the 25 cents, because that might be a matter of controversy. I will divide the duty in order to avoid that point of controversy, and I will say that he loses 15 cents. Now, 15 cents on 1,054,000 bushels is $158,000, that, it will be admitted, the farmers of Canada lose upon their potatoes, which they would save if we had free trade with the Americans. Out of that $158,000, $112,000 comes out of the pockets of the farmers of that little Island from which my hon. friend the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) comes, or $1 for every man, woman and child in that province. I cannot understand for the life of me how that little province elected two staunch Tories to support the Tory Government. Their little province produces over 7,000,000 bushels of potatoes, for which they have no other market in the world than the United States, with the exception of a few thousand bushels sent to Nova Scotia, when three-quarters of a million bushels of those potatoes go into the American markets upon which they cannot help but admit that the farmers lose 15 cents out of the 25 cents duty, and this encumbers their prosperity to the extent of $112,000. Now, Sir, there is more, and I think the Minister of Finance, although he is busy now chatting about something else, would do much better to attend to some solid sense when it is delivered from this side of the House. Let me enlighten him in his further advances along the line which he intends to pursue before long. I will call his attention to the barley question. Now, there has always been a dispute in this House as to who pays the duty on barley. That question has all been settled last fall. You will remember when the McKinley Bill came into operation on the 6th of October, that for a whole month previous to that date, every farmer in this country was quickening his steps in order to get first to the owner of a threshing machine to engage him to bring his machine to his barn to thresh out his barley as early as possible. All the farmers were vieing with each other as to who would get first to the owner of the threshing machine. Why any such hurry? Because the McKinley Bill was coming into operation on the 6th of October, and they wanted to get their barley threshed in order that they might get it to market before that date, and before the McKinley tariff reduced the price of their barley. That fact is enough to satisfy every man as to who pays the duty on the barley. These farmers were not acting from political bias, they were considering solely their own personal interests. Blind political partisanship was wiped away, they saw things in their true light, and then they came to the conclusion that they were losing that much money more on their barley than they got for it previous to the 6th of October. Barley in my town fell from the moment the Mc Kinley Bill went into operation, 20 cents a bushel in one day. But we are told: Oh, the price rose afterwards and we got just as much after the Mc Kinley Bill took effect as we did the year before. That is only begging the question. Barley was scarce in the United States the year before, the suppply was not equal to the demand, and they were paying more on the other side than they did in the previous year, and that influenced the price to some extent in the Canadian market, and, therefore, to compare the price of the year before to the price of last year was no comparison at all, because the two prices were under different conditions altogether. Now, Sir, how much did the farmers lose on their barley? Counting the loss at 20 cents a bushel, in order to avoid discussion upon the point as to who pays the duty, they paid $1,987,000 to get their barley into the American markets, or in other words the farmers would realize that much less by the effects of the McKinley Bill on an equal exportation to last year, namely, 1889-90. Then I come to eggs. We have heard a good deal about the egg market. The Minister of Finance has sent a gentleman to the old country to investigate the matter and to ascertain if it would be a profitable market for Canadian eggs. I think the agent brought back a favourable report; of course he was told to bring back a favourable report. But I am going to give you practical experiments. We have in our county the largest egg buyer, no doubt, in the Dominion of Canada. He ships annually 1,550,000 dozen. He tried the English markets as early as 1878, when he went there with 10,500 dozen, or over three hundred barrels, and he found on taking them there, that he lost $5 on every barrel, losing $1,500 on the experiment. A year ago last June he sent to the British market a carload of picked or selected eggs. Now, you will understand by picked eggs that they are selected according to size, the largest ones picked out and the smaller ones left behind, in order to have uniformity in size. He sent a carload to England in June, 1890, and he went to England so as to be there when the eggs arrived and push their sale. He says they came in good condition, there were very few breakages, and he sold them and realized a certain sum. On the same day he shipped a carload to the city of New York, consigned to his agent there, and told him to push the sale. He netted 4 cents a dozen more on the mixed eggs he sent to New York than he did on the picked eggs he sent to England. Now, there is a practical experience, and it is worth a whole ton of theory in regard to this matter. Now, Sir, we are told that we are getting as high a price this year as we were last year for our eggs, and the markets of Canada are quoted last year and the corresponding markets this year. That is begging the question. In order to ascertain whether we are getting as much as we should get, we should compare the markets of last year in Toronto and in New York, and see the difference in the margin. I find a difference in the margin last year of from 2 to 2½ cents, which is sufficient to send them to market and dispose of them. In the markets to-day we find the margin runs from 4½ to 6½ cents, making an average of 5½. Taking 2½ from 5½ leaves 3 cents that the Canadian farmer loses by the action of the McKinley Bill upon the egg trade. Sir, I have here a letter from one of the dealers in the County of Huron, and he says that he sent one lot of eggs to the English market this summer, but he has received no return yet. He has sent several lots to the American market this year, and he received 12 cents and 12½

cents net, free on board, at Seaforth. He tells me that he was speaking to a Montreal buyer who sent several lots of eggs to the English market this year, and he netted on the first lot 9 cents a dozen and for the second lot 11 cents a dozen, free on board in Montreal, and the western buyer realized 12 and 12½ cents free on board in the town of Seaforth, 500 miles further west than Montreal. He tells me that if the McKinley Bill was not in operation, instead of 10 cents, the average price paid this year, he could pay from 12 to 15 cents. Three cents a dozen on 1,550,000 dozen would be $46,500 that egg buyers would be able to pay into the pockets of the Canadian farmers more than they are now paying for their eggs. And does any hon. gentleman tell me that in face of these substantial and experimental facts, reported by men who have been engaged in that business, that the English market is as profitable to us as the American market at the present time? And what is the reason? Why, we are told that the English market affords a very large demand, and we can find a sale for eggs in the English market at any time. But we cannot find a sale in the English market at as high a price as we can in New York at any time, and that is the essence of the argument. It is estimated by the egg exporters that it takes from five to six weeks from the time the eggs are laid until they are laid down in the English markets. When these eggs go into the English market they are looked upon as stale by consumers, and only second class prices are obtained. Eggs from France, Portugal, and Germany, are taken over to England in two or three days, and being considered as fresh, they realize the highest prices, while, I repeat, the Canadian eggs are only reckoned as second class. Eggs, however, can reach New York in a few days at most, and sell there as fresh eggs and bring the highest price. This is the condition of the egg business, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to dispute these facts, because I have taken the trouble to gather them from parties who are thoroughly posted. Then there is the question of horses. It is very well known that England is not the proper market for our horses. We import horses of a certain class from England, but she imports very few from this country. Several attempts have been made to ship horses profitably to England, but they have proved a failure. The truth is, that the class of horses we raise here is not the class used there, and unless we change our breed we cannot obtain a market for them. Instead of sending a large number to England, only 125 were shipped last year, while about 17,000 went to the United States, showing that, notwithstanding the high tariff against our horses, the adjoining Republic is our natural market. The previous tariff had proved prejudicial to the trade, but the McKinley tariff has nearly destroyed it. I am not a horse buyer or a horse dealer, and I do not come before this House to express my own opinion on this matter, but the opinions of practical men who understand their business and know which market is the best. I desire now to quote the opinions of some of our horse dealers. Mr. Isaac Rattenbury, of Clinton, says:

"There has been a drop in prices of $25 a head at least, and this during the last month or six weeks since the McKinley Bill menaced the trade."

Let me give the opinion of another large horse buyer in the County of Huron, A. M. Polley, who says:

"The McKinley Bill has knocked the horse trade higher than a Gilderoy kite. The new duty has put a dead stop to the trade. I have been doing, and I can do, nothing until the farmers can be brought to see that they must sell for $20 or so less than in previous years."

Let me now give the opinion of a very respectable Conservative, an experienced horse buyer, John McMann, who says:

"Each year there has probably gone out of this section 1,300 horses, which would average $150 to $160 each. Now those horses would not bring more than $125 to $130 each. Or instead of those 1,300 horses at the old price putting into the pockets of the farmers say, $195,000, at present prices they would only bring $162,500, or $32,500 less."

Can hon. gentlemen, in the face of that fact, stated by a man who understands the subject, declare that the National Policy has brought prosperity to the farmers and filled their pockets with sufficient money to enable them to maintain their families in comfort? Do not these facts prove that the National Policy has largely injured the farmers in respect to horses? Take next the article of wool. The hon. member for Albert, I think, said that he remembered the time when our farmers sheared sheep in New Brunswick, which was equivalent to saying that it was not worth while to shear sheep there now. Before the National Policy came into force it was worth while doing so, because the farmers got 34 cents to 40 cents for wool, whereas last year they only received from 20 to 22 cents. It will be remembered how eloquent were the Conservatives in 1877-78 in telling the farmers: You are fools to support the Liberal party, for you are only getting 34 cents per pound for your wool, whereas under a national policy, which we propose to introduce, all your wool will be manufactured at your own doors, adding one-third at least to present prices. The farmers, always anxious to get money into their own pockets, believed these assertions, and they are now sorry they did so. At the present time, instead of the farmers receiving increased prices under the National Policy, their wool realizes only one-half what it did at that time. Hon. gentlemen will judge from what I say that the National Policy is a two-edged sword. It cuts into the farmer by preventing him obtaining as much for his products as he otherwise would do, and it cuts into him also by preventing him buying goods in the cheapest market.

Mr. AMYOT. Then they go to the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Why should they stay in Canada? Another objection to the National Policy is that it has been one of the chief causes of the depression in values in this country. I suppose I am touching on another subject in regard to which it may be declared I am decrying the country. I have facts on this subject, gathered from my personal knowledge, not merely guesswork. I know that the sum for which certain farms were sold several years ago, and the prices they have realized during the last one or two years, and as I will give both prices, hon. members will obtain an idea of the depreciation in farm property in my neighbourhood. When I say my neighbourhood, I refer to it with pride. I believe the county I represent is one of the finest in Canada, I believe it is the garden of the Dominion; and when I find that the farmers even in the very best portion of this country are failing to make both ends meet, and have not five cents in their pockets as a surplus at the close of each year, there is something wrong in the policy of the Government. When the indus-

trious farmers of that section, with the push and energy they exercise every day, with the skill and talent they display in the management of their farms, fall behind each year, they pick up stakes and go to a foreign land. Has that been the case? Yes. I have known farmers in that section, as every hon. gentleman has known farmers in some other sections of the Dominion, to leave this country. It is no use keeping back the facts from the people. It is just as well to tell the country that the people are in a depressed condition, and putting aside politics and partisanship, we should come together and see if we can devise some method by which the farmers can be raised from the state of depression in which they now are, and placed upon a higher level of prosperity. Well, Sir, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) told us the other night that property was not depreciating, and he took up a book and he read there the testimony from Mr. Blue, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in Ontario, that in 1882—I think that was the year—the estimated value of lands in Ontario was $632,000,000, and in the year 1888 the estimated value was $640,000,000. That is true, but the report for 1889, as the hon. gentleman said, showed that the total value of land in Ontario in 1889 was only $12,000 more than it was eight years before. Do you think that the 300,000 people, working day in and day out for eight years, going to their work early in the morning and leaving it late at night, putting forth their energy and skill for the purpose of enlarging clearings, and improving their farms and reclaiming waste lands during these eight consecutive years, do you think that the efforts and energy of these 300,000 people did not increase the value of their lands more than $12,000 in eight long consecutive years? Then, Sir, go up into the Rainy River district; some of our people have gone there and made large clearings and extended the acreage brought under cultivation. Go into Muskoka and into Algoma, and you will find some of our people who have wandered out there, and made new clearings and cultivated the land in various ways since 1882. Can any reasonable man contend that all this energy, all this skill and all this application of industry and perseverance by 300,000 people, for eight long years, only increased the value of land in Ontario by $12,000. Sir, if the value of the land was $632,000,000 in 1882, and if you consider all the improvements which have been made, and the expenditure which has been laid out on these lands since then, you will find that they have depreciated nearly $100,000,000 from 1882 to 1889. If the land increased by that sum, then the farms of Ontario are actually worth $100,000,000 less, and of whatever proportion each farm has in that $632,000,000 of total value, each farmer loses that proportion as soon as the farm goes into the hands of another man. It may be said that if a farmer is left in possession of his farm, it is his homestead, and it is as good for cultivation as it was many years ago; but whether that can be the case or not, the fact remains that the value of the farm has decreased, and that if the farmer wants to realize upon it, he loses money. But, Sir, let me give some of my own knowledge as to the sales of farms which have taken place within a circuit of thirty miles of the neighborhood from which I come. I need not mention the names of the farmers, for it will suffice to indicate them alphabetically. Farm "A" sold fourteen years ago for $5,500, two years ago it re-sold for $4,200; Farm "B" sold three years ago for $4,500, re-sold two years ago for $3,500; Farm "C" sold four years ago for $4,000, was re-sold two years ago for $3,200; Farm "D" sold five years ago for $5,150, re-sold two years ago for $3,200; Farm "E," comprising 214 acres, sold six years ago for $15,000, was re-sold two years ago for $11,200; Farm "F" sold five years ago for $7,500, re-sold two years ago for $6,200; Farm "G" consisting of 150 acres, sold six years ago for $11,000, and was re-sold two years ago for $7,500; Farm "H" sold five years ago for $4,000, re-sold two years ago for $2,700. The total aggregate value of the farms I have mentioned sold during the former period was $49,650, and the total aggregate of their re-selling was $41,700, or as near as possible, $1,000 loss on each farm, or $10 on every acre. Now, Sir, that is the condition of things in the best section in the Dominion of Canada, and if such depreciation takes place in such a section as that, how much more the depreciation must be in the poorer sections of the country. In many places where farmers are unable to make a living they sell their farms for almost a bagatelle, and move off to the Western States and settle on the prairie lands of that country. That is largely, although not altogether, the effects of the National Policy. But, Sir, the National Policy has done worse than that. I am sorry to learn from the official records that the farmers of our country are mortgaging their lands and chattels to an alarming extent. I am not one who would make incorrect statements before this House or any other place. I know that every word I utter is taken down in *Hansard*, and the public and the farmers of this country can peruse these statements, and easily correct them if they were wrong. If I feel that the Government should relieve the condition of the farmers of this country in some way, then it is my bounden duty as a representative of the people to tell those in authority, that the farmers are suffering from over taxation, and if they can improve their condition in any way, it will be a great blessing to the farmers. We have a statement of the chattel mortgages in Ontario, prepared by the various county clerks, as ordered by the Legislature of Ontario. Let me tell you that a chattel mortgage is about the very last thing a farmer or anybody else will give. When you find the farmer going into a store and buying his goods for the year, and at the end of that year has to give a chattel mortgage upon his personal property, it shows that the farmer is in a very bad condition indeed. If he had any credit, if the farm stood behind him, the storekeeper would not require a chattel mortgage because his credit would stand upon the books, as the farm would be an equivalent for the debt. I was told recently by a practical business man, not far from where I live, that he went to the registry office in the town of Goderich for the purpose of ascertaining the condition of the farmers within a circuit of eight miles of the place at which he was doing business. He examined into the circumstances of thirty-seven farmers, and he said to me: How many out of the thirty-seven do you think have their farms mortgaged? I said: I cannot tell you; I suppose half of them, and he replied: Well, there are thirty-six out of the thirty-seven who have their farm mortgaged, and he told me further, that there was no mortgage standing against a farm for less

than $1,000. I said to him: The thirty-seventh man must be a happy man; but I discovered that he was only happy because he had not yet received his patent from the Crown and he, therefore, could not mortgage the farm. I was acquainted with these farmers to which my friend referred, and nothing surprised me so much as when he told me that such and such parties had mortgages upon their farms, for I was always of the opinion that they were in a prosperous condition and doing well. Let me give you a few figures here in regard to chattel mortgages, which I take from the official statement prepared by order of the Ontario Government. In the County of Brant, from which my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) comes, out of 437 chattel mortgages there are 238 on the farms. In the County of Essex, out of 540 chattel mortgages 345 are on the farms. In the County of Grey—represented by the gentleman who speaks so eloquently from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), let him listen and learn—out of 1,130 chattel mortgages 921 are on the farms. In the County of Hastings, out of 833 chattel mortgages 589 are on the farms. In the County of Middlesex, out of 723 chattel mortgages 316 are on the farms; Middlesex is doing pretty well in comparison. In the County of Victoria, out of 352 chattel mortgages 257 are on the farms. In the County of Wellington, out of 497 chattel mortgages, 317 are on the farms. We, therefore, find that over 60 per cent. of the chattel mortgages in each county rests against the chattels of the farmers, and we find that on the authority of an official document prepared by the order of the Legislature of Ontario.

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

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the MacLeod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No. 130) to incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was concluding my arraignment of the National Policy. I will conclude that arraignment by a corroboration from a man who is well known to every public man in this county; a man who has been in public life for many years, and whose ability is acknowledged by friend and foe; a man whose eloquence has often been heard inside of this House, and whose opinions have been quoted by both sides of the House upon every great question upon which he gave an opinion; a man who has received particular prominence at the hands of the Liberal-Conservative party, especially this session; a man whose abilities have been more highly appreciated by them this year than they have ever been before; and I am sure that when I mention the name of that gentleman, hon. gentlemen will acknowledge that whatever opinion he has expressed on this great question is entitled to much weight. I have pleasure in quoting the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake upon the effects of the National Policy, in corroboration of what I have said this afternoon. In his letter to his late constituents in West Durham, he set forth his views on this subject in very plain and positive language. Speaking of the National Policy in that letter, he says:

"Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians. It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-West empty still; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and expensive tariff; with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special conditions) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and, therefore, less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, even more and more estranging us from the mighty English-speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse. Worse, far worse. It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and death-like apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed; with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids, and possesses withal by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed. It has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised, and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success."

Now, his arraignment of the whole National Policy thoroughly endorses every position I have taken this afternoon. It only remains to me, as far as my arraignment is concerned, to recapitulate the points I have proven this afternoon. I have proven that the National Policy has not increased our foreign trade. I have shown that it has not increased prices of farm products. I have shown that it has increased the prices of many goods manufactured in this country and largely used by the poorer classes. I have proven that the National Policy has failed to prevent the exodus of our people by thousands into the United States. I have shown that it prevents our farmers from selling in the dearest and buying in the cheapest markets, and I have proven that under it the value of farm lands have greatly decreased. If that is not a sufficient arraignment, supported by the best authorities, what more can be required to condemn any system or policy of such a character? But, passing from the consideration of the National Policy, we are frequently asked, what policy has the Liberal party to present to the country? Well, Sir, we have that policy which is known as an enlargement of the trade relations between this country and the United States. That is our policy: we do not define it down to the very articles that will be permitted to come into this country and to go into the other, but we, as a Liberal party, have always proclaimed, on the public platform and in the Legislatures of this country, that we are in

favour of free trade in natural products: but if the United States refuse to grant us that, we are willing to go further. We are willing to allow a large proportion of manufactured articles in the United States to come into this country free, provided we are given the same privilege of sending the manufactured articles of this country into their markets free. We do not say that we can formulate to the very letter the terms of a treaty that might be formed, after consideration of the whole question, but we are liberal on this side of the House, and if we were in power, I am satisfied that, within two years, we could place upon our Statute-books a treaty which would give us great advantages in the United States' markets, and give the Americans great advantages in ours. But we are told that we could not get that. We do not know, we are not positive of anything in the future. It was said in 1849 that we could not get a treaty along the lines of the Treaty of 1854. It took us seven long years of continuous negotiations every year to secure that treaty. We were refused, year after year, and ultimately, after a thorough consideration of the relations between the two countries, we succeeded, in 1854, in getting a treaty beneficial to Canada. But hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think they can get a treaty in one month. They dissolved Parliament last winter at a very unseasonable period. For what purpose? For the purpose of having a Parliament fresh from the people to consider the treaty they were to formulate with the United States; and yet, in the face of that appeal to the country, not a single step has been taken in order to secure such a treaty. My opinion is, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not in favour of a treaty at all with the United States which will materially widen our commercial intercourse. I make bold here to state definitely, from my place on the floor of Parliament, that it is my candid opinion they have no more intention of seeking a treaty with the United States than they had of getting a treaty with the Sandwich Islanders. Why, their whole history for the last two or three years proves that to a demonstration. We were told repeatedly, upon the public platforms and in this House, that they have been in favour of reciprocity for the last twenty years, and that they have placed upon the statutes of this country an offer of reciprocity to the United States. And what is that offer? They place a list of scheduled articles on the statutes, and say to the United States: If you will allow those articles to go into your country free, we will allow similar articles to come into Canada free; or if you will allow them to go into your markets at a less rate of duty than the ordinary duties charged, we will lower the duty on similar articles brought into this country. If these hon. gentlemen believe what they have been stating for the last few years, namely, that a treaty in natural products would destroy the farmers of this country, what are they offering the United States to-day? They are telling the United States that if they accept that offer placed upon our statutes, it will ruin our farmers, but, they say, we place the ruination in your hands, and if you wish to ruin the farmers of this country, all you have to do is to accept our offer. Does the Conservative party to-day say they are in favour of a treaty in natural products? Not one of them does. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to say that he is in favour of a treaty in natural products with the United States. And if they are not in favour of a treaty, and if they are not in favour of interfering directly or indirectly with the National Policy—if, on the one hand, they exclude raw materials or the natural products of the country, and, on the other hand, they exclude the manufactured articles of the country, I would like to know what articles the treaty is going to include. But we were told that Sir Charles Tupper, in 1888, made an unrestricted offer, to the United States, of reciprocity. Now, Sir Charles Tupper never made a *bonâ fide* offer to the American Government with regard to a treaty at all. I make that assertion here, as I have made it before, that Sir Charles Tupper never made a *bonâ fide* offer to the commissioners appointed by the Washington Government in 1888? And why did he not? He had no power, he had no authority delegated to him to make any such offer to the American Government. Sir, previous to the appointment of the commissioners for the settlement of the fishery question in 1887, Secretary Bayard wrote to Sir Charles Tupper in the month of May. His letter congratulated Sir Charles Tupper upon his patriotism—of course he knew that was one of his weaknesses. He hoped he would be appointed as one of the commissioners who were to meet in Washington the following fall, for which appointment Sir Charles Tupper afterwards asked, according to his own letter, and he was appointed one of the commissioners for Canada to settle the difficulties existing between the two countries. Now, according to the tenor of that letter, a private letter sent by Mr. Bayard, who knew the policy and views of the American Government upon the trade question, who knew what they were willing to do at that very time, Secretary Bayard suggested to him that the whole trade relations of the country should be discussed when those commissioners were appointed, and these are the words of his letter. After preliminary congratulations upon his ability and patriotism, &c., he says:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been a *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded.

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

"I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

There was an offer just as if he had said to Sir Charles Tupper: You are about to be appointed commissioner; seek to impress upon your own Government, and through them upon the British Government, that they should give powers to the commissioners to negotiate on these lines. But the British Government did not give these powers at all. I believe that Sir Charles Tupper was in favour of more extended trade relations with the United States, but the Government at Ottawa were not in favour of that policy, and no such instructions were given. How do I know that? Here are the instructions issued to the commissioners:

"Whereas for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit with plenipotentiaries to be appointed on the part of our good friends the United States of America, all or any questions relating to rights of the fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland, which are in dispute between our Government and that of our said good friends, and any other

question that may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorized by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

"May be authorized." That instruction was issued on the 24th October, 1887. The United States remained for eighteen days after these instructions were issued to the British plenipotentiaries, and then they issued instructions couched in almost the same language, and bestowing the same authority as that which had been bestowed by Great Britain on her plenipotentiaries. Therefore, the whole trade question was outside of the authority which the commissioners obtained from their respective Governments. Let me read the instructions which were given to the Washington plenipotentiaries:

"To meet and confer with plenipotentiaries representing the Government of Her Britannic Majesty for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit all or any questions relating to rights of fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland which are in dispute between the Gevernments of the United States and that of Her Britannic Majesty, and any other question which may arise and which they may be authorized by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

You will observe that the language is nearly verbatim. Sir Charles Tupper said that he made an offer to the plenipotentiaries to settle the question on a wider basis of the trade relations between the two countries. He had no power to make such an offer, and the offer nor the answer to the offer was put in the protocols. It was said that it might be found in these protocols, but, when the protocols came down to this House, I found that the offer was printed on a fly-sheet and was not signed by anyone, but was issued, as it was marked, "By the authority of the Privy Council." Can it be said that Sir Charles Tupper made a *bonâ fide* offer? How could he do that when on the floor of this House every man who rose condemned, at the very time Sir Charles was in Washington, reciprocity, stating that it would destroy the interests of the Canadian farmers? It is true that, when Sir Charles Tupper came back he knocked the bottom out of many of their speeches. It was rumoured that there was a fracas in one of their caucus meetings and that Sir Charles Tupper said that, if the policy he advocated was not in accord with the views of the Conservative party, he would step down and out, and he did step down and out and went back to his office in England. At that time the party in power in the United States was in favour of free trade. They were Democrats, and the President and the Secretary of State were in favour of extending their commercial relations, and many of the Republicans of that day were strongly in favour of widening the trade between Canada and the United States. But it was not expected that in 1890 a little star would appear from which the Ministers here thought they could see a little light. They found that the colony of Newfoundland was trying to obtain extended trade relations with the United States, and they decided that this great Canada could not allow that little Island to settle its own affairs without their interference, so they wrote to Lord Knutsford stating that they desired that no further step should be taken by Newfoundland in regard to that treaty, until Canada was placed in the same position. Then Lord Knutsford was instructed to inform Sir Julian Pauncefote, and by this side wind our Government tried to get an introduction of some scheme of reciprocity. Then they went to the country and told the people that the whole of the negotiations were initiated by the United States Government, and Mr. Blaine gives the lie to that in a communication which came from him and was placed on the Table of the House. Let me read what he said. This is in a letter which he addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote. After referring to several other matters, he says:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with these proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference, as explained in my minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later, during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State. I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has for some weeks been open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not 'initiated' by me, but, on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke was a modification of your proposal, and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States."

That proves that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper falsified the facts on the public platforms of this country, and Secretary Blaine stated in an open letter to his friend Mr. Baker that he was not the first initiator of the interview that was proposed to be held after the 4th March, showing that the whole scheme from beginning to end was an electioneering dodge. I am informed on good authority that before the elections came off, one gentleman was sent west to interview the leaders of the party there and ascertain whether it would be wise to bring on the elections a year before the expiration of the constitutional limit of Parliament; and that another was sent east to ascertain the opinion of the leaders of the party in that direction; and I understand that these two gentlemen brought back the statement that unless the Government went to the country at once, the popularity of the free trade policy would be such that they would be swept from office. Then they said to themselves: If we go to the country we must have some plea along the lines of reciprocity: we will make out that we are just about going to Washington to negotiate a treaty along the lines of 1854. And what were the lines of 1854? That treaty included the natural products of the farm. Now, Sir, I can prove from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite that nearly every single one of them are opposed to the establishment of a treaty along the lines of 1854. Let me call attention to this fact, that even during this debate, many of those who have spoken upon the question have stated that the United States are not our natural markets. Why, then, seek to get our natural products into a market that is not our natural market? The Finance Minister stated in this House the other day that the United States were not our natural market. The Minister of Agriculture has stated on different platforms, in various parts of the country, that they are not our natural market. Here we have statements from prominent men in the Government who have told us that the United States are not our natural market, that their market is glutted, that they have far more than they can use of every particular article that our farmers send there, consequently there is no use seeking a market in that direction. Members and followers of the Government have stated time and again that they were opposed to reci-

procity in natural products. I see an hon. gentleman opposite me, the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I am sure, would never support a treaty along the lines of 1854. The hon. gentleman made an eloquent speech here last year and the year before, in which he stated that it would destroy the interests of the Canadian farmers if we had a treaty in natural products. And in order to enlighten him, as he has forgotten it, and in order to enlighten his party, and to show the inconsistency that prevails among them, I will read a few extracts which will edify him and instruct my hon. friends on this side, as to the position that the would-be Minister of Agriculture takes upon this question. On page 3045 of the *Hansard* of 1890, he says:

"I would like to ask the farmers of Canada whether they would be willing to allow the bogus cheese and butter that is made by millions of pounds over in that country, to be sent into our own country to the destruction of one of our most important industries."

Well, Sir, reciprocity along the line of 1854 would destroy that industry, according to your doctrine, and, therefore, you are opposed to the proposition of the Government. Then he goes on:

"There is no farmer in Canada to-day that could prosecute that industry profitably as he now does, if we had unrestricted reciprocity."

Now, unrestricted reciprocity would not affect that more than restricted reciprocity, because reciprocity, according to the principle of 1854, would include this very article as well as the other, so that he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products. Then, speaking of pork, the hon. gentleman says further on:

"If the price advances only half a cent a pound, and it will be that at the very lowest computation, it means on 15,000,000 pounds of pork, $76,030 for the farmers. Taking other lines of products, and beef, on which there would be a duty of three cents a pound, it is easily understood what an important advantage is given to our farmers."

Again he says:

"In my part of the county there is a great deal of attention given to raising plums; we ship about 10,000 bushels a year, and if it was not for this duty of 30 cents a bushel, our orchard owners would be brought in direct competition with the American fruit raisers."

Now, see what he says. He takes up butter and cheese and says it would destroy the interests of the farmer in that trade to have reciprocity. He takes up pork and says it would destroy the pork trade of our farmers if we had reciprocity. He takes up the fruit trade and says that reciprocity would destroy the interests of our farmers in the fruit trade. It shows to my mind that the hon. gentleman is supporting a Government whose policy he does not understand. But let me quote from another authority on the matter. Last year, you will remember, there was an able and popular gentleman belonging to the Government. He represented an eastern constituency, he was a very eloquent man, a man very popular among his colleagues, and he was put up last year to propound the policy of the Government upon the trade question. During that eloquent speech he was asked a question by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and in reply to that question he made use of these words:

"I am sure the farmers of this country will endorse me when I say that free trade between Canada and the United States in all agricultural products, would be the worst possible thing that could happen to the farmers of our country."

That was the policy of the Government last year. They went before the country this year saying that they wanted that very policy to be established between the two countries that he condemned last year. But I will come still nearer to the Government than that. We were told from platform after platform that unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our cattle trade; we were told it would destroy our flour trade, that it would reduce the price of pease and oats to a corn standard by the introduction of free corn. We were told it would introduce cheap American flour and destroy the Canadian market for flour, and we were told that by supporters of the Government high up in the esteem of the party. But the paper that supports them, the organ of the Conservative party in the city of Teronto, that great organ which is the mouth-piece of Conservative public opinion, the organ that has been supported by the Conservative party, yea, built up from its very foundation by the Conservative party, and every word it says is supposed to be the echo of the leaders of the party—what has it said in regard to reciprocity in cattle? It said that such a policy would destroy the cattle trade, and it published that announcement in its columns with large display letters in order to attract the attention of the farmers to that particular point. We saw an advertisement that was put into that paper and kept there for weeks during the election campaign, headed with large display letters. Here is what the *Empire* says:

"Facts!—Farmers!—It would kill the cattle trade!!—This is no exaggeration, but a sober solid fact.—This is exactly what unrestricted reciprocity would do.

"Why? Because Canadian cattle are now allowed the special privilege of entering Great Britain alive and of being taken into the interior of the country for sale.

"The United States cattle are scheduled, that is, must be killed immediately on arrival, because there is cattle disease in that country and none in this.

"This privilege is worth to you, Canadian farmers, at least $10 per head of cattle!!

"We could not keep out United States disease from this country under unrestricted reciprocity, because we would be virtually one country.

"Great Britain for protection of her own farmers, and through no ill-will to us, would be forced to 'schedule your cattle:

"And you would lose over $650,000 per year on your cattle alone!"

Sir, now, in face of all these facts, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite how can they be consistent in telling the people of this country that they are going to Washington on the 12th of October, to negotiate a treaty along the lines of a policy which they assert will destroy the interest of the farming community of this country? Sir, we are not of that opinion on this side. We believe that a reciprocity in natural products would be a great advantage to our farmers, that it would give them an open and a freer market, it would give them two strings to their bow, the English market for what it would take, and the American market for what it would take, and in this way it would largely increase the prosperity of the Canadian farmer. That is one advantage coming from reciprocity in natural products only. But we go further, and we say that if the manufactured articles of the United States were permitted to come in free and our own to go in there free, then we would be able both to sell in the dearest market for our products and buy in the cheapest. But, Sir, is it possible that the Government of the present day are seeking to gull the people of this country? Is it posible they are telling the people in one part of the country that the policy is reciprocity, and they are telling the people in another

part of the country that their policy is the old National Policy? Sir, that is the case. The present Minister of Justice, when he delivered his first speech in the late campaign, said they were going to enter into reciprocity with the United States, along the lines of the treaty of 1854. Sir John A. Macdonald, in his letter to the electorate of Canada a few days afterwards, never mentioned, from one end of it to the other, anything about reciprocity with the United States. But he did say something in regard to the National Policy. He said: We go to the country on the same policy as in 1879, in 1882, in 1887, and in 1891 with the same policy also. Here was the leader of the Government telling one story and his first lieutenant another story, and the people of the country waiting for the great meeting to come off for the purpose of getting at the Government's policy. In my own town a little occurrence took place, which I will mention. Just after the Minister of Justice delivered that speech in which he declared that the Tories were in favour of reciprocity in natural products, a Tory in the town said that his party had always been in favour of reciprocity in natural products; but, when Sir John Macdonald's letter came out, he and several Tories went back on their opinion and said they would stand by the National Policy. It is our duty to ask the Government for a declaration of their policy, because they are in a responsible position and we are not. The people have a right to know from their mouths what kind of policy they intend to pursue, so that the people can judge them. We are often asked what our policy is. It is as clear and distinct as the light of day. We want reciprocity of the widest character with the United States. We do not want to hand over any of our legislative power to the United States. What is reciprocity, as I understand it—and I have discussed reciprocity on the public platform before it became a political or party question? Unrestricted reciprocity, to my mind, means this: Our political position will remain as at present, and we will impose any duties we please on articles coming from foreign countries, and the United States will do the same; but goods from the United States will come in free, and the same liberty will be given to Canada to send her goods free to the American markets. So we would have complete control of our tariff; we would place any duties we pleased on goods from foreign countries, and the United States would follow the same course with regard to themselves. In reviewing the whole question we must come to the conclusion that the policy of the Government is still the National Policy, and that they are determined to stick by the manufacturers and the combines of this country who have extracted millions from the pockets of the people and placed them in their own pockets to enrich themselves. Mr. Redpath, the great sugar refiner, after he had made millions out of the Canadian people, did not feel disposed to remain and spend the money here, but he went to England, purchased a great castle and is living there in luxury on the money he has taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada. So it is in regard to many other manufacturers of the country. The Government stick to the manufacturers because they have plenty of money and are capable of contributing large sums to the boodle fund as has been proved this session by the investigations going on. I predict that the day is not far distant when all this corruption will be unearthed, and that the characters of those who have been guilty of corruption and dishonesty will be exposed before the righteous indignation of the people, and then more honest and better men will be placed in positions to govern this great country. The Liberal party has been accused of being narrow-minded. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in his speech the other night, referred to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is one of the broadest and most liberal-minded statesman of this country, and who possesses a greater grasp and deeper insight into its affairs probably than any other man in it, pointed to him with a finger of scorn and said, referring to our party, and to the hon. gentleman as one of our leaders, that the political sky is too near his head and the political horizon too near his fingers. What a charge to bring against the Liberal party! The hon. gentleman has studied the constitutional history of Canada. Has he not found therein the great works the Liberal party have done? Who fought in 1837-38-39 for the great principles of responsible government against the strong arm of the Family Compact? Who was the party, with that spirit of broad liberalism which stepped into the breach, who fought and won the great battle of responsible government and made it one of the corner stones of the constitution of the country? It was the Liberal party, still further down in our history, that declared that the various municipalities should have local government to manage their affairs, so that they might expend their own money for local purposes and assess themselves to meet their obligation for local improvements? The Tory party, ever lagging behind, declared that the Liberals were opposed to British principles, that they were seeking to follow the customs and habits of the United States, and the Conservatives went so far as to call the municipal institutions sucking republics, and they called the Liberal party disloyal and unpatriotic. What was the result? These institutions were established, and to-day there is not a single Tory in this country who would look back and say that the Liberals of that day were wrong. Still further down in the history of this country which was the party that first agitated and largely carried out our system of free education? It was the Liberal party, and under our system the sons and the daughters of the poor man are educated side by side with those of the rich, and are educated to take part in working out the destiny of this country. Again, it was the Liberal party that suggested the confederation of the provinces, and was largely instrumental in its successful consummation. We have often heard it from public platforms, as well as from the members of this House, that the late leader of the great Liberal-Conservative party was the father of Confederation. The Tories of that day fought against the principles of Confederation, and when a dead lock took place between the people of Upper Canada and of Lower Canada, who was the man who saw and suggested the remedy? It was the late George Brown, the great leader of the Liberal party. He came to the front; he asked Parliament to appoint a committee of twenty to take into consideration the propriety of uniting the separate provinces into one great country. That committee considered all the details of this question. The committee was directed upon the question.

Two reports were submitted to Parliament in favour of Confederation. The report of the majority was signed by seventeen, the report of the minority opposed to Confederation was signed by three, and the first name on the minority report was that of the Hon. Sir John Macdonald, late leader of the Conservative party. The second name was that of John Sanfield Macdonald, and the third name was that of Mr. Scoble, who then represented Elgin. The next day after these reports were presented, the Government was defeated on a resolution moved by the Hon. Wm. Macdougall for paying in the interim of the session, $100,000 to the city of Montreal without the assent of Parliament. Then came forth the magnanimity of the Reform party in this country. They might have taken office then, but George Brown with that magnanimity of soul which ever characterised him—and he was a fitting representative of those who followed him—went to the Conservative party and offered them his support if they would take up Confederation and carry it out. After that, both parties united together and made Confederation a success. Tell me after these great measures and these great accomplishments by the Liberal party that our political sky is near our heads, and that our horizon is near the point of our fingers. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have detained the House so long. I thank hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for the kind attention they have given me: and I thank you especially, Mr. Speaker, for the cordial courtesy you have extended to me during my remarks.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, we have listened for a good many hours to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. We have heard from him the same old story, which we have heard for a number of years past repeated on every platform in this country. We have heard his denunciations of the National Policy; a policy which has been approved by the people of this country on four different occasions, and a policy which I believe the people would again endorse to-day if the question were submitted to them. We have heard from the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that the National Policy was a fraud, and that protection was a delusion and a snare, and had worked great injury to the people of this country. But, Sir, after all his denunciation of the National Policy generally he made one little exception in its favour. That, Sir, is characteristic of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. He went over a very great variety of arguments to try to show that protection was injurious to the people of this country, but when he came to the question of salt, he made a pause, and I believe he reversed in this particular the decision he had given on all other matters. Salt, according to the member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), was the one article in this country that required protection, and the only denunciation that he could find for the Government in reference to this matter was, because salt did not receive sufficient protection. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are in the same position as the member for Huron, in regard to special commodities of their own. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), for instance, was last year loud in his contention that pork and bacon should have a high duty placed upon them, although, according to him, all other duties were wrong. We have also the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in a similar position. He is not satisfied with the immense duties which are now placed upon candles and upon biscuits. He is engaged in that business himself and he is so badly satisfied with the 25 and 35 per cent. duty on these articles, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) himself goes into a combination to increase the price enormously, in addition to the protection received by this 25 and 35 per cent. duty. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) also denounces the National Policy. He denounces all kinds of protection, but when he comes to the question of oil, he says: Oh, 100 per cent. is too little protection for oil. Then, Sir, we come to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He is against protection through and through, but he is interested in the wrecking-tug business, and he made a most vigorous speech not very long ago in this House, advocating that protection should be given to the Canadian wrecking tugs. And so, Sir, it goes through all the lists, until we come to-night to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) who after declaiming against all kinds and forms of protection, says, that the article of salt upon which we had a duty of 15 cents per 100 lbs., or 42 cents per barrel, is not sufficiently protected. Why, I remember that for many years, salt was delivered on the cars at the railway stations in the county which the hon. gentleman represents, for 55 cents a barrel, and it was undoubtedly sold at a profit then, or else they could not continue to sell salt for so many years at that price. Now, if there is one combination in this country that is utterly indefensible, a combination that is doing more injury to the people and making them more dissatisfied than anything else, it is this combination on salt, which the member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) upholds and protects here this afternoon. Why, Sir, what is the history of that question? Two years ago, salt was sold for 55 cents a barrel delivered on the cars, but a combination was formed—an illegal combination as I contend—and salt was raised first to $1 and then to $1.10 per barrel delivered on the cars. The hon. gentleman told us that there were about 800,000 barrels of salt produced in his district, and if salt could formerly be sold at 55 cents per barrel, then there was an illegal, exorbitant and unnecessary profit to the men engaged in this business, of at least $440,000 over the old price. Notwithstanding this the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) thinks that all protective duties are indefensible, and he gets up in his place to-night and upbraids the Government because they have made salt from Great Britain free of duty. He says that we have no protection for our salt in the eastern part of this Dominion. Well, Sir, we have a law which operates equally in every part of the Dominion, to the effect that salt from Great Britain comes in duty free, and the people of every part of the Dominion do, as they have a right to do, take the advantage of having the British salt free of duty. I presume that the objection the hon. gentleman makes is that the American salt is not brought in free of duty, instead of the British salt. We learned from his speech to-night that the hon. gentleman is wholly American in his views, and that his sympathies are not with Great Britain,

but entirely with the United States. I will refer very briefly to one or two matters on which the hon. gentleman dwelt in his speech to the House to-day. He started out with the assertion, which has been frequently made in this House, and frequently made throughout the country, that the duty increases the price of the article by exactly the amount of that duty. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if that is the case, how did it happen that in the United States for many years, while there was a duty of $28 per ton on steel rails, they were sold there for from $28 to $30 per ton. If what the hon. gentleman says is correct, the manufacturers of steel rails in the United States produced and sold them for nothing. I think that that one case is sufficient to dispose of the argument of the hon. gentleman that the duty imposed by the Government increases the price by exactly the amount of the duty. The hon. gentleman went on to say that he buys Canadian tweeds on which there is a duty of 45 per cent. I think one does not need any particular intellect to know that Canadian tweeds do not pay any duty at all. They are made here. The hon. gentleman also referred to Canadian blankets, on which he said there was a duty of from 80 to 120 per cent. Why, Sir, you can buy a Canadian white blanket to-day at 40 cents per pound; it takes one and one-fifth pounds to make a blanket, which would cost about 26½ cents; the cost of manufacturing added would bring it to about 36 cents; add the manufacturer's profit and the wholesale dealer's profit, and yet the blanket is sold for 40 cents. Now, I ask any man in this House where does the duty of from 80 to 100 per cent. on that article come in? I contend, Sir, that there is not a farthing of duty upon it. The competition among the woollen manufacturers of this country is so keen to-day that there is not a farthing added to the price on account of the duty. But, Sir, there is this advantage in the duty, that it gives the Canadian manufacturers the whole of the home market. There is no combination among these men; and the competition has kept down the price to the lowest point at which these articles can be sold, I do not care where they are made. The hon. gentleman says that plain shirting pays a duty of 65 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you of my own knowledge that better shirting is sold in Canada to-day at 12½ cents a yard than was sold for 22 cents a yard several years ago, during the time of the 17½ per cent. duty on these goods. At the same time, these articles are made in this country and give employment to our own people. Another important consideration is that the price of the raw material is not materially advanced in consequence of the duty; and what is known to every woman in this country who handles these articles is that the Canadian manufactured article is much superior in quality to the imported goods which we used to have before the National Policy was inaugurated. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to some other articles. He said that solid steel spades are sold at Gananoque at $10.60 a dozen, while those of the Pittsburg make are sold there at $7.80. Now, we all know that there are a dozen different qualities of spades made, so that to compare these prices without knowing anything about the respective qualities of the two articles is absurd. But under the impetus given to the manufacture of these articles by the National Policy, we find that all articles of that kind are sold in Canada from 25 to 35 per cent. cheaper than they were before the introduction of the National Policy, besides which they are of a superior quality to what our people used before. The hon. gentleman refers to coal oil, and says that No. 1 white is sold in Canada at 13½ cents a gallon, while United States oil is sold at 7½ cents per gallon. There are two or three points that deserve consideration in this connection. The wine gallon by which American coal oil is sold, being one-fifth less than the Imperial gallon, 7½ cents per wine gallon would be equal to about 9 cents per Imperial gallon. Then in the United States the barrel is paid for extra, while in Canada coal oil is universally sold at so much a gallon, and the barrel is thrown in.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member who says "no" does not know anything about it. No man can show an invoice for Canadian oil in which the barrel is charged extra. I have dealt in it for 24 years, and I have never heard of such a case. The barrel costs about 3 cents a gallon, and if you add that to the 9 cents, that brings the cost of American oil up to 12 cents a gallon; then add the freight, which will be a cent or two, and you will find that the price of American oil is really higher than the price of Canadian oil, which costs from 12½ to 13½ cents per gallon. Then, Canadian oil had to pass two tests which American oil is not subjected to. To salt I have already made some reference. It is most preposterous to think that an article of consumption in every house in the country, particularly on every farm should be increased in price from 55 cents to $1.10 per barrel. It is an indefensible impost on the farmers of Canada, resulting from an illegal combination; and yet we find the hon. member for East Huron justifying that combination and the exorbitant prices which it has exacted. But the Government have come to the rescue of the people, and have reduced the duty one-half; so that instead of being 15 cents per 100 lbs., it is now 7½ cents per 100 lbs. And what is the result? On the 2nd of July a circular was sent out by this illegal combination saying that the price of $1.10 a barrel has been reduced to 85 cents a barrel. I think the Government would have been justified in going still further and abolishing the duty altogether; in that way to teach these men that they cannot defy the laws of Canada with impunity. The hon. gentleman refers also to the question of sugar, saying that the duty was imposed on account of the National Policy. Now, everyone knows that the duty on raw sugar was imposed for revenue purposes, and brought in several million dollars a year to the treasury. But the Government felt this session that their surplus was large enough to enable them to abolish the duty on raw sugar, which was no protection to the manufacturers whatever, because while the duty on raw sugar is abolished the protection to the Canadian manufacturer remains. What is that protection? The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) represented most unfairly that the cost of the raw sugar, with the duty added, amounted to $4.40 per 100 lbs., and then he made the assertion that the average selling price in Canada during the year ending 30th June, 1890, was $6.64 per 100 lbs., and he asked: Who gets the balance of $2.24? He did not say that the refiners pocketed that money, but he left that in-

ference and made that insinuation. Does not that hon. gentleman know that the difference is not $2.24 at all? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) gave the figures here, and he is in a position to know them, being interested in the sugar businesses himself and having an accurate knowledge of it; and he showed that sugar, instead of costing the refiner $4.40, cost him $5.14 per 100 lbs. He insinuated that $2.24 per 100 lbs. go not into the Dominion treasury, but into the pockets of the refiners. What are the facts? Does the hon. gentleman not know that the prices quoted are the prices at the place where the sugar is grown? Does he not know that a hundred ships are employed carrying a thousand tons each, or carrying one hundred thousand tons of sugar into Canada? Does he not know still further that there are 800 men employed in the manufacturing of this sugar, and there are 800,000 barrels required to hold it, costing 32 cents per barrel, making a value of $256,000. Does he not know that 50,000 tons of coal are used in the refining of that sugar, making an additional value of $200,000 to this country, representing the wages of the men employed in the mines less the profits of those who employ them? These enormous sums are to be deducted out of the imaginary $2.24 which the hon. gentleman mentioned. More than that, does the hon. gentleman not know that the prices he quoted are the prices at which sugar is sold by the wholesale dealers, and we have sworn evidence to prove that the profits of the wholesale dealers are from 40 to 50 cents per 100 lbs. I believe the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) is one of the men who pocketed these profits, and when, in making that quotation, he did not state that 40 or 50 cents out of the $2.24 went partly into his own pockets and partly into the pockets of those who were with him in the combine, I do not think he was treating this House fairly. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says he is opposed to the National Policy because it promised a market to the farmer and presumably did not give the farmer that promised market, and he returned to the question of wheat. He said that wheat was dearer between the years 1873-74 than it has been since. Well, if it was dearer then, that was due to the fact that the markets of the whole world were higher; but I say we have in this question of wheat this advantage: Last year there were about 207,000 barrels of flour exported from this country to Great Britain, and there were imported from the United States almost exactly the same quantity, or 205,000 barrels. The imports of and exports of wheat flour being about the same, it follows that the whole production of the wheat of Canada was consumed in Canada. How much is that? It is estimated that it requires 27,000,000 bushels of wheat to feed the people of Canada, and we have this gratifying fact, that out of that 27,000,000 bushels at least 26,000,000 were supplied by the Canadian farmers, so that we have almost the full control of the Canadian market. It is the more gratifying to find that although last year there were about 167,000 barrels of flour imported into the country, that from the nine months up to the first of April of the financial year the return show 45,000 barrels imported into this country. That would be for the whole year 60,000 barrels, while for the previous year there were 200,000 barrels imported, including wheat, showing that this 15 cents of duty on wheat has given almost entire control of the Canadian market to the Canadian farmer and miller. But these gentlemen will tell you that has raised the price of flour to the consumer, and I will quote what the hon. leader of the Opposition has to say on that point. These gentlemen are always very solicitous about the interests of the farmers. They claim that the manufacturers are robbers, and that the farmers are their own special care. Here is what the leader of the Opposition said last July at Ste. Anne, in the County of Montmorency, Quebec:

"This tax, however, was not imposed of public necessity, as it is alleged that there is a surplus of $7,000,000, but rather in the interest of the Ontario and Manitoba farmers, who raise wheat in great quantities. In other words, it takes the money out of the pockets of those who buy the flour, and puts it into the pockets of those who produce it. These are the tactics of our Tory Government."

Now, these gentlemen, when speaking to the farmers of Ontario, ridicule the idea that the protection on wheat is of any benefit to the Canadian farmer. But when they come to the Province of Quebec where the farmers are not straight wheat-growers, but are consumers of flour, we have the leader of the Opposition saying that this tax is put on for the benefit of the Ontario and Manitoba farmers. In reply to the assertion that the duty increases the price to the consumer in the Province of Quebec and the lower provinces, I would say that there are 1,200 to 1,400 flour mills in Ontario alone, that these millers have no combination of any kind whatever, for it would not be possible for them to have a combine. They are competing with each other in buying wheat as cheaply and selling flour as dearly as they can. There is no combination among them but the strongest competition, and, therefore, the consumer in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces gets the article at the lowest price. Then they ask, what benefit is the duty to the Manitoba and Ontario farmers? It gives to the Canadian farmer the control of the Canadian market, almost exclusively. The returns show this year that there will be about 60,000 barrels of flour, or less than 300,000 bushels of wheat, imported into this country, while the consumption being 27,000,000 bushels, we control almost the entire supply of the products of wheat to the people. What we have always contended for, and what we can demonstrate from history, is that the home market is the best, not only in the case of flour and wheat, but for every other product of the farm; and by keeping this home market for the benefit of Canadian farmers, we are helping to enrich an important industry of the country. I will read what evidence was given by Mr. W. G. Blaney, a miller in the city of Boston, before the Committee:

"The general tenor of the evidence may be gathered from W. G. Blaney's testimony. He said: 'Until the Canadian Government placed a duty upon flour and grain we had a very large and profitable trade with the provinces. At that time there were a number of merchants in Boston engaged in business with the provinces. At the present time there are but one or two. We shipped largely flour, provisions and other merchandise, and in return received their products. There are one or two firms who do a large business now with the provinces, but it is in Canadian flour. They handle somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200,000 barrels of Canadian flour, which is brought here in bond and afterwards forwarded to the provinces. Altogether there are some 500,000 barrels of flour shipped through Boston to the Maritime Provinces, from Canada. Should we have free trade with Canada, the larger part of that flour would be American flour."

Now, the National Policy, as we have it here to-day, prevents that from being American flour, and keeps the supply of this article in the hands of the Canadian farmer, and therefore benefits the Canadian people. As with flour, so with all the other products of the farm; but the hon. member for South Oxford, like all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, is continually inveighing against the manufacturer. The most polite term he can apply to them is that of legalized robbers. In a speech delivered at Chatham not long ago he said:

"We pay $31,000,000 or $32,000,000 of taxes every year into the treasury and we are really taxed $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year, counting what we pay to the legalized robbers whose hands are never out of your pockets at your downsitting or your uprising:—whether you eat or drink, or work or play, or sleep or fall sick, even."

In the same speech he went on further to say:

"King Solomon would have said: Let me have famine, let me have pestilence, let me have red war—nay, if I must, let me have all three together, but spare me! oh spare me a high protective tariff! (Loud cheers and laughter)."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency which had a population of 18,800 according to the last census. We are confident that the census for 1891 will show that, with the same geographical boundaries, that constituency will have a population of over 40,000 people, or an increase of 22,000. The hon. member for South Oxford says the agricultural population is decreasing. If that is so, these must be manufacturers or those who depend on manufacturers. The hon. gentleman says that manufacturers are legalized robbers. How, in that case, could I go back to my constituents, if I supported the hon. gentleman, and tell them that 22,000 of them were legalized robbers? But it is not only the manufacturers who have protection given to them. Our tariff shows that the farmers are also protected. They are protected by a duty on wheat of 15 cents, flour 75 cents a barrel, oats 10 cents, corn 7½ cents, pork 1½ to 3 cents, beef 3 cents, cheese 3 cents, butter 4 cents, lard 2 cents, cattle and sheep 30 per cent., live hogs 20 per cent., and all other animals 20 per cent.; tomatoes 30 cents a bushel and 10 per cent., apples 40 cents a barrel, vegetables in general 25 per cent. Every product of the farm receives a pretty fair protection, and if the manufacturers are legalized robbers it follows that the farmers are legalized robbers also, so that instead of having 22,000 legalized robbers in my riding we must have over 40,000. We are all legalized robbers, according to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I state that the best market in this country was the home market, and I say that for many reasons. There are many products of the farm which cannot be exported, but which are consumed by the home market, where better prices are obtained. We find that the products of the farm amount to about $400,000,000. Suppose the farmers consume half of that themselves, what becomes of the other $200,000,000? We export to Great Britain $22,000,000 worth, to the United States $13,000,000, and to other countries $5,000,000, making altogether $40,000,000 out of the surplus of the products of the farm which are exported to foreign countries. What becomes of the $160,000,000 worth, which is the balance of the $200,000,000? Through the National Policy we have built up manufactures, and those engaged in manufacturing, those engaged in lumbering, those engaged in commercial pursuits and in all the other pursuits in this country who have been assisted by the National Policy consume $160,000,000 worth out of the $200,000,000 of the surplus products of the farmers of this country. If that be the case, it is evident that our home market is enormously the best market we have. It has been computed by Mulhall that in 1880 the total production in Great Britain was $172 *per capita*, of which $136 was consumed there and $36 exported. Nimmo, in the United States, considers that the produce of that country is $200 *per capita*, of which $183 goes to home consumption and only $17 is used for export. Evidently the home market in each country is the best market. We produce many articles which cannot be exported to other countries, and, therefore, we have endeavoured to build up other industries in this country. If the census of 1881 showed that there were 254,000 people employed in mechanical operations, I have no doubt that the census of 1891 will show an increase of 100,000 people engaged in manufacturing pursuits, and representing a total population engaged in and depending on mechanical pursuits of one million and three-quarters or two millions of people. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we want free trade with the United States, that we want our most valuable markets thrown open to the American farmer as well as our own. I do not believe in that. I think we should keep our own markets for ourselves as far as possible. Of course, there are two or three articles that we could send to the United States with advantage to ourselves, but any Government should be exceedingly careful before making any bargain which will throw open our markets to the American farmer and drive the Canadian farmer away from his home and from his most profitable market. I read in the speech made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) a number of most extraordinary statements. He was quoting ostensibly from the trade returns of last year, and he said:

"We sold to the United States 9,939,000 bushels of barley on which the duty, the trifling duty, amounted to $2,982,000; of beans and pease we sold 710,000 bushels, on which the duty amounted to $284,000."

The duty on barley was 10 cents, and he makes it out to be 30 cents. I think he was going a year or two ahead of time. The duty on beans and pease he makes out to be 40 cents a bushel. As the McKinley Bill only puts a duty of 20 cents a bushel on pease, and pease form the greater portion of this export, he is evidently getting ahead on that also. Then he says:

"Of horses we sold 16,000, on which the duty was $566,000."

How does he know that? We know that a large proportion of the horses that we send to the United States are for breeding purposes, and they enter free of duty. Where did he get his figures? He drew them from his imagination. He says further that:

"Of the article of eggs alone, we sold 12,835,000 dozens, on which the duty amounted to $640,000."

The duty did not amount to anything, because at that time there was no duty on eggs. The duty was not imposed until about four months after these got in there. He says further:

"Of hay we sold 115,000 tons, on which the duty was $400,000."

We did not export the whole of that amount of 115,000 tons to the United States, because we sent

some 10,000 tons to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman ridiculed the idea of sending any hay to Great Britain, but we sent that amount last year, and it is now an established fact that we can profitably send hay to England. He makes the duty out to be $4 a ton, whereas it was only $2 a ton anyway. Then he says:

"Of sheep we sold $251,000, on which the duty was $502,000."

Where did he get the duty of $2 apiece on sheep? The old duty was from 15 to 20 per cent., and the new duty is $1.50 for sheep and 75 cents for lambs. When we consider that these 251,000 sheep that are recorded were sold for $760,000, which is $3.02 apiece, we must conclude that they were not very large-sized sheep, especially when we consider that the sheep sent to England during the same year averaged, according to the trade returns, $8.50 apiece. The duty on lambs was exactly 75 cents apiece; he puts the duty at $2 apiece, and such a statement as that goes to the country. What more does he say? He says:

"There is no doubt whatever that most of that comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers. It is perfectly true, I have never denied it. I do not deny it now, that the American consumer pays the duty likewise."

We pay the duty and the American consumer pays the duty. This is a new doctrine. The old doctrine was that the Canadian consumer always paid the duty; recently they have revised it, and say that the producer pays the duty if he happens to be a Canadian. He goes on to say:

"But let the hon. gentleman and his friends lay this to heart: while the American consumer pays the Canadian consumer loses."

That is strange doctrine, and I think we had better call upon the member for South Oxford to explain it further. He says:

"There is some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 paid by the farmers of Canada."

I have added up these figures and they come to just $5,637,000, according to his own estimate. He calls it seven or eight millions; he is not particular about a few millions. I added up what the duty was according to the returns, not considering who pays the duty—but simply what the duty was on these articles, and I find it amounted to $2,089,389. Now, I think the hon. gentleman is trifling with this House and the country when he gives utterance to such statements. But we come to the next question of who pays the duty. I do not see the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in his seat, but I have a speech delivered by him in 1878, when he was a member of the Government, when he had the figures at his command and had leisure to study them, and here is what he says, speaking at Fergus, Ontario, on 18th July, 1878; I find his remarks in a pamphlet setting forth the policy of the Government. These gentlemen always assure us that the Canadian farmer pays the duty—that it cannot be otherwise. Here is what the Hon. David Mills said, discussing the question of who pays the duty on exports:

"I had better give you some evidence of the fact that the duties imposed by the American Government upon the various products of the agriculturists of Canada have in no wise affected the price of the various articles which have been sent into the American market. I have here the prices of the various farm products for the twenty-two years from 1854 to 1876, during eleven of which years reciprocity prevailed, and during the other eleven our produce was subject to high duties. In 1854 the Canadians received on the average for the horses they sold $65.27 per head."

I will not trouble the House with all his figures, but he arrives at this result: that during the time of the reciprocity treaty, when there was no duty on horses, the average price was $77.74. Then he quotes the price of horses for the next twelve years, when there was no reciprocity treaty, but when there was a duty on horses, and the result was that horses averaged $94.73, or an increase during that period of $17 per head. Then he says, speaking of horned cattle:

"We received in 1854 an average price per head of $23.83."

And so on. He winds up with the conclusion that the average in these latter years was quite as high as when they were admitted free of duty. Who, then, pays this tax of 20 per cent. on cattle exported to the United States? Then he comes to sheep, and after going into a calculation he concludes that the average was just as high during the 11 years that duties were imposed as when sheep were admitted free. Next he takes up some of the cereals:

"In 1854—and mind this was the period of the Russian war—we received for wheat an average price per bushel of $1.45"

And he quotes prices for various years and gives the total result, showing that the prices were as high during the period when there was no duty as during the period when there was a duty. He winds up his whole statement in this way:

"I might go over the prices of barley, rye and other cereals with much the same result, thus establishing the incontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

That was the statement the hon. gentleman made as to who paid the duty. Now, we will go still further. On the question of barley, these gentlemen are most persistent that the Canadian producer, as was stated by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, pays the duty on barley. In 1883 the duty on barley was 15 cents a bushel. The American brewers and maltsters went down to Washington and spent large sums of money lobbying, and induced the American Congress to reduce the duty to 10 cents a bushel. What was the result? These gentlemen will say, of course, according to their theory, that barley went up 5 cents in Canada. Not so. I have the figures here, but I will not trouble the House with quoting the details. They show, however, that, instead of barley being dearer, after the duty was lowered from 15 to 10 cents, it was cheaper in the following year. At Toronto, in February, 1883, the average price of barley was 72 cents, and in February, 1884, the average price was 62 cents. I will take the two last years which are covered by the returns. In 1889 the average price for barley in the Toronto market, and in all the markets of Ontario, was at least 8, 10 or 12 cents a bushel less than in 1890, though in the meantime the duty was raised from 10 cents a bushel to 30 cents per bushel. According to the law these gentlemen have enunciated, during the last year, barley ought to have sold at a lower price, after the duty was put on, than it did at the corresponding dates of the previous year. This shows, to my mind, that the Americans themselves pay the duty upon these articles. But there are other articles very important to the Canadian farmers—there is the article of cattle, for instance. Last year the returns show that we sent 123,000 cattle to Great Britain. We know that Canadian cattle have an immense advan-

tage in the markets of Great Britain over American cattle. American cattle have to be slaughtered within a few days after they arrive in port, while Canadian cattle can be kept there as long as the shipper pleases, when he can take advantage of the market in other places and at other times. The American Agricultural Commissioner, whose report I have here, gives it as his opinion that the advantage to the Canadian shipper is from $10 to $15 per head. Now, an average of $12 per head on 123,000 cattle would represent $1,476,000, which represents the advantage the Canadian farmer has over the American farmer in the British cattle market. Then they tell us the advantage this country would derive if we had commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Would we have the same advantage still? Not at all. It is with great difficulty we retain this advantage over the United States in the markets of Great Britain. We know there are large areas in the United States not affected by pleuro-pneumonia, and in Canada our herds are not so affected. Strong efforts are made by interested parties in Great Britain to have Canadian cattle scheduled, the same as American cattle: but it is altogether on account of our being a portion of the British Empire, of which the people of this country are proud, we occupy our present favoured position. Suppose we declare to the people of Great Britain: We do not want to trade with you, but only with the United States; we will increase our tariff by 100 per cent. over what it is now against you, while we will have free trade with the United States, and take their manufactures and exclude yours, how long would we retain that privilege in the British markets? Not forty-eight hours. We have that advantage, therefore, because we have our present fiscal arrangements, and because we do not have free trade with the United States. As the price in Great Britain is $12 more than the American price, that affects the value of all the cattle in this country. It is estimated that we have 5,000,000 head of cattle. We will not say that they are of the same value as the cattle exported, but we will take half the price, and say that the increased value of each is not $12, but $6, and then that calculation would show that $30,000,000 are added to the wealth of the Canadian farmers by the present arrangement, which would be destroyed if we adopted the policy agitated by hon. gentlemen opposite. With regard to sheep, I have already mentioned the fact that the exports of the United States last year have averaged $3.02 each; while the exports to Great Britain, numbering 57,000, averaged $8.50 each. That would show there is a better sale for our animals in Great Britain. I have here a remarkable letter written by Mr. Thos. Mills, who a few years ago I knew as a very strong commercial unionist, and I think he is now getting very well over it. He went to the old country with Mr. Frankland with a number of Canadian lambs. He now admits that the English market is immensely superior to the American market. And says:

"I never did feel so much concern regarding the price that would be paid for the lambs, as regarding their acceptability in the English market. This matter I regard as forever set at rest. In addition to what Ald. Frankland has stated so well in his letter regarding the quality of these lambs, I may add that the English press have been loud in their praises. Since these lambs have pleased the people of England so well, I have no hesitation in saying that we can easily give them lambs in the future which will please them even better. These lambs were good, but not so good as this country can furnish."

He says further:

"It is to be hoped that our farmers will give this matter the attention which its importance demands. There are, doubtless, great possibilities connected with the future of this trade. It may yet become one of the most important industries of Canada. I go further, and say that it is likely to become one of the most important industries of this country; nay, it is almost certain to become one of our most important industries, and I ask the farmers of all Canada to note this fact and to weigh it well. If each farmer of this province were to fatten but six lambs a year for this market he would get a return of about $54 for good average lambs for his outlay. This is a paying return, as our farmers very well know. We would then have 1,200,000 lambs for annual shipment. This would bring annually into the country more than $10,000,000 of British money—a larger amount than is now obtained from our export of cheese from the whole Dominion. The chief obstacles would arise in connection with the transport of the lambs, and these would relate to the lack of shipping accommodation Notwithstanding, it is certainly true that there are splendid possibilities in reference to this trade."

I think we have an opening there, as we have an opening for every agricultural product we raise, in the British market. With respect to eggs, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) decried the idea of the availability of the British market for eggs. He says it would take six weeks to send them, and they would be no good when they arrived there. I have a letter from Mr. Flavelle, in which he says:

"We ship from Lindsay to England one to three cars of eggs per week and do better than by sending them to the States, and are now making more out of them than we ever did. Warrington, of Belleville, has a standing order for 2 cars of eggs per week to England, 12,000 dozens in a car."

These two dealers alone require 3,000,000 dozen of eggs per year. Last year there were 93,000,000 dozen of eggs imported into Great Britain; we sent to the United States 12,000,000 dozens. We have, therefore, an unlimited market in the mother country. With regard to the price of eggs, hon. gentlemen opposite predicted that eggs would be almost valueless and that all the hens would be killed off. I have prepared a statement of prices given in the Toronto *Globe* for a period of six months from November, 1889, and for six months from November, 1890. I will simply quote the results. The average price in November, 1889, was 21¼ cents; November, 1890, 22 cents; December, 1889, 22⅝ cents; December, 1890, after the Americans had imposed their duty, 25½ cents; January, 1889, 20 cents; January, 1890, 21¼ cents; March, 1889, 13⅝ cents; March, 1890, 18¾ cents; April, 1889, 10¾ cents; April, 1890, 15¾ cents. These figures show that the market for eggs did not go to pieces after the McKinley Bill came into operation. All through this season the prices have been higher than at corresponding dates last year. We know that we have still a market for our eggs, that we have the home market, which is a very important and valuable one, and the English market as well; and, more than that, the Americans have to pay the duty on the eggs they take from us. I have here also quotations of other articles, of American and Canadian hogs, and of the prices of oats, which averaged during last year 8 cents per bushel higher in Ontario, taking the quotations of the Bureau of Industry and the Chigago prices, than in Chigago. We produced 52,000,000 bushels of oats last year in Ontario alone, and they had a greater value by $4,000,000 in our market than they would have had if our market had been thrown open to the Ameri-

cans. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, say that the American market is our natural market. Mr. Goldwin Smith dilates on that view, as do hon. gentlemen opposite. Why is it our natural market? Is it because the United States are contiguous to us and lie alongside of us? Why do not the nations of Europe find their best markets with their next neighbours? If our natural market is our next neighbour, then of course you would go down to Spark street to a grocery store, and the best market for the proprietor would be with his neighbouring grocer; you could go to the dry goods man, and his best market would be with the dry goods man who is opposition over the way; then you go to the farmer, and his best market is his neighbouring farmer, who produces exactly the same articles as he does. According to the hon. gentlemen opposite, the neighbouring farmer would be the best customer for the farmer next to him. No, Sir, the only market for any community, or for any person, is the market which demands what you produce and the market which produces what you require. We find that that is true as regards Great Britain and other countries. Hon. gentlemen opposite may sneer if they like, but they cannot explain away these facts. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the other day: "What have you got in the West Indies, only negroes, and creoles and half-breeds, and what could you trade with them?" Well, we get our sugar and spices and a great many other articles from these coloured gentlemen, and why should we not supply them with our products in return. We go to China and we buy tea from the miserable Chinese, as the hon. gentleman would say, and why should we not sell the Chinese what they want from us in return. The West Indies require $48,000,000 worth of products, most of which we produce in Canada. We, therefore, have a large market in these countries; but we certainly have at our command the British market, which, next to our own Canadian market, is the most valuable market for the farmers of Canada. We have been told by the hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a great exodus, that the people of Canada are leaving by thousands and tens of thousands, and as a consequence that the farms of Canada are depreciating in value. I have here the official report of the Ontario Government for 1887–88, a report which is compiled by Mr. Blue, who is no lover of the Conservative party and no lover of the National Policy. I find in this report the following information, which is interesting, and which proves that Ontario is a prosperous province rather than the reverse, as hon. gentlemen opposite would try to make us believe:—

VALUE OF FARM PROPERTY.

	1888.	1887.	Increase.
Value of farms.....	$640,480,000	$636,883,000	$3,597,000
Value of farm buildings.....	188,293,000	184,753,000	3,540,000
Value of farming implements.....	49,754,000	49,248,000	506,000
Value of live stock	102,839,000	104,406,000	.....
	$981,366,000	$975,290,000	$7,643,000

Increase.....	$7,643,000
Decrease in live stock.....	1,567,000
Net increase.....	$6,076,000

These statistics were certainly not made for a purpose, or if they were made for a purpose it was not a purpose friendly to the National Policy, for it was made by the official of the Ontario Government (Mr. Archibald Blue), who, as I said, is no lover of the National Policy. I have still further evidence here to show that our farmers are not in the condition represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have a carefully-prepared editorial article of the Toronto *Mail* of 7th November, 1890, a paper not particularly friendly to the Dominion Government. They take Mr. Blue's statistics, and they show that the assessed value of the farms in Ontario was $824,000,000, and that the mortgages amounted to about $74,000,000, or 9 per cent. Every one knows that the assessed value of farms, which is given here at $824,000,000, is never more than two-thirds of the actual value, and that being the case, if we make a calculation we will find that the mortgages on the actual value of the farms would not amount to more than 6 per cent. I consider that that shows that the farmers of Canada, instead of being the poor, helpless and despondent people that gentlemen opposite picture them to be, are the most prosperous people on the face of the earth to-day. I contend that there is no class of the community that can show as good a record as the farmers of Ontario can, according to this report of the Ontario Government. What more do we find? We find that according to the official returns, in the State of Ohio the mortgages represent 26 per cent. of the value of the land, instead of 6 per cent., as in Ontario. In Illinois the mortgages are 29 per cent.; in Michigan, 22 per cent., and in Kansas 83 per cent. of the farms are mortgaged. The figures quoted by the hon. gentlemen opposite to show the depreciation in the value of the lands in Ontario prove exactly the opposite of what their contention is, for they show that the farmers are in a very prosperous condition in the Province of Ontario. But, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us of the exodus from this country. We had some pretty wild statements from the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this subject, but the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) outdoes him in this. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that between 1871 and 1881 nearly 400,000 immigrants came into Canada, and that in 1881 we had only 15,000 more persons of foreign birth than we had in 1871, so that we lost mostly all the foreign immigrants. That is rather a peculiar statement. What about the immigrants who came here forty or fifty years ago? According to the statement of the hon. gentleman none of them had died at all. The hon. gentleman says further: "I calculate that between 1871 and 1881 we have lost 3,600,000 people." That appears to be a large estimate, but the hon. gentleman says: "We will call it 3,000,000 people," and he kills off 600,000 at one blow. He continues to say: "If Canada to-day had 8,000,000 instead of 5,000,000, and had profitable employment for them and markets for their labour, would not my hon. friend get more revenue out of 8,000,000 than he would out of 5,000,000 people?" Then the hon. gentleman goes on to argue that we have lost 3,000,000 people in this country during ten years. I do not think we need stop to seriously reply to that. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that our population is going away from our country, but they do not give any evidence of it, and I do

not see myself that such is the case. I have stated to the House before that in my own county the population of 18,800 last census will be increased this census to perhaps 40,000. That is the case in the West Riding of York, with exactly the same geographical boundaries as it had ten years ago. In that riding, at all events, we have increased more than 100 per cent. These people must have come from somewhere. They did not go off to the States; they are living here in Canada. More than that, Mr. Speaker: the city of Toronto and all our cities are growing; but we find these hon. gentlemen still sounding dismal tones and saying that the people are going off to the States. I have here an editorial from the Toronto *Globe* of the 28th April, 1891, headed: "Mr. Phipps' Letter," referring to which that paper says:

"In an interesting letter printed elsewhere, Mr. R. W. Phipps gives his personal experience of the exodus of population to the United States."

They do not go into particulars here; they contend themselves with bewailing the exodus of people from Canada, but where is the proof of it? Here is one proof of an exodus, but not from Canada. It is taken from the same number of the Toronto *Globe*, only it is from the news columns, whereas the other is from the editorial columns. It is dated Winnipeg, 27th April, and is as follows:—

"People still continue to flock into Manitoba from South Dakota with stock and effects. A large contingent arrived this morning, their train being decorated with legends as follows: 'No more 2 per cent. a month,' 'No more five-mile water haul,' 'No more two bushels to the acre,' 'No more oxaline fuel,' 'No more grinding machine agents,' 'Good-bye, South Dakota,' 'Bound for the Canadian North-West,' 'Free land, plenty of timber, plenty of water, interest 8 per cent. per annum,' 'Hurrah for Yorkton.'"

Their editorial columns invariably contradict their news columns. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a very interesting article, by an eminent Canadian writer, Mr. E. E. Sheppard, editor of the Toronto *Saturday Night*, and I will trouble the House by reading a portion of it:

"At one time Canadian farmers went to the United States believing that cheap land and an immense market would soon make them rich. They have all been undeceived. The imaginary line which separates the Canadian North-West from Minnesota, Dakota, Montana and Washington Territory is now cut up by the waggon tracks of those who come to us. We have a country infinitely more productive than theirs; the gods have given us two hours more sunlight to mature our grain than shines upon their wheat districts. The north-east end of this continent is greater in extent, grander in scenery, more noble in the exploits of the men who settled it, and it must become attractive to the people to the south of us. Until now we could not hope to look for emigrants from the people of the United States. Canada has waited until the United States has achieved its limit of speculative population. No longer will that country be the Mecca of those journeying towards a gold mine; it has ceased to be the land in which sovereigns can be picked up by strangers. Chiefest amongst those who recognize this are the Americans themselves. We are not waiting for their overflow; it is not desirable; but we are receiving the best and most frugal element that is being created by a wave of foreign aggressors unwelcome in the United States as it was distasteful at home. Canada is slowly but surely building herself up. It is only the brave who will venture into the north; it is the idle that cluster neath the palms of the south. As we develop and strengthen ourselves, money, everything will be ours. Our cities will grow; those stretches now uninhabited will be peopled; and while it takes longer to accomplish the task of settling our prairies, yet when they are settled there will be no reconstruction, no flitting, and the northern part of North America is as certain to dominate, as sure to absorb the wealth of those who are careless and luxurious, as that the northern tribes in the history of the earliest centuries swooped down upon the effete and luxurious people of the south without a single reverse. We cannot reckon the ratio of the past to be the progress of the future. The northern lands succeed after the warmer climes have exhausted their energies. We have had to wait, but we shan't have to wait much longer. Even now the tide has turned our way; the tracks of the waggons which cross the lines are drawn by horses whose hoofprints point northward. Everything is coming to us; this is a moment of transition; those men who protect what they have and acquire the property of those who think that the world is going to turn backwards will, in the near future, be successful. From the old song which adjures us never to take the horseshoe from the door we might at least learn this lesson, never to be discouraged when all the horseshoes are turned towards Canada."

I think, Sir, we have reason to be hopeful of our future. We have reason to be hopeful, not only for the older provinces, but also for our great North-West. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to trouble the House any longer. I thank you and the House for your careful attention to these few remarks.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, as I have not trespassed upon the time of the House thus far during this session, I think I may fairly ask the indulgence of hon. members for a time, while I attempt as best I can to give expression to my views upon the question now under debate. Twelve years ago, when it was my privilege to occupy a seat in this House, I recollect well the memorable night on which the vote was taken which launched the National Policy on its way in this Canada of ours. I recollect well the predictions then made as to the advantages that were to be conferred upon this country by the introduction of that policy. On that occasion I felt it my duty to oppose that policy. Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my views since. I must admit, however, that in the years 1880 and 1881, when large amounts of capital were being invested in my native province, when brick and mortar was being piled up in all directions, when I, as a humble member of this House, heard the hon. gentleman who has since retired from political life addressing this House year after year and lauding the National Policy to the sky, devoting one-half of his Budget speeches to the laudation of that policy, and pointing out what it was doing and what it was destined to do for his native province, for a time I and some of my friends may have had some misgivings as to the course we were pursuing. But, Sir, if in those years a doubt crossed our minds, that doubt has been dispelled. We are no longer of opinion that the National Policy was calculated to benefit the Province of New Brunswick at least; and here I may say that in the few remarks I shall address to the House on this question I purpose following the course I have taken on previous occasions. I believe it is my duty and my privilege to discuss a question of this kind from the standpoint of the province from which I come. I understand that there are in this country diversified interests, so that what is best for one part of Canada is not always best for another part; and I am here to assert that the policy which was adopted in 1879 and which has been contined from that time to this has proved detrimental to the Province of New Brunswick. Mr. Speaker, I notice that a marked change has taken place in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. I remember that when I had the pleasure of listening to their speeches from 1879 to 1887, invariably when they rose to their feet they not only predicted what would be the outcome of that policy, but pointed to the good

results which had already flowed from it. Sir, it has been my privilege during this session to listen to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, and what do they say to-day? Do they point out the good results that flow from this policy? Not at all; but they are on the defensive, and are anxious to show that this policy has not proved as detrimental to the interests of this country as we thought it would. Mr. Speaker, I could not help remarking, in listening to the eloquent speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, whom I am always proud to hear in this House, that not one word in it was devoted to the National Policy. This was in marked contrast to the speeches delivered by him a few years ago in this House, and by his honoured predecessor, the present Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, when he occupied the position of Finance Minister. Sir, I do not think that I need waste time to-night in attacking the National Policy from the standpoint of my province. I am satisfied that among the thirteen gentlemen from that province representing the Conservative party in this House there is not one who will rise to his feet and say clearly and distinctly that that policy has proved the success in the Province of New Brunswick which its advocates predicted it would. No, Sir, any hon. gentleman on that side who will address himself to this question must honestly admit that so far as that province is concerned the policy has not been a success. I shall, perhaps, before sitting down, take occasion to make some further remarks on this question, but for the present I propose to address myself to the other and more important subject. I had the honour and the pleasure, a few nights ago, of listening to a lengthy speech from the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). I confess I was anxious to hear that gentleman speak, as I had not enjoyed that privilege before, and I supposed he would have advanced some argument which might have gone far to settle this question as to what is the best policy for the Province of New Brunswick. I confess I was disappointed in the hon. gentleman's speech. I am not going to read extracts from the Toronto *Globe* or the St. John *Sun* or any other paper, but I am going to give my own practical experience of the working of the National Policy, and of what I believe would be the effects of the adoption of the other policy which is mentioned in the amendment before the House. But before going further, I desire to call attention to some statements made by the hon. member for Albert. I am not disposed to go over the old ground and discuss this sugar question afresh, and I think I may fairly be excused doing so, as the hon. gentleman has summed up the whole question in a few words. The hon. Minister of Finance said in his Budget speech that by his action he was relieving the people of this country of $3,500,000 taxes. The hon. member for Albert went $1,500,000 better, and put the amount at $5,000,000. Now, I would like that hon. gentleman or some other hon. gentleman to reconcile these two statements. It is true the hon. member for Albert attempted to explain what he meant, and where did his explanation land him? He had to account for $1,500,000 in some way, that being the difference between $3,500,000, the estimate of the Minister of Finance, and the $5,000,000 which the hon. gentleman asserted was saved by the action of the Government. The hon. gentleman was not disposed to place it on the shoulders where it should be placed, and to admit that the sugar refiners shared largely in that $1,500,000. I regret the hon. gentleman is not present, but I have his words here, and he said that 25 per cent. went into the pockets of the retail sugar dealers in this country. I wonder did he expect any retailer to believe that statement. Every business man who handles sugar knows that no such profits go to the retailer in this country, and I think the hon. gentleman will have to invent some better explanation of the statement he made to this House than the one he has given. But I want to put this matter a little plainer. During my political life it has been my aim, and I have been honest in it, to convince the people of this country that increased tariff meant increased taxation. My hon. friends opposite have been attempting to instil into the minds of the people that increased tariffs do not mean increased taxation; and when this Government was compelled, at the dictation of Washington, to drop $3,500,000 from the revenue of the country, then they turn around and say that they have relieved the people of a burden of $3,500,000 taxation. I could leave the question there, but I propose to follow it further, and put it in a way that will bring it home to the minds of the people. The hon. member for Albert has, I believe, during the past twelve years, though not in this House all that time, been giving his support to the party now in power; and if that hon. gentleman's contention is correct, what, in the light of the past twelve years, does that tariff policy which was repealed the other day and which has been in existence all those years mean? It means that the people of Canada, during all those years, have been paying a dollar per head on sugar. It means that in a county like Albert, whose population is some 12,000 persons, they pay $12,000 sugar tax per year. That means $144,000 in twelve years. I understand that the reason why the hon. gentleman received the support of his people in his county is that they have a railway debt hanging over them, and that hon. gentleman's mission here is to obtain for them relief from that railway debt. I am sorry, in the interests of his constituents, both Liberal and Conservative, that he has not succeeded so far; but I wish to point out to the people of his county that during those twelve years this Government, by their sugar tariff, have extracted from them a sum equal to double the railway debt which they owe. There was another statement made by the hon. member for Albert to which I wish to call attention. I think it my duty to that hon. gentleman to put him right on this question before it goes any further. He is not now in his place, but my statement will go to his county, and in addressing the House to-night I recognize the fact that I stand here in a minority from my province, supported only by two other gentlemen. That, however, will not deter me from giving expression to the views I hold, and which are held by a large number of people behind us in the Province of New Brunswick. Now, as the hon. gentleman is not present, I shall take the liberty of reading an extract from his speech:

> "I am not going to an extreme length when I say that the National Policy is calculated to develop foreign trade. That is its aim and purpose, and I submit that in a reasonable degree it has accomplished its purpose."

He is the first gentleman I ever heard make such an assertion in favour of the National Policy. During

all my time in this House a different doctrine was preached. It was said that the National Policy was intended to curtail foreign trade, that we were to do our own manufacturing at home, but the hon. gentleman now attempts to prove it has increased our foreign trade. He then adds:

"It has done this in respect to our foreign trade: It has advanced the production of the materials which we ourselves grow, which we handle by our own labour. In the article of household furniture, school furniture, church furniture, and all that, the effect of the National Policy was to cut off the export of that birch and ash timber, to cut off the drain of our sons who were going away to the American States to work up that wood and send it back to our provinces, and to cut off the supply of food products that was leaving our provinces as food for our own boys who were there in those foreign mills and factories making up that furniture."

I deny the truth of that assertion. The hon. gentleman referred us to the Trade Returns of this Government. I would ask the hon. gentleman to again consult the Trade tables, and he will find that, in place of an decrease in the export of the kinds of lumber to which he has alluded, there has been a large increase. Sir, in 1879 we exported from Canada of birch and ash, square timber—mark you, not sawn lumber, but the kind which the trade returns specify—to the amount of $176,980. If I am correct, as I believe I am—and if I am incorrect I expect some hon. gentleman opposite will put me right, though I have taken considerable pains to verify my figures—the returns for 1890 show that there has been no decrease in the export of birch and ash timber from the Dominion of Canada. In 1879 the export amounted to $176,980, while in the last year of which we have any record, 1890, it reached the amount of $328,457. That was not all. The hon. gentleman is still further astray. I admit that perhaps he is not to blame; perhaps the Trade Returns are to blame; but if I am wrong the Minister of Customs can put me right. I know of what I am speaking, as I am engaged in the lumber trade myself, and I say that since this National Policy has been introduced a trade has sprung up in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which did not exist before, and what is that? It is the manufacture and export of sawn birch lumber. This year it is somewhat less than it was the year before, because the price is not sufficient to warrant the export, but a year ago millions of feet of sawn birch lumber were exported from ports in New Brunswick to ports in Great Britain. I do not suppose there is any pretension on the part of anybody to cover that up in the Trade Returns, and if the Minister of Customs can point it out to me in those returns I will withdraw the statements I made in that respect. I find that pine deals are specified, but when you come to spruce it says "spruce and other," and I think I am correct in believing that under this "spruce and other" is contained this large export of sawn birch from New Brunswick. When an hon. gentleman who is as capable as the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) undertakes to address the House on this subject I think he should post himself a little better. If he lived in the county which he represents he would have known better, because I know myself that a large quantity of birch lumber which is exported from the port of St. John is manufactured in the hon. gentleman's county. But the hon. gentleman says that we are manufacturing the furniture at home, and he refers us to the Trade Returns in proof of that. I have referred to the Trade Returns, and I find that in 1878-79 Canada imported $247,970 worth of house, cabinet and office furniture, while in 1890 we imported $352,430. Does that look like a decrease in the imports? I would be disposed to call it an increase. I admit that there has been some falling off in the imports in furniture in the province from which I come, and that in the city of St. John there was more American furniture imported than there is to-day, but is the furniture which takes its place supplied by the manufacturers of St. John or by the manufacturers of Ontario? I believe that the furniture is supplied by the manufacturers of Ontario. I do not object to that; but in the city of St. John, before the adoption of the National Policy, we had more and larger furniture factories, employing more hands, than we have to-day. I do not believe that we have to-day more than one establishment in that city which can be fairly considered a furniture factory. I am aware that there is some cheap furniture manufactured in Nova Scotia and that some of it finds its way into St. John, but the hon. gentleman's contention was that this large export of hardwood was stopped, and that the furniture was being made in Canada, and that our own boys were finding employment close to their homes. I am not going to delay the House at present by dealing with the question of the exodus. I am willing to leave that question to be settled by the people who understand it best, and who know the vacant chairs which exist in almost every home in the province from which I come. I say that in the county I represent and in the county represented by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and in other counties, there is scarcely a family with grown-up sons and daughters in which some members of the family are not labouring and toiling beneath a foreign flag. In Boston alone, if the figures do not lie, there are probably to-night lying on their couches some 75,000 people who first saw the light of day in the Maritime Provinces. That is the answer to that question. But the hon. gentleman made another comparison, and assured us that the market of the United States was not to be compared to the market of Great Britain. He went further, and instituted a comparison—and for all practical purposes he might as well have taken us back to the time of the flood, or to the time when Christopher Columbus landed on the shores of America—he compared the trade of Canada to-day with that of forty years ago. Did the hon. gentleman forget that the Dominion of Canada did not exist forty years ago? Would it not have been sufficient for him to go back twenty-four years and contrast the trade of Canada then with its trade to-day? I have done that, and I propose to give my figures to the House and let the people judge for themselves. Here, again, it may be well to read an extract from the hon. gentleman's speech, in which he says:

"The English market for our farmers, as everyone knows who will study our statistical tables, has been a growing market. We sell twice the bulk of agricultural products in the British islands that we did forty years ago, and during that same interval the American market has shown no growth whatever."

Now, going back to 1867-68, the first year after Confederation, I find that the people of Canada, taking the Trade Returns, because the hon. gentleman has referred to them, and looking carefully under the heading of agricultural pro-

ducts, we exported to the markets of Great Britain to the value of $4,050,175. In 1890 Canada exported to Great Britain $3,661,826 of agricultural products. I admit that perhaps the hon. gentleman made a mistake here again. I believe that his intention, though he did not say so, was to include in that statement all farm products. I submit that if you include the two items the showing will be entirely different. I think in the delivery of the speech made by the hon. member for Albert, a man who is so thoroughly educated and so well posted, considering, too, that he followed my hon. friend from South Oxford, after having a week to prepare himself—I say that, in making a statement to this House, he should have been more accurate, and if he meant to include animals and their products along with agricultural products, he should have so stated. But the hon. gentleman has not done so. The facts are, that taking the articles named under the headings in which they appear in the returns, it will be found that in place of an increased export of agricultural products to Great Britain there has been a falling off of $389,000. But I will do him the justice now to give the other figures. Looking back to 1867-68 I find that animals and their products amounted to $2,673,039. The latest Trade Returns show that this amount has been swollen to $18,578,000. I admit that is a very large increase, but I want to point out to you that nearly the whole of that increase is due to the export of cheese and beef cattle from the Province of Ontario, a trade in which that hon. gentleman's constituents do not participate, I may say, at all, or, if at all, to a very limited extent. I believe that some efforts have been made in the Lower Provinces to encourage that trade, and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) will be able to inform the House as to the success of those efforts. Now, I propose to call attention to the trade between New Brunswick and Great Britain and the United States. I find that in 1867-68 the exports of farm products, including all agricultural products, and animals and their products, amounted to $3,103. This growing trade with Great Britain in twenty-four years has reached the enormous sum of $4,987. But I will go further, and I desire now to call attention to the trade between that province and the United States. I regret that on the whole it does not make a better showing, but when I make the statement, and hon. gentlemen contrast, as they will, the increase in these twenty-four years in the trade of agricultural and in farm products from that province to the United States, and when I tell them that in that same year our trade in those products with the United States amounted to $31,879, I am able to point to the fact that that trade has increased, as shown by the Trade Returns of 1890, to $401,143, or in twenty-four years, while trade with Great Britain in farm products has increased $1,884, trade in the same products to the United States from the same province has increased $369,264. Now, I propose to deal more fully with the trade of New Brunswick as a whole; and let me say at the outset that the Trade Returns of the last year show that our total exports from New Brunwick in round figures amount to $7,000,000. I might go further, and point out to this House that one-half of that total amount goes to Great Britain; but while making that statement I desire also to point out that, with the exception of $127,000, every dollar of that $3,500,000 represents products of the forests of New Brunswick. There you have the trade with Great Britain that has been built up in all these years. Now, let me call attention to the trade with the United States. In the last year, according to the Trade Returns, our trade with the United States amounted to $3,100,000. I admit—for I want to state the matter fairly—that included in that sum is $800,000 or $900,000 for lumber which is not the produce of our province. But it cannot be said that we do not derive very great benefit from handling that lumber. I may state that in the production of this lumber in the State of Maine our people assist in cutting, in hauling, in driving and rafting and sawing that lumber in the city of St. John; and I go further, and I tell you that out of that eight or nine hundred thousand dollars representing the lumber which is exported from New Brunswick, the produce of the State of Maine—I will not say the whole of it, but I will say the major part of it is carried in the coasting vessels built and owned and sailed by the people of New Brunswick. Sir, I think I may safely include that in my statement. The lumber exported to the United States amounts to $1,733,068, including that item from the State of Maine. To all other countries we sent $162,105 of lumber to the West Indies, to South America and to Australia, showing that of the total exports from New Brunswick, amounting to $6,977,885, $5,266,996 are forest products. Now, you will readily understand that any policy which goes into operation in this country must seriously affect, either for good or for evil, a trade which is so large, compared with our whole trade, as the lumber trade of New Brunswick. But, Mr. Speaker, there is still $1,710,889, exclusive of forest products, exported. Let us see where that goes, and in what proportion that reaches the markets of Great Britain and the markets of the United States. In 1879 we exported products of the mine to Great Britain to the amount of $3,473; the United States took $112,166. Of the fisheries Great Britain took $27,475, and the United States took $476,638. Of farm products Great Britain took $4,948, and the United States $404,892. Of manufactured goods Great Britain took $91,904, and the United States $362,961. To sum it all up, Great Britain took $127,970, and the United States $1,356,657 of the products of the mine, the fisheries, the farm and manufactures. Sir, does it lie in the mouth of any hon. gentleman coming from New Brunswick to undervalue the markets of the United States to the people of that province after I have submitted these figures for their consideration? I do not believe, notwithstanding that the Conservative party are represented in this House by 13 gentlemen, that there is one among the number who will have the hardihood to follow me and say that the United States is a market to be despised by the people of New Brunswick. Sir, I regret that we did not have in the last campaign a few Ontario speeches made in the Province of New Brunswick, such we have listened to to-night from the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). One dose of what that hon. gentleman has given the House to-night would have changed the result in New Brunswick, and hon. gentlemen know it. I am not prepared to say what my hon. friends opposite, coming from the north shore, did in the last election, but I am here to-night to say that any number of

Conservatives in my province ran their election squarely, as I did, upon a reciprocity platform: The only difference between us was this: They said we can get reciprocity in natural products, and we said you cannot. Time will tell who is right. We expected a long time before this that we would have had something tangible in regard to these negotiations. We have had two visits by Ministers to Washington, and there will be another in October. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite may succeed in their efforts, and I am here to-night to admit that if hon. gentlemen can secure from the United States reciprocity in natural products I for one will be willing and anxious to accept it. But I wish to call attention to another matter which I think of great importance, I will not say to the whole of New Brunswick, but to the major part of the province, and I am sure in the statement I am about to make I will be borne out by the junior member for the City and County of St. John, and that is, that in the trade carried on between New Brunswick and the mother country, which is principally in spruce deals, we have to compete in freights with the world, and that the cargoes are principally carried in iron steamers and the balance mainly in Norwegian vessels. It is true that occasionally a large ship is launched in Nova Scotia or elsewhere, that finds her way across the bay, and I am proud to be able to state that there is loading in St. John to-day the largest ship ever launched in the Maritime Provinces. She will take a cargo of deals to the other side of the water; but we have to compete in that trade with iron steamships, with ocean tramps, as they are called in St. John. But is that the case in regard to the export of lumber to the United States? Not so. I hold that 75 per cent. of our whole export of lumber from St. John to the United States is carried in vessels built, owned and operated by people in New Brunswick. What does that mean? When you send $1,700,000 of lumber to the American market do you get only that money back? No. The average rate of freight to Boston and New York is $2.50, while the average price of lumber, as shown by the Trade Returns, is about $8 per 1,000; call it $10 per 1,000, if you like; so the freight is equal to 25 per cent. of the value of the cargo. In round numbers, I believe, the people of New Brunswick have returned to them every year from that trade $500,000 by way of freights. This does not apply to the same extent to the trade carried on across the Atlantic. Let me point to another feature of this business worthy of the attention of the House, and it is this, that our exports from New Brunswick which are not carried by our coasting vessels are very largely carried by a line of steamships which has been in existence for a great many years, and which has been run successfully all those years. There is no better stock to-day in Boston than that of the International line of steamers between St. John and Boston. Does any hon. gentleman recollect any application to Parliament asking for a subsidy in order to establish or perpetuate that line? Not a bit of it. The trade between the two countries, in spite of the tariff walls, has maintained and kept running that splendid line between St. John and Boston, a line which the people of St. John would not care to lose. What is a further fact? It is, that last year two lines were put on between that port and the port of New York. I confess I look on this as a great boon. But this line does not come here asking a subsidy from this Parliament. It is established because the trade wants it. While I do not desire to trespass on the patience of the House, I feel it necessary to point, not to industries that are being carried on in New Brunswick at the present time, but to some industries which have been killed by the policy of the Government, and which would be revived if we could secure free trade with the United States. Let me call the attention of the House and of the members for St. John to the lime business in the city they represent. The hon. gentlemen will pardon me for alluding to it, but I do so because my county is as much interested in the lime-burning business as is their county. What are the facts? In 1881 St. John had a trade in lime of less than $2,000 with the United States. In 1890, the Trade Returns show that, in spite of a heavy tariff, the trade had increased to $143,000. The figures in the Trade Returns do not, however, indicate the value of that trade to St. John. The major part of it is carried in St. John vessels. I am not prepared to make any prediction with respect to the actual outcome of the summer work in the lime business at St. John, but I will venture to say, from what I know, that instead of lime to the value of $150,000 being shipped to the States from St. John, the value will fall below $15,000. Why? I charge this reduction upon hon. gentlemen opposite, and I ask them to defend it if they can. It will be remembered that St. John, in the last Parliament, was represented by hon. members sitting on this side of the House, and it will be fresh in the memories of some hon. members that Mr. Weldon asked the Government and pressed the Government, when the McKinley tariff was before Congress, to reduce the duty here from 20 to 10 per cent. Had they done so it is firmly believed that no increase in the duty on lime would have been made in the United States. But our Government declined to do so, and then the McKinley Tariff Bill became law, and instead of a duty of 10 per cent. in the manufacture of lime that industry is taxed to the extend of 40 or 45 per cent., the duty being 6 cts. per 100 lbs., including the weight of the barrel. I will not say there would have been as much lime shipped to the United States as formerly, on account of the condition of affairs in New York and Boston, for I am free to confess that on account of the labour strike business is somewhat depressed and the demand may have fallen off somewhat. But, Sir, I think I will be prepared to establish one fact, that whenever there is a market in New York or Boston for lime the people of St. John are prepared to compete in that market with any people on the face of the globe. I am not going to ask the House to take my statement for that, and although at the outset I said I did not propose to trouble the House with many extracts, yet this is an important matter, and I want the House thoroughly to understand it. I will read briefly from the report of a commission appointed by the State of Maine on this subject. The people of St. John, at all events those engaged in the business, pretty thoroughly understand the question, but I wish that others should understand it as well. First of all, let me say that in St. John we have, I believe, the largest quantity and the best quality of limestone to be found anywhere in the known world. That is a pretty big statement.

Mr. FORBES. Cape Breton is just as good.

Mr. KING. Even suppose it is, we have in St John limestone towering mountains high alongside fifty feet of water. We have got it in St. John towering mountains high, almost in sight of Boston and New York, and capable of being transferred there at less expense than from any other place in this Dominion. We have got in the country behind this limestone immense quantities of wood. It is true that we have a market for that wood in the United States, but it could be equally well employed at home burning lime: and to prove my statements I will now quote from the third annual report of the Bureau of Industry and Labour Statistics of the State of Maine. The report says:

"Most of the quarries in Knox County are very deep, requiring a great expense for the pumping of water. A good steam engine and a set of pumps are indispensible for every quarry of any extent. Much expense, now and then, is incurred in clearing away chips (small pieces of rock) and other loose débris from the quarries."

Nothing of that kind happens in St. John, for, as I before said, the limestone is towering up mountains high, and instead of mining it, as they have to do in the State of Maine, we have simply to quarry it in St. John. This report continues to say:

"There were in Knox County, in 1888, 92 patent kilns, which produced 1,800,000 casks of lime, and in this production the kilns consumed 85,000 cords of wood. Of the 85,000 cords of wood, about 52,173 were imported from our neighbours in the Maritime Provinces. The wood was invoiced from about $1.50 per cord. Our domestic manufactures paid on an average of $3.75 per cord. The gross sum paid to foreign producers of kiln wood was $195,648.75. To freight this 52,173 cords of wood there were 604 foreign arrivals at Rockland alone. This wood was brought in what is known as St. John wood-boats. The boats will carry 50 to 60 cords on an average per load. The crew generally consists of three or four men to a vessel. The lime is put into casks that will hold about two bushels and a peck. It will take about five coopers working nearly all the year through to supply the lime casks for a kiln, or about 460 coopers to make all the casks required for the kilns in Knox County for the year 1888. These casks are made within a radius of twenty miles of the kilns. To burn, fill, cooper and put on board of vessels and cars for shipment requires about six men to a kiln, or about 644 men to the kilns in Knox County. To distribute this lime to the various markets it takes 275 vessels. These vessels on an average, for the Boston market, will carry 700 casks: vessels for the New York market will freight 1,500 casks. This gives employment to over 800 sea-faring men. Boston and New York are the two principal distributing points for the lime. The Knox and Lincoln Railroad transported, for the year ending 31st December, 1888, over their road 114,000 casks of lime. To run these plants requires an active capital of over three-quarters of a million dollars annually, giving employment directly and indirectly to 3,000 men. These employés, as a class, are very intelligent. There are but few foreigners employed in this industry. The employés, as a class, are industrious and frugal. Quite a percentage of the workmen own their own homes. As in all other commercial transactions, the lime burners of Knox County are not exempt from competition. Their competitors are neighbours of the Maritime Provinces. The St. John lime comes into direct competition with the Knox County lime in the Eastern States, and more especially in the markets of Massachusetts and New York. Lime can be produced cheaper in the British Provinces than here in the States."

And yet hon. gentlemen tell us that we have reason to fear that under unrestricted reciprocity we cannot compete in manufactured goods. I notice, Sir, that in our trade and navigation returns lime is set down as a manufactured article, and I claim that it fairly has a right to appear under that head. I have not asked the House to take my word, but I give them a good authority to show that the only thing the people of Maine have to fear is the competition of the St. John lime burners. The report continues:

"Good authorities estimate that in the year 1888 there were shipped to the States 225,000 casks of this St. John lime. The duty on this lime is ten per cent. *ad valorem*, but the lime is invoiced for 35 cents per cask, which gives a specific duty of only 3 cents per cask."

Be it remembered that this was before the McKinley tariff became law:

"The following are some of the advantages our province neighbours have over the manufactures, viz., the rock is dug and placed at the kilns for 10 cents a cask; rock costs our lime burners at the kilns 22 cents per cask. Wood, at the kilns at St. John, cost on an average from $2 to $2.25 per cord. Nor is this all: the cord at New Brunswick must have the following dimensions: when wood is 4 feet long it must be 4 feet high and 12 feet in length of pile, making 192 cubic feet, or equal to one and a-half cords of our wood. Wood, per cord, on an average, costs the Knox County manufacturers $3.75, 128 cubic feet for a cord, or it costs the above lime burners $5.62 for the same amount of wood that it costs the St. John lime burners from $2 to $2.25. Labour, which is the largest item in this industry, is certainly 25 per cent. less at St. John than at the Knox County plants. For the first few months in the year, at St. John, it is the custom to pay at the rate of $1.40 per day; later in the season they advance the wages of their employés. The highest wages they ever paid to kiln men, as far as we can learn from personal investigations, were $1.80 per day. The general average would be $1.50 per day, while in the Rockland lime industry labour in and about the kilns is paid at the rate of $2."

And yet this is in the State of Maine, that place in which we have heard so much from the other side of the House, about the deserted farms, and the misery and the poverty with which that State is affected at the present moment. Yet, Sir, we have it on the authority from which I am quoting that the labouring man in St. John's gets $1.40 per day, while the men engaged in the same occupation of burning lime in the State of Maine are getting $2 per day, notwithstanding that the lime burner in Maine is paying two and a-half times as much for his fuel as the lime burner in St. John. I am not charging it on the lime burners of St. John that they are oppressing their men, but I am here to-night to state that if free trade could be secured between the United States and Canada in that article of lime alone it would be worth more to the city of St. John than all the cotton factories that ever were built in New Brunswick under the National Policy. Sir, I am perfectly safe in stating that in the last year to which our trade returns refer the lime trade was worth from $200,000 to $250,000 to that city and province alone. Is that trade not capable of expansion? Have I not pointed out from the returns that that trade between Rockland, Boston and New York is worth $2,000,000 per annum, and will anybody tell me, after the facts I have given to the House, that if we had free trade in lime alone that we would not in less than five years transfer to the city of St. John the capital and the enterprise of Rockland. I believe, Sir, that we have capital and enterprise of our own; but, if it were necessary, I am sure that that free trade would be sufficient to induce the Rockland manufacturer to transfer his plant to St. John and manufacture the lime for the American market. Sir, it is not too much to say that inside of ten years at the most that trade, in place of amounting to the paltry sum of $10,000 or $20,000, would run up to at least a million dollars a year. Sir, that is not all. I propose to call attention to some industries which might be promoted in the Province of New Brunswick under free trade, while not interfering with the lumber industry, which is the leading industry of that province, next to farming. We have in the Province of New Brunswick an inexhaustible quantity of freestone of a variety of colours, a stone which is much sought after in the markets of Bos-

ton and New York. To-day it is taxed by the McKinley Bill $1.50 per ton. And it appears strange and inconsistent on the part of the hon. member for Albert to stand up in this House and defend the National Policy and condemn reciproity, when the hon. gentleman knows that he cannot make a canvass of his county without seeing in open daylight a number of freestone quarries now closed down which were worked successfully a few years ago. I am not able to give the exact figures to-night, but if you consult the Trade Returns of twenty-four or twenty-five years ago you will find that we exported from New Brunswick to the United States at that time about $85,000 worth of freestone. Do the Trade Returns show that this has been growing? Not a bit of it. They show that it has dwindled down to $11,000 a year. Now, we know that twenty-four years ago Boston, as it stands to-day, was scarcely built. New York had an existence and a large population, but who will say that the best and finest edifices in the city of New York have not been erected during those twenty-four years. And yet during all those years we have been barred out by a tariff from sending our freestone to those cities. I do not hesitate to say that had this country enjoyed free trade during that time, in place of our export of freestone to the United States amounting to the paltry sum of $11,000 there is not a shadow of doubt that it would have amounted to from half a million to a million of dollars. I took the trouble a few days ago to look over the census returns of the United States, in which I find that every quarry of any extent in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is referred to; and in those returns our freestone holds a place as high as any except one particular kind—I do not remember the kind. The freestone of our province has much to commend it. Hon. gentlemen can see a sample of it in the new departmental block in this city. Now, give us free trade with the United States and you will see a trade in freestone spring up with the ports of Boston and New York which will do more for the Province of New Brunswick than the National Policy could ever hope to do, if it should meet the highest possible expectations of its friends and advocates. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. Everybody knows that in the county of my hon. friend who sits at my right, the County of Charlotte, there are immense deposits of red granite. I may be told that there is red granite in the United States; but in quality, in quantity or in the size of the block which can be taken out of the quarry there is nothing in the United States that can compare with it. To-day, in spite of the McKinley Bill, some two or three hundred men are engaged in Charlotte County in the occupation of preparing red granite for the United States and the local market. The McKinley Bill has had the effect of stopping entirely the importation of the finished article into the United States. In St. John we have a factory to-day engaged in the polishing of that granite, the proprietor of which states that he will be obliged to move his works across the line to escape the duty. He has moved in part, and I believe he contemplates moving the balance at no distant date. There is no telling what the possibilities of the trade in that stone would be under free trade. Every one knows that that stone is admired the world over, and the New Brunswick article is equal to any found in this continent or elsewhere. The only stone that compares with it is the Scotch granite. When I tell you that our granite has been shipped by rail all the way to Chicago I think that I have said sufficient to convince the members of this House that there is a market for it in the United States, provided that market were open to us. Now, with regard to coal, I know that our friends who support the Government are somewhat afraid of free trade in that article. They are afraid to face the competition in the American market. They are much more willing that the National Policy should be maintained, and that this country should be mulcted in the sum of $600,000 annually for the purpose of transporting Nova Scotia coal to the markets of Ontario and Quebec, or as far west as they can. But I wish to state to-night that we have in the Province of New Brunswick immense undeveloped coal fields. I presume there is not an hon. gentleman from that province who will venture to rise in his place and depreciate its coal fields. If he chooses to do so, I am willing that he should do so. In the county which I represent we have to-day, according to the most authentic account, millions—yes, hundreds of millions—of tons of coal. I will not say that it is as good as the Pennsylvania coal, or even the Nova Scotia coal: but I will say that that coal is being produced at the mines at $1 a ton, and is being hauled by team 14 miles and delivered to the railways at $2.75 a ton, and that coal is being used successfully on two lines of railway in New Brunswick. I challenge anybody to show a coal in North America which has its equal for ordinary forge purposes. That coal is within four hours by express train of Bangor, Maine, and within a day of that point by freight train, from which it is to-day shut out by a duty of 75 cents per ton. It is true we have not the railways necessary to enable us properly to develop these mines, though a considerable quantity finds a local market. But give us free trade with the State of Maine, which has a climate like ours, which has extensive manufacturing facilities, and which is well supplied with railroads, and that coal, which lies alongside of that State, will find a large market there, and the duty of 75 cents per ton, if removed, would pay the freight. Even if it should go no further, that would be an immense benefit to the country and to the province from which I come. Now, with regard to the lumber business, I know something about it, and I am prepared to say to-night that under present conditions there is a great waste of lumber in our Province. I do not know whether the legal gentlemen who represent the City and County of St. John know anything about it; but I know that every manufacturer, every tanner, and every shipper of lumber in St. John, knows something about it. When the treaty of 1854 was abrogated bark was left on the free list; and what has since gone on in our province? Millions of hemlock trees have been felled and stripped of their bark, and the bark has been going to the American market to supply the American tanner, and because we have no market for hemlock lumber the trunk of the tree has been allowed to lie and rot in the woods. Give us free trade in hemlock lumber with Boston and I do not hesitate to say—and I know what I am talking about—that all this waste will be utilized. We have got the capital and the enterprise among our-

selves, but we are cramped, crippled and shackled by these restrictions on trade. I know that capitalists from Boston have visited my section of the country several times, and I know that the only thing which prevents their going in for the manufacture of hemlock lumber in that section is the fact that import duty prevails in the American market, which closes us out. There is no telling under free trade what the export of that particular article might reasonably be expected to amount to. Coming back to hardwood: it is all very fine to talk of manufacturing our own furniture, but let me make this statement, that there is being erected at the Chaudière Falls in this city a mill which, when running on hardwoods, such as are used in the manufacture of furniture in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, I will guarantee will, in twenty days, stock the market and leave a surplus. That one mill will produce enough in three weeks to supply all the furniture factories in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. We have mills all over New Brunswick and Nova Scotia seeking a market, and none to be found, except when the English market will afford a price which will enable us to ship to that market, and this year I regret it does not. I have pointed out some interests which have lapsed under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite and some which might be promoted under a different policy, and I now desire to point to some interests which exist in New Brunswick and which are suffering from the evil effects of the National Policy. Take the most important—that of lumber. What are the facts? Hon. gentlemen opposite say if we had free trade we would not get the full benefit of the reduction in duties. I would not be so unreasonable as to claim we would, but I say that we would increase our production, and if you will give us the market we are prepared to divide with the Americans that two dollars duty, and be still better off than we are. While on this point I think it is but fair I should call attention to an act of which this Government has been guilty, with reference to the lumber interests of New Brunswick. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a measure was introduced here some years ago authorizing the Government to impose an export duty on logs, for the avowed purpose of compelling the Americans to lower or wholly abolish their import duty on lumber coming from Canada to the United States. Sir, had we no claim on this Government? Does the hon. Minister of Finance think that the people of New Brunswick engaged in the lumber business have no claim on him or his Government. I recollect, after that hon. gentleman and his esteemed leader, who has since departed, were in St. John last fall, their first official act, when they came back to Ottawa, was to abolish the export duty, in order that our friends on the Ottawa should get their pine lumber into the American market for $1 per thousand, forgetting that 95 per cent. of our lumber is spruce, and that the great lumbering industry in New Brunswick had some claims on the Government as well as the gentlemen who lumber on the Ottawa river. We have the best evidence possible, right in the city of St. John, as to what free trade in lumber will do for our province. I am in that business, and when I go to St. John to make a sale of 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 spruce logs, and the mill owner offers me $8 per thousand feet—a price we cannot get this year, but which in other years we have got, I find that American logs bring in the St. John market $10 per thousand feet, the difference of duty going into the pocket of the producer in Maine. This is the best possible proof of the advantage the reduction of the duties would be to the lumbermen of the Maritime Provinces. But that is not all. It may be said that to the men who supply the parties who go into the woods and haul the logs it makes no difference; but I will tell you where the shoe pinches. In New Brunswick I can only pay my hired men $16 per month, while the American operator across the line, in sight of my shanty, can afford to pay $26 per month. That is the way the labouring men are affected by the tariff, and it shows what a relief it would be to us if we could secure reciprocity with the United States. It may be said that I am too fast in making these predictions, but I am willing they should go on record in *Hansard*, because I do expect the time is not far distant when we will be able to avail ourselves of that market. I remember that I am here in a minority from my province, but I recollect that I have stood here in a minority from all Canada, when the Government possessed ninety of majority, and I realise to-night that the times have somewhat changed. Notwithstanding the proud boasts of hon. gentlemen opposite, I realise that I am face to face with a Government who dare not count on more than twenty to twenty-three of a majority. They tell us the country is with them. Sir, it is gradually slipping from their grasp, and I have the proud satisfaction of knowing that while in the past I looked jealously around on my friends from Quebec and Ontario, and felt that we would be better out of this Confederation than in it, feeling that they might be a selfish lot—I speak of both Liberals and Conservatives—only disposed to consider their own interests, and that to them this National Policy might be some advantage, I am proud to be able to stand here with a majority from the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which have both pronounced against the Government. It is true that my province pronounced in the March election against the Liberal party and their policy. But my province is a province which generally takes time to consider, and I venture to say that when the opportunity is offered us again we will pronounce a different verdict. I referred a short while ago to the trade in bark, which has been carried on owing to that article having been left on the free list when the treaty was abolished in 1866. I will now call attention to another industry in the Province of New Brunswick, which stands exactly in the same position. I refer to the export of Rockland wood, to which I alluded when reading the extract from the report of the commission in Maine. A large trade is carried on in that trade of soft wood, which has not a commercial value, but is of great value to the people of the county I represent. Here again the price, as shown in the trade returns, does not indicate the value of that trade to the people of New Brunswick. You can multiply it two and a-half times. If we export $100,000 of wood from the Maritime Provinces to Rockland, Maine, that means a quarter of a million dollars returned to us. What I said before with regard to lumber I now repeat; and I say further, that in that particular locality, when we talk about the exodus, in my

county and in the other counties that participate in this trade there is no exodus ; the people find employment, they stay at home ; it gives the farmers employment in the winter in preparing the lumber, it gives their sons employment in building ships ; but how much better would it be if we could do the whole business, if we could use the wood and manufacture the lime for export to the foreign market, and bring back three or four times the amount in cash which we now do. I have pointed out these different industries, and if my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) were in his place I would challenge him, as I do any other hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick, to say where on the face of the globe a market can be found for lime, freestone, plaster, hemlock lumber, coal or cordwood outside of the United States. My hon. friend from Albert said something which seemed to foreshadow the idea of Imperial Federation, because he pointed to a cloud in the sky, and spoke of a differential duty of 5 per cent. being put on in favour of the people of this country, which he though would be of great benefit to the lumberman and the fisherman. Supposing we got the benefit to which he referred, it would amount to about 50 cents a thousand feet superficial measurement on lumber. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides would agree with me that the reduction of $2 a thousand in the United States is far preferable to the duty of 5 per cent. in our favour in Great Britain, which also we are not likely to get. The industries to which I have been referring would be in addition to the industries which are prosecuted at the present time ; and I agree with one remark of the speaker who preceded me (Mr. Wallace), that the home market is the best market for our farmers. There is nothing clearer or truer than that, but I want to put the matter squarely before this House. If, as I believe, under free trade our industries can be developed, they would give a home market for the farmers. I believe that in New Brunswick, if the business were carried on as it should be, we would have no necessity to export many of our farm products to the United States, because our farmers would have at their doors a market infinitely preferable to that of the United States. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we cannot get free trade. That is a question upon which neither they nor I am prepared to pass judgment to-night. If it is true that they are attempting to get free trade in natural products do they or do they not believe that they will succeed ? They say that we cannot succeed on the basis which we propose. Do they intend to humbug the people by stating that they can succeed on the basis they propose ? We know with whom we have to deal, and we know that, unless we make some sacrifices, we cannot expect to secure a trade which would be so valuable to us. They tell us it would be treason to make such sacrifices. I deny it. If freestone can be exported from Albert County to Boston, and if our people should invest their money in manufactured goods and bring them back to New Brunswick, I do not see anything treasonable in that. During the last campaign those hon. gentlemen said they were going in for reciprocity in natural products and such other articles as the changed condition of the two countries would admit of. Where do they draw the line ? Where does the treason begin and where does it end ? I have pointed out who would be helped by the adoption of free trade with the United States. First of all, the farmers of New Brunswick would be helped, next the lumbermen would be helped, the miners, the fishermen, the coasters would be helped, and in fact ever other class in New Brunswick would be helped. I would like some hon. gentleman from my province on the other side to rise and point out who would be hurt. It is true that we have some cotton factories in New Brunswick, but the most extensive of them is owned by Mr. Alexander Gibson, and though he opposed the policy of the party on this side of the House in the last election—and I suppose he had good and sufficient reason for doing so—I know that he has stated that he was not afraid to compete with the cotton manufacturers of the State of Maine, or any other part of the United States. I ask why that gentleman, with his enterprise and energy, a man who built a railway from the Province of New Brunswick to Aroostook, in the State of Maine, and operated it until of late the Canadian Pacific Railway has got hold of it, and carried the products of the northern part of that State to the seaboard by a railway built by a citizen of New Brunswick, could be afraid to compete in the open market in the manufacture of cotton. We have some cotton manufacturers in St. John. I admit that some people might be hurt by this policy being put into operation. Possibly some lawyers might be hurt. There has been a suit going on for some time before the Equity judge in the city of St. John in connection with these cotton factories, and I believe there have been some twenty-one lawyers engaged in that *pro* and *con.* Possibly these lawyers might be hurt. There is a cotton factory in Charlotte County, and I regret to say that New Brunswickers were induced to invest their capital in that factory, and they lost their investment. It passed into the hands of American capitalists, and is now being run by American capital and American enterprise. Will any hon. gentleman dare to tell me that a factory situated on the borders of the State of Maine, with cheaper coal and cheaper labour than can be obtained in the State of Maine, cannot manufacture the article cheaper than it can be manufactured in that State. I know of no one else who will be hurt, unless it is the lawyers from St. John, by adopting free trade ; certainly it cannot hurt the cotton factory very much. Now, I have not the slightest objection to express my views in regard to the loss of revenue which our friends predict would be the result of the adoption of a policy of this kind. I am here to-night to say that no system which can be devised—and I want to guard my words well—taking matters as they stand to-day, while I do not favour a system of direct taxation, I defy my hon. friend from South Oxford, if he had the reigns of power, to devise a system of taxation which would press more heavily upon the people of that province than the policy which is in existence to-day. What are the facts ? In St. John and elsewhere what are we doing ? At present we are forced to export our surplus products for which we have to receive gold, and we are compelled, under the present system, to send that gold to Montreal and elsewhere to buy manufactured goods. I ask if that does not bear heavily upon us. I would like my hon. friends to take their constituents and visit some of the streets in Montreal, and look at the fashionable residences and palaces built by the sugar refiners and the

cotton lords, and other men who have been enriched by the National Policy. They can point to nothing like that in New Brunswick. Another matter which was referred to in the election campaign was the loyalty question. I know my hon. friends opposite do not here, and I do not believe they did elsewhere, charge the Liberal party of New Brunswick with being disloyal. But I have one remark to make. I notice on every occasion when those hon. gentlemen rise in this House to speak, instead of pointing out what they think would be beneficial to their province, they always and invariably attempt to deal with what was said in a speech of the hon. member for South Oxford—that is, they charge that he has given utterance to disloyal sentiments. Sir, that hon. gentleman does not need any defence at my hands, and I am not here to defend him; but I do say that in the campaign which terminated in New Brunswick on the 5th of March last an unfair use was made of an extract taken from the speech delivered by that hon. gentleman at a banquet in Boston, and the unfair use that was made of that speech contributed largely to the success of some of the Conservative candidates in that province. I have read that hon. gentleman's speech through from end to end; I have read it more than once. I am proud of that speech and I am proud of the man who made it, and I think in justice to him, if it was not so late, I would only do right to read it word for word. But I will say this, that never before has a Boston audience heard a more patriotic Canadian speech, or a speech more in sympathy with Canadian interests, than the speech the hon. gentleman delivered on that occasion. It is a speech of which every Canadian has a right to be proud. Did he belittle this country? Not a bit of it. If he erred at all it was in lauding the country too much. Sir, our friends forget that it was in the interest of Canada that the member for South Oxford was addressing a Boston audience. I do not say that he was attempting to pull the wool over their eyes; but our friends opposite are oversensitive, and they pretend that because the word "St. John" and the word "Halifax" are not mentioned in that speech, but that his reference was mainly to the future of Boston, therefore an attack was levelled at St. John and Halifax. Nothing of the kind. These gentlemen are at fault in their geography. Look to the west of us, and what do you find? There is a North-West in the United States as well as in Canada. There are Maritime Provinces as well as a Province of Ontario and a Province of Quebec; and, Sir, will not free trade in the Maritime Provinces help the City of Boston? Certainly it will. Boston to-day, I admit, is circumscribed, compared with the City of New York, but Boston to-day in the matter of trade is competing with the City of New York. New York at the present time is getting more than its fair share of trade. If you can convince the citizens of Boston that under unrestricted reciprocity there would come from Western Canada, and their own North-West, and the Maritime Province, a large influx to their city and a large addition to their trade, you have done a good service to Canada; and I do not believe that the citizens of St. John or the citizens of Halifax are the men that our friends opposite take them to be; I do not believe they are afraid to face this free trade question. They have no fear that they will be ousted from the trade they now have in the ports of St. John and Halifax. I say that Boston is the most desirable market to-day, outside the home market, for the people of the Maritime Provinces, and under unrestricted reciprocity a large increase in that trade must naturally take place. Our export trade to-day with the United States, speaking from memory, I believe, is something like $40,000,000. Can anyone doubt that if we had free trade with the United States for the next ten or fifteen years that trade would not reach $80,000,000? And do you tell me that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford was not warranted in saying to the people of Boston that under the free trade relations which would exist if we negotiated a treaty of that kind, Boston would benefit more than any other city in the United States? Sir, our friends from St. John and Halifax are over-sensitive when they attack that speech of the member for South Oxford. Suppose we fall back upon the National Policy, and suppose that the Chinese wall which is now erected should be raised considerably higher between St. John and Boston, where would we be? Cut off completely. I ask my hon. friends to reconsider that speech, and when next they address a St. John audience to read, not an extract from the speech, but the whole speech. Thanking the House for their kind attention to my remarks, I now resume my seat.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. He said: It will be within the memory of hon. gentlemen that at the commencement of this session a statement was laid upon the Table of the House showing the amount of Governor General's warrants issued during the recess since last session, for carrying on the public service. A reference to that statement shows that the gross amount of the warrants so issued was $1,310,876.38, and it appears from this statement that there was only expended of that a sum of $750,646.60. I am not finding fault with the fact that there was not more spent, but I merely mention the circumstance that only that amount was spent to show that the Governor General was moved to grant authority to his Ministers to expend a sum of $560,000 more than they had any occasion to spend under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. When you look at this statement I think you will be struck with many features in connection with it, showing on its face, and I am afraid in sub-

stance as well, an exercise of the prerogative far beyond the spirit of the Act in question. For example, the very first item for which there was a Governor General's warrant was on the 30th May, 1890, within one week after Parliament prorogued last session? That item was for "Contingencies, Exchequer Court, $2,000." Why was it necessary for the Government, the moment Parliament prorogued, to ask the Governor General for a warrant to expend this money? Why, I say, was not Parliament consulted the week before, when Parliament was in session. The very next item is on the 30th May, 1890, within thirteen days after the prorogation, and is a warrant for $24,231.59 for, as described in this statement, "House of Commons Contingencies." I am unable to understand how, within thirteen days after prorogation, the Government could have called upon the Governor General to give that authority for twenty-four thousand odd dollars, for something, which they must contend at all events, was within the spirit of the Act: for something unforeseen, something unprovided for, something urgent. We go on through this whole statement of Governor General's warrants issued from that time down to the present, and we are confronted with these extraordinary entries. We find just prior to the general elections and at the close of the elections large expenses for public works. For example, we find here, on the 26th March, 1891, "Cape Breton Railway, Grand Narrows, $95,000;" we find on the 26th March, 1891, "Cape Breton Railway construction, $100,000;" 17th April, "ditto, $32,000;" 17th April, "Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, $65,000;" 17th April, "Intercolonial Railway construction, $1,000;" 17th April, 1891, "St. Charles Branch, $3,000;" "Y at Truro, $10,000;" and "Rolling Stock, $33,000." How comes it that it was necessary, fourteen days before the assembly of Parliament, to obtain a Governor General's warrant for the purchase of $33,000 worth of rolling stock? Under what part of the Revised Statutes does that come in? Was it urgent; was it unforeseen; was it to repair some public work or building? I should like to know how the Government came to move His Excellency to issue a warrant such as this. Then the statement goes on: 17th April, "Increased accommodation, St. John, $4,600;" and so on through the whole statement, which I will not take up the time of the House to read, but upon which I will say: that so far as I can judge, and so far as any explanations that have been offered the committee have gone, there has been no valid reason given for the exercise of the power I complain of. I asked the Minister of Finance, in regard to some of these items, if he would lay upon the Table of the House the reports of the Ministers upon which the Governor General was induced to put his hand to these warrants. What was the answer? It was: The Audit Act provides for it; and that I may not misinterpret what the Act provides, I will briefly quote the words of the Act itself. The Audit Act itself says: There shall be no expenditure of public money except there be authority of Parliament, except under certain circumstances; and what are these circumstances? In sub-section *(b)*, section 32, the special circumstances that warrant such procedure as this are set forth as follows:—

"If when Parliament is not in session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good"——

Why urgently? The point of that is, that the urgency must be of such character as will not admit of the Government waiting until the representatives of the people can be consulted on the proposed expenditure. That must be the degree of urgency. The section goes on to say:

"Then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor General may order a special warrant to be prepared to be signed by the Governor General, &c."

These are the conditions. Now, under these conditions, before the warrant could issue it was the duty of the Minister whose service was in question to have laid a report before the Governor General in Council within the spirit of that Act. Is it within the spirit of that Act for the Minister having charge of the service in question to simply say to the Governor in Council: The public service requires so much money because there is some urgency, without setting forth the urgency, the need of it, the circumstances and facts, in order to enable both the Government and His Excellency to draw conclusions; and further than that, as another safeguard, Parliament required the Minister of Finance to add his report to that of the Minister in question to the effect that there was no appropriation. These reports, in order to give an intelligent idea of what is required, should, in my judgment, not be merely an echo of the statute, not copy merely the words of the statute, but should state the circumstances and the facts that warranted the Minister in question drawing the conclusion or inference which the Act requires to be drawn in order to the exercise of this prerogative. Well, when we came the other night to one of these items and asked that the reports on which certain expenditure had been made should be laid before the Committee of Supply, what were we told? That I may not be charged with making any mistake, I will quote, for the information of the House, the discussion that took place:

"Mr. MULOCK. Why should not the reports of Ministers on which Governor General's warrants are issued be laid on the Table? We have simply a statement, but not a report.

"Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman would obtain much more information if that were done.

"Mr. MULOCK. Then what is the use of the reports to the Governor General?

"Mr. FOSTER. The report, if the hon. gentleman got it, would inform him that so much money was required, and there was no appropriation out of which it could be taken, and it was so declared on the report of the Minister of Finance, and therefore a Governor General's warrant do issue."

The report contains, as a rule, no statement whatever of the circumstances which moved the Minister in question to ask for this special grant. The Minister went on to say that in some cases there might be a more detailed statement, and then added that he himself had been impressed with the fact that there had been more or less laxity in the matter of these grants, and that he was struggling with the difficulty and intended adopting some means to meet it. I want to strengthen his hands in his endeavour to remedy this abuse. If it is possible for abuses of this kind to take place it is time that the people's representatives endeavoured to provide extra safeguards against their recurrence. We have placed the Treasury under the care of the

Finance Minister, and we have the Minister in charge of the service for which the warrant is required, and these two gentlemen are supposed to present to His Excellency the reports which will warrant His Excellency, if he is to take any responsibility at all, in determining whether he shall or shall not issue his warrant. At present what do we find? We find His Excellency, so far as appears here, signing recommendations from the Government practically in blank. It would be as reasonable, it seems to me, for His Excellency to give an unlimited power of attorney in this matter at once to the Government as to go on signing recommendations which, judging by what has taken place, are without justification. To the extent of over half a million dollars at least the advice of the Government to His Excellency was without justification. That is not a state of affairs which should exist, and I propose, since the Minister of Finance and the individual Minister who has to do with this have disregarded the spirit of the law, to put some extra guards on the public treasury. It is somewhat late in the session to do that, but the occasion for the reform only became known to us on the 3rd of July, for it was on that day that the hon. Finance Minister made known to the House for the first time that these reports were practically valueless; and a few days afterwards, as soon as I could, I gave notice of this Bill which I have now the honour to introduce. I would ask the Government, if they do not approve of the measure, if the precautions I have suggested do not commend themselves, to prepare a Bill themselves —and I will be glad to defer to their judgment if they can improve on my measure—and let it become law before the close of the session. It is our duty to take every possible means to guard the treasury. We would not be doing our duty now if we allowed the laxity which the hon. Minister of Finance has permitted to creep into the Administration to continue until another session.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the call of several hon. members was that the hon. gentleman should explain his Bill. I do not think he has done anything of the kind, but he has gone into a long argument to show that certain abuses have existed which he feels called upon to reform. He has not, however, given the House any inkling of the provisions of his Bill, and that is the explanation we require just now.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose that, in addition to the precautions existing at present, that the report of the Minister having charge of the service for which the special warrant is required shall set forth all the facts and circumstances which warrant him in asking for a special grant, and that his report shall be referred to the Finance Minister, who will endorse the recommendation, and that these two reports shall be laid before the Minister of Justice, who will report thereon as to whether a case has been made out, within the spirit as well as the letter of the Act, by these reports, and whether the grant should be given. Then, and not until then, shall the Governor in Council be at liberty to issue the special warrant.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not enter into a discussion as to the necessity for this resolution, or into a reply to the allegations of the hon. gentleman, until the Bill comes before the House on its second reading. The hon. gentleman has given the outlines of his Bill, and those the House can consider in the meantime.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRAUDULENT MARKING.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 140) in restraint of fraudulent marking. He said: This measure deals only with the article of white lead, but it takes power to deal with other articles by Order in Council; but any Order in Council dealing with other articles besides white lead, after this session, will have to be confirmed at the next session of Parliament, or else the Order in Council will fall through and the articles so dealt with will no longer be subject to the Act. This Bill establishes a certain standard at which white lead is to be sold as pure, and provides a penalty in cases where white lead is marked pure and the standard not up to that required.

Mr. LAURIER. Has this Bill been suggested by the Boards of Trade?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This is merely to amend section 19 of the original Act, which provides as to the rights of parties in the Exchequer Court intervening at the relation of any person interested, and I propose to substitute therefor "at the suit of any person."

Mr. EDGAR. I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will not require the assent of the Imperial Government, because if he does we shall never have it, I suppose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PATENT ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to amend the Patent Act. He said: This is for the purpose of making the same provision regarding patents which the other Bill makes regarding copyrights.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

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

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 7th July, 1891.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DALY asked, 1. Has the Chief Engineer of Government Railways duly certified to the com-

pletion and equipment of the first fifty miles of the Great North-West Central Railway? 2. If so, can the acting Minister of Railways say why the said fifty miles of railway have not been operated? 3. When will the company operate the said fifty miles?

Mr. BOWELL. To the first part of the question the answer is, yes. In answer to an enquiry made a little while ago, Mr. Codd, the president of the company, stated that the railway had not been operated owing to the contractor having failed to deliver up to the company the fifty miles completed, in accordance with the agreement between the company and the contractor. Mr. Codd states that the company will operate the road as soon as it is delivered up by the contractor complete, according to the contract with the company.

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. AMYOT (for Mr. FRÉMONT) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to grant a subsidy to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway for the twenty miles of the Eastern or Chicoutimi extension of the railway to complete the seventy miles of distance between Chambord Junction and St. Alphonse, and also for the expensive bridging on the above Chicoutimi Extension Railway?

Mr. BOWELL. The question of railway subsidies has not yet been considered by the Government.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. AMYOT (for Mr. FRÉMONT) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to abolish the duty on vessels for the relief of sick and distressed mariners?

Mr. TUPPER. This subject has not been considered by the Government, but enquiries are now being made by the Department of Marine as to whether ship-owners would prefer to take care of their own sick mariners and pay no sick mariners' tax, thus avoiding the payment of corresponding tonnage dues in the United States.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RELIEF FOR INJURIES.

Mr. AMYOT (for Mr. FRÉMONT) asked, What was the amount paid by the Government for relief afforded to the passengers on the Intercolonial Railway, at the time of the disaster at St. Joseph de Lévis? Has the Government paid the cost of medical attendance on, and the board of the wounded while they were suffering? Why have not the doctor's bill and the charges for board against Eugène Robitaille, of the parish of Ancienne Lorette, one of the victims of the said accident, been settled?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount paid to doctors and others was $2,560.02. No services were paid for except in cases in which the claimants were called upon by the railway officials to take charge of the patients. The Government cannot recognize any liability for injuries caused by this accident.

FISHERY OVERSEER LAVALLÉE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, 1st. Whether the Government has been informed of the difficulties which have been raised for the first time by the fishery overseer for the County of Richelieu, Mr. N. Lavallée, who denies to licensed fishermen from the other counties surrounding Lake St. Peter, the right of fishing in the waters of the County of Richelieu? 2nd. Whether the Government gave authority to Mr. Lavallée, fishery overseer for the district of Richelieu, to issue to the licensed fishermen of the adjoining counties the following notice:—

"NOTICE.

"You are strictly prohibited from fishing within the County of Richelieu.

"By order of the Overseer.

"Under pain of fine, as I cannot grant you licenses.

(Sgd.) "N. LAVALLÉE,
"*Fishery Overseer.*"

3rd. Whether the Government are aware that the said Lavallée has refused, and still refuses to grant fishing licenses in the waters of the County of Richelieu to fishermen holding licenses, or otherwise, to fish in the waters of the adjoining counties, and has refused to take the price of such licenses? 4th. If so, what steps do the Government purpose taking in order to put a stop to the abuse of power committed by the said Lavallée since his appointment as fishery overseer for the County of Richelieu?

Mr. TUPPER. The Fisheries Department was a few days ago informed of the difficulties which had arisen in Overseer Lavallée's district regarding the issue of fishery licenses on Lake St. Peter. The department did not give authority to Mr. Lavallée to issue the notice mentioned. The department is not aware that Overseer Lavallée has refused, and still refuses, to grant licenses to fish in the waters of the County of Richelieu to fishermen holding licenses, or otherwise, to fish in the waters of the adjoining counties, and to take the fees for such licenses. Mr. Lavallée has been called upon for an explanation of his action, and upon receipt of his report such steps will be taken as are deemed necessary.

MILITIA AT WELLINGTON, B.C.

Mr. GORDON asked, 1st. Whether the pay of the active militia called out by Lieutenant Colonel Holmes, ostensibly in aid of the civil power at Wellington, on the 5th of August last, was guaranteed before the troops left Victoria? If so, by whom? And by whom paid? Have the expenses of said military expedition been collected from a municipality; and if so, from which municipality? If there are no details of those payments in the department, as indicated by the return brought down to this House, will the Minister of Militia obtain an answer to the following questions by telegraph? 2nd. Did any person or persons become responsible for, and guarantee the payment of the active militia under the command of Colonel Holmes, that were ordered to Wellington on the 5th of August last? Did such guarantee, if any, include cost of transportation, the rent of cars used as quarters for the force while at Wellington, the board and lodging of officers, and board of the men at the Wellington hotel? And the blankets and other camp equipments required by the troops while there? If so, by whom was such guarantee given? Giving the name of the person or persons in each case. 3rd. What amount was paid to the

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company for transportation and use of their cars for quarters for the troops while at Washington? 4th. What amount was paid for the board and lodging of the officers and for board of the men under the command of Colonel Holmes, at the Wellington hotel? 5th. What amount was paid for active service of officers and men? What amount in lieu of subsistence? 6th. What amount was paid for blankets and other camp equipage while so stationed? 7th. Whether any sum or sums were paid to either officers or men in excess of the regulation rates for active service? If so, what amount? And to whom paid? And any other information in his possession pertinent to this enquiry.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the first question, I may say that the pay was guaranteed by R. Dunsmuir & Sons before the troops left Victoria. I cannot say who paid them. I am not aware that the expenses were collected by a municipality. In answer to the second question, I may state that the guarantee given by R. Dunsmuir & Sons included all reasonable expenses in connection with the trip of the militia force to Wellington. In reply to the third question, I may say that the expenses not having been paid by the Government, I cannot state what amount was paid. No account has been presented for board and lodging of officers, and for board of the men at the Wellington hotel. The amount paid for active service of the officers and men of the British Columbia Brigade of Garrison Artillery and for cartage, &c., was $198.08. Nothing was paid for "C" Battery detachment. There was a small bill of $4 for the commanding officer, and 75 cents for his master gunner for cab hire, which was also paid. The receipts in each case of the parties receiving the money were sent to Messrs. Dunsmuir & Sons. In reference to the sixth question, I do not know what amount was paid for blankets or other camp equipage while they were stationed there, as no account was submitted for these items. I am not aware of any sums being paid other than those I have mentioned. The claim for pay was made out under the supervision of the deputy adjutant general and was strictly in accordance with the regulations.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he does not know by whom the money was paid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The department never knows except when the amount is paid by the commanding officer.

Mr. LAURIER. Then in this case, it was not paid by the commanding officer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, it was paid to the commanding officer.

Mr. LAURIER. And the Minister cannot say by whom it was paid?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I see it was paid by the firm of Dunsmuir & Sons, and I cannot say anything further.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a very grave question, and the correspondence ought to be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must rule that it is out of order to discuss a question.

Mr. GORDON.

OVERSEER LAVALLÉE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, On what date, under what circumstances, and on whose recommendation was Mr. Lavallée appointed fishery officer for the County of Richelieu.

Mr. TUPPER. Narcisse Lavallée was, on the 4th November, 1890, appointed fishery overseer for that portion of the waters of the River St. Lawrence fronting on the County of Richelieu, including the islands therein, on the recommendation of the late J. A. Massue, ex-M.P.

LAKE ST. PETER—DIVISION OF FISHERY DISTRICTS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Has the Government considered the inconvenience resulting from the division of the waters of Lake St. Peter into six fishery districts,—thereby creating six concurrent jurisdictions over the same waters, with the clashings which necessarily arise? Is it intended to make one district of Lake St. Peter, and to grant fishing licenses valid in all parts of the said lake for the price of a license in one district?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government has considered the system of licenses for this district, and believes that no inconvenience has resulted from the division of the waters of Lake St. Peter, and that no clashing will arise if licensees keep within the limits prescribed in their licenses. It is not intended to make one district of Lake St. Peter nor to grant fishing licenses valid in all parts of the said lake for the fee of a single license.

MONUMENT TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) (for Mr. TAYLOR) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have a monument of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, P.C., G.C.B., &c., erected on the Parliament grounds at Ottawa? If so, when, and where will the same be located?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to vote a sum of money for that purpose.

ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF LIQUOR.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether the Government ordered an enquiry respecting an illegal seizure of liquor effected on the premises of F. X. Lamonde, hotel-keeper, Montmagny, a few weeks ago by Eugène Hammond, preventive officer for the said town; and if so, what was the result of such enquiry?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government did order an investigation under date of the 18th June, and the inspectors reported that a seizure had been made on insufficient grounds, and recommended that the amount should be refunded to Mr. Lalonde, amounting to the sum of $15. That amount was refunded to him, and the officer who made the seizure was ordered to pay the amount out of his own pocket.

ATLANTIC CATTLE TRADE.

Mr. SPROULE asked, When will the regulations be issued concerning the Atlantic cattle trade?

Mr. TUPPER. The regulations which have been made, in addition to those which are now in force, will be issued after the Bill now before Parliament becomes law.

RELIEF OF DISTRESSED CANADIANS ABROAD.

Mr. INNES asked, What reasons had the Government for refusing to refund expenses incurred for the relief of distressed Canadians abroad, as indicated in a circular issued by the Imperial Government to Her Majesty's Consuls abroad as follows:—

"FOREIGN OFFICE, 31st May, 1890.

"SIR,—With reference to previous circulars relative to the relief of distressed British subjects, I am directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to state that, in view of the refusal of the Governments of Barbadoes and the Dominion of Canada to refund expenses incurred for the relief of distressed Barbadians and Canadians, you should hereafter refrain, under all circumstances, from affording them any relief on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, as the Treasury have intimated that claims for the repayment of sums advanced for the relief or repatriation of British Barbadian or Canadian subjects cannot in future be entertained.

"I am, Sir,

"Your most obedient humble servant,

(Sgd.) "T. V. LISTER.

"Her Majesty's Consuls."

And what actuated the Government in revoking their former instructions in this matter, as indicated by a circular issued from the Foreign Office, London, dated 1st April, 1891, in which it was stated that the Government of Canada would assume the responsibility of affording relief to distressed Canadians in all foreign countries except the United States of North America?

Mr. TUPPER. In 1882, it was considered that there were difficulties in the way of assuming the responsibility for the relief of distressed Canadians abroad, for this, among other reasons: That there was no fund out of which such money could be paid, and it would not be expedient to ask Parliament to vote money for such purposes; that the population of Canada is largely composed of persons not born within the Dominion, and immigrants are constantly arriving from all parts of the world; that it would be impracticable to provide only for the relief of distressed Canadians abroad, who have been born in Canada, as no particular means could be provided for proof of birth, and to assume the burden of relieving every person in distress, abroad, who might claim Canada as his home—no matter what his nationality—would be to assume indefinite responsibility. Subsequently, it was, however, decided by the Government to assume the responsibility of affording relief to distressed Canadians in foreign countries, except in the United States, the exception in this case being due to the contiguity of that country, the long border line, and the difficulty of adjusting and ascertaining the merits of each particular case that might be presented. The Foreign Office circular, I may add, of 1st April, 1891, has not been received in the Department of Marine.

Mr. INNES. It has been published; I have a copy of it.

MANAGEMENT OF GRAVING DOCK, LÉVIS.

Mr. DELISLE asked, (*a.*) Is the Government informed that the following facts are consigned in the minutes of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners at the date of the 24th October, 1890, viz.:

"It was decided to call in the engineer-in-chief and his assistant, who were in attendance, and ask them some questions relative to the graving dock management. Mr. George Boswell was thereupon introduced and asked by the chairman if he had heard any complaints against Captain J. E. Bernier, the Commissioners' dock master, and answered, 'No.' Mr. H. Laforce Langevin was then called in, and the following questions were, by the direction of the board, put to him by the acting secretary-treasurer: 1st. 'You have been in the employ of the Harbour Commission all summer: during that time did you make reports against any other employé of the Commission direct to Ottawa?' Answer, 'Yes: against Captain J. E. Bernier, the graving dock master.' 2nd. 'What right had you to make any report except through this Commission or through Mr. Boswell, your chief engineer?' Answer, 'That having been allowed by Mr. Boswell to superintend work at the graving dock, that he considered he had a right to make this report to his chief, Mr. L. Coste of the Department of Public Works, Ottawa.' 3rd. 'Did you receive a salary from the Public Works Department, as well as from the Harbour Commission?' Answer, 'No; not as a salary, but I received pay for services rendered.'"

(*b.*) What was the nature of the services rendered by the said Laforce Langevin? (*c.*) What is the amount of money received by the said Laforce Langevin from the Department of Public Works since January, 1888, up to date, and for what services was the amount paid? (*d.*) What was the nature of the report made to the Public Works Department against the said J. E. Bernier, the graving dock master, by the said Laforce Langevin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (*a.*) The Government is not informed that the above was consigned on the minutes of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. (*b.*) By Act of Parliament, chapter 6, 51 Vic., assented to on the 22nd of May, 1888, the management of the Lévis Graving Dock was vested with the Department of Public Works, which undertook certain works of construction and repairs, such as the roofing of the engine house, the building of a fence around the dock property, the erection of a coal shed, &c., under the direct control of its chief engineer and officers, during the fiscal years 1889-90 and 1890-91. The question of placing someone in charge was left to the acting chief engineer of the department, Mr. Louis Coste, who found that Mr. J. E. Bernier, the late dock-master of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, was not qualified to take charge of the engineering work, and who therefore requested Mr. H. Laforce Langevin, who had previously been employed on this work as assistant engineer, to act as superintendent of the work for the short period required. Mr. H. Laforce Langevin having obtained permission from his chief, Mr. St. George Boswell, assumed the work of superintendent on the 1st June, 1890, and performed his functions to the satisfaction of the department until the 13th October, 1890, when Mr. U. Valiquet, C.E., was placed in charge of the graving dock after the resignation of Captain J. E. Bernier had been accepted by the department. (*c.*) The amount of money received by Mr. Laforce Langevin from the Department of Public Works since January, 1888, up to date, has been $618, as follows: $540 for services as superintendent of the work, $78 for travelling expenses in connection therewith. (*d.*) On the 10th of October, Mr. Laforce Langevin verbally informed Mr. Louis Coste, of the Public Works Department, then in Quebec on a tour of inspection, that he had been told that Captain J. E. Bernier's management of the affairs of the graving dock would not bear investigation;

and Mr. Coste having reported to the department, was subsequently authorized to make an investigation into the management of the dock, which investigation resulted in Captain Bernier resigning his position as dock master.

CLERK OF WORKS, WALKERTON,

Mr. TRUAX asked, Did John Talton, clerk of works at Walkerton Public Buildings, resign his position prior to or during the election contest in February or March last? If so, what was the date of his resignation, and when was he reappointed, and did he continue to draw his salary after he resigned and up to the time of his reappointment, and is he still in the employ of the Government as clerk of works at the Walkerton Public Buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The name of that man is J. S. Talton. He did not resign his position, and continued his work. He is still in the employ of the Government as clerk of works.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR.

Mr. PERRY asked, What amount of money has been expended in blasting rock and improving Cascumpeque Harbour, P. E. I., up to 30th of June, 1891?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $16,906.81.

WELDFORD POST OFFICE, N.B.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. GILLMOR) asked, Have any complaints been made to the Postmaster General about the post office business at Weldford Post Office, in Kent County, N.B., being conducted in a room at the rear of a store kept by the postmaster's wife? Has the department been informed of the postmaster's failure in his mercantile transactions and of the nature of that failure?

Mr. HAGGART. Mrs. Sarah J. Livingston made a complaint to the above effect on the 29th of May last, alleging that the postmaster derived a business advantage from the necessity that people were under of passing through his store to get at the post office. An answer was given under date the 3rd June, to the effect that the case did not seem to call for the interference of the department, as it was not uncommon for post offices to be kept in stores. The department received intimation from the same source that the postmaster had made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS FROM CAMILLA TO WHITTINGTON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (for Mr. MCMULLEN) asked, Who has the contract at present for carrying the mails beween Camilla Post Office and Whittington Post Office, County of Dufferin, Ontario, and the price paid? How many tenders were put in, and who was the lowest? When was the contract let? What was the price paid to the previous contractor? Did it expire or was it cancelled, and when? Was the new contract advertised, and where and how long?

Mr. HAGGART. Contractor, Joseph Howard, senior; present rate, $95 per annum; number of tenders, one; the lowest, Joseph Howard, senior; contract let, in February, 1891; price under former contract, $75. This service was performed under a memorandum of agreement terminable at the Postmaster General's pleasure, which was not exercised until the 31st of March, 1891. The new contract was advertised between the 10th December, 1890, and the 23rd of January, 1891, by placards posted up in Camilla and Whittington post offices, and by notices in the local newspapers.

FISHERY LICENSES.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, 1st. What is the amount of fee levied on each salmon net fishery license in the County of Bonaventure for 1890? 2nd. What is the amount of fee levied on each salmon net fishery license for the County of Restigouche in 1890? 3rd. Is it the intention of the Government to levy a uniform fee on each salmon net fishery license in the Counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche for the year 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. On the salmon net licenses in the County of Bonaventure a fee of 40 cents per barrel of fish caught was levied in some districts, and in others 3 cents per fathom on nets. In Restigouche County the fee levied on each salmon net was 3 cents per fathom. The Government has instructed its officers to levy a uniform rate or fee (3 cents per fathom) on each salmon net fishery license in the Counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche in 1891. The reason of the difference in Bonaventure and in Restigouche, and in that of the districts in Bonaventure itself, was due to the fact that instructions changing the old rate from 40 cents per barrel did not reach the officers of certain districts until the licenses under the old system had been granted to the fishermen and the fee exacted.

PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA—SINKING FUND.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. Who are the trustees of the Sinking Fund with respect to the Public Debt of Canada? 2. What is the amount of such Sinking Fund? 3. What amount of such Sinking Fund consists of Canada Dominion Stock? 4. What amount consists of debentures? 5 What amount consists of any other securities or assets? 6. What part of said Sinking Fund is payable to bearer? 7. If any Dominion Government debentures have been purchased or redeemed to form part of such Sinking Fund, in whose custody are such debentures? 8. What is the amount of the interest on said Sinking Fund? 9. Is such interest paid to the trustees? If so, what application do the trustees make of the interest so paid them? 10. What commission, if any, is paid by the Government on interest on the Sinking Fund?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to state in the first place, that the Sinking Fund is divided into two parts; one is held for the guaranteed, and the other for the unguaranteed. 1. Guaranteed loans: The Permanent Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Permanent Secretary of the Treasury, the High Commissioner of Canada for England (by appointment of the Dominion Government), Lord Revelstoke. Unguaranteed loans: The hon. the Receiver General of Canada, Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co., Messrs. Glynn, Mills, Currie, & Co. British Columbia Loan: Sir Robert George Wyndham Herbert, K.C.B., Sir Montague Frederick

Ommanney, K.C.M.G., Ernest Edward Blake, Esq. 2. $25,959,225.32 on 30th of June, 1891. 3. $19,613,706.15. 4. $6,259,506.66. 5. $85,958.51. 6. $6,259,506.66. 7. In the custody of the Bank of England in trust for the trustees. 8. $982,461.45. 9. Yes. Invested in securities for Sinking Funds. 10. As the Canadian securities form part of the principal of the loan, one-half of 1 per cent. commission is paid on the amount invested in Sinking Fund.

POSTMASTER AT ALLISONVILLE.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Have any charges been made against Benjamin C. Ainsworth, postmaster at Allisonville, Prince Edward County, Ontario, which have been investigated since the last Dominion election? Is the result of such investigation to support the charges, or otherwise? 2. Has any order been given by the Government for the removal of the Allisonville post office from the postmaster's house to one James Boyd's shop? If so, when was such order given?

Mr. HAGGART. Charges have been made against B. C. Ainsworth, postmaster at Allisonville, County of Prince Edward, since the date of the last Dominion election. An investigation has been held, and the charges have not been substantiated. No order has been given for the removal of the Allison post office to the shop of one James Boyd.

CORNWALLIS VALLEY RAILWAY CO.

Mr. FORBES asked, Has the Cornwallis Valley Railway Company applied to the Dominion Government for a subsidy to assist in extending its line westward from Centreville, on the line of the said railway, to a point at or near Middleton, on the Nova Scotia Central Railway, being for a distance of about 30 miles?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

POST OFFICE AT YAMASKA EAST.

Mr. MIGNAULT asked, At whose instance and for what reasons have the Government closed the post office of Yamaska East?

Mr. HAGGART. The post office of Yamaska East was closed owing to the postmaster's resignation and sudden departure from the place; and as, during the time it was in operation, a good deal of confusion in the distribution of correspondence had arisen from the close proximity of this office to the Yamaska post office, it was not thought advisable to reopen it.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the High Commissioner for Canada, at London, is authorized by the Government to promote Imperial federation, and to afford to that scheme his active, public, officious and official concurrence; or is he acting solely on his own responsibility? Are the Government of Canada in favour of the establishment of Imperial federation? Have the Government a fixed policy as to the establishment of an Imperial federation; are they hostile, favourable or indifferent thereto?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say, to the first question, that the High Commissioner had no authority from the Government. The Government have not considered the subjects mentioned in the remaining questions.

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. ALLISON) asked, Was the tower of the Napanee public buildings built according to the plan, that is, is the height the same as required by the plans? If not, what change was made? If lower than the contract required, how much lower, and was any deduction made in the contract price on account of any such change? From whom was the clock in such tower purchased? What was the amount paid for same? Were tenders asked for, for the clock? Who tendered, and the amount of each tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. No; it is higher. 2. The roof of the tower, which is of wood covered with galvanized iron, is 18 inches high, and the additional amount allowed in final estimate is $33. 3. Messrs. F. W. Smith Bros., of Napanee. 4. Clock complete, $1,850; fitting up same, $125; total, $1,975. 5. Messrs. F. W. Smith Bros., Napanee, were invited to furnish specifications and tenders, it being conditional that the clock be of Canadian manufacture, that it have four illuminated dials, &c. The department has previously supplied and fitted up a number of tower clocks at Cornwall, Sorel, Woodstock, N.B., and was thoroughly conversant with the values of works required, and as the tender of Smith Bros. was reasonable, it was recommended for acceptance. 6. Messrs. F. W. Smith Bros.

QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY.

Mr. FORBES asked, Has the following publication, which has appeared in many newspapers, come to the notice of the Government, or any member thereof?

"VERY PERTINENT QUESTIONS."

"A correspondent of *L'Echo des Deux Montagnes*, writing on the subject of the 'National lottery under the patronage of the Rev. Curé Labelle,' asks a number of interesting questions, among others being the following: 'How much money has that lottery given to the Diocesan Colonization Societies?' 'Has Mr. A. A. Audet, who signs the advertisement of a drawing, really got an office at 19 St. James' Street, Montreal?' 'Is he not, rather ex-Colonel Audet, residing in Ottawa and custodian of the Federal Archives, with a salary of $2,000 or thereabouts?' 'Is the Hon. J. A. Chapleau head of the department in which the said Mr. Audet is, and is it to his knowledge and with his consent that the said Mr. Audet takes part in the said lottery?' 'What does that lottery do with the funds which are not employed for colonization, and to whom does it pay them?'"

Is the person named therein as Mr. A. A. Audet an employé of this Government? If so, what steps do the Government intend to take in the matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The answer I have from the department is: That the publication referred to has not come to the notice of the Government otherwise than its having been brought to it by the hon. gentleman's question; and that Mr. A. A. Audet, the person referred to, is not Lieutenant Colonel Audet, the Keeper of the Records, nor is he an employé of the Federal Government.

NAVIGATION OF THE GRAND RIVER.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved for :

Copies of reports of engineers as to improvement in the navigation of the Grand River.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government here, as I have done privately, to the manner in which the navigation of the Grand River above the dam at Dunnville is interfered with by the dam. I need scarcely say, Sir, that the Grand River is one of the most important rivers of the province, and at one time bore the greater portion of the carrying trade of the district through which it passes. Nor need I say, Sir, that it for years performed a most important part in connection with that great public work, the Welland Canal, its waters being utilized for the purpose of supplying the canal with water, to which end a dam had to be constructed, and which dam destroyed the continuous navigation of the river. When the work was taken over by the Government from the private company under whose auspices it was begun, one of the first improvements made was the digging of a channel from the feeder to the river mouth, by which means the difficulty of the dam at Dunnville was gotten over. At first, Sir, the feeder and the link I have referred to, afforded eight feet of water, which was quite sufficient for the class of boats engaged in the trade. But by the washing of the banks and other accumulations the water is reduced now to a depth in many places of four or five feet. Hence boats cannot be profitably chartered for the large grain and plaster trade of the upper river, because they cannot load to anything like their full capacity. The dredging of the canal feeder would, I understand, cost something like $800,000. The construction of a lock in the dam would serve the same purpose and would cost only $50,000. Something should be done in this matter at once. I respectfully urge this question publicly, as I have privately, upon the attention of the acting head of the department.

Motion agreed to.

JOSEPH DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of the petition of right presented to the Minister of Justice for his *fiat* by Joseph Desmarteau for improvements alleged to have been made by him on a piece of land forming part of the property heretofore known as Logan's Farm, and being a portion of the lot number eleven hundred and thirty-six (1136) of the official plan and book of reference of St. Mary's Ward, in the city of Montreal, measuring one hundred and fifty-six feet in width by a depth of four hundred and fifty-two (452) feet on the south-west side, and four hundred and eighty-seven (487) feet on the north-east side, English measure, and more or less, and being bounded on the north-east side by the highway known as Papineau Road, on the south-west side by a portion of the said lot number eleven hundred and thirty-six (1136), on the south-east by the lot number eleven hundred (1100) of said plan and book of reference, and on the north-west by Sherbrooke Street, being another portion of the said lot eleven hundred and thirty-six; of the decision of the Minister of Justice; and of all correspondence on the same.

He said: I understand that this man Joseph Desmarteau had bought this property which is described here, from a man named P. O. Bones, and that he had made upon it improvements which he valued at several thousands of dollars. It appears, however, that the land, instead of belonging to Bones, who had sold it to Desmarteau, belonged to the Government of Canada, and Desmarteau was sued in ejectment by the Government. By his answer to the action, he did not contest the action of the Government, he acknowledged it, but he pleaded that he had to that extent been deceived by the vendor to whom he had paid, as he alleges in his plea, $800. Then he set up a plea which is admitted by the laws of Lower Canada, setting forth that he had improved the land by building, levelling the ground, making sewer works, and some other improvements which he valued at a sum of $5,000 or $6,000. I have no conception at all of the value of the works which he pretends to have made; perhaps he asks more in order to obtain less. However, this plea was set aside by the court on a demurrer by the Crown; the Crown holding that such plea could not be urged against it. There is no doubt, however, that if the suit had been between subject and subject, the plea would have been a good one, and the determination of the suit would have resulted on the single question: Whether the possessor who had made the improvements had been, or had not been in good faith. The law of Lower Canada enacts that under such circumstances, if the improvements are made by the possessor in good faith, the owner could not be placed in possession of his property unless he had previously paid to the possessor the value of his improvements, or, at all events, the increased value of the property. As I have said, however, the Crown held that this plea which might have been good between subject and subject, could not be set up against the Crown. I understand that Desmarteau has asked the Minister of Justice for his *fiat* of petition of right, in order to claim the value of the improvements which he has made upon the lands which are now in possession of the Crown, and that this *fiat* has been denied by the Minister of Justice. I simply bring up the question in order to ask the Minister of Justice if he would give the House the reasons which induced him to refuse his *fiat* in this instance. I have no opinion at this moment to express, as to whether the *fiat* should have been allowed or not allowed, but if the man has really made improvements on the property in good faith, and if in consequence the value of the land has been improved to a certain extent, then under such circumstances he would be entitled at least to compensation to the amount which the property of the Crown has been benefited by his action.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman has been misinformed as to the facts of this case, or else I have been. I would not hesitate to recommend the granting of a *fiat* on a petition of right, if the petitioner would have the right of compensation if the case had been between subject and subject. I understand this case, however, to stand in a totally different position. In the first place, Desmarteau has not presented any petition of right or requested any *fiat* to be given. He has sent to the Governor in Council, a petition for the payment of $6,580, not as a right, but as a matter of grace. The facts, I am informed, are these. So far from Desmarteau having made any improvements on the property, it has suffered a great deal of detriment from his operations. I had not understood, until the hon. gentleman stated it just now that we avoided a judgment on the merits of the case by a demurrer raising the objection that the Crown is not liable for improve-

ments. That may be so. But the facts are, as I understand, that this is a piece of Ordnance land in Montreal, known as Logan's Farm, that it was leased for a term of years to the city of Montreal, that while it was so leased this man Desmarteau squatted on a portion of it, and turned it into a brickyard; and that, so far from making any improvements that would benefit the property, he devastated it by making excavations for the purpose of carrying on the brick business. An action was taken against him in the Superior Court of Montreal, and after a great deal of litigation, judgment was given compelling him to pay $850, being $200 for sand removed for brick-making, $400 damages owing to his excavations, and $250 for rental at the rate of $50 a year for five years, and giving the Crown possession of the property. He appealed against this judgment, and the appeal was dismissed; and then he presented the petition, which, as I have said, asks as a matter of grace that he should be paid this large sum. As a matter of fact the Crown have never been able to get from him the taxable costs in the suit. Some bricks were seized, but they realized only $183.

Mr. LAURIER. I know nothing of the facts, but simply state them as they were given to me by Desmarteau himself. However, the answer the hon. Minister gives, that he would not take advantage of any plea which could be raised between subject and subject, is quite satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

THE STEAMER *ADMIRAL*.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. TARTE) moved for:

Copies of any Order or Orders in Council, adopted between the years 1883 and 1888, in relation to the steamer *Admiral* and the service performed by the said steamer between Dalhousie and Gaspé or other points, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Copies of the contract or constracts between the owners or owner or person in possession of the steamer *Admiral* and the Government, between the years 1883 and 1888; also copies of all deeds of transfer, &c., filed with the Government, in respect of the said steamer: also a statement of all sums paid during the said period of time for the service of the said steamer, with the names of the persons to whom the said sums were paid, and the dates of such payments.

He said: I would suggest that the Government should, as soon as possible, bring these papers down, because an enquiry is going on elsewhere in which they are involved.

Mr. BOWELL. There is but one contract in connection with this service, that is with Mr. Julien Chabot, dated November, 1883, and no other. There have been no deeds of transfer filed with the Government. The accounts in favour of the Intercolonial Railway for coal supplied to the steamer, repairs to steamer, and for back charges on freight and passengers, exceed the amount of the subsidy. The amount of the subsidy was, therefore, credited against these accounts, and the balance was paid over by Mr. Julien Chabot to the Intercolonial Railway. Whatever papers there are in connection with this matter will be brought down.

Motions agreed to.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE moved for:

1. Copies of the specifications prepared by the Government and which formed the basis of the call for tenders for the work of constructing a drain from Lachine to Côte St. Paul, along the Lachine Canal; 2. Copies of all tenders filed for the said work, and of the reports of officers of the Department of Railways and Canals thereupon; 3. Copies of the report awarding the contract for the said work, and of the said contract.

Mr. BOWELL. The papers referred to will be brought down, but no contract has yet been entered into, owing to the town of Lachine not having yet complied with the terms it agreed to with the Government regarding the providing of the lands for the construction of that drain. As soon as the Department of Justice has reported upon the title for the land sent in by the corporation, a contract will be entered into and the work proceeded with. Meantime all papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM SAUNDERS AND Mr. MUTTART.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and orders relative to the dismissal of William Saunders and Mr. Muttart, section foremen of the Prince Edward Island Railway, in March or April last.

He said: I may say, in connection with this motion, that these two gentlemen have been section men on the Prince Edward Island Railway since the inauguration of that railway. As far as I know, these men have not been guilty of neglect of duty; and about two or three weeks after the elections in March last they were dismissed, and for what reason I am not aware. I do not know whether I will be able to get that information now, but I would like very much to get it. It appears that they must have been discharged under the impression that they had either canvassed or voted for the Liberal candidates. Well, I do not know how the Department of Railways has found that out. I believe the elections there are carried on under the ballot system, and I am not aware, unless certain gentlemen who were pretty busy on the day of the election were looking in through the windows or behind screens, how it could have been found out on which side these gentlemen voted. Admitting that they did vote for the Opposition candidate, is that a good reason for their dismissal? Is that the way the Railway Department is being managed? No wonder that the headship of that department has been going abegging these last two or three months. Is there no gentleman on that side competent to take control of that department? There ought to be a head to it, and we ought to be able to get the information we require. I do not admit that these gentlemen voted for the Opposition candidate, and I have no right to know how they voted. I saw these gentlemen every day during my campaign, and I am not aware that they attended one public meeting, nor am I aware that they canvassed any one for either party. Were they, then, dismissed to gratify the defeated Government candidates, in order to punish someone for their defeat? If a proper investigation was held, and it was found that these men had been derelict in their duty, of course I can have no objection to their dismissal. If there is no other reason given but that they voted for the Opposition candidate, it is a wrong principle. In Tignish, which is a mile from where I live, a gentleman went to work on the railway. He used to be a Liberal, but, by certain promises which the Conservatives made to him, he promised

to vote for the Tory candidate. Of course, it was his privilege to vote for whom he chose, but, when he came back to work on the railway, he was told that he had not voted for the Tory candidate, and he was told to go to the other side of the street in Tignish, to a Tory magistrate, and swear that he did vote for the Tory candidate. Is that independence? When a man issues a card to the electors, how does he address it? "To the free and independent electors." Is that what is practised in connection with this Government railway? I find that the same thing was practised in Westmoreland, N.B. I find that a certain gentleman, who voted for the two Opposition candidates in the local election, who were friends of the present Government in the Dominion, was told, he being an employé of the Intercolonial Railway, to go and swear before a magistrate that he voted for the Government candidate. How many more instances are there of this kind of thing? That is, no doubt, why Liberal constituencies are so difficult to carry, when this sort of thing takes place throughout the length and breadth of the land. Men are told that if they vote for the Liberal candidates they will be dismissed. In 1887, I remember a gentleman living in Prince Edward Island who was a tidewaiter, and no fault could be found with him except that he voted for myself and my colleague, and an investigation was held at Summerside, a very farcical one, it is true, but we find that this is the practice carried on in Prince Edward Island at the last election. These two men have been dismissed, and for what? We find this Government railway is being used—for what? We find a man in Charlottetown, who was acting as agent for the Conservative Association in King's County, writing to his friends there to say that there would be trains leaving on the morning of the election day at 10 o'clock to convey the electors, and that it would be all O K, and that they had made arrangements to pay $100 to bring the voters there from the three counties, but it would be refunded, though they must keep it all dark. I ask the Minister if this money has been refunded? The promises were made by this gentleman that the Department of Railways would refund the money, and the same parties also made use of the railway to carry the whiskey which they obtained at $6.50 a case for election purposes from Charlottetown to Montague, and I should like to know how much freight was paid on that. Very likely the railway carried this whiskey for nothing, and I have no doubt if the money was paid it has been refunded. I think I am safe in saying as I do, and in making the charge I do against the Minister of Railways that the money has been refunded. We are living in an age when presents are made and when gentlemen take spells of weakness very often, and we will show by the returns of the revenue of the Prince Edward Island Railway whether this money was returned or not. It is not surprising that the deficit on that railway should be as it has been for some time if the favoritism is so great and electors are taken free to the polls on election day. It is due to these gentlemen, Mr. Saunders and Mr. Muttart, that a proper investigation should be held, and if they are not guilty of any serious political crime, more than having voted according to their conscience, they should be put back in the places from which they were so unjustly driven. The country expects fair-play in these matters, and if these men do not get fair-play the country will blame the Department of Railways. If these men had been found guilty of any dereliction of duty, or of standing on public platforms agitating the electors in favour of the Opposition candidates,—if they had been found guilty of all these great crimes, then they might be dismissed; but if they simply recorded their votes in the ballot box, the Minister of Railways nor anyone else has any right to know how they did vote, and they have a right to occupy the positions from which they were driven away. Mr. Unsworth is not a man who is likely to do that kind of a thing; he is too much of a gentleman for that, and I do not accuse him of that, but I am inclined to accuse other men, because, when they were disappointed and could not carry the election, they were willing to blame anyone whatever, even presidents of railways and the Minister of Railways, or somebody else, for leaving the candidates 300 or 400 behind. I think the Minister of Railways, or the administrator of that department, should satisfy the House on this question. I am told that all the charges against Mr. Saunders amounted to this: that he was ordered to clear a certain portion of the track and had to hire men to do that; that he hired all he could, and he got, amongst others, Mr. Peters, who lives near there, but who is a Liberal, and this was one of the great crimes committed by this gentleman and one of the reasons why he has been turned out of his employment, simply that he hired a Grit to go on this work on the railway when the section man could not find anyone else. Now, has it come to this in the Dominion of Canada, that the Government, before they will give a man a day's work, are going to swear him to know whether he is a Grit or a Tory? Has it come to this? I believe it has, in some parts of Canada, I believe it has come to that in Prince Edward Island, and, Sir, if it has come to that, the sooner we have a change the better. I do not know how this change is to come about, but one of these days, perhaps, there may be a vote of want of confidence in these gentlemen. But, all these jokes apart, I know very well that it is easy for the department to make reasons where there is no reason, and I say that unless they are able to satisfy this House and the public generally, that they were justified in dismissing these two men, they have a right to give them redress by replacing them in the position from which they were driven without rhyme or reason. I, for one, would not be satisfied, and the country will not be satisfied, until it is known publicly what were the faults for which these two men were dismissed. When I am at home I see them often, but I never heard a word against them. I made enquiry and could not find out one single reason why the department had dismissed them, except the political reason that I have mentioned. I believe Mr. Saunders was told to be very particular not to hire a Grit, but to hire all Tories, but as he could not go out of the place to look for hands, as he had no horse and sleigh, he had to hire the men he found on the spot, and one of them happened to be a Grit. Something in the same line was done to a gentleman in Summerside in 1887, a Mr. Ronald Campbell, tidewaiter, who was dismissed for no other reason than that he had voted for the Liberal candidate. It is true there was a sham trial in

Summerside, but Mr. Campbell was not invited to attend, and the result was that he was dismissed and another man appointed in his stead. I await with some interest to see what information the department will bring down.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken referred to the treatment of railway employés in Prince Edward Island by the Government. I know very little of what occurs in Prince Edward Island, but I understand the hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, intimated that the same practices had occurred in the County of Westmoreland. There may be, of course, some mysterious practices in Prince Edward Island—I confess that it has always been somewhat of a mystery to me to know what practices did prevail there, from the fact that the hon. gentleman has been so long representing the constituency that sends him here. But so far as the County of Westmoreland is concerned, I am prepared to give a most distinct denial to what the hon. gentleman has stated. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the County of Westmoreland, railway employés are left in all cases perfectly free to vote just as they choose. I can tell the hon. gentleman more than that. In the election of 1887 every effort was made by my opponents in the county to coerce the railway employés to vote against the Government, and so effectual were those efforts, so thoroughly did my opponents convince many of the employés on the Intercolonial Railway that the Government was going to be defeated, and if the Government was defeated, every one who voted for the Government would be discharged, that a number of the employés were afraid to vote at all, and in these wards of the city of Moncton where the railway employés did vote, there was a majority against the Government. These were the facts in 1887, and they resulted from the threats that were circulated in the county by my opponents in that contest.

Mr. MULOCK. Could you name some of the persons who circulated those threats?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Yes, I could, but I do not know whether it is fair to do so. I believe my opponent in the contest was one, and his agents in the town of Moncton certainly did. These reports were zealously reported in the workshops in the town of Moncton, and among the employés everywhere on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and the results, as the returns will show, were just as I have stated to this House. Now, what has happened since? Why, the hon. gentleman cannot point to one instance in the County of Westmoreland where a railway employé has been discharged who voted against me in that contest, and I can show him letters by the score which have been written to me since, complaining that those people who voted against me in that contest, and who took an active part in the election, are still retained in the employment of the Government. I am able to say that I have not in one instance asked the Government, or asked the Minister of Railways, or any official in the department, to discharge one person who voted against me in that or in any other contest.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is very satisfactory to find at last, that we have a Minister of Railways to answer for the Government. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Perry) desired information from the Minister of Railways as to why certain officials, or certain paid servants of that department, on the Intercolonial Railway, were dismissed, and my hon. friend suggested as a possible cause, that it was because these men had voted against the Government candidate and in favour of the Liberal candidate. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) undertakes to reply for the Government. He replied by stating that his opponent in the election of 1887, and some others, had threatened these railway employés that if they voted for the Government they would be dismissed. That is not the charge made by the hon. member from Prince (Mr. Perry). The charge is that the Government, on the supposition that these men had voted against the Government candidate, without an enquiry, without investigation, without giving them an opportunity of being heard, relieved them from the discharge of the duties in which they were engaged. Well, it is just as well that we should understand the position in this matter. I think I understand it from the language made use of not long ago by the Minister of Customs. He laid down the rule broadly—I am not disposed to quarrel with it so far as I am individually concerned—he laid down the rule broadly, that the employés of the Government, the salaried officials of the Government, had a right to vote, and vote, of course, for the Government candidate. He went further than that, and he declared that not only the employés of the Government, the paid servants of the people of this country, not paid by the Conservative party, but paid by the Liberals as well as the Conservatives—not only did they have a right to vote, but they had a right to work, for the Conservative candidate at the general election, or at any other election. He justified the resignation of the officials, their taking part during the contest on behalf of the Government candidate, and reappointing them after the elections were over, their absenting themselves from the offices here, perhaps their pay going on, and taking part in the election, and sometimes an effective part, and coming back to their offices and discharging their duties as if nothing had happened. I do not quarrel with that position. It may be, of course, the rule that to the victors belong the spoils, and what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What satisfies hon. gentlemen opposite, may satisfy us when the occasion comes, as come it will before long, when we can put that practice into operation; and I tell my hon. friend before me (Mr. Laurier) that if, when he assumes the reins of government, he does not cut off the head of every Tory official who has taken an active part in politics, an offensive part in politics, against a Liberal candidate, he shall not receive my support for 24 hours. I have no objections to this rule. The hon. gentlemen chose to introduce it, and they will find it will work both ways. They have not only introduced it with respect to large offices, but they have come down to the contemptible meanness of dismissing workingmen engaged on Government railways. They have done so on more than one occasion. The hon. gentleman challenged us to point to an instance where an official, an employé of the Government, was dismissed or relieved from the discharge of his duties for the reason that he had taken part in politics, or was supposed to have taken part in politics. I will give the hon. gentleman one; I have one in my hand now. I will give the hon. gentleman the information, and I hope

the Minister of Public Works had no hand in the matter. From what I have known of him during 25 years, and from, considering he is a Conservative, a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the hon. gentleman, I hope his hands are clean in this small matter. In my town there is a person of the name of McIver, who has been for years engaged on the Government dredge at $2.50 per day, I believe, under the Department of Public Works. He faithfully discharged his duties for many years. I do not believe, there ever was a complaint against him, or a word said against him: I am quite sure there was not truthfully. He did not vote at the last election. His father and brothers voted for me. This servant of the Government, I repeat, did not vote, but he is supposed to have had strong sympathies on my behalf. On 2nd March, two days before the election took place, he wrote to Mr. Arnoldi, who, I believe, is in the service of the Public Works, and in reply received from Mr. Arnoldi the following letter:

"CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
"10th March, 1891.

"D. M. McIVER, Goderich, Ont.

"SIR,—Yours of 2nd has been received in connection with your re-employment on the dredging service of this department.

"I note what you say, that you had been to see Mr. Porter, that you were to get a letter from him. Please do so as early as possible, after receipt of which there will be no difficulty in arranging your matter.

"Yours truly,
"JNO. B. ARNOLDI,
"*Chief Mechanical Engineer.*"

That is to say, he was to continue in the service of the Government on the Government dredge. I do not know whether my friend, Mr. McIver, saw Mr. Porter or not, but I am quite sure, if he did see him, he was not at all likely to obtain a letter of recommendation from him to the Minister of Public Works. Mr. McIver tells me that he did see Mr. Porter, and Mr. Porter promised, if my memory serves me, to give him a letter, but subsequently he did not do so. He again wrote to Mr. Arnoldi on 9th April, 1891, and a letter was received by him from the Chief Mechanical Engineer. Recollect that in the first letter Mr. Arnoldi says: "It is all right; if you get a letter from Mr. Porter you will remain in the service of the Department of Public Works."

Mr. MULOCK. That was before voting.

Mr. CAMERON. On 9th April, the Chief Mechanical Engineer wrote as follows:—

"CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
9th April, 1891.

"Mr. D. McIVER, Goderich.

"SIR.—I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 5th instant, further inquiring about your being re-engaged on dredging staff. In reply I have to say that your engagement on the dredging staff terminated with the close of navigation last fall, and this spring the department has made some changes on the staff by which the position you held last year is now filled by another.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN R. ARNOLDI,
"*Chief Mechanical Engineer.*"

Before the election Mr. Arnoldi wrote that if Mr. McIver obtained a letter from Mr. Porter his services would be continued. After the elections, and when he had not obtained the letter, he was informed that the department had made some changes on the staff "by which the position you held last year is now filled by another." Will the Minister of Public Works tell the House why he dispensed with Mr. McIver's services on 9th April, when he promised on 10th March that he would continue him if he obtained a letter from Mr. Porter? Had politics anything to do with it? There were no complaints against Mr. McIver.

Mr. TUPPER. What was the promise on 10th March?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The words are:

"I note what you say, that you had been to see Mr. Porter, that you were to get a letter from him. Please do so as early as possible, after receipt of which there will be no difficulty in arranging your matter."

The promise is as clear as a pike-staff: "After you get a letter from Mr. Porter there will be no difficulty in arranging the matter." Mr. Arnoldi subsequently replied: "The department has made some changes in the staff, by which the position you held last year is now filled by another." What was the reason? It is true the season was over in the fall of 1890. So it was in the fall of 1889, and yet this man has continued for several years to occupy the same position and the same salary without any question. Between the season of 1888-89 his services were continued. On the 5th of March he had, in fact, the promise of the Government that his services would be continued. After the election his services were dispensed with because, as I gather from the tone of the letter from Mr. Arnoldi and from what Mr. McIver said, he was supposed to be an active partisan on my behalf and to have voted for me. He was neither an active partisan nor did he vote for me. Unless there is some justification for this petty spite, the Government do not occupy a particularly enviable position. I go back again to the old position, and I say that, so far as I am individually concerned, I am glad the Minister of Customs laid down that rule. I am glad that he did not assume this responsibility without consulting the other members of the Government, and that the policy of the Administration is that every man supporting the Government has not only a perfect right to vote, but a perfect right to take the stump and advocate the cause of the Government, and make himself offensive on the stump and work in the best way he knows how for the Administration, and the Liberal party has no redress. It is a bad rule that will not work both ways, and so far as I am concerned, sitting as I have always sat in the ranks and where I hope to remain during the remainder of my life, I will support no Liberal Government which will not cut off the heads of men who make themselves justly offensive against a Liberal candidate during a political contest.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sure the leader of the Opposition must be trembling in his boots at the threat made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), that he will not support him unless he will cut off the heads of all the Tories.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not say that.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will have something to do, and it will occupy him more than the remainder of his natural life.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I said officials.

Mr. BOWELL. And they are very numerous.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes, they are.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is also quite incorrect, and I think he will find some difficulty in establishing the fact that I have laid down any such doctrine or principle as that which he lays to my charge. There are certain portions of his statement that are quite correct; there are other portions which are not correct. If the hon. gentleman refers to the remarks to which he has alluded, he will find that I challenged any one to show that in the administration of the Customs Department any man had been dismissed for political reasons or for interfering in elections. That is my recollection of what I said. If I were understood to say anything more, I was misunderstood. I take the responsibility of my own acts, and I spoke for myself only. Does the hon. gentleman think the remarks he made were fair and courteous to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). Is it to be laid down as a principle that when a member of the Opposition rises in this House and prefers charges against the Government, and drags into the discussion acts done in other counties which affect materially the representatives of those counties, those members are to be denied the right of rising and defending themselves without having it said: "We are glad there is somebody here to speak on behalf of the Government." Now, that may be the Liberal doctrine, and I have no doubt it is: that no man has a right to defend himself, or to say anything unless it is in accord with their sentiments. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was strictly in accord with his right as a member of this House in contradicting the statement made by the member for Prince, (Mr. Perry). The charges as made, in addition to those brought against the Government, affected his own constituency and were equally strong against the Government for something that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) said had been done in the County of Westmoreland. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) repudiated that, and I do not think he has stepped without the bounds of propriety, nor did he interfere in any way with the functions of any member of the Government, in defending himself and that county in this respect. I have no sympathy myself with the doctrine laid down by the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to the extent to which he carries it, and I hope the time is far distant when any Government will adopt the principle in this country that he has advocated to-day. I have very little to complain of in the statements of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) providing they are accurate, but I have no knowledge of their accuracy, and I venture the assertion that when an investigation is had upon this question, it will not be found that anyone in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway ever asked a man to swear how he cast his vote before that man could obtain employment.

Mr, MULOCK. If the statements are correct what will you do?

Mr. BOWELL. When the statements are laid before me, and if I am in that department, I will act as I usually do in matters of all kinds—properly and correctly, and I feel sure my action will meet with the approval of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman has told us that some person—I did not catch the name, and I might say that it would be much easier to have the investigation made, if the hon. gentleman will supply the name of the person who wrote the letter to which he referred.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not speaking about you, I am speaking of the member for Prince (Mr. Perry). I hope you do not deny him the right to make charges, even if you do deny the right of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) to defend himself. The statement was made that some person—if he gave the name I did not catch it—had paid $100 for the use of a train to convey voters, and that it was stated in that letter that the $100 would be refunded—I presume after the election—and the hon. gentleman said that he had no doubt that the $100 had been refunded. The hon. gentleman then complains that the Minister of Railways does not give him an answer at the present moment to the charges. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the head of the Railway Department, or of any other department, can by any possibility keep within his memory all that he desires investigated; the payments made for tickets, or the employment of trains in different parts of the country? If he does think this, I am inclined to believe that if ever he attains to the position of a Minister, he will find that he would have more to carry in his head, large as it is, than it is capable of holding. I have made enquiries of the chief engineer, who came into the Chamber behind the Speaker's chair a few minutes ago, if he had any knowledge of this transaction, and he assures me that he has not and that he knows nothing about it. However, as the matter has been brought before Parliament, and as a charge has been made, it will be my duty to instruct the chief engineer to make enquiries into the charge. I know that the member for Prince (Mr. Perry) is fertile, not only in his denunciations of the Government, but also in the charges which he prefers against them on all questions; but the hon. gentleman did not tell me who the tidewaiter, preventive officer, or Customs official, I forget which, that was dismissed because he voted for him. I inform the hon. gentleman that no such dismissal ever took place, and if any officer was dismissed it was for cause. If an officer was dismissed it was because, as I read in a report to the House two or three years ago, a number of officials on Prince Edward Island who had no work to do were dismissed. All the dismissals were made upon the responsibility of the inspector who made a thorough investigation into the working of the Customs Department all over Prince Edward Island.

Mr. PERRY. They immediately appointed another officer in this man's place.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know to whom you refer, but if the hon. gentleman gives me the name, instead of making broad charges, then I will be able to tell him how correct he is in the statement he makes. As I told the hon. gentleman before, I cannot be expected to remember what has transpired in reference to the cases of individual officials among the thousands throughout this whole Dominion. I repeat the statement I made a few moments ago, namely, that if any one in his locality, or upon the Island, was dismissed, it was not on account of the vote which he gave, but for good and sufficient cause. I have no objection to

bring down whatever papers there may be in the department on this subject, and I have no doubt that in this, as in every other case, it will be found that these men were dismissed for proper and good cause, and not, I am quite sure, for the reasons alleged by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I shall be more specific. I tell the hon. Minister of Railways that at Port Mulgrave Station, in the County of Guysborough, within two days after the election, every Liberal there who was in the employ of the Government was dismissed, and orders given that none should be employed but Conservatives.

Mr. BOWELL. Repeat that statement please. I was engaged at the moment and did not hear you.

Mr. FRASER. I said that I would be more specific in my charges, so that the hon. Minister of Railways will have no cause to complain of not knowing who the parties are. I said that at Port Mulgrave every Liberal employed at the station was dismissed, and orders given to the station master to employ none but Conservatives. I state that a Mr. Murray who was employed there was dismissed among others, and his brother or uncle—a man of some influence—who was collector of Customs, made it so hot for the superintendent that Mr. Murray had to be restored to his position, and with that exception no other person is employed there.

An hon. MEMBER. You mean no Liberal.

Mr. FRASER. Not one single Liberal, and I further say that that statement was put in writing by the superintendent and that since that time—I will not go into that question just now, but I will take it up afterwards—that many other things have been done; changes made without investigation, and salaries reduced without one single charge or investigation into the reason why. That is specific enough.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; that is specific.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), whether he is aware of the political opinions of the agent at that station? The hon. gentleman said that all the employés at Port Mulgrave were dismissed. Does he include the agent there?

Mr. FRASER. Not at all. I mean the poor men who were working outside on the railway, at very small salaries. Since that time, the agent at that place was removed to a smaller office and his salary reduced from $50 a month to $35 a month, because he was suspected of political leanings against the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer given by the Minister of Customs would have been more satisfactory if he had been ready to lay down some principle upon which it would be understood that the Government were prepared to act upon all occasions. The charge made by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry) is, that two labouring men, men who from their station in life I suppose had not much influence, have been dismissed from the service simply because they were suspected of having voted in favour of the Liberal Government. The hon. Minister says he knows nothing about these two men, but he will make enquiries. So far so good. But the hon. gentleman is asked by my friend from North York (Mr. Mulock): "Supposing the facts to be as stated, what would you do?" and the only answer the hon. gentleman is able to give at present is, "I will act; I will not say now what I will do, but I will act."

Mr. BOWELL. I said a little more than that. I said I would act in such a way as to meet his approval.

Mr. LAURIER. That is very vague. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to act in a way which would satisfy my hon. friend, then he should be able to say at once that if these facts are as stated by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, these two men will be reinstated in office, and the man who discharged them, after having enquired how they had voted, will be dismissed from office. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will not controvert this proposition, that no officer of the railway has a right to enquire as to how a man in his employ has voted. The law gives the ballot to officers in the employ of the Government, and, therefore, it implies that they have a right to use the ballot in whatever way they think proper; and if an officer above them ventures to enquire as to how they have voted, and dismisses them because he believes they have voted in a certain way, then this man should be dismissed, and not the men who exercise their right under the ballot. I would have expected the hon. Minister, not merely to say that he will act in future in a way to satisfy my hon. friend, but to lay down a general rule that no man is to be subject to enquiry as to how he has voted or exercised his franchise. More than that, in these matters, if the law is to be respected at all, as it is conceived to be, every man in the service should be able to cast his vote unchallenged, and without giving any reasons except to his own conscience. I am not prepared to say that I understand the hon. member for Huron to be as radical as the hon. Minister of Customs made him out to be; but at all events, I would agree with him in this, that every officer has a right to a vote, but every officer in the service who goes out of his way to make an offensive campaign ought not to be retained in the service. Nothing in my estimation is more calculated to bring the service into contempt than to allow an officer, while in the public service, whether high or low in station, to go offensively into a campaign. Let every man in the Civil Service vote; that is his right; but it seems to me unjust and intolerable that a man should go out of his office to canvass or to take any prominent part in elections. This is going beyond the right the law gives him: and with these remarks I quite agree with my hon. friend from Huron that these things, although tolerated by this Government, ought not to be tolerated at all by any Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Well, Sir, I do not think that any one on this side of the House will find fault with the rule which the hon. leader of the Opposition has just laid down; and so far as my experience with public officers goes—and I have had a pretty extensive experience, having found that many of the post offices and office holders' houses in my constituency have been made the committee rooms of my opponents—that is the rule I have observed. Every public officer in my county knows that he is just as free to vote as I am, without the slightest danger to his salary or his office. But I have a right to expect that the interference of these officials in elections shall cease

there; and I shall be perfectly satisfied to have the rule which the hon. gentleman lays down applied to my own county. Just one word with regard to the case which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Forbes) has mentioned. If the rule which has just been laid down by the hon. leader of the Opposition had been observed in that case, Mr. McLeod would have been dismissed years ago, as he is one of the most offensive partisans in that part of Nova Scotia, and his offensiveness is not confined to election time, for he can hardly avoid being offensive even when the election is five years off. With regard to public employés—workmen at Port Mulgrave—being dismissed, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, for I happen to know some of the facts. I may state that the station-master was authorized to give employment to men on the arrival of steamers in removing baggage between the steamer and the station. He was given a list by his superiors of perfectly proper and efficient persons to do that work, but he refused to employ them because they were friends of the Government and not friends of the Opposition; and it would be exceedingly difficult for a friend of the Government in that locality to get one hour's work from Mr. McLeod, even if he had the written order of his superior to give it to him. I myself, after the election, saw his answer to an order given by his superintendent almost in these words: "You are instructed, whenever you have employment of any kind, to give it to the following persons, unless you know any reason why they are unfit for that service;" and his answer was an impertinent refusal to employ those persons, and a statement that he would continue to employ certain other persons. Not only has he done that, but he makes an unfair discrimination against the Government in the exercise of the little patronage he enjoys in that way. I do not think that an order has been given that Liberals should not be employed there. The hon. gentleman must have been misinformed by a colouring of the set of facts which I have given.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N. S.) This is a matter which has given me a great deal of trouble, because in my county more than one-half the officers were appointed at the instance of my opponent when his friends were in power, and have been active canvassers against me; they attended the revision of the voters' lists, and they were actually engaged in bringing voters outside of the province and even outside of the Dominion, to vote against me. I also found that the principal office-holders in the country were writing letters stating that if Mr. Ross were returned and the Liberal party brought into power, they would resign and have the persons to whom they were writing appointed to office. One of these letters, which was written by a Dominion official, who holds the most important and lucrative office in his county, was written to a friend of mine in the county, a gentleman supposed to have considerable influence, asking him to pursue a certain course. Then the writer proceeds:

"It would assist Mr. Ross for the Dominion. You can scarcely understand how largely interested I am in Mr. Ross' election. This is becoming an important office; and if I had a friend at headquarters, I would get $200 added to my salary. Then I am getting old, and would like to leave here altogether. If Ross was returned I could be pensioned, as in a few years I will be thirty-five years in the service. So you see it is almost life or death to me who is returned by the County of Victoria at the next Dominion election. Then, again, I would not give up the situation unless I was assured a friend would get the place; and if it would suit you to take it, I could make you pretty sure of it, as I know of no one I would so soon see in my place as yourself, or one who could fill it better. John A. Macdonald is a sworn enemy of mine, and if he is again returned for the county, will do his utmost to have me dismissed; and I am sure you would not like to see me and my family sent adrift without a pension. Now, my friend, I know you have no personal interest in the matter that could not be better served on the Liberal side than on the Tory side. Free trade is going to carry the day everywhere. I see by the papers that the Americans have gone free trade in Congress by 1,000 majority at the elections last month. It will be so in Canada, and the Liberals will be in power before very long."

I may say that there is considerably more in the letter; but the writer winds up by asking his friend to write him a letter as soon as he can, and if he is too late by the mail, to telegraph at his expense, as the winter would pass much more cheerfully if he had an affirmative that he would support Mr. Ross in the election. I never in my life asked for the discharge——

Mr. FORBES. Give the name of the writer.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) You will have it very soon, I presume, and will have something to do with it by-and-bye. I am not at liberty to give the name of the official just now. I never asked for the removal of that gentleman. He would be the last man in the county I would ask to have removed, and no person knew it better than he did when he wrote that letter. He expressed himself to me as perfectly satisfied that I was returned in 1887, and expressed himself as glad to hear that my opponent was defeated, as he felt safe in my hands and the hands of the Government. Nothing could have surprised me more than to have received that letter, because he is a gentleman for whom I would have done everything rather than see him removed from his position. But that was not the worst. There were a number of other officials in the county, and I was in a peculiar position. My opponent and his partner represented the county from Confederation until 1882 in this House, and although they were returned as Liberals they found it convenient to support the party in power, and thereby secured the patronage of the county for 15 years. For 15 years they controlled the appointment of officials in that county. All the officials appointed by the Liberal Government did everything they could, even acting as agents in different parts of the county against me; and some of them said they were willing to spend next year's salary in order to have Mr. Ross returned, as they knew he would increase their salary when he got in. They even sent parties to ask me if I would leave them in office. I said I did not intend to dismiss any person, no matter how he voted, but I did not like any person holding office to come out in such a way as to give my friends an excuse for asking for the dismissal. When that answer came to some of them, they came and asked if I would guarantee their salaries would be increased if they voted for me. Of course, I would not agree to that. With regard to railway passes, several parties came over the railway in my interest, but, as far as I know, every one of them paid his fare. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has said that people were given passes over the road, but he himself had a pass for three or four months of this year to which he was not entitled. As a member of the Executive Council of Nova Scotia he was entitled to a pass; but even after he

resigned that office, he still held on to it, until one of the officials took it from him and tore it up on one of his trips. Here is a gentleman getting up in this House to talk about passes to others, when he himself travelled back and forth on a pass which he had no right to hold, once he had resigned his seat in the Executive Council.

Mr. FRASER. I would say in explanation that I did get a pass as a member of the Government, and travelled on it once. The first time I travelled on it, after I resigned, the conductor said he would take it up and did so, in which he was perfectly right. I was a member of the Government until that occurred, and did not travel on the pass after I had resigned.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) Let the hon. gentleman say that he travelled back and forward on that pass in his county during the election, and then back and forward to Halifax, and here to Ottawa and back again, and then it was taken from him.

Mr. FRASER. I was in my county the whole time of the election. I can well understand the hon. gentleman's remark, from the character of the constituents who sent him here, as depicted by himself.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) The hon. gentleman himself tried for a number of years to get a nomination for the county without success.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). There are quite a number of Dominion officials in my county who are Liberals or Reformers as you may choose to put its They are Liberals simply because they were appointed by my opponent during the time he was in Parliament. Of that I do not complain. I think that every Liberal official of the Dominion Government has a perfect right to vote against me, but when I heard the leader of the Opposition laying down a rule, which will probably cut off the heads of many of them, I think it is my duty to call the attention of this House and the Government to the actions of some of them during the late Dominion election. I never complained of the conduct of any one of them, although I felt that their conduct at elections was frequently so offensive to myself and to the party I supported that they deserved dismissal. I shall call attention to the correspondence of the *Island Reporter*, which was anonymously signed "more anon;" and dated from Hastings, 25th December, 1890, and published in the Liberal paper called the *Island Reporter*, on 7th January, 1891. The writer says:

"Ever since the fishery bounty became in vogue it was customary for the people of Creignish, Long Point, and very largely for the people of Judique, to enlist their names as fishing claimants in Port Hastings. But recently the scene has changed. D. F.'s business has much developed; every new bounty man means a fresh customer to him, and modestly he whispered to Dr. Hugh Cameron to stop the fishing tide to Hastings in order to expand his mercantile scope from sea to sea. On being checked, Mr. Forbes rose for an explanation, asking Dr. Hugh, Why depart from the good old rule—that fishermen are not allowed to get their bounty here? With eloquence not very lofty, yet very pointed, the doctor did reply: Our pets must be fed, no hunger, no cold, must they suffer."

Mr. Forbes is a Customs official at Port Hastings, and he assists the agent of the Railway Department at the same place. Mr. Forbes, at the time, was actively engaged in canvassing against myself. A few days after this publication appeared in the paper, I met him in the streets of Hastings, and called his attention to this letter. I pointed out to him the fact that I never knew there was any change in the manner of disposing of the fishery bounties, that he never wrote to me with reference to it, and that I never gave him an answer. He admitted that such was the case. I said to him: As an honest man, it is your duty to contradict that false report published in the *Island Reporter* of 7th January, and unless you do so I will have reason to believe that, if the letter was not written by you, it was at least suggested by you. He promised he would do so. Not many days afterwards Parliament dissolved, and after the dissolution I happened to meet him again in Hastings, and asked him why he did not contradict the false statement published in the *Island Reporter*. His answer was that he did not see very well how he could do it. My reply was simply this: Mr. Forbes, it may be perfectly true that you had nothing to do with the writing of the letter; but whether you had or not, you are now equally guilty with the writer, because you are an accessory after the fact. This is one of the cases in question, whose head the leader of the Opposition would cut off immediately. I believe that such officials do deserve immediate dismissal. I have not lodged any complaint against him and I would not have mentioned it had not such cases been brought before the House. I say that the agent of the Railway Department, in whose office he worked, is the most vigorous and active designer in the Liberal interest in the party. I also say, that a number of the postmasters have gone to a greater length in attempting to defeat me than this official of the Government. A very respectable lady, a Mrs. Macdonald, has the post office in the village of Whycocomagh, and it was asserted by her friends that I had secured her dismissal about the time that Parliament was dissolved. I made no complaint against her, and as a matter of fact she was not dismissed. A brother-in-law of hers who occupies the position of postmaster at West Bay, made use of the report referred to, and another brother-in-law of hers at Port Hastings travelled from house to house complaining of my having dismissed their sister-in-law, who was a widow. This was without any foundation, in fact she was not dismissed at all, and yet a personal canvass was made against me on the ground of her dismissal, and that false report was the cause of a considerable loss to me in regard to votes in that constituency. If the principle laid down by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is to be carried out, I have no doubt that all these officials will be summarily dismissed. It is not only the officials of these districts that I have found in very active opposition to the Government candidates. There are a large number of officials in other parts of the county, the friends of whom, it is true, do not go so offensively to work as these did, also vigorously opposed me. I always concede that they have a perfect right to vote against me, and also I say they have a perfect right to advise their friends that the policy of the Opposition, if they feel it is right, is one which would subserve the general interests, but, when they take such a prominent part in their party contests as those to whom I have referred, I feel that an investigation should be made, and that they should be dealt with as they deserve, and in exact accordance with the rule which has been laid down by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is somewhat remarkable to listen to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite and to learn from them how many Reform officials there are in the public service of the Dominion. I had no idea that the service was stuffed to repletion with officials who were opposed to the Government of the day. It is true that there has been no Reform Administration for thirteen years, but it seems that a Reform official never dies. The Tory Government lives and the Reform officials live in order to spite that Administration. I am rather incredulous, however, as to the statements which have been made by the hon. gentlemen. I think they must be labouring under some delusion or hallucination. They may have been timid in that election, but I had no idea that the timidity of a Tory candidate reached the dimensions indicated by the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen who have just addressed the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) says that the Reform officials in his constituency and everywhere else—for it appears there were no others in his constituency except Reform officials—laboured with every possible means to defeat him, but he is a Christian gentleman and would not think of attempting to dismiss them. He continues these men in office for the purpose of showing to his political opponents how generous and good he is.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I might change my mind at your suggestion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He desires to change those who were his political opponents into his supporters. I suppose now he has fallen from grace, and it may be in a moment of weakness, but I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will recover his equanimity when the discussion is over and will extend to these people the same magnanimous conduct which has characterized him in the past. My experience is that Reform officials are "like angels' visits, few and far between." They are a class whom it is not easy to discover, and here in the public service at Ottawa, I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that the Government have been injured by the number of Reform officials who have taken an active part against the Administration. No one is complaining that, as long as you give to the men in the public service the right to exercise the franchise, that franchise is exercised, or that a man should write a letter stating what he desired, just as the British ambassador at Washington wrote to a person in California, who asked for some information from him. The complaints which are made in regard to officials who, at the instance of the Administration, have gone on the public platform, neglected the duties of their office and canvassed in support of one party and against another. If there were a change of Administration, if an official had gone into the county of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) and had succeeded in obtaining the votes of a member of the people against him, what would be the relations of my hon. friend to that official in the case of a change of Government to which I have alluded, and how much confidence would he be able to place in him, and how far would he be able to trust him as a faithful servant of the Crown under the guidance of the party to which he was politically opposed? It is impossible to maintain the system of permanent officers in the public service if the officials are permitted to take part in elections on behalf of one party or the other. The two things cannot be maintained.

RETURN ORDERED.

1. Copies of all claims presented to the Government since 1880, by Mr. Joseph Antoine Maurice, merchant, of the Village of Chambly Basin, and Dame Julie Fournier, his wife, for losses suffered by them in reference to lands purchased by them from the Government in 1875: 2. Copies of all correspondence and letters addressed to any department of the Government by any person or persons, in relation of the said matter: 3. Copies of all correspondence between any of the said departments, or between any department and the claimants, or any persons acting for them or in their interest, in relation of such claims: 4. Copies of the order of reference made by Government referring the said claims to Joseph Simard, Esq., then Dominion Arbitrator, and of his award: 5. Copies of correspondence following the said award: 6. Copies of the opinions given on the subject by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and of the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice. (Mr. Préfontaine.)

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

After Recess.

RELIEF OF JAY SPENCER CORBIN.

Mr. REID moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 30) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find on reading this Bill that there was no evidence taken by the Committee. The great object in referring the Bill to the Committee was that evidence should be taken in support of the statements of the petitioner. I therefore move in amendment that the order for the third reading be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration.

Amendment agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the MacLeod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

Bill (No. 123) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Oshawa Railway Company."—(Mr. Madill.)

Bill (No. 124) further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

ADAM RUSSWORM—DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. WALLACE) moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) for the relief of Adam Russworm.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In regard to these Bills, I may say that we generally take a vote on one

of them, and the other Bills are carried on division. Perhaps hon. gentlemen would prefer to-night that the second reading be taken on division, and when the Bills come from the Committee we can take a vote on the third reading of one of them.

Mr. LAURIER. This is not a question of party, and anything the hon. gentleman may suggest in regard to the matter will be acceptable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I make this suggestion because these Bills have no reference to party. I do it in order to set myself right, because we generally divide on some of these Bills.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There may be a difference in regard to some of these Bills themselves and it may be that some of them are not entitled to pass.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. Minister is assuming that they pass in the usual way.

Bill read the second time on a division.

DIVORCE BILLS—SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) for the relief Thomas Bristow—on a division.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Isabel Tapley—on a division.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 132) for the relief of Mahala Ellis—on a division.—(Mr. Taylor.)

SAWDUST ON LA HAVE RIVER, N.S.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Kaulbach:

That an Order of the House do issue for Return of all letters, correspondence, petitions and papers between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to sawdust on the La Have River, Lunenburg County, N.S., with the object of having the river relieved from the operation of the said Act,

and the motion of Mr. Flint in amendment:

That the following words be added at the end thereof: "Also, a list of rivers and streams exempted from the operations of the Act, and a Return of all letters, correspondence, petitions and papers between all persons and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to such exemptions."

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall have to trespass on the House for some length in discussing this question, although I occupied a good deal of the time of the House when the subject was up on a previous occasion. The reason I was compelled to do so I mentioned at that time, and I need not repeat it now. My remarks, I think, at that time were confined largely to the river that is mentioned in the motion before the House in connection with the administration of this law so far as regard La Have River in the Province of Nova Scotia. I have endeavoured to point out to the House, whether rightly or wrongly, whether guided by a proper appreciation of the spirit of the Sawdust Act or not, that I have endeavoured, so far as I possibly could, to see that the wishes and intention of Parliament were carried out, in reference to that river, whether the county at that time happened to be represented by a political opponent as it was when first this question came up, or whether it is represented as it is now, I am glad to say, by an hon. gentleman who is in accord with the trade policy and general policy of this Government. It was, and it is much to my regret that I have not had the support of either of these gentlemen in connection with the administration of this law. I will not repeat the many careful and elaborate enquiries which have been made, and to which the attention of the House has been drawn, but just now I happen to have in my possession a recent report from Lieut. Gordon which I will read to the House. I stated the other day that the inspector for that district had, in a late report, given his reasons for suggesting that the law should be suspended in the River La Have. That is the result which both my friends, the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) and Mr. Eisenhauer, in this House were very anxious should come about. I cannot myself appreciate the reasons given by the inspector of the district. The facts upon which his report was based seem to me to be entirely contradictory to the enquiry that had taken place a very short time previously under the auspices of a man in whose opinion I have certainly the very greatest confidence; that is Lieut. Gordon, the present commander of the fishery protection fleet on the coast of Nova Scotia, a man who for years has been entrusted with that great responsibility, and who during that time has given intelligent and unremitting attention to the question, relating to the fisheries on the coast. I am sure his reports placed before this House from year to year, elaborate as they have been, have commanded the respect and confidence of all the members of the House who have had their attention drawn to them. That gentleman made a careful enquiry—a much more elaborate enquiry than the present inspector—he took his ship, the *Acadia*, into the river as far as he could, and taking the boat and a gauge he proceeded up the river, with I believe some of these gentlemen who are especially interested in having the river exempted from the operation of this law. Having made this investigation he reported his conclusions in the Annual Report for 1889, and he gave then, not only a statement as to the result of his soundings, but he gave also the profiles of these soundings, showing the actual depth of the river now, as well as the depth shown by the admiralty charts, and consequently the change that had taken place because of the heavy and large deposits of sawdust. Now, I wish to mention to the House that at this date, having before him the arguments which have been so strongly urged by the different hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House on this subject; having these placed before him in the newspaper of the district, he is as strong as ever in his opinion and in his advice to me, that the law should be carried out and enforced, and his reasons summarized are briefly as follows. I hope the House will bear with me while I read these reasons from a memorandum which I have drawn up from his report which will be brought before the House:

"Lieutenant Gordon contends the La Have should not be exempted from the operation of the Act respecting sawdust and mill rubbish, because a stream frequented by anadromous fish should not be exempt, for if so harm will be done these fish, and the welfare of the coastal sea-fishing depends very much upon the success of anadromous fishing. This year owing to the scarcity of bait anadromous fishing would have been specially valuable, and instead of having to get bait from elsewhere as was the case, bank fishermen would have been able to procure it at their own doors. This state of things on the La Have is due to the deposit of sawdust in the river."

I may explain, although to many members of the House the facts are well known, that we have been considerably handicapped by the operation of the

Newfoundland Bait Act, and that at certain times of the year when fresh bait, so absolutely necessary now-a-days to the successful operation of the bank fishing, happens to fail on our coast, it usually is found on the Newfoundland coast, and *vice versa*. Hitherto our bank fishermen have been able to resort for bait to either coast, to enable them to engage in the fierce competition with our American neighbours, and with the French people operating these fisheries, and it was of great importance that we should have access to these bases of bait supply. This year, unfortunately, the Newfoundland Government have prevented our fishermen from the access hitherto enjoyed by them to Newfoundland ports for the purpose of obtaining bait, and Lieut. Gordon points out, in this connection, that the question now before the House becomes of the greatest importance to the coast fisheries in the Province of Nova Scotia. In the extract from his report, to which I have alluded, he argues that it is most desirable that our fishermen should have all these sources of bait supply fostered in the most careful possible manner, and that, had this river been in the condition it was by nature, and before these enormous deposits of sawdust were there, then the benefits would have been incalculable in securing to us a supply of bait. There were, as my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is aware, at one time this season no less than ten, perhaps more, bank fishermen with their large crews, their costly outfit, and their splendid ships, lying idle at anchor, and unable to go on with the bank fishery because there was no run of fresh bait in our rivers; the bait being on the opposite coast. To prevent a repetition of this it becomes the duty of Parliament, in my humble opinion it becomes the duty of all representatives of these fishing counties, and all representatives of our coast fisheries, to sink individual interests for a time, so far as they clash with the general interest of the fishery. It is in my judgment necessary that we should sink for a time the interests of the lumbermen, who are endeavouring to save here and there a few dollars, and to conserve the greater, the larger, and in my opinion the more important industry, if it is properly looked after, namely, the fishery interests of the Maritime Provinces in general. Lieutenant Gordon very properly draws attention to the great importance of carrying out the Act which prohibits the deposit of sawdust and the consequent pollution of the rivers which are frequented by anadromous fish. He goes on to say:

"The intention of the Act was that its operation should be as general as the necessities of the case demand, and even more so in waters frequented by anadromous fishes than in inland waters. Witnesses in previous La Have investigation testified that gaspereaux were formerly plentiful there and that cargoes were shipped to West Indies, but the mills have stopped this by running sawdust into the river. Were the reverse the case it would be found to be of greater benefit to the people than the saw-mills and timber industry. (Value of bait supply.) Navigation is seriously impeded in the river by sawdust deposits."

Lieutenant Gordon contends also, and no one knows better than himself, that the navigation has been, and is, seriously impeded in the river by the sawdust deposits; and as one hon. gentleman has already drawn the attention of the House to the fact, the interests of navigation are specially concerned in this as well as the fishery interest, to which most attention has been given in this debate. He goes on to say:

"Mr. Kinney's contention that the question of damage caused fish by sawdust is still undecided, is offset by experience in the case of St. Mary's River, where the water has been made turbid and nauseous by rotting sawdust and which effectually prevents fish proceeding up the river. The mills on the La Have could be fitted up to comply with the law—two out of the three lower mills easily, and the other mills at some cost—but all could comply with the law, and it is not impossible for them to do so."

I have called the attention of the House to this river. I have also asked the attention of the House to the fact that the question is frequently agitated in this country. But it is by no means singular to Canada to have this question agitated as often as it can be agitated. The same thing occurs in other countries. The mill-owners, strong in their capital and strong in their position, endeavour, of course, to produce the product of their mills at an economical cost; and, consequently, so far as they can shape the laws, they will naturally do so, so that the obligations imposed upon them will be as light as possible, and their profits as great as possible; and we find that in England and the States, the same agitation occurs at exactly the same time. In one of those countries it is chiefly chemical pollution that is complained of; but the manufacturers, uniting their influence and their wealth, and retaining able counsel on their behalf, endeavour to drive their coaches and fours through many Acts of Parliament, and in many cases, I am sorry to say, they have succeeded to such an extent that the fisheries have received great and permanent injury. But so far as this country is concerned, let me ask the attention of the House to the careful consideration which has been given to this question by the Governments of both parties. This is not a political question, although some gentlemen have endeavoured to make it so. Some gentlemen have attacked me upon this question; but I care little for that so long as I can show that my skirts are clean from the charge of having used any Act of Parliament for mere political gain. But I wish to point out that this cannot be made a political question, that this law is not a law of the present day or of the present Government, and that the enforcement of this law is not peculiar to the present regime or to the present incumbency of the department upon which devolves the administration of the law. The hon. leader of the late Government was one of the loudest in bringing the attention of Parliament to this question; and as long ago as April, 1870, after there had been legislation on the Statute-book, previous to Confederation, in 1865 and 1868, to prevent the pollution of rivers by sawdust, he drew the attention of Parliament most vigorously, as he was well able to do at that time, to the question, and called for more legislation and a more effective enforcement of that legislation. He was supported in 1871 by the present hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who at that time brought the subject formally before Parliament in the shape of a Bill. In February of that year, that hon. gentleman having asked Parliament to legislate in the very direction of the present law, supported by members of this House wholly regardless of their political proclivities. He was supported by eminent gentlemen, among whom was Mr. Mackenzie, in calling the attention of the House and the country to the necessity of legislation and the enforcement of that legislation in order to serve the interests of navigation and the fisheries. So that we have Parliament legislating on the subject

previous to Confederation in 1865, and subsequently on no fewer occasions than in 1868, 1872 and 1873; and on every occasion the mill-owners combined to resist the enactment of that legislation, using the very arguments we hear to-day—saying that it was impossible to comply with such a law without ruin to the lumber industry, that this sawdust was swept down the channels of rivers and did not interfere with navigation, that fish rather than otherwise liked the substance of sawdust, that it was nonsense to talk about sawdust affecting the life of fish. They used all these arguments, published them through the press, and brought them before Parliament; and with their well known influence they succeeded oftentimes in staying the hand of Parliament, in preventing legislation and in inducing enquiries to be made. There were enquiries made previous to 1874 and also during the time of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration. The representations of the mill-owners, which were never despised or put aside carelessly, induced the Government of that day to order another formal enquiry. There was a formal enquiry, the result of which was put in the blue-books. That enquiry has not been alluded to in this discussion, and I doubt if the report of it has been studied by the hon. gentlemen who have attacked the present policy, which was also the policy of that day. The men who made that enquiry, including a Mr. Mather, who was himself, I understand, interested in the lumber trade, gathered facts which, to my mind, place beyond dispute the necessity of having this Act on the Statute-book and enforcing that Act. With regard to the Ottawa River, to which allusion has been made, I do not hesitate to say that I am in accord, so far as my understanding of the question goes, with the necessity of removing the exemption from that river; but still, that river had been exempted before I came into office. The subject has been brought up in the other House of Parliament as well as here. It is now being considered, and a careful enquiry, which is necessary, is to be made, as I understand, with a view of ascertaining whether there are any exceptional reasons why this river should enjoy exemption. But I may say that, coming, as I do, from the Province of Nova Scotia, and the House remembering that the greater part of my argument has reference to the importance of the coastal fisheries, many of the arguments which render it necessary to put into operation a law the enforcement of which brings a great deal of unpopularity and a great deal of suspicion with it, in reference to the rivers flowing into the sea, do not apply to the case of the Ottawa River. We have not, in such a case, the question of coastal fisheries; we have not the question of keeping up the bait supply for the larger and more valuable fish; so that it is burdening this question considerably to come down to a detail of that kind; and I mention that case to point out that in reference to the river about which enquiry is being made as to whether it should be exempted or not. No doubt other rivers might be mentioned where the exemption should never have been applied; and Parliament will remember that last year I introduced a Bill—which for various reasons I was unable to proceed with, not being here—taking away from the Governor in Council the power to exempt rivers. I feel that this is a most difficult responsibility to discharge in many ways. It is calculated to create in the public mind a distrust in the Government of the day, that favouritism is shown to this river or that, according to the political complexion of the Government; and it seemed to me that when mill-owners endeavoured to make a case for an extraordinary power, for dumping these deposits into clear and navigable water, they should be bound to come to Parliament like other people and ask that that exemption should be given by special legislation, after they had put all the facts of the case before Parliament. Parliament could then deal with the subject, and the department would be beyond the suspicion which attaches, unfairly I claim, to the administration of this Act at present. In the Senate this whole question came up again, and the representations which hon. gentlemen have advanced with regard to other rivers were advanced there by gentlemen interested in the mill industry on the Ottawa River. They argued that it was impossible to save this sawdust except at great cost, and advanced other arguments. Hon. gentlemen who care to pursue the enquiry into that case further will find the results of the enquiry in the reports of 1888. And after taking all the evidence, that House of Parliament came to the conclusion that the law was a good law, and that its enforcement was necessary on that river, as well as other rivers in the Dominion of Canada. This legislation, as I have said, is not peculiar at all to Canada, either before or since Confederation. It is found in the different States of the Union; it is found in the mother country, where the trouble with sawdust is comparatively insignificant compared with ours. Nevertheless, in the mother country, eminent men have been engaged, at much higher salaries than any of our officials command, investigating this question over a long period of years, and we find the results of their labour, not only in the Statute-book, but all through the Government reports. They have gone into the question scientifically and shown the reasons why this pollution is most hurtful to fish, and particularly to the fish of the kind with which the La Have River is stocked, the king of fish, the salmon. As regards the enforcement of the Act and the statements made that in one district it is in force, and that in another it is not, leading to the suspicion that the department first looks to ascertain who represents a particular district before deciding whether to put the law in force or not, if hon. gentlemen will look to the report of 1888, the first report made after I became Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they will find that the Act, so far as the department can cause it to be enforced, has been generally enforced, or that instructions for its general enforcement have been issued, save in the cases I have mentioned, and with regard to which all the papers will be brought down, which have been exempted, under that power of exempting a river or stream, or part of a river or stream. The reasons, in such cases, which have been given and which have decided the department to issue orders of exemption, are on file and open to inspection. An hon. gentleman mentioned that the Act was a dead letter in the Counties of Guysborough and Pictou. Pictou I know something about, and I can only say this, that the fishing interests are of comparatively minor importance in that county. They are not so great as I should like to see them, and I doubt

whether we could do very much in the County of Pictou by improvement in this direction. Nevertheless, the instructions to the officers in that county, as well as in the County of Guysborough, have been the same, and, judging from the reports under my hand, I fancy that the hon. gentleman who made that statement is talking without the book. Certainly no officer except under special instructions, for the reasons I have given, and which are open to inspection at any time, has had any authority or information, direct or indirect, from the head of the department to permit, for one moment, any violation of the law.

Mr. FRASER. I did not mean at all that they had. My statement was that the law was a dead letter, simply because there was no necessity for putting it in force, and they did not think it was necessary.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may have said that, and I quite accept that; but, according to the reports, it is clear, that unless the officers entrusted with the enforcement of the Act in those counties have directly contravened the instructions of the department, the law is not a dead letter there: and I am endeavouring to clear my own skirts, as it is only right I should, with reference to the indirect charge—a charge which has not been very bold or open or straight in this House—that I have maladministered the Act, though such charge has been made directly outside the House by the Messrs. Davies and others. In 1888, I find that the officers for the district of Guysborough reported:

"The sawdust order gave the mill-owners a scare, and the most of them went to work to put their mills in order and prevent the rubbish and sawdust slipping into the river."

Another says:

"The law has been in force, and there has been a general though reluctant acquiescence."

That is all I have to go by until any hon. gentleman states to me in this House that these officers have not reported correctly, and notice of course will be taken of that without delay. But in the County of Pictou, which I have the honour to represent, the officer reports:

"The rivers and streams of the district have been kept clear of sawdust and other mill rubbish."

Those are the reports with reference to the two counties singled out. Similar reports will be found with reference to Cape Breton Island, all the counties of which are represented, I may say, by steady, intelligent, and earnest supporters of the present Administration. There has been no exception made in their favour. It has been reported to me by the officer in that district, and his report is not disputed, that that order reached them and that it was obeyed. In the Georgian Bay and in Manitoba, I am glad to say, that public opinion supports the department. In the west, where the milling industry cannot be said to be very small, public opinion is in that condition, that the mill-owners are not sufficiently strong in the communities in which they live to have these good beneficent laws in the interests of the fishermen set aside; but, so far as I can judge, all the reports show a very vigorous enforcement of the law, and we know that all kinds of contrivances are used throughout the Province of Ontario for the disposition of sawdust as well as mill rubbish. The general instructions appear in the report for 1890, and at page 78 in the appendix will be found from various districts, not the statements made by hon. gentlemen from incorrect information, but the statement that this law has been in force and is being carried out, and I had it put in the report for the benefit of the mill-owners. I do not wish to oppress them, I know the law is vexatious to many, I like popularity as well as most gentlemen, but I cannot believe that the law is bad, and cannot find an argument on which I could ask the House to repeal it; and that being so, I am compelled to see that the law is carried out. I have had in the report of 1890 inserted the reports of various officers as to the methods adopted by various mill-owners to dispose of their mill rubbish, so that those who desire to comply with the law may be enabled to do so. In the mother country, the same difficulties exist and the same arguments are used; and as I do not pretend to be an expert in the matter, I wish to put the House in possession of much of the information which induces me to believe it my duty to enforce the law. In support of the statement I made that the arguments against the law are always advanced by the manufacturers or those interested in manufacturing as cheaply as possible, I wish to refer to the last report on the salmon and fresh water fisheries of England and Wales for 1890. I wish to point out particularly the reports made by Mr. Barrington and Mr. Fryer, gentlemen holding high and responsible offices as inspectors of fisheries in the mother country, who allude to similar difficulties which have confronted them in regard to what is still a great source of wealth in the British isles: the fisheries. Speaking of the mines, which cause an obstruction of a somewhat similar nature to the sawdust to the fisheries, Mr. Barrington says:

"The mischief done by these mines affords a very good illustration of the difficulty of dealing with cases of pollution under the Fishery Acts. The refuse matter is not necessarily of such a nature as to 'poison or kill' fish, but it practically does as much or even more harm in deterring the fish from entering, or in driving them from, the river, while it completely destroys the spawning beds, thus causing more permanent mischief than the discharge of a directly poisonous liquid."

And again:

"It certainly is anomalous that in all cases of river pollution the excuse of poverty in the one case, and of wealth in the other, should be urged, and be accepted, as of equal weight as a reason for non-interference."

Then again:

"In other parts of the country county councils are showing an active interest in the question of the prevention of river pollution. In addition to the cases referred to in my last report, I may mention that the Northumberland council have directed that all deposit of solid matters in streams should be taken cognizance of by the police with a view to preventing, at any rate, one source of evil."

But Mr. Gladstone's remarks will be of great service in this connection, in view of his vast experience, his knowledge of this legislation and of the agitation which has existed in the mother country for so many years, and representing as he does so many varied interests in the mother country. This is the result of his matured opinion. In his speech in October last to the employés of the Pumpherston Oil Company, at their works near Edinburgh, he referred to the case of a paper-maker in the south of England, who now makes a profit by the treatment of the refuse which he formerly threw into the river:

"That," said Mr Gladstone, "is the practice in many trades, and then when a Bill is brought in to prevent it, they declare it will ruin them. But what happened? A Bill was passed to prevent their poisoning the river by throwing into it their refuse. They were obliged to set to work to consider how they could turn it to account; they found a means of turning it to account which brought them £3,000 a year net, and enabled them to give me an answer that they were doing a rattling trade in this way."

That is so far as other refuse or rubbish is concerned. But, in the State of Maine, we know that they are using sawdust in a very useful commercial way. They have used it for making brick in some places. At all events, the ingenuity of those who are engaged in the trade soon finds the means of turning anything of this kind, which has at one time been supposed to be rubbish, to good and profitable account. I must ask the House to allow me to place on record for reference in this debate, or for the consideration of the country generally, some further extracts to show the reasons which have induced Parliament so often, whether under a Reform or a Liberal Conservative régime, whether before or since Confederation, to place this legislation upon the Statute-book and to maintain it. As I said before, if the country has changed its wishes on this matter, that can be shown after this debate, and my only surprise is that gentlemen rise and attack the Act in this Parliament, but Parliament has not been asked to reverse its opinion and to take away the power from the Government or to repeal the legislation altogether. In the face of scientific enquiries which have been made the world over and having only to meet the statements of those who are interested in having as few possible obstacles as possible placed in the way of carrying out their work, I think it would be found very difficult for any hon. gentleman to get the Parliament of Canada to remove this legislation. Mr. Fryer, one of the inspectors of fisheries for England and Wales, in his report of 1887, makes a statement which I will quote, though it is rather long, but his experience on this point is very valuable, and it is upon reports of that kind that I have formed my own opinions and that probably Parliament will form its opinion. He says:

"It is at any rate clear that there must be a point beyond which the pollution of the estuary of any salmon river cannot be carried without extinguishing its salmon fisheries; for, however pure the upper waters may be, however unobstructed by weirs, and however abundant and excellent the spawning grounds, they are useless so long as the fish are prevented by the polluted state of the tideway from reaching them; while even if artificial propagation in the fresh waters were resorted to it would produce no result if the smolts were to be poisoned *en route* to the sea * * *

"Fifteen years ago the Royal Commission on the pollution of rivers expressed their deliberate opinion that the pollution of rivers, instead of being a necessary consequence of commercial enterprise, is an easily preventible nuisance. Summarizing the result of their inquiries into the effects of the existing system of disposing of mining, manufacturing, and town refuse, they reported that in every case efficient remedies exist and are available, so that the present use of rivers and running waters for the purpose of carrying off the sewage of towns and populous places, and the refuse arising from industrial processes and manufactures can be prevented without risk to the public health or serious injury to such process or manufactures. In an earlier report dealing specially with the Mersey and Ribble, the Commissioners had gone further than this, stating that of the many liquids polluting and poisoning these rivers, there is not one which cannot be either kept out of the streams altogether, or so far purified before admission as to deprive it of its noxious character, and this not only without unduly interfering with manufacturing operations, but even in some instances with a distinct profit to the manufacturers: and even in those cases where a certain amount of expense must be incurred in unremunerative operations, the use of the purified stream will more than recompense this expenditure. Recent scientific and industrial research has multiplied processes for converting 'waste' products which now pollute our streams into valuable marketable commodities. In a few cases the enterprise of manufacturers has led to the adoption of these processes to their own profit, but, generally speaking, the waste of such products, with the accompanying evils of impure rivers, goes on increasing.

"If this were a mere matter of the waste of the material thus carelessly or deliberately thrown away, it would probably be in accordance with the prevalent doctrines of political, if not of commercial, economy, to leave the waste unchecked until the self-interest of the manufacturer stepped in to stop it. But the question does not end with waste. Every gallon of liquid refuse, and every ton of solid matter, cast into a river tends to render its waters more incapable of supporting fish life: more unwholesome for animals to partake of; more unfit for man's use for manufacturing and often for agricultural purposes; more poisonous for him to drink, and more conducive to the contamination of the atmosphere and the spread of disease. In addition to all this, the river-bed gets silted up to the obstruction of its free flow and to the consequent aggravation of the injury caused by floods."

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. Did an hon. gentleman say "hear, hear"? Because there is no comparison whatever, between the relative importance of these interests in the mother country and in the Province of Nova Scotia in which this river under consideration is situated.——

"If it were a mere question of the interest of the fisheries against those of manufacturers and miners, no doubt the former, being of inferior value, would have to succumb—though in estimating the relative values of the two interests, it would be unfair to the fisheries, to take them at their present worth, handicapped as they are by pollutions and in other ways, and not to take into account the great developments which they would undergo if they were allowed fair-play in the matter of pure water. But to the interests of the fisheries pure and simple, whether they are assessed at their present or their prospective value, are added those of public health, for which a pure water supply is essential; of agriculture, which is similarly concerned in the question, and, in many cases of inland navigation, to which the deposit of solid refuse in streams is frequently detrimental, while in the same scale may be placed the interests of the manufacturers themselves who would be the first to benefit by the application of a general law prohibiting the pollution of streams."

It seems to me that this extract, although long, is useful; it is material, and certainly, within my knowledge, it has not been placed before this House or the country in a consideration of this question before. Now, then, a few brief references to other reports. In 1888, the Chief Inspector of Fisheries, Mr. Barrington, reporting to the Board of Trade, specially says:

"Sawdust is deadly to fish from its choking their gills."

Now, I have heard men by the score in my own province laugh at the idea that a fish could be choked by sawdust in the gills. They have an extraordinary idea of the intelligence of fish, and they argue that a fish would have no occasion to open its gills so as to take in the sawdust. But, nevertheless, this is the statement of an expert, of a man who has not merely studied the art of catching fish, but has studied the habits of the fish thoroughly, and the conditions which are required for its propagation and for its increase in the waters where it is desired. So Spencer Baird, a man of great standing in the United States, a commissioner, now dead, whose evidence and whose influence were of great weight in the Commission that sat at Halifax in connection with the old Washington Treaty, has placed on record, in 1886,

in part 15 of his report, at pages 157 and 158, opinions which it would be worth while for any one to peruse who is interested in this subject, and which opinions support the principle upon which this legislation is based, and which agree with the opinions of similar officers in England. In 1872, Professor Baird, writing of the destructive agencies in connection with the depletion of fish life in New England, a subject of tremendous importance, from which we can draw a great lesson, attributed it to the reason which I repeated, and to the falling off of anadromous fish by the attraction that they have for each other when they go together into their accustomed haunts. That is the opinion of our own superintendent of fisheries, Mr. Wilmot, who has spent a lifetime in the study of this question, a gentleman whose reputation, where he is best known, is such as to enable him to claim and obtain great confidence in every respect so far as this subject is concerned. He is most pronounced upon it in every report, whether dealing with the La Have or with the Otonabee up in Ontario, where we have the same difficulty as on the La Have, and where we have overcome that difficulty, and where these mill-owners who said they could not save the sawdust, have found that they could save it, and are prosecuting their business just as well as ever, and the people at the same time are enjoying greater pleasure in their streams and better fishing in the rivers and in the lakes. As in this case, Mr. Wilmot found all the authorities to be in accord with the extract which I have given. But I will draw particular attention to his report for 1889. For the benefit of gentlemen who are giving attention to this subject, I asked him to arrange all these authorities, and he has given them from the different States of the Union, from men who are employed in connection with the fisheries, not to embrace the manufacturers, not to embrace fishermen either in the restriction found necessary in this connection, but to add to the benefits of the people in the various localities. These men who, in the interest of the country have pursued their enquiries, have all come to the conclusion that the rivers must be kept pure and clean, for the clean fish are the most valuable fish; therefore, while the manufacturers may here and there object to it, it is ultimately not a bit to their detriment to comply with the law. And here let me remark that the *Morning Chronicle*, a good sound Liberal organ in the Province of Nova Scotia, representative of Liberal opinion, has persistently attacked me with reference to the La Have River, and has denounced me as a most vindictive man, endeavouring to prosecute this poor Mr. Davison, a gentleman, whom I never saw until casually once last winter, saying that I had selected him for martyrdom—that paper the other day stated, as a news item, after we had enforced this law in the La Have against the wishes of my friends, who were equally down upon me, I may confess with my political opponents—the *Morning Chronicle* a day or two ago stated that the salmon in the La Have River was never so good as this year, and I may say that in most places salmon fishing has been far poorer this year.

Mr. FORBES. Does he know in what part of the La Have the salmon was taken?

Mr. TUPPER. It does not matter for him to know the exact spot, any more than it does to the editor of the *Chronicle*, who states that salmon fishing in the La Have was never so good as now. As the sawdust goes from the mill to the mouth of the river, and the salmon must come in at the mouth, it is not necessary for me to fix the exact mathematical point at which these particular salmon were found. If hon. gentlemen care to see other opinions of eminent men who have looked into this subject in all countries, they will find in the report of 1889, on pages 13, 16, 17, 20 and 21, copious references and extracts that certainly will satisfy them that if these men know anything of the subject from which they speak, the only attack that could be made against myself in connection with the law is that I did not ask Parliament for sufficient power, that I have not control of sufficient money to enforce that law as it should be enforced, rigidly and to the letter, in every place. One weakness in my armour is, as I frankly confess, that here and there a fishery officer may not find it worth his while to make a careful investigation, may not find it safe to be as active in reference to his neighbour's business as the law requires him to be. While we have so little money placed at our disposal for carrying out these laws, that difficulty may occur, the law may be, in some places, not known to the department, a dead letter, and in some places it is enforced in a perfunctory manner, and that is the only point of attack that it will be found I am open to. Now, then, these authorities to which I allude, are chiefly from the Commissioners of the various States of the Union. Lieutenant Gordon, in a most elaborate report—and it is, perhaps, superfluous that I should be adding my little mite to the literature on the subject—in his report for 1889, goes fully into these matters on pages 263, 264, 267 and 268, and deals with the statements made by the petitioners from that district giving their reasons why this law should not be enforced on La Have River. I have met them, I think, conclusively in the light of the authorities, and I have no doubt whatever on the subject. But it is very gratifying in connection with the consideration of this subject after this debate, and after hearing the speeches of hon. gentlemen who are well able to submit the other side of the case, that I have not found any of them undertaking even to meet these points I have mentioned, which must be discussed, and which must be overcome before I can reach a decision in the direction which hon. gentlemen suggest. In *Forest and Stream*, a leading paper published in the United States, in a number published on 24th October, 1889, it is reported that a special committee of the Oregon Legislature strongly recommended the prohibition in that State of sawdust in streams. In the Boston *Journal* of October 24, 1889, "Shooting and Fishing," referring to Pleasant River and salmon, says: "They must soon die from the quantity of sawdust in river; no fish could long survive said pollution." Sackville River, Nova Scotia, in 1868, which was a splendid salmon river, was absolutely ruined by the erection of a saw-mill six miles from the sea, which was permitted in the day when fishery laws were made to be broken, as all hon. members from Nova Scotia know was the case previous to Confederation, and for a long time after the Fishery Department was organized. I do not pretend that there is no room for improvement, but there is an attempt at enforcement being made, so much

so that politicians opposed to the present Administration have in many counties played as their strongest card : enforcement of fishery restrictions ; oppression of the poor lobster and mackerel fishermen, who should have the right to put up traps where they please! There is, judging by the attacks made on the Government for the enforcement of the Act, an entire change taking place in the condition of affairs. But to come back to scientific opinion, I may refer to Willis Bond, chairman of the Severn Fishery Board, who, in a paper read at a sanitary conference at Worcester on standards of purity for effluents from sewage works, said : "Salmon avoid filthy waters at expense of forsaking birthplace." Many hon. gentlemen have been taught to believe, and I always was so taught, that it was almost impossible to prevent salmon from overcoming any obstruction except an impassable dam to return to the place of their nativity. But on enquiry it is found that salmon will even overcome their strong natural inclination and disposition when the waters are made filthy. Certainly the La Have River has been made filthy. It is not unfair for me to refer to the *Morning Chronicle*, which informs me on these questions, and which I read with very great delight ; when on one sheet I find I am the subject of an attack for attempting to prevent mill rubbish being cast into La Have River, and then I find on another page an account of how an excursion party from Halifax had visited that river, and on disturbing the sawdust were made as sick as if they had attempted to cross the Bay of Fundy or the English Channel. I may, therefore, be pardoned for saying that the products of sawdust do tend to make the rivers, which were formerly splendid salmon streams, filthy and to change their character as fishing rivers. One man, and one man only, so far as I am aware, who has been connected in any official capacity with this matter in the Province of Nova Scotia, is on record as saying that the fish are not injured by sawdust. He is the gentleman to whom I alluded on a previous occasion when I spoke, and his name is Mr. Rogers. But I find that gentleman is on record time and again with a contrary opinion. In 1869, page 81 of his report referring to Cumberland County, he says : "Mill rubbish and sawdust have nearly depopulated both rivers and coasts, and but little business is done in fishing." It is to overcome that state of affairs that the department has been recently directing its attention to the condition of the fisheries, although there is much still remaining for improvement in connection with keeping the rivers pure and in a better condition than that described in 1869. That gentleman is also on record in 1878 ; but I will not weary the House with his observations. I refer to them only as showing that any opinion given since he has been attacking the department, and all the officials connected with it, from the head down to the most insignificant member of the staff, should be carefully considered and weighed before any further attention is given to it. We find in 1875 under the good Liberal régime that some hon. gentlemen would like to see renewed, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the father of this legislation, stated in answer to a question asked in the House : "It was part of the duty of the officers of the Fisheries Department to enforce the Sawdust Act and the Government intend to enforce it more rigidly in future."

The then inspector for Nova Scotia reported that he had given formal notice of a strict enforcement of the law. It is a matter for regret that, from that day to this, there has not been a more vigilant, determined and conscientious enforcement of the law. Thus we have all the authorities, Wilmot, Venning, Duvar, Fortin, Veith and Whitcher, concurring in their testimony and agreeing with the testimony of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and with the opinions quoted by me, given by experts in other countries. There have been, I say, many enquiries. There was the enquiry by a special commissioner in this country. There was the enquiry under Order in Council in 1871, when a vast amount of information was collected. There was the inquiry in 1877, with a similar result. There was the enquiry and formal report in 1874. There was the enquiry in 1888, in the Senate. I desire to refer hon. members to the report of the Fisheries Department, 1890, Appendix No. 5, pages 79, 80, 81, where the methods of disposing of sawdust are pointed out, and where mill-owners who wish to make an effort to save their sawdust, can ascertain the means of doing so. In a prize essay on "Salmon Disease, its Cause and Prevention," submitted at a gathering in connection with the International Fisheries Convention in London, at which the eminent men of all countries in Europe read papers and discussed these different questions, it is stated at page 71 : "If the sawdust from a saw-mill, or the chaff from a flour-mill, are permitted to add however little to these suspended particles, the irritation is no longer discomfort but frequently death." I will not further trespass on the good nature of the House, already shown in permitting me to go so uninterruptedly through these various points to which I have been obliged to refer. I will merely state to the House that as far as having formed any obstinate opinion upon this subject, I found the law as it is, I have studied all the opinions upon which I can lay my hands, from the time the duty was imposed on me of carrying out this law to the present, and I would be exceedingly glad to find that there was a solution of this question which would satisfy all parties, the manufacturers, the fishermen and the public. But the result of the authorities to which I have directed attention leads me to the conclusion, as I have more than once stated in regard to this question of the La Have, as well as other rivers, that the only charge that can be laid at the door of this department, in my own time, as well as at the time of my predecessors from the passing of the Act down to the present day, and for the special reasons to which I drew attention, is, that the Act has not been enforced sufficiently rigidly, and mill-owners have been induced to believe that by this influence or that, by their influence as carrying on the richest and largest industry, and their influence with this Government and other Governments, they might hope by agitation and obstruction to have that law changed. I have not seen any evidence on the part of this Parliament, or on the part of any other Parliament in which I have sat, of a disposition to change that law ; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before the policy can be attacked, legislation should be promoted and supported in this House, with the object of repealing that Act and wiping it from the Statute-book. I would not have travelled into the merits of the question on a motion of this

kind, had it not been that hon. gentlemen were good enough to mention in this House, points mentioned for other purposes outside of the House, and which involved a consideration of the general policy of the Government on this question, and the administration of that Act in particular. There is one amendment I would like to make ; it is hardly an amendment, it is a verbal alteration. I would ask the hon. gentleman to add after " papers " the words " not already brought down," because we have brought down a great deal of the information asked for in a return last session.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken to the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Marine has just moved another amendment.

Mr. TUPPER. I have made a suggestion for a verbal alteration on the motion, which I suppose hon. gentlemen will assent to.

Mr. LAURIER. This is an important question, and if it is necessary, to enable the hon. gentleman to speak, I shall move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can speak with the consent of the House, but, of course, it is contrary to the rules.

Mr. TUPPER. I would be very glad to hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FLINT. My first remarks were made on the motion of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), and the observations which I propose to make at the present time will be made as a matter of form on the amendment proposed by myself. I do not rise to reply to the observations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because, according to my observation, the very able address we have had from that hon. gentleman has been directed in a large degree to phases of this question which are not strictly before the House in connection with the motion or amendment. The motion, backed up by the appeals of the hon. members for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) and Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), have reference to the La Have River, and the desirability in the interests of the people living upon that river and transacting business in connection with the lumbering of that river, for the exemption of that river from the general operation of the law. The amendment I had the honour to move was in order to have before the House information as to the reasons which actuated the Administration in exempting a large number of rivers in various portions of this Dominion from the operation of this Act. I have not had an opportunity of finding out the bases upon which the petitions were laid before the Government asking for these exemptions, nor the number and names of the various rivers already exempted from the operation of the Act. The address of the Minister, for which I for one desire to thank him, has been very able, very candid and very thorough, but it dealt almost entirely with the Act itself, and was a defence of the propriety of the legislation now upon the Statute-book. With a great deal which the hon. gentleman has said I am disposed to agree. That the Act in itself is well intended, and that it would in the main, if properly enforced, have a beneficial effect as regards the fisheries of the country, I think no one can possibly doubt ; but the Minister has travelled into regions of argument which do not at all refer to the circumstances appertaining to the La Have River. For instance, the mass of evidence he has given in regard to English and Scotch rivers can scarcely be said to apply to the La Have River or to any of the rivers in the Dominion of Canada. The pollutions in the English rivers are probably very much more serious than we have to contend with here. They arise from flour mills, from factories and from the various establishments on the banks of these rivers, and are not at all similar in their effects to the pollutions which are alleged to arise from sawdust. In order to discuss this question intelligently, it is necessary to make a large amount of discrimination as to what we are dealing with. In the first place, there is the effect of sawdust on the river, and, in the second place, there are the effects caused by other rubbish. Gentlemen who are at all cognizant with this subject, even in a superficial way, know that the effect of bark in a river is far more serious in its pollution and its effect upon fish life and the habit of fish, than is sawdust. Then, also, there is the question as to the effect of edgings and heavy material which block up the rivers and give the sawdust an opportunity for producing any ill effects it may produce. Allusion was made to the steamer *Halifax* having grounded in the La Have River.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me. I did not elaborate on the sawdust as distinguished from other rubbish, because I feared to trespass too much on the time of the House. I gave reference to pages and reports which specially dealt with sawdust as distinguished from rubbish, and which say that one is equally as bad as the other.

Mr. FLINT. I think the Minister was perhaps too apprehensive of the effect of a continuance of his remarks on the House, because, although the subject may not be interesting to a number of the members, yet it is one upon which a great deal of information is needed and desired by a large number of the members of this House. I do not speak as taking sides very strongly in opposition to the views of the hon. Minister, but at the same time it is only fair to point out to the House that there are two sides to the question, and I have been amazed in reading the evidence to find how seriously and how strongly persons who might be called experts differ on this very subject as to the effect of sawdust on fish life. I have not had an opportunity to arrange, as it would be desirable, the evidence I have had in my possession for the last few days ; but I will venture to read the opinions of one or two gentlemen who are, presumably, well qualified to speak on this subject, in order to show that even practical men differ on the question. Now, at one of the early stages of this controversy, a gentleman well known in Nova Scotia as a sportsman and fisherman, and also gifted with some literary talent, sent a communication on the subject of the effect of sawdust on the La Have River to the Halifax *Herald*, a few extracts from which I will read to the House. After some happy references to the pleasures of the sportsman, he

speaks of the effect of sawdust upon salmon, saying:

"I think that I can prove conclusively that sawdust is innocuous to trout and salmon. I have fished mercilessly all my life a charming little river not ten miles from Halifax. Some ten years ago a sawmill was erected on this stream, after an interval of fifteen years during which there was no sawmill and consequently no sawdust. Since then there has always existed in the river a plentiful supply of sawdust. There is an excellent natural fish-way—a sluice brook from the lake—a kind of fish-way that far surpassed the highly vaunted but always doubtful fish-ladder. Since the erection of this sawmill the numbers of salmon have very largely increased. I attribute this remarkable increase, not to sawdust, but to Mr. Wilmot's occasional tribute of young fry from his hatchery at Bedford."

I think this is one of the points largely overlooked by the gentlemen who have been quoted by the hon. Minister of Marine. It must be remembered that these gentlemen are particularly devoted to the interest of fishing, so that their minds are very much bent in the direction of considering the effects of all sorts of so-called pollutions upon fish; and when men come to have remarkably strong opinions in one direction, they are not likely to be influenced in the contrary direction by any evidence that can be brought. I will call the Minister's attention to the fact that the inspector who preceded the present inspector in that district took strong issue with the gentleman whose report he has quoted. The late inspector of fisheries, Mr. Rogers, no matter what may be his differences with the department and his connection with the controversies with regard to the benefit of fish ladders of various kinds, is a gentleman of great ability and wide observation; and, although he reported to the department originally on the same lines as quoted by the Minister, yet in subsequent years, after careful investigation of the matter, he saw reason to alter his opinions. Then, the present inspector of fisheries, also a gentleman of keen observation, who has devoted considerable attention to this matter, and who threw himself recently into it with a great deal of energy, has come to the same conclusion that the hon. member for Lunenberg (Mr. Kaulbach) and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) have reached in regard to the comparative harmlessness of sawdust upon fish life, at any rate in the La Have River, and he joins with these petitioners in favour of exemption. Now, this fact ought to have a great deal of weight with the Minister and with this House, that men who are greatly interested in this matter, who are careful observers, and who have been in the past strenuous agents of the Minister of Marine in enforcing the law, and in educating those about them in the principles of the law, have differed from the gentlemen who have reported on the subject. I will, however, continue to read a few extracts from Mr. Silver's letter, showing his opinion on the subject:

"But this marked increase in the number of fish visiting this river of late years proves effectually that sawdust does not check their increase or drive them from a stream when other conditions are favourable. Impassable mill dams are the great factors in the destruction of our river fisheries."

This is a point on which Mr. Rogers dwells with a great deal of ability. It may be true that his mind was influenced to a great extent by being the owner of a fish ladder of whose merits he made great claims; but at all events the evidence strongly supports him that a good fish-way would go far to keep the river free from rubbish. That sawdust does become innocuous and harmless to fish to a large degree, Mr. Silver shows:

"Pour in all the sawdust you please, gentlemen in the lumber trade, but do not vex the lordly soul of the salmon by fencing him off from the upper reaches of his river where the spawning beds lie, and without reaching which his aspiring spirits droops and dies, and his race becomes extinct. See that his onward passage is not barred by cruel mill dams, without means of further ascent, and he will grow fat and flourish in spite of sawdust. In further confirmation of my opinion I may state that in the small river referred to one of the best pools for years was immidiately below the saw mill, where I have seen salmon dart out from a bed of sawdust where they have been resting, at my fly. It is true that the sawdust has of late filled up this particular resting spot, and the fish have moved to another part of the pool, but this would have happened had there been a deposit of gravel on the place, or any other substance than sawdust. In further support of my views, I may also mention that in a brook near Windsor, part of the stream is full of sawdust and the upper part is free: that trout are found in larger numbers in the waters that are sometimes of the consistency of pea soup with sawdust than in the clear stream, and that the best pool of all, the mill pond, is lined with sawdust, has sawdust on the sides, sawdust on the bottom, and sawdust floating, and the bellies of the fish are yellow from resting on sawdust. Also, that in the Gaspereaux River, near Benjamin's mill, salmon are caught with the fly in water often thick with sawdust floating. Piscator asserts that the current is 'too strong where a salmon or trout would spawn to allow sawdust to remain on the spawning bed.' Now, I do not agree with this statement. I know spawning beds that could easily be ruined by a deposit of sawdust, but I do not consider this important. For there are always other spawning beds to be found, and even in a short river new places favourable for spawning ground would not be far to seek. In the Port Medway River, near Greenfield, an excellent pool has been much injured by partially filling up with sawdust, but there are scores of other pools on the river where the fish can rest. It is surprising how nice they are about their resting places. I have known a good pool ruined by a freshet depositing gravel in little hollows where they were wont to call a halt on their march. I heartily agree with the views quoted from Charles Hallock. I have never quite forgiven him for publishing a list of salmon many years ago (see 'the Fishing Tourist,' page 30) including 'spring silver salmon,' 'weak toothed,' 'white,' 'square tailed,' 'spring,' 'hooked nose' (running in the autumn) 'hump-backed,' 'dog, or spotted salmon;' for each of which so-called variety he adduces a specific Latin name. He has doubtless since much condensed this formidable category. He has earned a reputation that gives weight to his utterances on fish; and Mr. Davison may congratulate himself on having 'smoked out' such a widely recognized authority on his side of the fence. As to the effect on navigation of sawdust at the mouths of streams, I am hardly qualified to give an opinion. But I have stood where the following rivers empty into the sea: The Ingraham, the La Have, the Port Medway, the Liverpool, the Sable, the Jordan, the Shelburne, the Musquodoboit, the two Salmon Rivers, the Ship Harbour stream, and I have failed to observe that navigation has been interfered with in any degree that can attract serious attention. At the mouth of the La Have is the only place where I have heard any complaints at all and these struck me as of a very trivial nature. A steam dredge could in a few days remove the accumulations of a long series of years—if they were found to be inconvenient to vessels loading or unloading.

Now, the Minister did not dwell to a very great extent upon the question of inconvenience to navigation, although this has been a strong argument in regard to La Have River. I think any objection made on the ground of the tendency of sawdust to injure navigation, can be completely met on the ground that in this particular case the mill-owners, the Messrs. Davisons referred to, and other mill-owners on that river, are the parties most interested in preserving the navigation of the river, and that it is not to their interest to ask for an exemption from the general operation of this Act, which would tend to hamper, if not destroy, their business. Now, in former public correspondence with the hon. Minister of Marine, it appeared that these gentlemen—who have strong political feelings,

though at the same time they are gentlemen of high personal character, and have shown unusual ability in dealing with this subject—made a statement which I presume the Minister is familiar with; and in order to place it on record as part of the literature on this subject, I will read it to the House:

"There is another and much more important letter bearing on the navigation of La Have, to which we do not notice any reference in your communication. I refer to that of Capt. Cashon of the tugboat *La Have*, who from the nature of his business would naturally be watchful of the movements of sawdust in the channel. As your attention may not have been called to it, we herewith reproduce it:

"BRIDGEWATER, 22nd Nov., 1888.

"C. H. DAVISON, Bridgewater:

"SIR,—I am in receipt of yours of 20th inst. You wish me to inform you by letter how the depth of water in the channel of the La Have compares now with the time I first took charge of the tugboat; also if I can or cannot now bring as large vessels to the wharves as I could years ago? In reply, I may say that I have been towing on the La Have every season since 1878, and have noticed but little variation in the depth of the channel during that time, and I find no more difficulty in bringing large vessels to, or taking them from the wharves now, than I did when I first took charge of the tugboat. I took the barque *Montreal*, from the wharf this season drawing over 17½ feet, the greatest draught I have taken down the channel since I have had charge of the tugboat.

"Yours truly,

"W. H. CASHON.

"As Captain Cashon may well be considered an authority on the subject, and besides is deeply interested in having the channel kept perfectly clear, he being an owner and manager of the tugboat, we think his statement is sufficient to show that the 'prevalent feeling that the harbour was being ruined,' to which Mr. Rogers refers was and is entirely groundless."

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Rogers, of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken, said with reference to the Messrs. Davisons that they admitted that vessels had been stopped by this sawdust of which there were several feet in the Medway River.

Mr. FLINT. I did not refer to the fact that the largest vessel that ever took cargo in the La Have River, a vessel drawing 17 feet 8 inches of water, loaded at Davison's mill, I think, in the year 1888 where, for a great many years previously, vessels of her tonnage were obliged to load partially and then drop down the river to complete their load. Every gentleman familiar with the subject must know that from the nature of things sawdust of itself cannot offer any obstacle to navigation, because it is very light and easily moved. With regard to the steamer grounding and a disagreeable odour being stirred up by her screw on the occasion referred to, this would occur in any harbour or river, because all those at all familiar with that subject are aware that the bottoms of harbours and rivers always do create a very unpleasant odour if they are stirred up by screw steamers or paddle wheel steamers, and the fact that there happened to be a certain quantity of sawdust there had nothing to do with the odour. I am going to read a few quotations from the report of a former inspector of fisheries, Mr. Rogers, not giving his opinion, because that might be received, under the circumstances, with a certain amount of suspicion, but he quotes from persons of undoubted standing in connection with the subject of fisheries, whose opinions are diametrically opposed to those given in the very able address we have had from the hon. Minister this evening. Dr. James S. Miller, overseer of fisheries, at Canning, King's County, says:

"In regard to the question of sawdust and its effects on fish, in my opinion in cannot be poisonous. If it was, the fish would be found in numbers, dead or dying, floating on the surface of the water in rivers where sawdust in large quantities is allowed to run. But I have never heard of any reliable person having seen such a state of things. I have seen shad on more than one occasion opened in which was found sawdust, but whether the shad swallowed the sawdust in the ordinary way as food, or whether it was swallowed in the death struggles, I am not prepared to say. This, however, I do know, that in no way did these fish appear different from their fellows. They were as fat, as large and as plump as any. Now if the sawdust was poisonous, one would expect to see some effect from it. Sawdust being woody fibre could not become poisonous without decomposition or fermentation. The cool spring waters that form our rivers, as well as the motion of the water, the currents, would prevent anything like fermentation, as the water at any given place is constantly being renewed. I take it, therefore, that decomposition would be about impossible under these circumstances, and I believe the idea of sawdust poisoning fish will have to be abandoned when the question is more fully understood. From what I have seen and read, I am satisfied that sawdust does not kill fish."

Mr. Rogers, further in his report, says:

"The following from a paper by Prof. H. Rasch, of Norway, published in the United States Fishery Reports for 1880, page 517, gives an idea of how the sawdust question is viewed in a country where they have had a much more extended experience than we could have in a country so young: That the rivers on which there is considerable cutting of timber gradually become more and more destitute of salmon is an undeniable fact, but while it is asserted that the sawdust introduced into the river from the saw mills causes the salmon coming from the sea either to forsake its foster stream because of meeting the sawdust to seek another river not polluted, or else when the fish attempt to pass through the areas quite filled with sawdust, then this by fixing itself into the gill opening or between the gills causes its death, yet later experience seems to entitle us to the assumption that sawdust neither causes the salmon to forsake its native stream nor produce any great mortality among the ascending fishes."

He then proceeds to give a large number of statistics with which I will not trouble the House at present. I may say this is a report made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and probably he may explain on a future occasion why it was not published among the other reports of his Department. Mr. Rogers proceeds to state:

"I beg next to call attention to the state of the river fisheries in many parts of Nova Scotia where there is abundance of sawdust, and also to the river fisheries of Cape Breton where there is substantially no sawdust at all. The Margaree River, in Inverness County, Cape Breton, which has neither mill-dams nor sawdust to interfere with its fisheries, and which used to be one of the most prolific fish-producing streams in Nova Scotia, has given a yield of salmon during the ten years, 1870-79, of 67,927 lbs. per annum, and for the eight years from 1880-87 of 36,991 lbs., an average yearly decline of nearly fifty per cent. The catch of alewives on the same river during the former period was 1,431 brls. per annum, and during the latter only 826 brls., a decrease of 505 brls. per annum. Should there have been a few saw-mills on this river, the decline would have, of course, been attributed to sawdust, and demands that the law be enforced would be made. The four counties of Cape Breton, whose rivers are comparatively clear of sawdust, produced of salmon per annum, from 1870-79, 284,792 lbs., and from 1880-87 but 125,292 lbs., a decrease of 159,400 lbs. per annum. The following table shows the catch of salmon in the rivers of Nova Scotia proper where sawdust generally abounds, and also in the rivers of Cape Breton where the opposite is the case:—

Year.	Catch of Salmon in N. S. proper.	Catch of Salmon in the four C. B. Counties.
1880	232,890 lbs.	150,660 lbs.
1881	196,313 "	83,730 "
1882	468,956 "	111,155 "
1883	469,900 "	106,100 "
1884	601,850 "	146,100 "
1885	615,153 "	144,100 "
1886	499,574 "	109,600 "
1887	625,368 "	159,985 "

"This shows that while there has been an increase during this period of nearly three hundred per cent. in Nova Scotia proper in the catch of salmon, there has been none whatever in the comparatively clean rivers of the Island of Cape Breton. The alewive fishery tells about the same story:

Year.	Catch of Alewives in N. S. proper.	Catch of Alewives in Cape Breton.
1878	4,354 brls.	1,379 brls.
1879	6,110 "	3,279 "
1880	13,546 "	2,599 "
1881	19,636 "	2,837 "
1882	20,035 "	1,621 "
1883	16,845 "	1,503 "
1884	17,887 "	2,801 "
1885	14,271 "	2,443 "
1886	15,099 "	1,713 "
1887	15,077 "	1,513 "

"There is surely no evidence here of injury to the alewive fishery of Nova Scotia from sawdust nor of benefit to that of Cape Breton from its absence."

Mr. TUPPER. I understood the hon gentleman to admit that sawdust is nocuous to the fish.

Mr. FLINT. No; the point I make is that a distinction must be drawn between the sawdust itself and a combination of causes of which sawdust is one. I say that the injury to fish is caused, first, by inadequate fish-ways or fish-passes or by none at all; second, by sawdust, combined with mill rubbish and other refuse which is thrown into the river. The result of my own enquiry is that, given proper fish-ways and with no other mill rubbish, the sawdust is innocuous or nearly so. While I admit that the authorities quoted by the Minister of Marine are very strong, they can only be answered by authorities of equal eminence, who take opposite ground on this subject, and here is the difficulty which laymen, who are desirous to reach a fair conclusion on the matter, have to contend with. I am now endeavouring to impress upon the mind of the Minister—for he and his colleagues must settle the question, unless there is legislation—that the exemption of this river is desirable on the ground that there is no reason why it should be kept under the regulations because of the deposit of sawdust. I quote again from the report:

"The Medway River in Queen's County has been afflicted with sawdust for a full century. The dams were opened for the ascent of fish in the year 1873-74, with the following results, and in spite of sawdust:—

Years.	Salmon.	Trout.	Alewives.	Smelts.
1878	22,871 lbs.	.....	70 lbs.	.....
1879	11,896 "	.....	262 "	2,000 lbs.
1880	5,323 "	.....	725 "	4,000 "
1881	7,615 "	.....	4,864 "	3,750 "
1882	8,388 "	.....	2,747 "	7,400 "
1883	21,169 "	915 lbs.	3,262 "	8,550 "
1884	20,315 "	1,650 "	3,082 "	15,200 "
1885	30,230 "	2,050 "	3,005 "	16,000 "
1886	22,005 "	2,378 "	3,505 "	18,250 "
1887	22,984 "	2,615 "	3,837 "	21,500 "
1888	18,450 "	2,775 "	2,916 "	22,700 "

If that is of any practical value, it goes to show that the effect of sawdust in the river is rather to increase and improve the facilities for fishing. I do not go so far as that, but I say that there is no proof of any injury being done to the fish by the sawdust itself. There must have been other causes to injure the growth and development of fish life. As was stated the other day by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), the question of the migration of fish and their reappearance is not yet understood even by the experts. We find every few years, as the Minister is aware, that there is an outcry that for some reason there has been a depletion of certain fish. One year it is the herring, another year it is the salmon, and another year the lobster, and yet, after volumes of complaints have been filed and long enquiries have been made, you find suddenly that the shell fish or other fish are pouring in again. Perhaps after some time we may be able to discover some of the laws which govern the migration of fish from one quarter to another. No doubt, if year after year fish are prevented from returning to their haunts for spawning purposes, they will not come to those grounds for some time, but it is very difficult to find the reasons for the extraordinary changes which take place in the migration of fish. I will read a quotation from one of the reports of the official overseers, written by a very efficient officer under the Minister:

"Overseer John Fitzgerald, of Mill Village, Queen's County, an officer of eighteen years' experience and an efficient and reliable one, writes of the Medway: 'There is, without doubt, an increase in salmon, alewives and trout during the past eight years. This is a matter of notoriety, and I have no hesitation in saying that sawdust is no impediment whatever to the ascent of fish of any kind. In rivers in which other mill rubbish, slats, edgings and bark are deposited, I firmly believe any decrease is due to the obstructions caused by these and the dams and not in the least degree by sawdust. Where sawdust is from any cause deposited on the spawning places and remains in such quantities as to cover up the gravel in which the ova are deposited, it might and probably would cause injury to the natural increase of the fish; but I know of no case of this kind, and can confidently assert that no sawdust was deposited on the spawning ground in the Medway. I have spoken with a score or more of persons, all of whom have spent their lives on the Medway River, some of them old men and all past middle life, and they are unanimous in the opinion that sawdust in the Medway causes no damage to fish of any kind, nor does it affect the spawning grounds in the least.'"

I think I will have the same consideration for the House and for other hon. gentlemen who may desire to speak as the Minister of Marine had. It might be interesting to me and to some few other gentlemen to continue these quotations, but it is only fair at this late hour that I should simply say that I could extend them for another hour if I thought fit to weary the members who are here. The point I make is this, authorities differ on this question and the facts seem strongly to show that the effect of sawdust itself, if the other rubbish to which I have referred is kept out of the river and the fish-ways are kept in good order, is not such as the gentlemen whose reports have been read to the House by the Minister of Marine would indicate. I trust the result of this motion and the return will be to bring the whole question before the House and the country for consideration. If any river in the Dominion is exempted, I think the La Have River should be exempted. I agree with the hon. the Minister that the power of exemption ought to be taken from the Administration, and I think he will acknowledge that I have carefully avoided making this a political issue. It ought not to be make a political issue, but should be settled on its own merits upon an intelligent and intelligible principle. I think the Ministry is placed frequently in an embarrassing position in consequence of the power given to them by the law, and I believe that either the law should be made uniform, permitting of no exemptions at all, or that, if any exemptions are permitted, a complete case has been made out in favour of the La Have River. In the first place the lumber interests are very extensive. Taking the men who work in the forests in the winter and

those who handle the finished product, if I am not mistaken, at least 2,000 men obtain their livelihood in this business, and a large amount of capital is invested in some of the finest mills of the Dominion of Canada on different portions of this magnificent river. We are informed upon good authority that, at any rate in regard to the majority of these mills, they are so situated that it is absolutely impossible for the owners to undertake to burn this sawdust without endangering their property, endangering the forests, and endangering the villages to an extent entirely disproportionate to the benefit that would accrue from that manner of disposing of the sawdust. They are also satisfied that the inventions which have been referred to by the Minister cannot be operated in those localities. Notwithstanding the strong opinion the Minister has on the general subject, and on which I am inclined to agree with him, I trust that he will consider all these facts, and bear in mind the strong pressure put upon him by his own political friends, the vast interests at stake and the large number of men whose means of livelihood are imperilled, with a view to seeing whether he cannot give the La Have River the benefit of all the arguments that have been offered in regard to nineteen or twenty other rivers in the different portions of the Dominion which are already exempt. I believe that the general argument, with which I am inclined to agree, to a certain extent, in regard to the effect upon fish of sawdust, combined with other mill rubbish and refuse, will be unaffected by the favour being given to the La Have River which we are now asking for, and I think the political argument will disappear entirely. I am sure the Minister will find that both sides of politics, in the region where these mills are situated, would feel that their interests had been consulted, and that the benefits accruing to them would redound to the credit of the Administration, if the Minister took into consideration the strong representations made by these petitioners and would kindly accede to their request.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the very elaborate explanations made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and to the flood of information which he cast upon this very interesting subject. I have been surprised to hear from time to time the insinuations that have been made as to the motives which actuated that hon. gentleman in carrying out the policy of the Government, because I may say that in the county which I have the pleasure to represent, we have some streams upon which are situated a number of mills, manufacturing a very large quantity of lumber, and the owners of these mills, without exception, so far as I am aware, carry out the provisions of the Act and the regulations, save the sawdust, and prevent rubbish of every kind from falling into those streams. It is not necessary for me to say that those people are not of the same stripe of politics; no discrimination is made whatever, no discrimination has ever been thought of upon such a subject. The reason why the mill-owners in that county accede to the provisions of the statute so readily, is that the County of Shelburne is also one of the largest fishing counties in that province, and the people being interested in fisheries are extremely anxious to see that they shall be preserved and increased, and not injured by this mill rubbish. That is almost the universal desire not only of the mill-owners, but of the large body of the people who engage in the deep sea fisheries of the coast—because, as has well been said, the coast fisheries are dependent almost entirely upon the increase of the anadromous fish which frequent these streams. The moment these fish cease to come into our rivers and streams, that moment the coast fisheries will fall off. Now, with regard to the particular river which has been spoken of so frequently in this discussion, I express no opinion, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with that stream. I know the La Have River is one of the best in the province; I know there are a large number of mills upon it, and I know that a large quantity of logs and lumber have been manufactured upon it for a great number of years, and whether that stream should be exempted from the operation of this Act, I leave for those to judge who are better acquainted with it and who know more about its peculiar circumstances than I do. I feel, however, that in case that river is exempted from the operations of this Act, you will find applications coming from mill-owners on many other streams in the Province of Nova Scotia, and they will then urge their claims with a very fair reason. Now, I had almost imagined although I know a great many very diverse opinions have been expressed, I had almost imagined that at the present time, at all events, it had come to be almost universally admitted that the casting of sawdust and other rubbish into the streams was extremely injurious to the fisheries. Mr. Rogers, the late inspector, has been cited here at considerable length, but we must remember that Mr. Rogers has expressed opinions differing considerably at different times. His opinion, when he was inspector of fisheries, differs very much from the opinion he expressed after he ceased to be inspector; and as to his statistics, whenever he attempts to show that the fisheries have increased in these streams in which there is no sawdust, you will find, if you look at some of his many contributions to the press and his reports, that he quotes those very same statistics to show that the fisheries have increased in those streams where there is no sawdust, in consequence of the wonderful fish-ladder he has invented which he seems to think is a panacea for all the ills that affect fish life. Now, I am also of the opinion that this rubbish and sawdust is very injurious to the navigation of these streams, and of the harbours into which they flow. I am satisfied through my own observation that the sawdust which floats down the river and sinks to the bottom, affects navigation very materially, and that the harbours in many of these places are much shallower than they used to be, and if we pushed our investigations further we would find that in many cases they have become not only shallow, but applications are often made to the Minister of Public Works to send a dredge there to deepen them. Inasmuch as this matter has been very clearly and fully discussed, and after listening to the exhaustive remarks which have been made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I do not think it well for me to weary the House on this subject. I merely rose to express my approbation, not only of the remarks made by the Minister, but of the policy of the Government, and of the manner in which he has carried out that policy.

Mr. KENNY. It will be within the recollection of many hon. gentlemen who are now present that

this question was under discussion in the session of 1889. It was then very fully discussed, and on that occasion, as on the present, I am happy to say that the debate did not assume a partisan shape. The question was then discussed, as it has been to-night, very largely on its merits. I came to the conclusion in listening very carefully to all the arguments which were advanced on previous occasions when the sawdust question was under discussion in this House, that sawdust is injurious to fish life. I was surprised to hear from the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) this evening, that a correspondent of his, a sportman, in the Province of Nova Scotia, writing of a river on which there is a natural fish-way, had actually stated that sawdust had increased the quantity of salmon on that river. Such a statement I must now say——

Mr. FLINT. I do not think he went so far as that. I think he says that salmon had increased, although there was sawdust in the river.

Mr. KENNY. I quite recognize that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), did not endorse the statement of his correspondent, and I think from the general tenor of his remarks that he admitted himself that the contention which has been made by the Minister of Marine, that sawdust is injurious to fish life, commends itself to his judgment; but I understood from him in quoting the statement of his correspondent, that this gentleman stated to him that the presence of sawdust had increased the quantity of salmon in that river. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) must remember that as regards this particular river to which he refers, he himself admits there was a natural fish-way whereby the salmon could pass up to the spawning grounds, and that consequently the spawning grounds were not destroyed by the presence of sawdust, and therefore I can readily understand that salmon still frequent that river. But as the anglers of Nova Scotia have been referred to, I must say that I have discussed the question with gentlemen who fish in our rivers regularly every season, and there is a general consensus of opinion among them that sawdust is injurious to fish life. The hon. member for Yarmouth has expressed the opinion that sawdust *per se* is not injurious to fish life, but that the injury is done by edgings, bark, and so forth, and that these are the injurious substances. I will agree with the hon. member to this extent, that as regards the obstruction of the navigation, these deposits of bark and edgings are infinitely more injurious than sawdust: but I must repeat, with all due respect to him, that from what I have heard in this House, from the discussions I have had with practical men on the subject, and from information gathered from my reading, I am forced to the conclusion that sawdust is injurious to fish life. We all know, even those among us who are perhaps the least informed on this question, that where the waters of a river are habitually and constantly polluted, the fish, salmon particularly, will avoid those waters, and hence it is that in most of the rivers where sawdust is deposited the salmon fishing has very perceptibly declined. Reference has been made to the Medway River, and to the effect that lumber mills are now operated on the river. I think there is only one mill, but I am not very positive, the one worked by Messrs. Davisons——

Mr. FORBES. It is not operated.

Mr. KENNY. I was under the impression that they were carrying on operations on the Medway River. I am quite prepared to admit that under certain conditions the depositing of sawdust may be harmless in a river, but the conditions are very exceptional. I refer to a stream which is a short one, where the mill is actually at the head of the tidal waters, where there is a rapid current, and a certain configuration of the banks of the river, where the banks rise abruptly and where the river is deep; in such a locality the depositing of sawdust where it is immediately carried into the ocean is comparatively harmless. I do not for a moment say that the depositing of sawdust in the La Have has been any obstruction to navigation. Speaking from the information I have gathered from others, because I cannot profess to have any personal knowledge on the subject, I am rather of the opinion that so far the depositing of sawdust has not been very injurious to the navigation of the La Have; I do not think it has been a very serious obstruction to the navigation of that river. I must say, knowing Messrs. Davisons as I do, that they are men of great enterprise and great energy, who have developed the lumbering business of Nova Scotia with perhaps more zeal than any other firm in the province, that I felt very great sympathy with them when they were unable to carry on their business on the La Have River. The Minister of Marine in the concluding portion of his remarks—I was sorry I had not the pleasure of hearing all his remarks—referred to the enquiries held in 1871, 1877 and 1884 to ascertain the means for removing sawdust. I may say here to the Minister, that in my conversation on the subject with the Messrs. Davisons, those gentlemen intimated to me that they were quite willing to construct any apparatus which would effectually destroy the sawdust, but that they had not been able to ascertain of their own knowledge any plan whereby that could be effectually done on the La Have River. I took the liberty on a former occasion when addressing the hon. Minister on this question, the matter then being one relating to another river in our province, to say that if some officers of the Fisheries Department would visit the rivers in some of the northern states of the union, where the fisheries are now preserved and where the sawdust is not allowed to be deposited in the rivers, and if the plan of the apparatus which prevents the sawdust passing into the rivers from those mills was communicated to our mill-owners throughout the Dominion, because this is not a Nova Scotia question by any means, then they would have a plan which might be adapted to their own lumbering operations.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman evidently was not in the House when I explained that the officers of my department had already explained how to save the sawdust. It is not necessary to go to the United States to ascertain how this is to be done, because in the various provinces of the Dominion, not only in Ontario, but in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, this is being done; and Messrs. Davisons themselves are saving their sawdust. The plans for this purpose are given in the last annual report of my department; I gave the pages of the report to the House, as I did not wish to weary hon. members with the particulars. As regards saving the sawdust on the La Have River,

I quoted from the report of Lieutenant Gordon that the Messrs. Davisons can do this with their mills as other mills are doing.

Mr. KENNY. I was not aware of it. Certainly it was not the condition of affairs when I last had a conversation with the Messrs. Davisons. Since then Captain Gordon has made a survey of the La Have River; and now that the Messrs. Davisons have the information, I am quite sure, if the apparatus for saving sawdust can be supplied for any moderate sum of money, those gentlemen will take advantage of this information which has been given them by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Reference has also been made to the invidious power which the Minister now holds of permitting mills on a certain river to deposit their sawdust and prohibit others. I think that last session, or the session before, the Minister intimated to the House his desire to be relieved from that responsibility and a Bill with that object was introduced into the House; but I must say, that, in discussing this question with the mill-owners in Nova Scotia, they were generally of the opinion that it would be better that the power should remain as it is, vested in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the day, recognizing, as all fair-minded men must recognize, that in discharging these duties, the Minister is simply actuated by a desire to do what he best can in the public interest. Therefore, while I have very great sympathy with the Messrs. Davisons, and regret exceedingly to see that important industry in the La Have River suspended—because I hope it is only suspended—yet I am quite sure that the Minister will give their case the most careful consideration, as it has now been so prominently placed before him during this debate.

Mr. FORBES. I have already spoken on this subject, but I would like for a few moments to refer to one or two points on which the hon. Minister digressed from the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken. I would draw the attention of the House to this irregular mode of proceeding.

Mr. LAURIER. This has been an irregular discussion all through.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been regular, except that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) was allowed to speak a second time, which he had not the right to do.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think that in a matter of this kind so important to the interests of all, a very thorough and full discussion should be had on the subject. I do not think the House will object to the member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) being heard, and I should like to offer a remark or two myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has a right to speak on this amendment. He has not already spoken, but the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) has.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks myself when the others get through.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have listened during this debate with very great attention to the able remarks made by my hon. friends in connection with this subject, as to sawdust polluting the waters of the various streams and injuring the condition of the fish. I want to have the House clearly impressed with the idea that the persons engaged in the industry of lumbering on the La Have River do not object to a proper disposal of mill rubbish, such as slabs, edgings, and so forth, which I believe are injurious to rivers, and which cause obstructions in some causes almost as great as a mill dam. I feel satisfied that after the remarks which have been made by the various speakers, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that the lumbering industry on the La Have, is very seriously crippled because of the river not being exempted from the operation of this Acts. The Messrs. Davison have a very earnest desire not to do anything that they can help with regard to depositing this sawdust in the river, that is, they wish to avoid its deposit, and much credit is due to them for the manner in which they have promoted the lumbering industry on the La Have from its inception up to the present time. They are willing and desirous to prevent as far as possible the sawdust going into the river, but unfortunately for them, and for others interested in the industry, the construction of their mills prevents them putting in such machinery as would be necessary to destroy or utilize the sawdust. The situation of their mill is in a deep ravine where there is no possibility at all of disposing of the sawdust in such a way that it will not get into the stream. Under these circumstances the position of the Messrs. Davisons should be recognized, and should be carefully weighed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think that the fishery overseer should be instructed to make such a report as would enable them to be relieved from their disability, and to have their grievance in some way removed. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) referred to the condition of the River Medway. That river adjoins the county which I have the honour to represent, and as a portion of its head waters pass through Lunenburg County, I have some knowledge of the habits of the fish in that river. I can state without hesitation, that small fish, such as the gaspereaux, frequent that river as far as thirty miles from its mouth, and are now caught in quantities quite as great as at any time during the last twenty years. If the gaspereaux, which is not so active a fish as the shad, and far less active than the salmon, can get to the head waters of the Medway, I cannot understand why it is that the La Have River should not be exempted as well as the Medway. The Medway has been exempted, and the sawdust in that river has not offered any obstruction sufficient to cause the overseer of that river to make objections. On the contrary, as was quoted by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), the overseer on that river has reported that the sawdust in the Medway was not an obstruction or a grievance. As I have already contended, I cannot understand why it is that some of the rivers are exempted from the operation of this Act, while others are not. The Ottawa River has fifty times as much sawdust deposited in its bed as the La Have ever had, and I certainly cannot conceive why the La Have should not be exempted the same as the Ottawa. The people living on the banks of the La Have River have been for years obtaining a living from lumbering operations there, and I cannot understand why their industry should now be crippled and their means of living interfered with, more parti-

cularly in this case, when the people along that river have expressed their wish to sacrifice whatever injuries might result to the fishing, if any, by the depositing of sawdust in the river, rather than they should be compelled to sacrifice the lumbering industry by which they make a living. I say that, after careful consideration, they have come to the conclusion that they will undergo all that sacrifice in order that the lumber industry on the La Have River may be preserved to them. Under these circumstances, I again press most strongly that their wishes be complied with.

Amendment (Mr. Flint) agreed to, and main motion as amended agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 143) respecting certain female offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia (from the Senate). —(Sir John Thompson.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS

PRIVATE BILLS—REPORTS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended to Tuesday, 28th inst., in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved:

That all accounts in the Department of the Interior for salaries paid and for extra work done between the year 1884 and 1st July, 1891, inclusive, together with all cheques and other vouchers for the payment of the same, be produced forthwith before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When will the hon. gentleman require them?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As soon as possible.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will get them as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend "The Indian Act," chap. 43 of the Revised Statutes. He said: This Bill consists of four sections. The first section is in regard to trespasses on reserves, and the offences are made punishable by fine, which has not been the case heretofore. The second section is with regard to surrenders made of Indian lands in British Columbia, North-West Territories or Manitoba. It is provided to make the certificates on oath before the Indian Superintendent at Victoria, or some other officer specially authorized by the Governor in Council. Heretofore the oath had to be taken before a Supreme Court judge, which has proved very inconvenient, as the Indians had sometimes to travel two hundred or three hundred miles. Section 3 provides that the judge shall have the power to order payment of costs by a certain party to a suit. This is not the case at present, and each party has to pay his own costs. The last section has reference to shooting privileges on reserves. In several of the provinces, especially in Ontario, shooting clubs lease portions of reserves for shooting purposes, and this gives them protection against poaching.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement to the House. It will be remembered that in the debate on the prohibition question which took place some days ago, I made some quotations purporting to be from a speech which the Minister of Finance delivered some years ago on the prohibition question. I have discovered since, that in making those quotations I was in error, that the quotations really were from the speech of the late member from Brome (Mr. Fisher) instead of from the speech made on the occasion by the Minister of Finance. I may say that in making the quotations which I did, I made them, not as I ought to have done from the official report of the Debates, but from a pamphlet purporting to give a full report of the speeches made on that occasion and of the proceedings. In that pamphlet the name of Mr. Fisher unfortunately appeared in very small type, and I did not notice, as I ought to have done, where the speech of the Minister of Finance ended and where Mr. Fisher's speech commenced. I was thus led into the error into which I fell. I may say that so soon as my attention was called to the fact by the chief of the reporting staff, I spoke to the Minister of Finance on the subject and expressed my willingness to make such acknowledgment and statement as might seem to be called for under the circumstances; but at his suggestion, I delayed doing so until he should have an opportunity of examining the report himself and to say whether he considered the error of sufficient importance to demand this acknowledgment and statement on my part. The hon. gentleman intimated to me this morning that he thought it well under the circumstances, as the quotations were not his utterances at all, but were those of Mr. Fisher, the late member for Brome, I should make the statement which I have made. I trust it will be considered sufficient by the hon. gentleman and by those of my fellow members who have been unwittingly led into error by the mistake which I made, and it only remains for me to express my sincere regret that I committed the mistake I did commit.

Mr. FOSTER. The facts are exactly as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver). I should not have known that the quotation——

Mr. SPEAKER. Does my hon. friend think that there should be a discussion on this matter now?

Mr. FOSTER. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I should not have known that the quotations were not my own, if it had not been that my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) drew my attention to the matter.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dewdney for second reading of Bill (No. 119) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I am not aware that the House has been informed as to what would be the precise location of this railway, nor the length of the portion of it which the hon. gentleman now proposes to subsidize from the city of Winnipeg to the River Saskatchewan. Would the hon. gentleman give us information as to that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have mislaid my memorandum, but my recollection is that I gave the distance from Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan as about 300 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman obtain the information as to the amounts of stock which were held by the various persons in the list which he supplied to me? I have returned him the list in order that that information might be obtained, and my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) also made the request.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I find I am not able to get the necessary information asked for by the hon. gentleman, but I have this information for him which I will pass over in a few moments. It shows the names of the shareholders; the total shares issued (paid-up), 10,500; total amount realized for same, $285,793; the names of the directors of the company, and it also gives the following memorandum:—

"The Special Act authorizes the company to issue paid-up shares 'at such prices and upon such conditions as the company by by-law determines.' All shares have been issued in accordance with the terms of the 'Special Act' as 'paid-up shares,' and consequently there is no liability to the company by any shareholder. As most of the shareholders are transferees of the original purchasers, the shares having frequently changed hands, the company has no knowledge of the amount the present shareholders have paid for their holdings. It would be impossible to get that."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was not asked for. What we want to get is the amount of stock held by each individual, the amount subscribed and the amount paid thereon. The hon. gentleman will see that that is a necessary piece of information in order to judge of the strength of the company, and the chance of its being able to carry to a successful issue the enterprise it has undertaken.

Mr. DEWDNEY. To do that you have to go back to the original shareholders, and they are not now in existence. The stock has changed hands, and it is impossible to get any information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have they furnished no list at all? There are good names, and bad names, and indifferent names in that list, and the value of the holdings depend a good deal on who holds the stock and what amount has been paid up. It was stated by my hon. friend behind me, that since it was alleged—I know nothing about that matter myself—that certain members of this House were interested in this company, and I see that a number of shares are held in trust, we ought to know distinctly and exactly what members of the House are interested in promoting this railway. There is no doubt about that; and such statement having been made by my hon. friend, it is absolutely necessary that full information should be given as to who are the holders of the stock.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I had heard a rumour of that nature, and that such an accusation had been made. I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the company in regard to that, and which letter I will now read:

"SIR,—Referring to *Hansard* of the 9th inst., Mr. M. C. Cameron, M. P., is reported to have said, relative to the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway, as follows:—'As there are many stories floating about as to how the stock of this company was disposed of * * *' I have since learned that the stories he referred to were, that I had distributed paid-up stock of the company to members of Parliament, and others, without any consideration, other than the promise of support in obtaining legislation. In answer to the above permit me to say: 1st. No stock of the company has ever been given or promised to any person, member of Parliament or otherwise, directly or indirectly, for the purposes alleged. 2nd. No stock has ever been issued or disposed of otherwise than for cash or as part of the consideration of a contract made by the company, as authorized by the Act of incorporation and amendments thereto. 3rd. Only two members of Parliament are stockholders in the company; both these gentlemen purchased stock *bonâ fide*—one in the year 1882, and the other in the year 1885."

I think this disposes of that point.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The statement was made to me some time ago that this company had the power by Act of Parliament to issue paid-up stock. It was further stated to me that a portion of the stock had been disposed of without a money consideration—in fact, that it had been disposed of to persons having influence with a view to securing that influence to promote the railway. I do not know whether, as a matter of fact, that is true or not. I am bound to say that the president of the company stated to me, not long ago, that he was prepared to make an affidavit that no portion of the stock had been disposed of in that way; and on examining the list of shareholders, I found the names of only two members of Parliament as holding stock in the company. But it must be remembered that this company has peculiar and extraordinary privileges preserved to it—privileges which I think are enjoyed by no other private company that ever obtained incorporation from the Canadian Parliament. In 1880, a company was incorporated called the Nelson Valley Railway and Navigation Company. It was granted the right to bond the road to the extent of $25,000 a mile, and the right to issue paid-up stock for various purposes—to pay the engineer, to pay the contractor, to pay for the right of way, to pay for material, plant and rolling stock, and also—and this is a point to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice—for the services of such persons as may be employed by the directors in the furtherance of the undertaking. Now, I do not know any other private company to which such a right has

been reserved. Under this provision of the law the board of directors could issue paid-up stock and hand it over right and left to members of Parliament and others as payment for services rendered to the company for the furtherance of the undertaking in any way the directors might see fit. In 1880, another Act was passed incorporating the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company. It also granted to that company power to bond the railway to the extent of $25,000 a mile; but the right to issue paid-up stock was not granted to that company. But in the year 1883, by Act of the Parliament of Canada, these two companies were amalgamated and formed into one company, called the Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company; and the objectionable clause, taken from the old statute incorporating the Nelson Valley Railway and Navigation Company, formed part of the Act amalgamating the two companies. So that the amalgamated company was granted the right in 1883 to issue paid-up stock for the purpose of furthering the operations of the company. The third section of the amalgamating Act provides that all the rights which were reserved to the old companies should be preserved to the united companies. That Act was subsequently amended by an Act passed on the 19th of April, 1884, entitled "An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company;" and even in that Act the rights which were reserved to the old Nelson Valley Railway and Navigation Company were continued in these words:

"All the rights, privileges and franchises of the Nelson Valley Railway and Navigation Company shall vest in the company incorporated in 1883 by the Act of amalgamation and amended in 1884 by the Act of that year."

So that, up to that time, if I read the statute aright, the right to issue paid-up stock for the purpose of furthering the interests of the company, was still reserved to the Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company. In 1886 the Act was again amended, and the rights that were reserved to the Nelson Valley Railway and Navigation Company were still reserved by section 5 and by section 1 of that Act. That is substantially the statute under which this company operates. It was amended again in 1887, when the name was again changed, and it was thereafter known, as it is known now, as the Hudson's Bay Railway Company. But the hon. gentleman will find that, through all these Acts there is still reserved to the company the right to issue paid-up stock for the purpose of furthering the interests of the company. Whether the directors have exercised that right or not, I do not know beyond what I have been told; but I think it is an exceedingly objectionable right to vest in any railway company. Under that right a company might issue paid-up stock on which not a farthing has been paid, and might utilize that privilege for the purpose of doing things which ought not to be done by any corporation, and which no corporation ought to have the power to do. I think, therefore, it is important that we should have the information which the hon. member for South Oxford has called for. So far we have practically nothing except a list of the stockholders. We do not know to what date that list is brought down—whether to the meeting of this Parliament or to this day. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows that; at all events, we do not know it. I do not know that, without the information, it would be advisable at present to discuss the merits of the scheme itself, as no doubt amendments will be made on the third reading of the Bill. I may say that, so far as I am personally concerned, I am entirely opposed to the scheme. I will not call it a wild-cat scheme. I have no right, so far as my personal knowledge goes, to say anything of the sort; but, upon a somewhat cursory examination of the reports which have been placed at our disposal, it does look to me to be, if not a wild-cat scheme, at all events a scheme which the Parliament of Canada ought not to support or countenance. If this were a purely colonization railway, and if it could be shown that it would be in the general interest of the people of the North-West Territories, that it would open up fertile and valuable lands, that it would give to a large settlement access to markets in Canada and elsewhere, the objections to the grant would not be so obvious. But it must be remembered that this is the third railway running almost parallel to the others that we have bonussed. There is one from Calgary and one from Regina, and now we are asked to bonus a road which is called a colonization railway, but we know very well that it is more than that. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) are aware of that. They know that perfectly well, and yet they ask us to bonus a railway from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay, when we have not the necessary information to justify us in doing it. The only information we have so far shows the utter inadvisability of bonusing such a road. The information that we have from those who were sent to report on the possible navigation of the Hudson's Straits, shows that those Straits are not navigable at any rate for more than two months in the year, and yet we are asked to vote $20,000 a year for twenty years in order to give this supposed outlet for the productions of the North-West. I think that every hon. member will find the objections which are made to that grant very difficult to be got over. It is estimated that that railway will cost about $15,000,000. It has got a grant of $1,500,000 from Manitoba, and they ask $3,000,000 from this Government, that is, taking the amount per annum capitalized. That will be a very small proportion of the $15,000,000 which, it is said, the road will cost, and they must raise the balance of the money in some way. The only way in which that can be done is by bonding the road. They will issue bonds on the road to the extent of $25,000 a mile. That money cannot be obtained in Canada. The bonds will have to be floated in the English money market, and, unless we are satisfied that the undertaking is a *bonâ fide* undertaking, entered into with the determination of completing it to the end, and unless we are satisfied that the outlet on Hudson's Bay will be available for the carriage of the trade of the country, we are simply misleading the English investors. There has been a good deal of that kind of action on the English money market, as the hon. gentleman knows very well. There was that undertaking in reference to that Three Rivers Company which did not reflect any credit upon this country, and we know that nearly the whole of the money invested in that was lost. We know of many other companies that have been pushed in the English money market, and upon whose bonds money has been

obtained simply because the Dominion Government had made grants to them, and necessarily the English investors came to the conclusion that the particular undertaking was reasonably good or the Dominion Government would not have come to the conclusion to vote them a subsidy. I think that Parliament ought not to vote this money without any reasonable certainty that the undertaking will be completed, or will be successful when it is completed. Those gentlemen who made a survey of the Hudson's Straits have said that there is no reasonable evidence that these Straits are open for more than two months of the year. The evidence which was submitted by my hon. friend from Simcoe two weeks ago is clear. The reports which were published by the gentlemen who had charge of that undertaking in 1885, make that point quite clear. If the hon. gentlemen will refer to page 38 of the report of 1886, they will find very conclusive evidence on that subject, but the whole evidence contained in the reports show that it is only in part of the month of July, and perhaps the whole of August and part of the month of September, that these Straits are open for navigation. During the rest of the year they are utterly unfit for navigation, and the principal difficulty is that the time when they are open for navigation is so uncertain. Sometimes they are open early in July, and sometimes late in July. Sometimes they close in September, and sometimes in October. That being the case, it leaves it uncertain when the Straits are open for navigation, and therefore uncertain for those who are buying grain and cattle when they can with reasonable certainty make their shipments. If that is the case, it is impossible for the farmers of the North-West to derive any benefit from a road of this kind, because the crop of this year could not, with certainty, be shipped through the Hudson's Straits until the next year. What advantage will that be to the farmer? The purchaser of the crop is not going to keep it over on the chance of selling it the succeeding year. It is not necessary for me to read the reports which have been made, but if hon. gentlemen will read them they will see that for not more than two months in the year can it be said with certainty that the Hudson's Straits are open for navigation. In that case, is it not the height of folly to vote an enormous amount of money for the construction of a railway there, and, beyond that, to hold out to English investors the inducement to place their money in it because it is subsidized by the Canadian Government? I had hoped that the hon. gentlemen opposite would have considered the matter with greater deliberation. If this receives the sanction of Parliament I fear that a loss will follow to our securities, and that we will have the English investors blaming the Canadian people, so that our credit will be seriously injured thereby.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend has evidently approached the question of a subsidy to the Hudson's Bay Railway with a prejudice already formed against it. He has admitted that in the course of his remarks. He has heard from somebody that corrupt means have been used to promote the interests of this company, and that the powers conferred on the Hudson's Bay Railway Company have been used to bribe members of Parliament as well as others. Of course he does not pledge his personal veracity to such a statement, and I need scarcely say that he can have no personal knowledge of any such thing, and can have no personal ground even to suspect that anything of the kind has taken place. He has simply made the statement on the basis of a vague rumour that has reached his ears. He has repeated and emphasized the words "members of Parliament" as if he still retained that suspicion as strongly as ever, notwithstanding the statement that has been read to this House by the Minister of the Interior. Now, I am one of the two members of this House who have shares in this railway, the other gentleman being the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). The fact that we hold such shares is no secret, as our names are on the list which is on the Table of the House. Being a shareholder, therefore, I beg leave to state that I did not get my shares for nothing, and that I have done nothing for the promotion of the company except to watch with the greatest interest the company's chances of success as a commercial undertaking. I have also taken pains to know what has been written and discovered in connection with the practicability of this route, and that is the extent to which I have promoted this Bill. But on the present occasion, when I think the company has been rather unjustly attacked on the basis of a vague rumour, the injustice of saying things as if they were proven, things for which not the slightest tittle of proof exists, of which not the slightest suspicion exists, except in the mind of my hon. friend who has just spoken, compels me to speak in its favour. It is not often that a member on this side of the House has to speak in support of a measure promoted by the Government, but on this occasion I think it is inevitable that those of us who have given the matter our most earnest consideration, should do so. What is proposed to be done for the Hudson's Bay Railway Company is not a new thing; it is not a startling thing; it is exactly what has been done for two or three railroads in the North-West in regard to which no trouble has been made in this House. When we passed through this House a similar grant to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, to the Regina and Long Lake Railway, nobody that I am aware of called for the names of the shareholders, or made any inquisition into the private affairs of the shareholders of those companies before granting them what was asked. I am quite unable to find out from any quarter what reason there is for feeling greater suspicion, for trying to institute a more severe inquisition into the affairs of the individuals composing this company, than in respect of any other company. I admit that the House has a right to satisfy itself of the *bonâ fides* of the company beyond all doubt, but that is all, I think, that the House has a right to demand. Now, I want to refer to the question that has been raised as to the navigation of Hudson's Bay. We have spent already a good deal of time in discussing that, and it may be necessary for the credit of the company to spend some more time at a later stage; but I will begin by saying that the question of the navigation of Hudson's Bay has no more to do with the propriety of passing the grant now before the House, than the question of the navigability of Behring's Straits or the sea around the North Pole. The piece of road which we are now asked to assist has no more necessary connection

with a road to Hudson's Bay than the Calgary and Edmonton, or the Regina and Long Lake. We are asked at the present time simply to assist a colonization railway, to take advantage of the land grant which this House has already seen fit to give to it, in fact to realize upon its assets for the purpose of going on with the work. That is what we are asked to do, and this House has no concern with the question of whether that road will ever go any further, or whether it will go to Hudson's Bay or not, or whether if it goes to Hudson's Bay, the Straits will be found navigable. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) says that unless we know that the railway will be completed to Hudson's Bayand that it will be successful, we are doing wrong to the English investors by bonusing the road. I do not see how he makes out the connection. If this road does proceed towards Hudson's Bay they will have a right of bonding that part of the road, of course, as he has pointed out, but what connection there can be between the bonus given to this part of the road to the Saskatchewan now, and the bonding of the problematic extension of that road to Hudson's Bay, I cannot see for the life of me, and I do not believe the hon. gentleman can point it out. The piece of road which we are now asked to assist may be all right, may be a commercial success, may be the greatest possible boon to that part of the country, while its extension from that point to Hudson's Bay might prove to be a total failure, though I propose to point out later on that in all probability it would not be so. But even supposing it were a total failure, I do not see how the faith of the Government is involved, or injured in any way, by bonusing this first part of the road which we know passes through a habitable and rich country, which only needs a railway to be prosperous and well peopled as well as rich. Now, what is it we are asked to do for that part of the road ? I have not the map before me, but I understand that, in round numbers, 40 miles of the road are already built out of Winnipeg in a northern direction, and it is estimated that the distance is about 260 miles from that point to the Saskatchewan, at the point where it is intended to touch it, making about 300 miles in all. But I understand it is only from the end of the existing track to the Saskatchewan that this bonus is to apply. Well, now, what are we asked to do for it over that extent ? I have in my hands the agreement entered into between the Government and the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, and I am informed that the proposed agreement with the Hudson's Bay Railway will be similar in all respects to this. As I am aware that most of the members of this House who have discussed the question do not know what that agreement is, I propose to read some of the essential points :

"1. Whereas the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company have become entitled to a land grant from the Dominion Government, under the Act 53 Victoria, chap. 4, to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile of their railway between the town of Calgary and a point on the North Saskatchewan at or near Edmonton ; and also by virtue of the said Act have become entitled to a land grant from the Dominion Government of 6,400 acres per mile of their railway from the town of Calgary to the International boundary between Canada and the United States of America.

"2. And whereas by an Act of the Parliament of Canada intituled : 'An Act respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company,' assented to on the 16th May, 1890, it was enacted that the Governor in Council may enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, materials, supplies, and mails, for twenty years, on the company's line between Calgary and a point on the North Saskatchewan at or near Edmonton, and may pay for such service during the said term, eighty thousand dollars per annum, to be paid annually, on the construction of the railway from a point within the town of Calgary to a point on the North Saskatchewan at or near Edmonton, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the railway to such last-mentioned point."

Now, here is a proviso which obviates the difficulty as to the solidity of the railway company. If the railway company here spoken of were not able to build the road to the Saskatchewan, they would have got nothing, and if the Hudson's Bay Railway Company are not able to finish this colonization section of the road, then they will not get this $80,000 a year ; and they will not get it, in any case, until after they have completed the road to the Saskatchewan. I will proceed to quote further from the agreement :

"And whereas, in view of the fact that the speedy construction of a line of railway direct from Calgary to the North Saskatchewan is a matter of very great importance in the interests of the public and of the Government, both as affecting the maintenance of good order in the northern district of the North-West and the development of the rising centres of those districts, including Edmonton, and of the country along the route to be traversed * * * Therefore, the Government, under the authority of the said Act, has agreed to enter into this contract with the company. That the company hereby bind and oblige themselves to complete 100 miles of their railway northerly from the town of Calgary by the 1st day of November, 1891, and complete the said railway to a point on the North Saskatchewan at or near Edmonton within two years thereafter, and carry by their regular trains for the Government for a period of twenty years all mail supplies and material as before recited * * * In consideration thereof, and with a view to assisting the company to make the financial arrangements necessary for the construction of the said railway, the Government hereby binds and obliges itself to pay each year to the said company the sum of $80,000. Such payments to be computed from the date of the completion of the said railway as before recited and be made in half-yearly payments, &c."

Then, the next clause affects the rates of freight on the road, and is not material. And finally, at the end of the bargain, by way of indemnity to the Government, in case the amount earned by the company for such services should not amount to the sum paid by the Government :

"The Government, as the land grant of the company is earned, from time to time, shall retain one-third of the land grant so earned, which shall be held by the Government as a first charge or lien, securing the repayment of any such deficiency. * * *

"A complete adjustment of accounts, comprising all transactions entered into or made between the Government and the company, under this agreement, shall be made every year, and interest, if any, shall be computed at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum on such annual deficit."

Then there are other provisions in detail for carrying out this basis of agreement. Now, what does this amount to ? It amounts simply to a loan by the Government of $80,000 a year to the company, for which the Government take as security one-third of the land grant already voted by this House to the company, and which the company have the right to claim as fast as they build the road. That land is now hardly the property of the company, but it will become so as fast as they are able to build the road. In order to enable the company to make the financial arrangements to build the road and open up the country, the Government now propose to lend to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company, as they have lent to the Calgary and Edmonton, and the Regina and Long Lake Railway Companies, this annuity of $80,000 a year for twenty

years, less any services which the railway company may perform for the Government, the Government being secured all the time by the retention of 2,133 acres of land per mile of the railway. It is a very simple calculation for any one to make, to show that this quantity of land retained will amount to over 550,000 acres, on which the Government will have a mortgage for this $80,000 a year annuity for twenty years. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), estimated the present value of the annuity, the other day, as being in the neighbourhood of $1,100,000, and his estimate is probably correct. When we consider that this road will have mails to carry for the Government, supplies to carry for the Mounted Police, and a great deal of other work to do for the Government during the twenty years, it is only reasonable to assume that this 550,000 acres of land, at the end of twenty years, will be worth very much more than what the Government advanced to the company, and be ample security for the said advance. Take the rate at which land is selling, within any reasonable distance of the Canadian Pacific Railway, equal to this, and you will see, Sir, that my estimate is by no means overdrawn, and that the amount of land retained by the Government is amply sufficient to secure them for the advance they propose to make. This is not a bonus, in the ordinary sense, which is offered to the Hudson's Bay Company. It is an advance secured upon landed property, which is the best class of security the Government could have. My hon. friend beside me says it is a donation. The terms of the agreement show it is not. He knows very well that good land in Manitoba near a railway is very good security for an advance of money, and the land through which this railway will pass is of such a nature that it will be made valuable by the railway passing through it. I had some extracts from Government reports proving this, on which I cannot lay my hands at present, but I will refer to them at a later period. Summarizing, however, I may say that the road, at its start, passes through a country settled to a very large extent in anticipation that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would have gone that way, as arranged by my hon. friend in front (Mr. Mackenzie). After that, it strikes a good open prairie country, graduating off to a district containing a very considerable quantity of timber, some of it in scattered bluffs and some in wide belts along the shores of the lakes and rivers. I distinctly remember Professor Macoun and others stating in these reports that there was spruce timber there of four feet in diameter, but I shall try to lay the extract from the report before the House on a later occasion. This district, not being sub-divided yet into townships, we are deprived of the assistance of the surveyor's field notes in showing the quality of the land. To resume what I have said, the country through which this railway passes is valuable, according to the reports of all the explorers. The country is not asked to advance any money until the road is completed, and immediately the road is completed the land served by it will become valuable. Five hundred and fifty thousand acres of that land, made valuable by the construction of a railway, are then to be pledged to the Government for an annuity of $80,000 a year for twenty years, out of which the road will earn a great deal by doing business for the Government. The road is, as far as we have anything to do with it, a colonization road. We are not concerned with whether it goes on to the Mackenzie River or to the Hudson's Bay after it passes the Saskatchewan. I believe it would be a good thing to take it to Hudson's Bay, as the season of navigation there, according to Commander Gordon's report, is at least double what my hon. friend opposite me has said it could only be; but that discussion has nothing to do necessarily with what we are speaking of now. Another objection has been raised by my hon. friend. I was surprised that he should have raised it. He said two other roads parallel to this had been already similarly bonussed. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's objection. I am surprised that a gentleman so well acquainted with the North-West, as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) is, and so well acquainted also with the districts through which these railways we have bonussed runs, should make the objection. I know he is very well acquainted with the country along Long Lake, and knows how much that railway has benefited that district, because he has been an investor there, but when he finds fault with bonusing this road because it runs parallel to these others, I am astonished. What is the distance between them? I cannot give it off-hand, but I know it is a good many hundreds of miles between the proposed route of the Hudson's Bay Railway and the route of the most easterly of the others, the Regina and Long Lake Railway, and to oppose this measure because the road will be parallel to another railway several hundred miles away, running through a totally different country, seems to me absurd. My hon. friend forgets that this road taps the Saskatchewan just at the foot of its navigation. He forgets that the Saskatchewan valley is the coming promised land of the North-West, and that there are many millions of acres there only waiting facilities to be settled. He forgets that a thousand miles of navigation extend westward from the point this railway will touch, and that at the same point there is a water power quite equal, if not superior, to the Chaudière Falls in this city. He forgets that at that point there is every probability of building up a city as large and prosperous as the one in which we are holding our meeting to-day, based on an equally solid foundation, the cutting of timber and the grinding of grain for Europe, because the Saskatchewan is not merely a grain-growing country, but it taps the pine and spruce forests of the Rocky Mountains, and this railway will pass through a well-wooded country. With this water power, with the supplies of timber and grain to be brought by water to this point on the Saskatchewan, with railway connection from that point to Winnipeg, there is every reason to expect that a very large and prosperous city and surrounding settlement will be established at that point. My hon. friend has given notice of amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend says he has not, but he said that no doubt amendments would be moved on the third reading, and that, therefore, there would be no object in going into the matter fully just now. I call that giving notice of amendment. As amendments will be moved, I will reserve what I have to say for the present about the navigation of Hudson's Bay, because I think I

have taken as much time of the House as the House is willing to grant at one time, reserving my right to speak on the third reading or again in this committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been rather surprised at the speech of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not know whether, in his address to the House this afternoon, he was speaking for West Elgin or for George E. Casey. It appears to me that if I were an elector of West Elgin and my hon. friend appealed to me for a renewal of confidence, I would hesitate to give it to him. When we come to discuss questions of this kind, we should discuss them on their merits, and not allow personal interests to induce us to lead the course which should be followed in a matter of this kind. In the first place, I wish to refer to some remarks that have been made with regard to the shareholders. I have read over the list of shareholders; I am happy to say, with regard to many of them, that they may be very decent, respectable men. I contend, however, in the first place, that before we grant this money, if we should decide to grant it, we should have a detailed statement of the financial status of the company. That company has been in existence some years, and I contend we should know the entire amount of their receipts and expenditures and their present condition. They are asking now, by a clause in this Act, for the privilege of issuing paid-up stock. I would like to know to what extent promises of paid-up stock have been made and the amount they intend to issue, and I think it is wrong that we should give power to enable the company to carry out a pernicious issue of paid-up stock to those to whom they wish to grant it. My hon. friend has made some remarks with regard to Hudson's Bay. I am sorry he was not in his place in this House when we had an extended discussion, the other day, on this point. I think it was proved most conclusively to this House by gentlemen who have studied the question, that the navigation of the Hudson's Bay is not to be depended upon for a longer period than three months in the year. I fancy it is not disputed that navigation is open for that length of time; but those three months are not very clearly defined. Sometimes, we are told, it is not closed until October, sometimes till November, and sometimes earlier than October. In my humble opinion, we are not in a position financially as a country to grant this money, without crippling ourselves or drawing upon the resources of the people to too great an extent. At any rate, until there is a much larger development of the North-West, and until an additional outlet for the produce of that country becomes an absolute necessity, not a dollar of this money ought to be granted. We have already spent in the development of the North-West not a dollar short of a hundred millions. When you take every item of expenditure upon that country—for Indians, for the Mounted Police, for the Government of the North-West, for land expenses and other expenses—and put all these items together, including the grant made to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I contend that this Dominion has contributed fully a hundred millions of money towards the development of that country. In the face of that, and in the face of the enormous amount of land which is now surveyed and open for settlement—land which has been declared to be of good quality and the most desirable within the limits of this Dominion—amounting to hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of acres, and no settler asking on what terms it can be occupied, I say it is folly and worse than folly to ask this House to pledge itself to a grant of $1,600,000 towards the construction of a railway to Hudson's Bay. When we entered into the work of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, what was the argument by which the claims of that undertaking were presented to this House and the country? It was that this would be the great iron band that would bind together the several provinces of this Dominion, that it would promote increased trade between these provinces, that the wheat of the North-West would come down to the harbours of Montreal and Quebec, and Toronto, and bring about such a development of trade as would tend to enrich the towns and cities of the older provinces. Even supposing the Hudson's Bay should be open for a longer period than three months, and we could send by that route a large quantity of the produce of the North-West to the markets of Liverpool, I ask, would we not be doing an injustice to the older provinces if we took away from their cities, and ports, and shipping companies, which are now anxious to get trade, much of the advantage which they expected to derive from their expenditure of money on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West generally, and provided means for sending the surplus produce in the other direction, where we will never see it, and where we will never reap a dollar of advantage from it? In that view of the case it is imprudent to grant this money, even if the scheme were a feasible one. But I contend that we are bound as sensible men to accept the arguments which have been presented to this House, and which have not been confuted, showing that the Hudson's Bay is not a desirable route by which to export the produce of the North-West. In the present era of rapid transit, it is folly to think that any man will be found in any part of the world ready to invest money in produce that will have to lie at one port frozen up for seven or eight or nine months in the year, from which not a bushel could be got even to keep off starvation. I do not think either that men will be disposed to ship produce by that route. But when we come to consider the present financial condition of this country, the amount of our annual outlay, the enormous expenses we have incurred, and the demands of other sections of the country which have been rapping at the doors of Parliament for relief on the ground that since the inauguration of the system of subsidizing railways they have a right to be reimbursed for the money which they have granted to their own railways without receiving a dollar of aid from the Parliament of Canada,—I say that to ask that those people should be subject to a further drain in order to grant $80,000 a year for twenty years to a railway to Hudson's Bay, is a monstrous proposition; and I am satisfied that the representatives of the people in this House who will sanction this measure will not receive the thanks of their constituents when they go back to them and try to explain to them the grounds upon which they give it their support. Now, I hold that it is time we should draw the rein. We have not had all the information we should have with regard to the

route of this railway, the quality of the lands, and the prospects of the company as to getting the means of constructing the railway; but we are asked to grant this money for the purpose of enabling these people to unload their bonds on the London markets and induce people there to embark in this undertaking. I am exceedingly sorry that there is a single member to be found on this side of the House disposed to sanction this grant. I feel humiliated, and I cannot help expressing my humiliation, that we have one man who is willing to support it. We have had in the past men interested in railroads, advocating the granting of charters to them, and supporting donations for them taken from the Dominion treasury; but I had earnestly hoped that the day of such things had passed away, and I am sorry that we have an exhibition of the same thing on this occasion. I think this House should set its foot on the efforts of any member, I care not which side of the House he belongs to, either to promote his own interests or the interests of the company in which he is interested as a shareholder, by using his voice or vote for that purpose. I earnestly hope that we shall soon reach the day when the people of this country will frown most severely on members of Parliament guilty of conduct of that kind. I have used harsh language in speaking on this subject, perhaps too harsh; but I felt humiliated that we had a man on this side of the House who would dare to get up and advocate such a scheme in this House to-day—one that has been pronounced, and justly pronounced, a wild-cat scheme—a scheme of which we know one end, but not the other. I have nothing to say against the men who are associated in this scheme; I dare say they are trying to make a speculation out of it, both in their own interest and in the interest of the country; but I do hope that the day is not far distant when we shall not see repetitions of such scenes as we have had here this afternoon.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot very well sit still under my hon. friend's imputation, that I am working for G. E. Casey rather than for the county I represent. My hon. friend has amplified that by the statement that he feels humiliated that such a person as I should exist on this side of the House, and he thinks it is abominable that any member of this House should use his voice, or his vote, or his influence, in order to advance the interests of a company in which he is interested. I will not take refuge behind the law of Parliament that any member of a joint stock company is allowed to speak and vote on questions concerning that company of which he is a member, but, apart from the legal rule, if it is to be insisted upon that a member of this House is not to say anything in favour of any company in which he may have an interest, I think we would have very bald debates in this House on such a subject. The members who are interested in that company are best qualified to present the condition of that company to the House. Their business interests have forced them to satisfy themselves as to the soundness or unsoundness of the investment. As to voting, that is a matter of taste whether a shareholder in a company should vote or not on legislation affecting it, though I shall not vote on this matter. But as to this question I have no idea that any vote in this House or any subsidy granted by the Government will put any money into the pockets of those who first had the pluck to invest their money in this railway. I have not the slightest idea that I will ever get any money out of the Hudson's Bay Railway Company. I think the question the hon. gentleman has referred to, of whether I am speaking for myself or for my county, may be safely left between myself and my constituents. The hon. gentleman also objects that the Hudson's Bay Railway would divert trade from Montreal. I am altogether opposed to this idea of sectionalism. I believe that, in advancing the interests of any part of the country, you are advancing the interests of the whole country. In advancing the interests of Manitoba, we who live in Ontario are advancing our own interests. It is by the expansion of Manitoba and the North-West that we can advance the interests of the country at large and of our own constituencies. I also protest against the use of a phrase which was used by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), and that is the term "wild-cat scheme." That word has been constantly used in reference to this railway, and I say it is unjust and insulting, and outside of this House it would be libellous to use it in regard to any undertaking, unless it was proved. I ask hon. gentlemen to what they can point in regard to this road which would justify the use of such a term in reference to it?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I would not have troubled the House were it not that the hon. member for Wellington had spoken, as he admitted, very harshly in reference to this railway which is very important to the people in the West, from the great lakes to the Rocky Mountains. The hon. gentleman spoke as one of the leaders of the Liberal party, and it will be understood in the North-West that he has enunciated the policy of the Liberal party, or of one section of it, in regard to the North-West. He said that my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was interested in this matter, but he forgot that he had given notice of an amendment that this scheme should not receive any assistance until his constituents had received similar consideration for the railways which they had constructed. Had he not a personal interest in that matter? Is it fair for him to make a personal charge against the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casay), when he showed that he had a personal interest in the matter? In the North-West, we are not concerned with the spirit of sectionalism which the member for Wellington has shown, and this claim that the Hudson's Bay Railway would take trade away from Toronto or other ports in the east shows that we cannot depend on hon. gentlemen on the other side for any consideration in any cause we may lay before the House. I am perfectly justified in making that statement, and I adhere to it unless one of the leaders of the Liberal party contradicts the statement of the hon. member for Wellington. The hon. gentleman said that the navigation of Hudson's Bay was shown to be altogether out of the question. I do not think he can have read any of the reports which have been made as to the navigation of Hudson's Bay. Lieutenant Gordon says there will be three months navigation there. Captain Markham, now Admiral Markham, says there are four months navigation there, and all the reports show that the only danger is from the ice which is let loose from the north in the early spring or during June

or July. There is nothing to show that during the winter months there is anything to interrupt the navigation, and I believe that, if we had boats constructed to cut the ice between the shore and the vessels that would arrive in the bay, there would be ample means of carrying on the trade by means of lighterage, and that this would be of great benefit to the North-West, and in fact to the whole of Canada. If this scheme were carried out, coupled with a vigorous immigration policy, we should be able to place such a large number of people in the North-West who would be a great consuming population, as all immigrants are during the first few years after their arrival, that it would test the ability of the manufacturing industries of the east to supply them. If you look at this from a Dominion point of view, you will see that it will provide an immense market for the manufacturing industries of the east, as well as an immense population who will raise such an amount of produce as will increase the material wealth of Canada. The amount which is asked for, and estimated at $1,600,000 is a very small sum in comparison with the financial benefit which Canada will derive from this road, even as a colonization road, but we in the west believe that it will be continued, and it is our intention that it shall be continued to Hudson Bay and thus become a great avenue of commerce. But, from a financial point of view, if we take one of the greatest authorities on colonial affairs, Sir Charles Dilke, who, I believe, is one of the very greatest authorities in all the financial affairs of the colonies and the British dependencies, we find that he made an analysis of the financial standing of Canada and declared that it was one-third less in debt than the Australian and New Zealand colonies, and yet he considers the Australian and New Zealand colonies in a good sound financial position. Therefore, if we were to ask this Parliament for $50,000,000 towards railway development in the North-West and towards assisting immigration to that country, we would still be within the mark, and, therefore, our demand of $1,600,000 is very small and very moderate indeed, considering the great advantages this Dominion is going to reap.

Mr. LAURIER. You must be surprised at your moderation.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Yes, I am surprised at our moderation; but we have had a hard row to hoe, and in hoeing that hard row we have found it better to walk first and run afterwards, and we hope to run very soon. Now, with respect to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) regarding those who are connected with this Hudson's Bay scheme. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) says that he has not proved that they are not respectable men. We hope and believe that they are respectable men; we also believe that they have sufficient encouragement from those who are not only respectable men, but also men who stand financially high, to enable them to promise that that railway will not only be completed as far as this guarantee covers, but that it will be continued in the future on to Hudson's Bay; and I think that when he demands that information should be given him of the character of these gentlemen, and of the character of the undertaking which is before the House, he himself should be very careful before he finds fault with their respectability. We may leave it to the western members to enquire into these things, because the hope and the salvation of that western country is dependent on the Hudson's Bay route. There is, Sir, one great difference between Canada and the United States, and that is, that whereas the United States has its ports on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, as well as to the south on the Gulf of Mexico, we in Canada have our ports not only on the Atlantic and the Pacific, but the western country has its ports on Lake Superior, and we also have this great sea to the north of us which cuts directly into the centre of our territory, and which we believe is capable of being made one of the great arteries of commerce for that great western country, a commerce which can only be developed by this House giving the means to develop it. I recollect that before I was a member of this House, I heard an hon. gentleman, who was then a member, discussing the question of giving assistance to North-West affairs, when he said: "Why should we give assistance to North-West affairs? we have bought that country and gave $3,000,000 for it, and we got it very cheaply." I replied to him: "Yes, sir; but when you bought that country you assumed the responsibility of governing the country, and if you, in the Canadian Parliament, do not understand the responsibility of governing that country, we who come from that country will very soon teach you," and that is what we are doing here just now in discussing this Hudson's Bay Railway—we desire to teach you your responsibilities. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has time and again found fault with the present Administration. He says: We have listened to the speeches of Sir Charles Tupper and the roseate hues in which he has painted the early prospective development of the North-West, and he asked: Why has that development not taken place? I answer that the reason why it has not taken place has been the opposition of the Liberal party; it has been because the Liberal party say that we do wrong to spend money in that country, that we have already spent too much money there; they complain that the Government is bringing the country to financial ruin by developing the North-West. But I have already shown you that Sir Charles Dilke, one of the greatest authorities on this subject, says that Canada is one-third less in debt than the Australian and New Zealand colonies, and we know that for every dollar of money that is spent in the North-West there will be an increase of population and an increase in the material wealth of that country which will react upon the prosperity of older Canada. I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. members on your left desire ever to stand high in favour with the people of the North-West, it would be well for them, when they consider questions that affect that country, if they were to place themselves in the position of the people who live there, if they were to endeavour to appreciate the possibilities of that country. If they were to place themselves in that position they would better understand the sentiments of the people of the North-West. But when they oppose a small two-penny-ha'penny grant of $1,600,000 to a road which may possibly be the means of developing the resources and increasing the population of Canada, and when their spokesman, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), opposes it simply because he wants a

personal favour to his own constituency in the shape of a repayment of the moneys voted by those municipalities, or simply because he wants to develop some of the remote ports in the older provinces of Canada, then I say to the hon. gentlemen sitting on your left. Good-bye for ever to support from the North-West. I only returned to-day from Prince Albert, and when I was up there some of my fiercest opponents during the last campaign said to me: Well, the Conservative party has certainly done one good thing for the Dominion." I asked them what that was. They said: "Why, they have passed the resolution granting aid to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company." I said: "Well, but wait a little, the Grits are going to oppose that;" and they answered me: "Oh, send them up here and we will strangle them." It is a pity they were not strangled on the 5th of March, for then there would be no difficulty, and the Hudson's Bay Railway would become an accomplished fact. It is all very well for hon. members to laugh at this statement, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that although hon. gentlemen on your left may take pleasure in deriding the honest aspirations of the hard-working toilers of the western country, the people of the North-West are able to estimate at their true value every word that is uttered by those hon. gentlemen in this House. I shall have the greatest pleasure, for one, in sending hundreds of copies of the hon. gentleman's speech throughout that western territory in order that the people may understand what one of the most influential members of the Grit party thinks about the development of that country.

Mr. WATSON. At the present stage of the debate I did not intend to say anything further on this subject, having expressed my opinion upon it when the resolution was before the House a few days ago. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has taken the wisest course to obtain the favour of the House in support of the Bill now before us. He says that the people of the North-West can never look to the Liberal party in the House of Commons for any favour on behalf of that country. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who was the party that in days gone by have stood up for the rights and interests of the North-West?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The Conservatives.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has demanded that the petitions of the people of the North-West should receive consideration at the hands of this House? I would like to ask him who has advocated the principle that the Government of the day should grant the concessions asked for by the North-West Council, which body, I suppose, he will admit represents the people of the North-West? I should like to ask the hon. gentleman who has advocated the demands of the Province of Manitoba? None but the Liberal party. I asked who, when the Government voted large subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway, demanded that the principal portion of that money should be spent on constructing lines of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territories? The Liberal party did so against the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. While the people of the North-West were being kept down by the monoply granted by hon. members opposite to the Canadian Pacific Railway, who advocated the doing away of that monopoly? None but the Liberals on this side of the House, and it was not until the Government were forced --I say, advisedly forced—to yield to the demands of the people of Manitoba and the North-West, that the Government gave a guarantee of $15,000,000 in consideration of the abolition of that monopoly. In regard to the grant given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for doing away with that monopoly, the members of this side of the House felt that Manitoba had been unjustly placed at a disadvantage in regard to railway construction within the province by the disallowance of her railway Acts. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) voted on that occasion in favour of that grant, and by that vote he did more for the people of the North-West than the hon. gentleman opposite has done by his speech to-day. The people of the North-West, I consider, have not fully appreciated the policy which has been advocated by hon. members on this side of the House. We may be told that public questions have been submitted to the people, and that only one member of the Opposition has been returned, and he by a narrow majority. Let me say that if the ballot was extended to the North-West there would be a different result; and if that occurred, the hon. representative from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) would not be here to speak as he has spoken to-day. I hope the present Bill will pass, and it has my support. No doubt there are differences of opinion on this side of the House as to this scheme. I hold, however, it is as much entitled, if not more entitled, to this aid than are many other roads in the Dominion. As I have stated on a previous occasion, the Government have seen fit to grant a bonus to the Calgary and Edmonton equal to this amount, and to the Long Lake road $80,000 a year for 20 years on the same conditions and terms, and as we hope this road will be continued to Hudson's Bay, there is strong reason for giving it greater assistance than has been granted to the small roads running from Calgary to Edmonton and from Regina to Prince Albert. For this reason, I am in favour of the measure before the House. So far as the navigation of Hudson's Straits is concerned, it is a matter of no interest to this House. I consider that this railway is as much and more entitled to the assistance asked than were other roads which have been bonussed, and which may more appropriately be called wild-cat schemes. As a member of the Liberal party, I consider that our party has done more in advocating the interests of Manitoba and the North-West than gentlemen on the other side can claim credit for doing. They have done much by their votes in this Parliament, and by their criticisms the people of the North-West have attained greater liberties and privileges than they would have received if hon. gentlemen opposite had had all to do with the matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not yield on questions affecting the North-West until they were forced to do so by the advocacy of the Opposition and by petitions sent from the North-West and Manitoba, setting out what legislation was required by that country. As a supporter of the scheme under consideration, I hope no hon. member from the North-West will make such foolish remarks as were made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan on this matter.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I rise to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman does not come from this

province, but he seems to think that the "shreds and patches" when they have extended into the territories should not be allowed to express an opinion. I spoke very moderately and directly to the point. From the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman one would think I should not have spoken at all. The hon. gentleman has said the Liberal party have done everything for the people of the North-West. I deny it directly and distinctly, and I will prove that such is not the case. I will tell this House what the people of the North-West have realized. They have watched the life of this country during the last ten years, even before they had representation in this House;—and I was a member of the North-West Council long ago and took an active part in drawing the memorials to the Government at Ottawa. There were certain things we thought were required and these were embodied in our memorial, but we found that the Liberal party made use of these memorials to damn the North-West. They made use of them in such a way as only to make political capital for themselves, to be used in the older provinces; and, in consequence of that, we in the North-West Council came to the conclusion that it was better to have these memorials directed to the Governor in Council, where everything would be kept secret, where nothing would be given away to the press, because such base use was made of those memorials by the Liberal party. In what way did the Liberal party do anything with regard to half-breed scrip in the North-West Territories? During the last election this question was a very lively one in Saskatchewan; and I published in my address a statement that the leader of the Liberal party had declared himself against granting the scrip to half-breed children born up to 1885; and as that hon. gentleman had thus declared the policy of his party, the only party to which the half-breeds of the North-West could possibly look was the Conservative party. To my astonishment, at a meeting I held shortly afterwards, a telegram was read from the leader of the Liberal party which, so far as I can remember, and I have a pretty fair memory, said that the statements contained in the Conservative address were false in every particular, and that on ever yoccasion he (Mr. Laurier) had urged a special grant to the half-breeds.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I base my statement on what the hon. gentleman said in the House of Commons on April 14, 1890. During a discussion on this question the hon. gentleman said:

"If my understanding of it is right, it would mean that the half-breeds who were not residents of either Manitoba or the North-West Territories at the time of the acquisition of the Territories in 1870, who did not belong to the ceded territories, but who afterwards removed to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, should be put exactly on the same footing as the half-breeds who were residents of Manitoba and the Territories at that time. I would be prepared to favour such a construction."

The leader of the Government explained to him that that had been done. The leader of the Opposition went on to say:

"The only claim upon which the half-breeds could rest any pretension to any grant by this Government, was the extinguishment of those titles. The extinguishment of those titles can apply only to the Indians who were residents of Canada at the time the territories were ceded to Canada."

That is a particular date. He continued:

"We cannot admit the principle to any Indians who have removed from the other side of the line to our own territory, and the same principle applies equally to the half-breeds. The half-breeds' title cannot be extinguished in the same manner as that of the Indians, because they had moved out of the ceded territory."

Then the hon. gentleman went on to say, and this is the gist of the matter:

"In my judgment, this individual compensation could apply only to such half-breeds as were residents of our territory at the time it became the possession of Canada that is to say, in July, 1870."

The leader of the Opposition said, in effect, that those were the only half-breeds who should receive scrip, and he laid down the policy of the Liberal party in regard to the half-breeds in the North-West, for, I presume, he announced the policy of the party.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows I was not enunciating a policy. I simply said that the statute passed by this House applied only to Indians and half-breeds who were residents in Canada, in 1870.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case I suppose it is fair for me to assume that when my motion comes before the House, referring to the half-breeds in the North-West Territories, that I shall have the support of the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We will discuss that when your motion comes up.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I presume he will agree with me in asking for a further grant of scrip to the half-breeds.

Mr. LAURIER. I will join with you, as I have done time and again in this House, in urging upon the Government to carry out the statute passed by this Parliament, granting scrip to the half-breeds of the North-West. If that had been done long ago we would have had no rebellion in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MACDOWALL. If the hon. gentleman is ready to do that, I presume he will go a little further, and I think it is fair for me to assume that he will endorse whatever I may say in urging upon the Government to give further scrip to the half-breeds of the North-West. When this matter comes up I shall be able to explain then the grounds on which I desire this scrip shall be given. The hon. gentleman said that my statement was false in every particular. I say that my statement was not false in every particular, and I maintain and contend that my statement was perfectly true, and that it was perfectly fair for me to assume from these words that the half-breed population should not be granted scrip. I will go further and say that the hon. gentleman said, in concluding his speech:

"The inference is that the scrip should be given, yet not in the manner contemplated by the law, that is, to heads of families and to children born before 1870, and also to children born since. Now, I am not quite sure that this would be judicious, because, unless you draw the line somewhere, these claims will continually arise, and the children who are born next year will have the same claim as those that were born last year, and who have been settled with. I think, on the whole, if we adhered to the policy prescribed in 1870, that no cause of discontent would remain."

When these remarks were made on the resolution of the North-West Assembly asking that scrip should

be given to the half-breed children up to 1885, I should like to ask, then, what support the leader of the Opposition has given to the requirements of the people of the North-West in this matter? As regards the personal reference that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has made to me, that if the ballot existed in the North-West I should not be here, I may say that I do not think that either he or I are competent judges of that. But suppose the ballot were instituted in the North-West, I should have no objection at all to stand a tussle with him in my constituency; and if he desires very much to put it to the proof, I shall have no objection at all, if I be in political life, to have him as an opponent.

Mr. WATSON. Will you vote for the ballot, then?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I am not very sure that I shall, but I shall express my opinions on that subject when it comes up. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in advocating this vote to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company, says that the Government has "seen fit" to give certain assistance to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway. Does he approve of that; because if you take the ordinary meaning of the English expression, when you talk of those opposed to you as having "seen fit" to do such a thing, it generally tends to the supposition that you do not believe that it is a proper thing for them to do, but you insinuate that if they have made one mistake, they had better make another. That is not the position which the people of the North-West take with regard to this grant to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company. They take the position that it was right for the Government to extend aid to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and that it would be a sin, and a shame, and a neglect, and a failure of their duties to the North-West, if they did not give this assistance to the Hudson's Bay Railway. Then, Sir, when the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says that the Liberal party has always maintained the interests of the people of the North-West, I should like to know what position their press has taken on this question? What about the policy of the *Globe* with regard to the Hudson's Bay Railway, and what about the action of some of the leaders of the party here? These are questions I wish to put to the hon. gentleman, in order that he may have a chance to ponder over them before he goes to his constituents in the North-West.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House has discussed almost everything rather than the Bill which is immediately before us. The hon. gentleman has violently denounced the Liberal party, and he has told us that it is Codlin and not Short who is the friend of the people of the North-West Territories. Well, Sir, it is rather extraordinary that the people of the North-West Territories should have been involved in a civil war under this excellent régime which he has said so much in praise of. The hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten that we have still on the Statute-book a measure which authorizes the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to issue a proclamation, and to disarm any portion of the population there which he thinks cannot be entrusted with arms. Therefore, after their excellent administration of public affairs, after dealing with the North-West Territories in a way admirably suited to the wants of the people of that country who are so much devoted to the Administration: the Administration had so much confidence in the people, that it carried through this House a special Act authorizing the Lieutenant Governor to disarm the population of the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman must have a very bad opinion indeed of those who sit on this side of the House, when he exhibits so much confidence in men who have dealt in such a way with the people of the North-West Territories, that they are at any moment liable to break out into insurrection. The hon. member spoke as if no one had any rights in any of the older provinces which the people of the North-West Territories were bound to respect. He indicated that we all hold our properties by sufferance of the hon. gentleman and the friends who have returned him to Parliament. The hon. gentleman says: I am going to put my pistols in my belt, and I am going to take to the highway, and I will watch the Treasury coach, and if I do not get the amount of money I require in the North-West Territories I will know the reason why. So, the hon. gentleman has come here, and he has boldly put before the House these principles which elsewhere than in Parliament would be called rather the principles of a highwayman than of one who is disposed to uphold the rights of property. I do not know what his views may be as to whether we have any rights in any other portions of the Dominion or not. The speech of the hon. gentleman reminded me of a story that Hallam tells in his "Middle Ages," of a distinguished personage who lived not far from Cologne, and who had a castle in a very lonely section of the country. He had a very large troop of retainers and they were magnificently supported, and when he was asked by a friend how he was able to maintain such an establishment, he pointed to the fact that five roads met at that point, and there was a great deal of travel upon these roads. The hon. member comes here and intimates that the people of this country have a good deal of cash, and that the people of the North-West Territories have a very large claim to it—a moral claim which, if not voluntarily recognized, the hon. gentleman and his friends will take the proper means to enforce; and that it will be recognized, the hon. gentleman says, is much more probable, looking to that side of the House than to this. The hon. gentleman should also remember that we have contributed, since the North-West Territories have been acquired, a sum which is a great deal more than $100,000,000. He must not forget what has been paid to the Hudson's Bay Company for the extinguishment of their title; he must not forget that the money paid to the Indians represents something in the neighbourhood of $28,000,000, when capitalized. We must not forget the large sums of money that have been spent on railway enterprises in the territories. Most people who are acquainted with the facts would think that on the whole the North-West Territories have been pretty generously dealt with. I am sorry that they have not a larger population; but it is not astonishing, under the circumstances, that the population in that country is as small as it is. Now, with regard to the measure before us, let me say that I agree with my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) when he says that this railway which it is proposed to subsidize

is not necessarily a part of a railway extending to Hudson's Bay, and may never reach that water. It is perfectly plain to any man who chooses to exercise his ordinary intelligence, that the Government have come to the conclusion that this railway will never go to Hudson's Bay—that they do not look upon a railway to Hudson's Bay as, in our day at all events, a feasible enterprise: that nothing will be done to push a railway in that direction, and that if it were extended to Hudson's Bay, there would be nothing special for it to do. We have already a very large mileage of railways connected with the North-West Territories. We have a railway system capable of doing very much more than there is to be done, and it does seem to me that this country, through its representatives in Parliament, can make a better use of the money that the people may place at their disposal than to expend further sums at the present time on railway enterprises in that country, when there is so much distress and so much necessity in other portions of the Dominion. Why, Sir, we have hundreds of miles of railway in the North-West Territories, opening up millions of acres of land for settlement, lands which are still unoccupied: and why should we go on and expend larger sums of money in the construction of other railways when the lands along those already built are not yet occupied? I say it would be little short of madness to adopt such a policy. Are the people of this country so wealthy, is money with them so abundant, that they are prepared to take another $80,000 a year from their private property—for there is where the money is to come from—and make a present of it to a railway company in the North-West Territories?

Mr. CASEY. That is not asked.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says it is not asked. Why, Sir, it would be the merest infatuation on the part of any member of this House to assume that $1 of that $80,000 a year will ever be returned to the public treasury of Canada. The Government of this country are the trustees of the people of this country, and it is their duty to take from the pockets of the people so much of their money as may be required for the necessities of the state, but beyond that they have no right to go; and it is improper to take money without compensation or without a consideration from the pockets of one portion of the community and make a present of it to another portion of the community. That is what the hon. gentlemen propose to do; and a very strong case requires to be made out to justify such a course being taken. We admitted it in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We knew that that road was of the utmost consequence to the people of the North-West Territories, and the people of this country have ungrudgingly contributed towards the construction of that railway, and the union of the various sections of this country by means of that railway. But that being done, it is for the people of the North-West Territories, as it is for the people of every other portion of the Dominion, to depend now upon private enterprise and private energy for the further development of their resources. Sir, there is no doubt that the contribution of $100,000,000 odd from the public treasury of Canada towards railway construction and other public enterprises in the North-West Territories, and the other newer districts of this country, has diminished the value of real estate in the Province of Ontario alone to nearly double the amount of that contribution. Are you going to continue that? Are you going to engage in the imposition of further burdens on the people and the further impoverishment of districts already settled? Who helped the people of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces to construct their public works and develop their resources? They had to depend on their own resources, and it was by means of their own exertions, and by means of private agencies, that many of those improvements were made. The people of the North-West Territories must exercise patience, and they must depend upon the energy and enterprise of those who go in to take possession of the country, for a very large portion of the public works and undertakings of this character which they may require. The hon. gentleman has proceeded upon the assumption that we have 3,000,000 square miles unoccupied, and that we must open it all up for settlement at one instant of time. I do not admit that. I think that the construction of the two railways spoken of was altogether unnecessary for the time being. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway and its immediate tributaries, which were built without this active interference, were quite enough, and will be quite enough for many years to come. Look at the proposed road. There are people settled to the west of Lake Manitoba, and they are entitled to consideration: but that consideration is rather local than a consideration devolving upon the Dominion of Canada at large. But this road does not afford them any accommodation. It is a railway in search of a grant, in search of contributions from the public treasury. Where does it begin? At Winnipeg. Where does it end? Nobody knows where. Nobody knows precisely what direction it is going to take. Forty miles have been built, and beyond that the railway may continue between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegoosis, or it may pass at the Narrows of Lake Manitoba and continue until it reaches the Saskatchewan. That is a point on which the Government have not informed us. This railway is not for the accommodation of the settlers; it is for the accommodation of the gentlemen who subscribe the stock. How did this railway begin? Why, it was proposed many years ago to construct a railway to Hudson's Bay. It was to be a great commercial undertaking—not a colonization railway, but one of a wholly different character; and efforts were made to float the stock in New York, and in London, and in all parts of the United Kingdom, but no stock was taken; nothing was subscribed. Now, Sir, after several years have expired and nothing done, we have here a proposition to construct a road of a wholly different character. We have a proposition to construct a road, not running towards Hudson's Bay, but towards the Pacific Ocean. So far as it is to be carried, and in the direction it is proposed to carry it, it is to reach the Saskatchewan, but no one knows at what point. The hon. Minister of the Interior will not stand up and say that the location of this road is known. Whether it will accommodate any settlers or not is not known. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) proposed a colonization scheme last year, where the settlers are—west of Lake Manitoba—and that was rejected; and now a scheme is proposed here, which is called by one name, but is intended to

serve another purpose. On what grounds are we asked for this appropriation? Because this road will go to Hudson's Bay? Not at all, but because it will go to some point on the Saskatchewan, and the justification is that it will afford accommodation to some parties who have settled west of Lake Winnipegoosis. That is not an enterprise we are prepared to aid by large contributions from the public treasury. The circumstances of the country, the state of the public revenue, the policy it may be necessary to adopt in the future—all make it improper to inaugurate further burdens and responsibilities of this sort, and impose further permanent burdens on the public treasury. The people of this country ought to be free for the purpose of determining what taxation they will endure, and what policy they will adopt in the future. Those who are rotting in the churchyards ought not to be taken any longer to govern those who are sitting in the pews. That is the policy that hon. gentlemen opposite are marking out for the people of this country, and it ought not to be tolerated any longer

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had I been here when this motion was moved, I would certainly have taken the opportunity of remonstrating with the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government generally on the very extraordinary course they have seen fit to pursue with respect to the present debate. They are well aware that the motion I have moved is in the nature of a motion of want of confidence. They have so accepted and treated it, and they must know that the invariable practice of the House has, for obvious reasons, always been, although it is not a law of Parliament, that when a motion of that kind is moved, unless some extraordinary occasions of urgency arises, such as arose here owing to the termination of the fiscal year, that the Government should go on with the motion of want of confidence and have that decided before proceeding to ordinary business. That is, as everybody knows, the invariable practice of the English House of Commons, and has been ours, unless some extraordinary case arises, in which both parties are agreed as we were the other day. I really think the hon. Minister of Finance ought to terminate this matter and allow us to proceed with the regular business of the Budget debate, which ought to be got rid of; and I would suggest, as it is quite clear this thing may go on *in secula seculorum*, the Committee should rise and we should proceed with our ordinary business, or else the Government should explain why it is they depart so strangely from the ordinary custom of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a little late in the day for my hon. friend to raise this objection. In the first place, he was not in his place when the debate arose and the House went into Committee, and a very large part of the discussion has taken place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By no means.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will consider, he will recollect that five or six days ago this question came up, and my hon. colleague, the Minister of the Interior, explained the urgency for the passage of the Bill. His resolution was passed, and the Bill is founded on that resolution. At the time my hon. friend had no objection on the ground that his motion was pending, although it was then pending as it is to-day. He, however, took the ground that certain information which he thought the House should be in possession of, had not been given to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has it been yet?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has the information, and I understand he has so stated across the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He has the information which, he thinks, ought at least to be satisfactory to any reasonable judgment of the House. Now, although I agree with my hon. friend that it is not usual to take up any important legislation whilst a motion of want of confidence is pending, the House came to a tacit agreement the other day, that this Bill, being a matter of importance and urgency, might be taken up and disposed of; and as no objection on the ground taken by the hon. gentleman was made then, but delay was merely asked in order that information might be brought, my hon. friend is rather late now in making his objection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the first place, the information asked for, and which we understood would be brought down, has not been brought down; and, in the second place, I certainly did think that the Government would have proceeded with the debate on the Budget before going further with this other matter. I did not think it necessary to state to the Government, containing old and experienced parliamentarians, what the practice of Parliament was. They knew that as well as I. However, if it be their desire to go on with the discussion, so be it. It then becomes our duty to enquire minutely into the position of this road, and ascertain what surveys have been made, what the Government can tell us as to the probable cost, and what are the grounds on which they ask for this Bill. In short, on what we may reasonably expect this road can be constructed, if we make this grant, and why they deem it expedient to single this out, which, it now appears, is not a grant for the purpose of building a railway to the Hudson's Bay, but, as stated by several speakers, really for a colonization road. Those matters we can go into in detail, but this is a very inconvenient mode of dealing with an important debate affecting questions of public policy of the highest order, and I would like to know when the hon. gentleman thinks that, with all these interruptions, we are likely to terminate it. Even supposing, which is not likely, that we will get through this matter by six, you will have just one speech to-night, or at the most two, and there are a score of gentlemen known to me who are desirous of expressing their opinions on the motion of want of confidence; and the hon. gentleman knows that after this Bill goes through Committee, if it comes up for third reading, there will be further amendments and discussions. I must say I cannot possibly see what urgency there is for a matter of this kind, and I think a strict case of urgency ought to be made out before our existing debate is interfered with for the purpose of discussing this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the circumstances, which I related briefly before, I think it would be well at this stage to put the Bill through Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly my hon. friend has a perfect right to ask for any information he desires, and I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of the Interior and others who will speak will give it to him. With reference to the currency of the Budget debate after that, it will be my proposition, and my hon. friend will agree with me, that as soon as we have finished this stage, we shall proceed with the debate *de die in diem*. I shall be glad if my hon. friend opposite can indicate the possible date at which we can dispose of that.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister of Finance has not rightly apprehended the objection raised by my hon. friend from South Oxford. His objection is that it is contrary to rules and precedents to intervene another debate while a motion of want of confidence is pending. The hon. gentleman is aware of that as well as my hon. friend. I did not raise the point because, unfortunately, it has been my experience this session that this loyal Conservative Government is constantly breaking every British rule and precedent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we are going into this matter, I would like to learn from the hon. Minister of Railways or the hon. Minister of the Interior, in the first place, what he expects this road, which I understand is about 300 miles long, is going to cost, and whether he is prepared to make a statement to the House as to its cost?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If I remember correctly, this question was put to me when the matter was first brought before the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I told him then that an estimate had been made of the cost and that a contract had been signed by Messrs. Ross, Holt & Mann for the construction of the road at a price of $11,000 a mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the permanent way—the road-bed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Exclusive of the rails?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No: including the rails. It is almost entirely a prairie road.

Mr. WATSON. Does that include the bridge across the Narrows?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it does not include that.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to cross at the Narrows?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I believe that is the intention.

Mr. WATSON. If the contract has been let, it must define the route which is to be taken.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy there is very little difference in the nature of the road between the two lakes and that across the Narrows.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that there has been a survey made on the ground of the projected road, and that it has actually been located from one point to the other?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; and it would be unnecessary for anyone who has been accustomed to contract in that country to have such a location before the tenders were made. It was not done in connection with the Long Lake road or the Calgary road.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then this is not a colonization road?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is a colonization road, and I would like the House to disabuse its mind of any idea as to the Hudson's Bay road proper. The Government told the promoters of this road that they would give nothing more than the proposed guarantee for twenty years, for this is a colonization road.

Mr. LAURIER. We are anxious to have more information on this subject, and this is the language which is used in different places. In Manitoba this is called the Hudson's Bay Railway from Winnipeg to the Hudson's Bay. In the House of Commons here it is simply a colonization road from Winnipeg to some point on the Saskatchewan River; but the Minister is not able to tell us where it is to be located. The only information he can give us is that it will run from Winnipeg in the direction of Long Lake, and to some point on the Saskatchewan River. We are only asking for information which ought to be amply given before the moneys of the people are voted in this way. I do not know, after all, that it might not be good as a colonization road. The hon. member knows that this side of the House offered no opposition last year to the Calgary road, but the information was given, and it was stated that it was intended to serve one section of that country. If the hon. gentleman can give us full and accurate information, he may be entitled to this money, but so far he has not placed himself in a position to ask for a cent of money, because he has not given any information upon which the money of the people can be voted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the line has not been located. I would ask him if there has been any survey between the end of the forty miles of road which have been already built and the point on the Saskatchewan to which it is expected this road will go, and if he has any report of the surveyors as to the character of the country through which the road will run? Of course, there may be three or four surveys of different lines, but I would ask him if surveys have been made between the proposed termini?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; there have been thorough explorations made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I mean surveys, not explorations.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The surveyors have not been over both lines, and I stated that either line would end on the Saskatchewan. One is indicated on the map at the eastern end of the Saskatchewan River, and the other is, I think, a little further east. I stated to the House that it was proposed to take one of those two lines and to build this road on a colonization scheme, either to the Grand Rapids or to the Saskatchewan River, on the western side of Cedar Lake. The navigation at the one place is six weeks or two months earlier in the season than it is at the other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman misapprehends my question. I have no doubt in refer-

ence to the exploratory surveys, but I want to know if lines have been run showing the cuttings and the grades?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; that would be a location survey. There has been no location survey. There has been a trial line run.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there a contract let for $11,900 a mile?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And there has been no location survey at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; and there was none on the Calgary road before the contract was let.

Mr. DALY. There has been a survey made, which has been filed in the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Between what points?

Mr. DALY. Between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba. The plans were filed in the department a year ago.

Mr. WATSON. This question of the location would make a great difference. I understand from the Minister that the road is to run west of Cedar Lake. If it is to run between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, it will go through a country where there is practically no settlement. I think the Minister of the Interior made a mistake when he stated that the navigation was open west of Cedar Lake six weeks or two months earlier than it is on the Saskatchewan.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not open at that point until some time in July.

Mr. WATSON. When does the ice get out of the river?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Early in May.

Mr. WATSON. If the road is to run between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, it would make a great deal of difference as to the benefit to be derived from this subsidy, and I think the Government should insist on the line running west of Manitoba where there are settlements now in existence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the Minister to say that the contract is already let?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, who are the contractors?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Ross, Holt & Mann, who are building two other roads to the west of this road, from Calgary to Edmonton, and from Regina to Prince Albert.

Mr. CASEY. Did these contractors take these two other roads in the same way, without any survey at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Without any survey.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand the position, the parties who have taken the contract may locate the road between Lake Winnipegoosis and Lake Winnipeg, extending it between the lakes where there are no settlers at all, or they may cross the Narrows, and the Government have no control over the matter. These parties may build where they please and they will get the $80,000 granted by this House every year for twenty years, no matter which location may be chosen. The one may run through a settlement, the other may run where there are no settlers at all yet. Then the hon. Minister said—I am not sure whether it was a mere slip or whether he intended it—that the road may be located west of Lake Manitoba. Now, the 40 miles that are built are built east of Lake Manitoba—

Mr. DEWDNEY. The road crosses the Narrows.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it will be located west of Lake Winnipegoosis and will run altogether north of Lake Manitoba.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government has control of the line in this regard, that the company will receive no land grant until the line is adopted and agreed to by the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But as to this $80,000 portion, no such restriction exists, if I understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is in the proviso.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But as to this money grant we are now dealing with. According to the statement of my hon. friend, which the Minister did not deny, it would be in the option of these contractors to take this road exactly where they please without the Government being able to control them.

Mr. FOSTER. The money is not paid until the road is finished.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am taking the statement of the Minister of the Interior as he made it; if I am wrong, it rests with him to correct me. But there is another side to this question. It appears to me to be almost an absurdity to say that there can be any very great urgency warranting the interruption of such a debate as was going on, in order to grant $80,000 a year for twenty years to a purely colonization road which the Minister has told us is not intended by the Government to go to Hudson's Bay at all. Now, all through this discussion—and the very form of the agreement warranted the assumption—we have been discussing the question as to whether it was desirable to aid a road to the Hudson's Bay, and, until this explanation just made by the Minister, a great number of gentlemen on both sides of the House were under the impression that this was a necessary link in the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway. Now it turns out that, in the eyes of the Government, as voiced by the Minister of the Interior, this is purely a colonization road, and I ask where is the urgency, what is the reason for departing from our usual custom and practice to press forward a scheme for a colonization road which has been so far unlocated as that the Minister is not able to tell us whether it will go to Grand Rapids, or whether it will go to a point, so far as I can judge from looking at the map, 70 miles west of it. Now, it does appear to me that it is rather absurd to talk of urgency in a matter of that kind; I cannot for the life of me see where the urgency comes in. There may be urgency on the part of a lot of speculators who are interested in this matter, but there can be no urgency for the people of Canada, or the Parliament of Canada to alter their usual rules for the purpose of discussing this measure. Why, the Ministers themselves are very much at sea as to the details of it. It does not

appear that they have made any very careful analysis of the route, or that they know exactly where it is going to go. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) states that one of these projected lines will serve a population—he did not say how much, perhaps the Minister can tell me; but the other, he says, will serve no population at all. Now, a colonization road which may go through the country entirely uninhabited is not a matter of urgency for us to consider.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of the Interior has already mentioned that the Government will see that the money is not granted to the company unless the road is located where they may desire, and yet he begins by saying that either of the two lines may be taken that are projected. Now, I do not think there is any rule better established than this one: that the one thing over which the House of Commons ought to exercise control is the appropriation of public money. We do not delegate to the Government our right to judge of the propriety or fitness of an appropriation, and it is not for the Government to give the House an intellectual holiday and to assume the responsibility on its behalf of locating this road after the appropriation is made. It is the business of the House to see that the road is located on a line where they think it will justify the appropriation asked for, if any location can justify such an appropriation. But what the Minister is asking the House to do, is to vote this money without knowing anything about the location of the road, whether it is to be located where there are settlers or where there are none, where it is possible that settlers may not be able to go, in a very narrow district hemmed in by water on both sides. Now, I say this is a matter that the House must judge for itself and cannot shift the responsibility from its own shoulders to the shoulders of the Administration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that point is well taken. I think it is a safe rule that we should not hand over to the Government the control of money that belongs to the people until we know how that money is to be expended. I do not see myself where the urgency is in this matter, as the money is not to be paid over until the road is built, and the road is not likely to be built before the end of the session. Then, over and beyond the question of building this road, there are many matters to be considered before we grant the money for the construction of this road. If the Government say that all the land in the North-West that is open for settlement has been sold, that all the land that lies along the railway has been sold and is now occupied, that, in my opinion, would be a cause of urgency. If the land is not all settled even where they have railway facilities already provided at an enormous cost by the people of this country, then I consider there is no urgency. One of the great difficulties in the settlement of the North-West that has been complained of by people who go there, is the distance that settlers live apart. It is desirable in the interest of settlement that we should get the settlers to live close together, as a matter of protection, as a matter of improvement and progress in the different communities. Now, if we open up a new settlement, open up other lands, we will tend still further to increase the evil that has been complained of all along in the settlement of Manitoba. We know that in many counties in Ontario where they have built their own railways with their own money without being aided in a single dollar by this Government, the people of those counties will have reason to complain of the conduct of this Government in aiding railways in localities where settlement is not demanded, when the Government have any amount of land now unoccupied, and yet possessing railway facilities. I think those counties that have built their own roads will have great cause to complain of the grant to this railway for so many years. I do not know how the Government can justify to this House or to the people of this country the granting of this $80,000 for twenty years for this railway, to open up a new settlement, which must be a sparse settlement, in the North-West, when they neglect to refund any portion of the money that has been given by many counties in the Province of Ontario, the population of which, in some cases, are justly entitled to a refund of some portion of the money they have paid. I am one of those who believed, and I still believe, and I know it was the belief of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that it would retard the settlement of the North-West if the Canadian Pacific Railway was built too rapidly. If that railway had been built more slowly, the people employed in its construction would have acquired lands and settled in the country; but the rapidity with which the work was prosecuted caused the contractors to employ men from the United States, Norway, Sweden, China, and elsewhere, and they never became permanent settlers on the land. Now we have the fact that the general settlement of Manitoba and the North-West has not progressed as rapidly as we would have desired, especially in view of the large amount of money expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we are glad is now built and is completed as a substantial road. We believe that if much more land is opened for settlement and more railways are aided, settlement will be diverted, and we will not be doing as much good as we think we are doing. The Government should consider well before they grant this aid, and they should especially consider the claims of the people in other portions of the country for the refund of money already expended on railway construction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I desire to offer a few words in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman mentioned that he could not see the urgency of this Bill being proceeded with now, and he had not been able to see the arguments for it. I stated some time ago that English capitalists were here and expected to sail by a certain steamer which would leave in a few days, and I was anxious on that account, as some of the promoters of the undertaking wished to accompany them, that the measure should be pushed forward. There was also the additional reason that the financial season was about closing in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has closed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is one of the explanations I desire to offer. There is another in regard to the debate that has taken place on the Hudson's Bay scheme. If the hon. gentleman had heard what I said when I brought the Bill before the House, he would know it was not my wish and my consent that the debate took the turn it did. I read what the terms were on which we proposed

to grant this aid of $80,000 per annum, and afterwards I stated:

"The conditions upon which we ask the assistance of this House, and the terms upon which we propose to give assistance to the company who propose carrying out the work, are precisely the same as those given to previous companies. We propose that the company shall contract for the transport of men, materials, supplies and mails for twenty years from Winnipeg to a point on the Saskatchewan, at $80,000 per annum, to be paid on the construction of the railway from a point within the city of Winnipeg to a point on the Saskatchewan River, such payment to be computed from the completion of the railway to such last-mentioned point. The subsidy will be made payable in half-yearly payments and be assignable to trustees to secure the company's bonds on the whole or any part of the undertaking. The tariff rates will be the same as those agreed upon for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, and remain undisturbed for six years. And in case the amount earned by the company between Winnipeg and the point on the Saskatchewan River for Government service should not amount to the sum paid by the Government, one-third of the land grant earned will be kept to recoup the Government. At the same time the Government wish it to be distinctly understood that they are assisting this railway, not as the great Hudson's Bay Railway which we have heard so much about lately, but on its merits as a colonization road. It is also understood that the company shall at no future time make any demand on the Government for financial assistance for the construction of the railway northward from the Saskatchewan River."

To my astonishment, one of the members from Ontario occupied two or three hours in speaking on the navigation of Hudson's Straits, which had nothing to do with this project. With regard to the construction of the 300 miles, I have said I had no doubt the company would then be in a position to extend the line to Hudson's Bay, and if they were able to do so, I would be glad.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear the hon. gentleman make that statement, and it was made on one of the comparatively few occasions when I was not in my place. I am glad to hear it. not because I am opposed, or any member of the House is opposed, to a proposition to aid Manitoba *per se*, but because we thought, looking at this project, looking at the large amount required to complete our connection with Hudson's Bay, it was a matter which required very grave and serious consideration on the part of the Government of Canada before they put their imprimatur on it. If it were found to be possible, on mature consideration, to open up communication between the North-West and Great Britain and other countries by way of Hudson's Bay, I would be exceedingly glad to hear that it had been done; but as hon. gentlemen who have paid any attention to the question know, it is one which, to say the least of it, has a very considerable number of difficulties to be considered and examined. It is one on which especially and specifically it is the duty of the Government of Canada to form an opinion and to state an opinion. They obtained large grants of the public money, I think $150,000 or $200,000, some years ago for the purpose of sending out an expedition to investigate the possibility of navigating Hudson's Bay by steamers carrying grain. We all know perfectly well that Hudson's Bay navigation in a sense has been known to be open for probably 250 years. It has always been pierced by vessels of the Hudson's Bay Company and by vessels of war, time and again, and I think some of our settlements were captured in Hudson's Bay as long ago as 200 years or more, although I am not quite sure of the date. That point was not disputed. But the Government undertook to make a very careful examination of the Bay and Straits. From that day to this the Government have been very chary, and rightly so, I dare to say, of expressing the conclusion at which they had arrived with respect to the proposed Hudson's Bay Railway. Although the Government, as the Minister of the Interior has very properly stated, declined entirely to commit themselves to the project, everybody knows it has been used, as an hon. member has just told the House, as an electioneering cry, and a very unfair election cry, throughout the North-West. I desire to take this opportunity of stating here for myself, and I think I speak for hon. members on this side also, that every well-considered scheme for the improvement and development of the North-West will have our most hearty and earnest co-operation; but as guardians of the public purse we require and will demand that we should see our way clearly, and that we should not vote away millions of the public money for purposes which may not be for the general advantage of Canada, but which may be simply for the purpose of promoting this or that particular railway enterprise. And, therefore, it is that, particularly when a scheme comes before the House which is supposed by the public to involve our sanction of a very much larger scheme, which the Minister tells us it does not, but which the general public believe it did, we require full time to consider and full time to gather information. Now, for instance, if this is a colonization scheme, and if it be possible to construct this road for $3,000,000 or $3,500,000, as the Minister has just told us, then possibly the corporation, which is undertaking this scheme on a subscribed capital of, I think, about $1,000,000, may have financial strength enough to carry out the work with such assistance as it may obtain from the Manitoba Government. By-the-bye, the assistance which is to be obtained from the Provincial Government is not stated. But it is obvious that the company would be utterly unable to properly grapple with the difficulties of extending this road to Hudson's Bay.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that the company will get any assistance from Manitoba unless they carry the road to Hudson's Bay.

Committee rose; and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself in Committee on Bill (119).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, before the clause is adopted I would like to say a few words on the Bill. I regret very much that whenever any question affecting Manitoba or the North-West comes up, and when members on this side take the liberty, as they are in duty bound to do, to enquire into it and to criticize it, they are always accused of opposing anything that relates to the North-West. I protest against any such procedure as that. When any measure has been shown to be really for the good of the North-West, I have never found members on this side of the House opposed to it, but, on the contrary, they have always tried to do their best to forward any such measure. But Sir, it is their bounden duty when any measure is proposed, to canvass it in all its bearings, and especially to see that the measure proposed is the best one possible under the circumstances. This is

what we are doing to-day with the measure before the House. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that it would simplify matters very much if we really knew positively what road we are discussing now. The Minister of the Interior tells us, and I am bound to accept his statement, that it is a colonization road, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) declares that it has nothing to do with the Hudson's Bay Railway at all, that it is purely and simply a colonization road, but the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) gets up and tells us that it is part and parcel of the Hudson's Bay Railway proper, and he argues in favour of it from that particular standpoint. The Bill itself says, in the first clause, that it is:

"In order to enable the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway to construct so much of the railway as reaches from the city of Winnipeg to a point on the Saskatchewan."

Now, Sir, every hon. member in this House knows that many years ago the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company was incorporated. Since that time a grant of land has been made in their favour, and up to the present time they have been in active negotiations getting the company formed, and trying to secure the means to build that railway from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay; and the Bill now before us purports to be to assist them in building a part of the Hudson's Bay road. The same company that for years has been trying to negotiate to obtain funds and the means to build the whole road to Hudson's Bay; the same company is now offered a grant of $80,000 a year for twenty years, to help to construct a part of the road; and by so doing, the Government, and this House if it agrees to it, give a certificate of character to the Hudson's Bay road proper. That is just what it amounts to. They give that scheme a standing, and they say to the moneyed people of the world: We have so much faith in this scheme that we are going to assist the company as far as we can, that we are going to assist them at least to build a part of the road, and allow them to find the funds for the construction of the other part of it, if they can. When we look at the matter in that light, we are bound to consider the feasibility of the Hudson's Bay road as a route for the transportation of the produce of the West. Now, Sir, when that scheme came before the House in 1884, I think, the Government were doubtful whether the scheme was practicable or not. They were doubtful whether the navigation of the Hudson's Bay and Straits was such as to warrant this House in endorsing such a scheme as the building of the Hudson's Bay Railway. In order to test the matter, and in order to get the fullest information, they sent, for three consecutive years, an expedition to examine into the whole question, and that expedition was entrusted to the charge of a man whom they chose themselves, as they supposed, on account of his peculiar fitness for the office to which he was appointed. Not only did this gentleman navigate the whole of these waters during three consecutive seasons, but he established points of observation along the Straits, so that information might be taken as to the conditions favourable or unfavourable, to navigation, during the whole term of the three years. Now, Sir, after three years of patient observation, after collecting all the facts that he could, after observing himself, and securing the experience of others, what conclusions does he come to? In 1886, at the end of the season, he says:

"The season for navigation commences from the 1st to the 10th of July and closes in the first week in October."

In his report for 1885, he places the period for navigation at four months in the year, but he points out that the navigation of the Straits in July was very difficult and quite dangerous; that it was retarded by the floating ice, and that it was also impossible to get through before the end of July. Now, I do not want to say that there are not certain years when the season of navigation is not longer than indicated here, but these years are exceptional and the general rule is as stated. When I say that Lieutenant Gordon fixes the first week in October as the time that navigation closes, I may say that he also points out that the difficulty is not so much from new ice forming then, as from the old pack ice congealing together, and making it utterly impossible for vessels to go through, and he adds that during that short time when navigation is opened, it can only be performed successfully as a commercial venture by ships especially built for that purpose and which have a capacity of about 2,000 tons only. He states that navigation is impracticable for ships of a larger capacity than that. Now, Sir, there is another fact which we must take in connection with this matter. Lieutenant Gordon availed himself of all the information that he could get from those who had been in the habit of navigating the Straits and Hudson's Bay, and he gives the testimony of Captain Hawes, who had fourteen years' experience navigating these waters, who places the season of navigation between the middle of July and the middle of October, so that at the very outside there are only three months of navigation, and, as I have pointed out before, navigation during the month of July is difficult and dangerous. Now, Sir, in confirmation of that, let me draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Hudson's Bay Company has been for the last two hundred years carrying on a steady and regular trade with that part of the world. They send their ships from Britain over there every year, and it is of the most vital importance that their ships should get to Hudson's Bay at the earliest possible moment, because if they are detained until navigation closes they would have to winter in the ice, and that is very dangerous and very tedious. Now, Sir, Lieutenant Gordon went to York Factory, the point from which the Hudson's Bay shipping is done, and he examined the shipping records there and took the arrivals of 116 vessels. Now, these were not occasional ones which he picked out; but he gives the record of the arrival of 116 vessels, all consecutively, and he tells us that the earliest arrival was on August 6 and the latest on October 7, and the latter was compelled to winter there. He states also that the average of all the arrivals was September 4. Taking all these things into consideration, we are inevitably driven to the conclusion that it is only possible for a vessel of a certain construction to make one round trip between Great Britain and the terminus of the railway in Hudson's Bay in one season. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) tried to throw some doubt on the evidence of Lieutenant Gordon. He said he could only believe that he was prejudiced in the conclusions he drew. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat to-night, for it is a grave charge to bring against a man in Lieutenant Gordon's

position. The Government no doubt honestly tried to get the best man for the position, and I have no doubt that they considered Lieutenant Gordon to be that man. Now, Lieutenant Gordon has his character to maintain, and it is a serious thing even to hint that he had prejudged the case, and had based his conclusions, not on the facts as he found them, but on his preconceived opinions. Therefore, I think we may accept as authoritative his statement that the season of navigation is very short, and that only one trip from Great Britain and back again can be made in one season. Now, Sir, anyone can see at a glance that this fact makes the railway an utter failure as a commercial undertaking. Well, suppose we take the other horn of the dilemma. As I pointed out before, by making this grant at the present time this House gives the company a certificate of charter. It says, in effect, to the capitalists of the old country, that we have confidence in the venture, that we are satisfied that the Hudson's Bay Railway will be a success. We are told now, however, that it is simply a colonization road. Well, Sir, if it is to be a colonization road, and if it is located in the proper place, I see no reason why we should oppose it. I have never opposed a colonization railway in Manitoba or the North-West. I have found fault with the system of making grants of land to railway companies without setting any limit to the price at which those companies must sell those lands; but I have never once opposed making grants to colonization railways. Now, what is the first requisite in a colonization railway? It is, it seems to me, that it should run through a country fit for colonization. Now, it will not be denied that the country through which almost the entire length of this projected railway runs is a country not fit for colonization; and when we argue that if it is to be a colonization railway land and money should be granted to it only on condition that it is located in the best place for colonization purposes in that part of the country, we are accused of opposing grants to North-West enterprises, and standing out against North-West interests. I protest against any such assumption. This railway, as originally surveyed, is 250 miles in length. If it crosses the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, as it must, under the present scheme, its length will be so greatly increased as to make it nearly 300 miles long. For what purpose is that route taken? We are told that some alluvial lands lie along the line; but the great bulk of them are flat, marshy lands, with a good deal of timber, which is not particularly needed at Winnipeg at the present time. Now, the very portion of country where a colonization railway is most needed, and where people are now settled and settling, will not be served by this railway at all—that is, to the south and west of Lake Dauphin. This route passes by the Narrows of Lake Manitoba and to the east of Lake Dauphin, and does not touch the country which is fit for settlement and where settlement is going on. By building a railway of about one-third its length the same objective point could be reached. If you start from anywhere between Gladstone and Minnedosa, on the line of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, you could, with a railway a little more than one-third the length of the proposed road, reach the very same point, and have railway communication all the way to Winnipeg, and at the same time pass through a country all fit for colonization; and would it not be the part of wisdom to select the route most likely to prove a success for a colonization railway? By the other route it never can be a success as a colonization road. Again, if this railway is intended to be a part of the Hudson's Bay scheme, it is all wrong in conception. As I have already pointed out, the great object in railway construction at the present day is to shorten the lines of communication instead of lengthening them. Where does this railway start from? The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McDowall) is right: he says the railway ought to run through the middle of the country. Certainly it should, if it is to be a through line for carrying produce. But it really starts on the very eastern verge of the wheat-growing country, and it runs for about 150 miles to the west. What is the result? If you want to ship produce by that route to Hudson's Bay you would have to bring the produce over the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, or other railways, for two or three hundred miles to Winnipeg, and then you would have to turn back at an acute angle and carry it back about 150 miles in nearly the same direction before it started towards Hudson's Bay. Whoever heard of such a stupid project? If the railway is to run to Hudson's Bay, although I do not admit it to be practicable, the part of wisdom would be to start it from the point where freight is to be found and run it by the most direct route to the point of delivery. For all of these reasons, I feel it to be my duty to oppose this Bill, and I intend to oppose it at every stage.

Mr. McMILLAN. Before this Bill passes, I just want to say that while we in Ontario would like to see the North-West improved just as rapidly as the interest of the country would permit, and while we wish to afford all the opportunities for colonization that the people of that country require, yet we find that the people there have a certain amount of railway accommodation at present, and that even the choice sections are as yet very sparsely settled; and we know that one of the reasons why a great many people have left the North-West country is that the settlement has not been contiguous. All who have had experience of the early settlement of the Province of Ontario, as I have had, know that wherever a country is thinly settled the inhabitants cannot get along as well as they can in a closely-settled country, either with regard to roads, schools, churches or local improvements. So that it is in the interest of the country that those portions which are already provided with railway communication should be more rapidly settled up. I think we, in the Province of Ontario, have some cause to call a halt. In the early days of settlement in that province the people suffered as great hardships as the people of the North-West do to-day. I can go back to the time when we had no railway accommodation, when we had no such things as markets, when the whole of our grain—I speak of the County of Huron—had to be stored on the shores of Lake Huron during the winter; and I was very much amused when I heard the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) state that it did not injure the farmer to have his grain kept in store during the winter. I felt like asking him who paid the interest and the storage of grain, and who suffered the loss by shrinkage. It is not the grain dealer, because

he makes his calculations, and the farmer has to take that much less for his produce. To such an extent was that the case, that after I settled in the west of Ontario we sold good wheat for three York shillings a bushel time and again, and oats at a York shilling a bushel, and had to take a bill at six months. Before we got railway accommodation in the county I have the honour to represent we had to come forward and subscribe ourselves, and the County of Huron gave $240,000 to assist in building the Buffalo and Lake Huron branch of the Grand Trunk Railway. Since Confederation became an accomplished fact, we believed that it was only roads of national importance which were going to be built by the Dominion Government, and that all roads of provincial importance only would have to be assisted by the local municipalities and Governments; and the Province of Ontario, in good faith, went to work, both Government and municipalities, and subsidized railways, until over $9,000,000 have been granted by the municipalities alone of Ontario to subsidize local roads, believing that the other provinces would do the same, and that the Dominion Government would only build such roads as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway, and other roads of national importance. Since Confederation the County of Huron has given $390,000 in bonuses to build local roads, and many of the municipalities are not clear of that debt yet. They have been paying interest and sinking fund for over twenty years on their subsidies to obtain railway accommodation for themselves, and now we are asked to come forward and build, not only leading roads in the North-West, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, but colonization roads also. I say it is in the interests of the country that we should look well to what we are doing at present, considering the position of Canada, considering the circumstances of the older provinces and the commercial depression they have been passing through; it is certainly time the Government should call a halt, and only spend money where it is absolutely necessary. As has already been said, the expenditure cannot be shown to be a necessity in that country, where there is very little land in reality fit for settlement. If the Government pursue such a course of giving large money grants to a road not even located, and allowing contractors to locate their own roads, and build where it suits them best, that is a condition of things which should come to an end in Canada—and the more rapidly the better. We all desire to see the North-West, where many of us have our friends and relations, grow and prosper along with ourselves, but now that they have railway accommodation in many parts, and that the resources of this country are not in the most flourishing condition, they should not call on us for further sacrifices. And I am afraid, from the statements given in the two discussions that have taken place, this is not a road leading to Hudson's Bay at all; and even if it were, from the statements made and not successfully contradicted, it is not a practical route over which to carry the produce of the North-West to the English market. If this is only a colonization road, I hope the Government will consider what the older provinces have done, and allow the people in the North-West to assist themselves, as we in the older provinces have done.

Mr. LAURIER. The other day, the hon. Minister of the Interior promised to lay on the Table of the House, not only the list of shareholders, but also a statement of the number of shares held by each shareholder. The promise the hon. gentleman made on that occasion was very distinct, and I am not aware that he has complied with it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. At the time I said I would endeavour to get the information asked for by the hon. member for South Norfolk, and I was under the impression I would be able to get it from the president of the company. But he told me he could not get the information down for a week or ten days, and on my return I think I stated that to the House. Subsequently I received a memorandum from him which I read to-day, which showed me that the position of the company was different from what I understood it to be when speaking to him, and the subsequent memorandum I have produced to-day shows that it was impossible to get that information. But the president gave what information he possibly could in the memorandum I have read, in which he states that, as most of the shareholders are purchasers from the original purchasers, and that the shares have frequently changed hands, the company has no knowledge of the amount the present shareholders have paid for their stock. When I made the statement that I would endeavour to get that information I expected to be able to get it from the company.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it, the amount which appears to have been paid by the shareholders, $285,795, does not appear to have been all paid for in money. I have been told that shares were given for services rendered as well as for money. Could the hon. gentleman tell me what proportion was given for each?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. Minister could tell us how much money the company have on hand?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have they any at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. What amount in all has been paid in cash by the shareholders, on account of their shares?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That question has been put to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before recess the hon. Minister stated that a contract had been entered into, although the line had not been located, between the railway company now incorporated and a contracting firm, for the construction of the road. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to lay that contract, or a copy of it, on the Table?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have it here, and will submit it now.

Mr. CASEY. I have already said that I did not intend to discuss in detail the question of the navigability of Hudson's Bay at this stage, but I want to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong). He said that Lieutenant Gordon obtained at York Factory the dates of the arrival and departure of vessels for a period of 116 years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A hundred and sixteen consecutive arrivals.

Mr. CASEY. These were, of course, the arrivals and sailings of the Hudson's Bay Company's own schooner, which comes out annually from England. Now, this schooner is a small sailing vessel, and her captain naturally wishes, having only one trip to make in the summer, to make it at the time when it can be made with the least trouble and with the greatest speed. Consequently, this vessel starts from Scotland every year at such a time as to reach the Straits when they are practically clear of ice, so that she may be able to sail in and sail out without being bothered by ice at all. My hon. friend draws the conclusion from this that only one trip a year would be practicable between Great Britain and York Factory or Fort Churchill. That statement is not justified by the facts. This vessel makes only one trip, and that at the time when it is most easily made. It does not follow that the channel is not navigable at other times. If my hon. friend's rule were followed, I think the arrival of ocean steamers at Montreal in the spring would be much later than it is now. I have here a letter which I will read at length, on another occasion, from a captain who has commanded the Hudson's Bay vessel for twenty years, and who gives his opinion of the navigability of the Straits, and that differs entirely from the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong). This captain, who has been there for twenty years, thinks those waters are navigable for a much longer time than does my hon. friend from South Middlesex, who has never been there in his life, and probably never enquired into the matter until this session, when he felt he should oppose this Bill. I have also here a paper which was read by Commodore Markham, of the Royal Navy, before the Royal Geographical Society of London. He came out with Commander Gordon on the *Alert*, and went through the Straits with him and through Hudson's Bay. His opinion, also, differs very much from that of my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and also from that of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who seem to think they know more than this eminent Arctic explorer. Commodore Markham was with Sir John Nares in his polar expedition in 1874-5, and has had great experience in regard to ice navigation. I might quote from a speech of Sir Charles Tupper at the same meeting. He said:

"Under these circumstances, it was very gratifying to learn that Commodore Markham was able to add his personal testimony to the experience of those who had endeavoured to open up that country, and to give so many reasons for entertaining the belief that it might be found practicable to establish a comparatively safe route for the trade for several months of the year. It was true that the officers sent there by the Canadian Government had not taken so sanguine a view, but Commodore Markham was a higher authority than any one who had been employed there by the Government."

I only quote that to show that Sir Charles Tupper knows that Commodore Markham is a far better authority than Commander Gordon. My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) takes it for granted that the Government got the best man when they got Commander Gordon. I am not disposed to admit that, although this evening I am speaking somewhat in support of the policy of the Government. Commander Gordon had no better qualification for this work than any other officer of his rank. He had no experience of ice work, and, as Commodore Markham shows, he did not know how to handle a vessel in the ice or how to find the shortest channel through it. I have also letters, which I will quote on another occasion, from nearly all the observers who were left by Commander Gordon on the shores of Hudson's Straits while observations were being carried on there, and nearly every one of them contradicts the conclusions which Commander Gordon arrived at from those observations. And I think those who made the observations at first should have more authority than the gentleman who simply made conclusions from those observations. I was astonished to hear my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and I would have been more astonished to hear my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) suggest that we must not even hint that Commander Gordon could be prejudiced in this matter; that he must be an impartial witness and must be absolutely trusted. Considering the amount of feeling and of animus which has been shown in this debate, I was surprised to hear hon. gentlemen who oppose this Bill pleading in this manner for Commander Gordon. If it is not to be endured that we should hint at any prejudice or anything of that sort on the part of Commander Gordon, what are we to say when the hon. member for North Wellington thinks it proper and gentlemanlike to hint at, or rather to impute, in plain language, the basest motives to those who are promoting this Bill. What shall we say to those—I will not say those, but rather that gentleman, for I am only alluding to one—who has been so insultingly careless of the reputation of members of this House, of members of his own party, and of his own personal friends, as to say that those persons or that person, as it may be, are actuated by improper and base motives? I say that charity should begin at home, and that before we are so peculiarly careful of the reputation of Commander Gordon we should look after our own reputation here, and should not cast upon members of the same House the stigma of being actuated by interested motives, and that without a particle of proof to sustain such an accusation. My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) said that if we voted this we would be giving our pledge that this railway would be a success. We would not be doing anything of the kind. It would simply be an expression of our opinion that the part of the railway to the Saskatchewan would be a success. Beyond that, we are informed that this Government does not propose to give any assistance. The Government of Manitoba, which may be supposed to be better informed than this Government is in reference to that country, has made a grant of a large sum of money for the Hudson's Bay extension, which is only to be paid when the road is completed. I have found a memorandum which I had lost which answers another part of my hon. friend's statements, viz.: that the land was not good. Mr. Macoun, speaking of the country between Porcupine Mountain and Winnipegoosis, says:

"My own observations and the knowledge I could pick up from other sources led me to believe that valuable spruce and poplar forests are found around every point of the Porcupine Mountains.

"I know the eastern and northern sides are a continuous spruce forest, along the base and up the sides. At the southern end I penetrated the hills and found fine spruce in groves, and of very considerable size. White spruce never grows on wet or marshy ground in the West, and wherever these spruce are found there is no swamp.

"On the slope of the mountain I saw balsam poplar six feet in diameter, while in some cases the spruce reached a thickness of nearly four feet. This forest is more ancient looking than any other that came under my observation in the North-West.

"I conclude that the land here is well suited for cultivation.

"Mr. Frank Moberly, a Civil Engineer, Canadian Pacific Railway survey, who ran the lines on part of the Mackenzie route, says:

"'From Swan River, the country along north of Duck and Riding Mountains was found on examination to be nearly level, thickly wooded with spruce, poplar and some maple. A few small lakes and marshes were also found. Soil, sandy loam, and admirably fitted for farming.'

"Mr. J. W. Spencer, of the Geological Survey, speaking of the country around Duck Bay, in the northern part of Lake Winnipegoosis, says:—

"'As we went north of Duck Bay the richness and luxuriance of the vegetation increased. The banks became higher and the forest trees of larger size. As we proceeded up the lake the country constantly improved. The shore marshes became less and less, and finally disappeared. The timber increased in size, and at Pine River spruce of large size were abundant. Very fine forests were noticed at Duck Bay, but oak had disappeared and the balsam fir has taken its place.'"

These are a few samples of what can be drawn from the reports of the explorers of that country, and they are worth infinitely more than the wild guesses of these gentlemen, who have never been there, and have never taken the means of ascertaining from reliable reports what the country is like, or whether it is fit for settlement. Apparently they do not wish to think it is fit for settlement, because they have made up their minds to oppose this Bill. Some of those who have spoken against this measure speak as if they were open to reason on the subject; others speak as if they had made up their minds beyond all peradventure, as the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says he has. He declares that all sensible men have made up their minds against the Bill, and, therefore, everybody who thinks otherwise has not an atom of sense in his composition. Well, it is a very enviable state of mind to be in—to believe that all sensible men must think as you do. I confess, although there is a tendency in that direction in human nature, I have never been able myself to arrive at that sublime pitch of self-appreciation, and I must say that I envy the hon. member for North Wellington the calm serenity with which he sits in his chair and feels that all the sensible men in the House must speak his sentiments and agree with his opinions. I am sure I should gladly forfeit several years of my parliamentary existence to be able to attain to that sublime condition of mind. I shall not, therefore, say that all sensible men believe as I do on this matter, but I believe that those who will go into the matter with unprejudiced minds, looking at the facts on both sides, will not be so positive as some of them appear to be now in opposing this measure. Now, that is all I wish to say upon the matter at present. After so many challenges have been directed from gentlemen opposing this measure, challenges to say anything in reply to their assertions, I did not think that I should let the Bill go out of Committee without pointing out what I intended to prove at a later stage of the measure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister is kind enough to put the contract in my hands that I asked for. I find it is pretty much as he stated himself, that the line which has been contracted to be built is one entirely within the control of the company itself, and the location of that line is not in any way subject to the approval or direction of the Government for the time being. One section of the contract that I think the Committee should consider at the present time is the fourth, from which it appears that, so far as the contract itself goes, the House is not in a position to know whether the line runs east or west of Lake Manitoba. A subsequent clause in the contract provides that if the company is determined that the line shall cross the Narrows and go west of Lake Winnipegoosis a certain consideration shall be paid to the contractors. That is a matter to which I merely wish to draw the attention of the Committee, that the location of that line is one entirely in the control of the company, and the House has no guarantee whatever that the line will be built either east or west of Lake Manitoba, or that it will cross the Narrows at all, and we are voting this entirely in the dark. Of course, I speak with great diffidence in the matter, because I have not heard from the Minister or any gentleman supporting the Bill a statement as to the character of the country on the east side of this lake. But supposing it is built east of the lake, I have not heard anybody undertake to say that there is any positive information assuring the House that the country east of Lake Winnipegoosis is such a one as will justify this House in voting such a large sum of money to open it up with a colonization road. It seems to me that all the conversation that has taken place in the last hour with reference to the navigability of the Hudson's Bay is entirely wide of the mark. It is now admitted, it is now stated explicitly by the Minister, that there is no intention on the part of the Government to subsidize a road having in view at all the opening up of a line of communication with Hudson's Bay. This road for which we are asked to vote this money is purely and simply a colonization road, and the objections which seem to me to be very strong with reference to the proposition now before the House are, that the locality which that road is going to open up is an unknown locality, and the Government themselves do not know where it is going to run, and they are subsidizing a road which may run either east or west of this lake, which may cross the Narrows or may not cross the Narrows; and so we are to vote that money in the dark.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say one word with regard to the location of the road east of the lake. If the road went across the Narrows and was located west of the lake it would go into a district in which, I believe, there are already a number of settlers; if it is located east of the lake and extended beyond the point where it is now constructed northward to the Saskatchewan River it runs through a country that is not yet surveyed, that the Government have not seen proper to open for settlement. I am now speaking of the locality between the two lakes. It would run through a district where, if it is fit for settlement, the settlers would be within easy access of navigable waters, and where, without a railway, they would not be seriously incommoded. I think that where our means are limited, and our territory is well nigh unlimited, it is a mater entitled to the serious consideration of the House whether you propose to build a road in a narrow strip of land, not more than 20 miles in width in many places, situated

where, if it is fit for settlement, there are navigable waters which will enable those who settle in the country to reach, during the season of navigation, the principal centres of trade and commerce.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say I agree with a great deal of what has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). My impression is that the best line for colonization would be to cross the Narrows and go on the west side of Winnipegoosis. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that the country between Lake Winnipegoosis and Lake Manitoba is a country unknown, and respecting which no surveys have been made. I admit that through a certain portion of it there is water on both sides within some miles distant, but it is only navigable for a certain portion of the season. Exploration surveys have been made on the east and west of the lake. I will read an extract from a report made by Mr. Neilson to the directors of the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company some years ago. The surveyor says:

"The country between these points (Winnipeg and Grand Rapids on the Saskatchewan), a distance of 242 miles, is very flat and almost free from rock, except in the immediate neighbourhood of certain parts of Lake Winnipeg shore. The first 30 miles of it is prairie land similar to that in the rest of Manitoba. After passing through this there is a well-wooded country with many open plains extending as far as Fairford on the Partridge Crop River. All of this country offers great inducements to the settlers, and it is already occupied by farmers and fishermen along a large portion of the lakes and Swan Creek, which flows into Lake Manitoba, north of Oak Point Mission. It is well watered with many lakes, round which there are splendid hay lands and clearings for cattle grazing; especially is this the case at the Rat Lakes, about 75 miles from Winnipeg. After leaving these, the line passes close to Dog Lake, an offshoot of Lake Manitoba. This lake is about 14 miles long, and drains the best piece of farming land on Lake Manitoba. From this point to Fairford Mission (which is about 132 miles from Winnipeg) there is a little muskeg; otherwise the same good country prevails. There will be little or no difficulty in constructing the line so far, as the country is so level that, beyond raising the track and draining, no further construction would be required. There are no rivers to bridge. Fairford itself has already a good settlement, and only awaits a means of outlet to rapidly establish itself as an important agricultural and lumbering centre. It is one of the oldest missions in the country. There is a great quantity of exceedingly fine spruce and poplar all through this country, the spruce attaining to an enormous size, often growing from three and four feet across the stump. After leaving Fairford, the Partridge Crop River is crossed by the line at a point about 2½ miles from its exit from Lake Manitoba. The whole section of this country is excellent for settlement, and there is plenty of fine timber in its vicinity. A bridge 250 feet long would be required to cross the Partridge Crop, which here has high banks of clay and a gravel bottom. From Fairford to the Saskatchewan is about 110 miles, and, with the exception of the first few miles after leaving Fairford, the country round the Fish Lakes and the head waters of the War Path and Twin Rivers is a lumbering country."

That report is as to the land running up between the two lakes. The character of the country on the west side of Lake Winnipegoosis is very well known, for settlement has extended from the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as Dauphin Lake, and is continually growing north.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman say that the land between the two lakes north of the Narrows has been surveyed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. WATSON. In what year was that report made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Seven or eight years ago, probably nine years ago. With respect to the country on the west side of Lake Winnipegoosis, I have here a report made by Mr. Cunningham in 1874. He says:

"It is in the Swan River Valley, however, that the richest and most extensive area of agricultural country is found. The valuable part of this valley, or rather basin, begins at the eastern slope of Thunder Hill and extends in a north-easterly direction to Swan Lake. It is bound on the north and north-west by Swan Lake and Porcupine Mountains; on the west by Thunder Hill; on the south by Duck Mountains, and on the east by an elevated ridge which lies between it and Lake Winnipegoosis. Its extent is about 60 miles in length by 20 miles in width (768,000 acres). The soil is remarkably rich and productive. Throughout it consists of plains clothed with tall succulent grasses, alternating with clumps and strips of timber, well-grown and admirably adapted for building purposes. At the lower end, that is near Swan Lake, the timber is more varied than in any part of the country yet described. Here one may see spruce, tamarack, oak, elm, poplar, maple and birch, each species being represented by trees of very considerable growth. In the gardens attached to a few houses forming a little hamlet at the mouth of Swan River I had ocular demonstration of the productive power of the soil. This valley is looked upon by the natives as the garden of the district. First autumn frost noticed 15th September, when the thermometer registered two degrees of frost. Early summer frost (so the half-breed settlers say), is unknown, and that in every way the climate is well adapted for agricultural purposes.

"The country from Lake Dauphin to the Swan River Valley may be described as alternate strips of timber land and meadow, a proportion of about two to one. This character of country and timber gradually changes as we ascend towards Duck Mountain—the timber becomes larger and the 'opens' fewer. At about 5 miles from Mossy River (the discharge of Lake Dauphin) we meet with spruce and tamarack. As we continue, the size and quantity increases. At 30 miles many white spruce, 30 inches in diameter, of thoroughly sound quality, can be obtained. From here on for 50 miles, when we turn the north-east corner of Duck Mountain, this heavy character of timber is maintained. On the banks of Mossy River there is a strong loamy clay, producing rich vegetation. Further on we reach the meadow before alluded to, where there is a very luxuriant growth of long grass."

With respect to the country on the western side of Lake Winnipegoosis, from reports in possession of the Department and from the reports made by surveyors in connection with the Indian reserves, I am led to believe that within twenty years that portion of Manitoba will be the garden of our western country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to be misunderstood by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). The reasons for my opposition to this Bill are as follows: In the first place, I consider the expenditure of the money proposed is, under present circumstances, unnecessary. We have in the North-West a sufficient quantity of land open for settlement, in the meantime, without any further expenditure of money, even for colonization railways. In the next place, I contend that the utilization of Hudson's Bay as a route for the exportation of grain from the North-West is not a necessity. The Minister of the Interior says it is only as a colonization road he asks this subsidy, and not with the intention of extending the road to Hudson's Bay. If I have read the Act aright on which the Province of Manitoba has granted aid, I am led to conclude that the people of that Province anticipate its extension to Hudson's Bay. If the Minister will carefully look into the Act he will find that the Manitoba Government have made their grant with the full understanding that the road will ultimately reach Hudson's Bay. That is the condition of their grant. Accordingly, the position of their grant is, apparently, different from that of the grant now

asked. Whatever the result of that may be, I contend that, in the meantime, the period has not arrived, even supposing that Hudson's Bay was navigable for many more months in the year than is the case, when this expenditure should be made, and the application is premature. In the next place, I contend that there are whole sections in this Dominion where the people have been compelled to place themselves under very serious financial embarrassment for the purpose of constructing lines for their own immediate accommodation, and that these people are now, and have been for the past ten years, contributing to the construction of railways in every section of the country, including Manitoba and the North-West, and have never received one single farthing towards the construction of their own lines or towards relieving the debt which has been incurred by them for the construction of these lines. I contend that, under that condition of things, it is unjust and unfair to these people to continue subsidizing lines in sections of the country where there is no immediate necessity for them, while you leave these people struggling under heavy embarrassments and compel them to contribute their mite towards the construction of such schemes as the Hudson Bay Railway. Now, with regard to the principle which I expressed my regret should have been adopted by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), it is this: We have continuously, and I think unitedly, advocated on this side of the House for the last ten years, that members of Parliament personally interested in the promotion of any railway or other scheme should not take an active part in urging upon the House the granting of aid for that particular scheme. Take the case of the late member for Lincoln, who was compelled to present to this House his resignation, and to return to his constituency. That gentleman stated in his address to his constituents afterwards that there were dozens of men in this House guilty of the charge for which he had been tried and virtually dismissed. Now, I do not want, and I should be sorry to see any member on this side of the House who could have a finger pointed at him in the same direction, or who could be charged with similar action. I hope that the hon. member has seen his way to adopt the course he has taken, but at the moment I thought it was not in line with the principles which we have adopted on this side of the House. I know that on the other side of the House I have seen members of Parliament, who I believe are conscientious and honest men, withdraw from the House when questions came up in which they were personally interested, and decline to either speak or vote upon them. I give them credit for that, and I could name these members, but I have no desire to mention names. I believe that that is the principle which should be followed out. I contend that under present circumstances, and in view of the condition of things which I have described as existing in the section of the country from which I come; in view of the struggle of these people who have been compelled to build their own roads, there should be no public money put into a scheme of this kind, which virtually will amount to $1,600,000 altogether, for the construction of a road which is not needed at present. If all the North-West were settled up, if our land that is now open for settlement was pretty well taken hold of, I would not say that it was not the duty of this House to provide for the influx of settlers into new sections, but while we have an enormous quantity of land open for settlement we should not go on spending money in building colonization roads, and committing the people of this country to a further indebtedness, in order to carry out schemes of this kind. I am opposed to that policy, and I do not care who advocates it, whether it be a Reformer or a Conservative, I say it is not in the interest of the country.

Mr. CASEY. I rather thought, when my hon. friend from North Wellington commenced his remarks, that he was going to apologize for the most improper and unfair attack which he made upon me at an earlier stage of the proceedings. I was quite prepared to accept any sort of an apology, because I did not expect the hon. gentleman would go very far in that direction; but since he has attempted to draw some sort of a parallel between the action of members of Parliament who lay before the House facts connected with a corporation of which they happen to be members, and the conduct of Mr. Rykert, he has put himself in such a position that no member of this House, with any self-respect, can make any reply to his accusations. I reiterate my belief that it is perfectly parliamentary, perfectly fair, and perfectly proper that those members of the House who are connected with any corporate body which is asking a favour at the hands of this House should lay before the House such facts bearing on the case as are in their possession. It is perfectly proper that a member should do so. As to my having a direct personal interest in this matter, I may say that I have no more interest in it than any other shareholder, and what member of this House is not a member of some company that might come before this House asking for legislation? What member of the House so connected with a company would hesitate to lay the facts before hon. gentlemen? I do not urge the House to do one thing or the other; I tell them what I know on the subject, and what I suppose some other gentlemen do not know, and I leave it to them to decide. I do not intend to vote on this question; I never had the slightest intention of voting upon it, for I feel in that respect as other hon. gentlemen have felt under similar circumstances. I may mention that when the present Premier (Mr. Abbott) had a seat in this House, and when he was solicitor for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, he did not vote on any question affecting the company, although he gave information and explanations about them. Again, our former Speaker, the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), is now a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not think that he is to be precluded from discussing matters connected with that corporation. Parliamentary usage has always been consistent in this respect: That no member shall be shut off from expressing his views on any question by the fact that he may happen to be a shareholder in any company whose affairs were being discussed in this House. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is mistaken in supposing that the Liberal party have ever held that a member's mouth should be stopped in that way.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was rather unfortunate in the comparison he made when he

compared my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) with the late member for the County of Lincoln. The late member for the County of Lincoln received substantial advantages from his position as a member of Parliament, while my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), so far as I am able to judge, will receive no advantages at all.

Mr. CASEY. I will receive substantial losses.

Mr. LISTER. So far as I can see, this stock that my hon. friend has is not worth half a cent a bushel if he had the whole of it; so that he can hardly be charged with trying to advance his own personal interests in the scheme now before Parliament. I agree to a great extent with what has been said, that if a member of this House is personally interested in a scheme before the House it would be bad taste on his part to vote in favour of the proposition; but even if my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) thought proper to vote, under all the circumstances, and from the experience we have had of the past, it can be safely said that he has no substantial interest whatever in this railway, even if he owned the whole stock. The bondholders I fancy will after a time own whatever there is. So far as the position of members is concerned, I infinitely prefer the position of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), who I understand has a judgment for $30,000 against this road. His position will be far better than the position of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), and if I were asked to select as between the two, I would certainly take the position of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald). I am not prepared to say whether this scheme is one which ought to be subsidized by this Parliament or not. The Minister of the Interior read a very glowing account of the fertility of the soil in that section, and of the prospective advantages of this road. I have been long enough in this House to know that these are rose-coloured representations to a certain extent, and that when the matter comes down to a solid basis we find that a good many of the representations are not borne out by the facts. There is no doubt that this House is determined that the Bill before it shall become law, and my own judgment is, that if it is to become law, and the Government having so determined; if the statement of the Minister of the Interior is to be received, the Government has determined that this Bill shall become law, and I do not see that its continued discussion will do any particular good. I, for one, would be prepared to have the discussion closed up now.

Mr. WATSON. Before the discussion closes I wish to say that after listening to the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior I have come to the conclusion that this debate would not have lasted as long as it has done if that hon. gentleman had been in a position to give this House the information to which I think it is entitled for the proper consideration of this measure. It appears to me that, in view of the action of the Government both this session and last session, they should be prepared to state that this railway will run either not further north than the Narrows of Lake Manitoba or else south of Lake Manitoba, for this reason: At the last session of Parliament I promoted a Bill for the incorporation of a strong company, which I believed was prepared to build a hundred miles of railway through that country last year; and that Bill was defeated at the instance of the promoters of the Hudson's Bay Railway. The railway which I promoted was intended to run from Portage la Prairie to the Lake Dauphin country and to the west of the country described by the hon. Minister of the Interior. The reason given at that time by the late First Minister for his refusal to grant a charter to that company was that it was for the construction of a railway which might conflict with the Hudson's Bay Railway. If that argument was good then, I think it is the duty of this House to see that the people who were intended to be accommodated by that railway shall be accommodated by the Hudson's Bay Railway to which it is proposed to make this grant of $80,000 a year for twenty years. Now, the hon. Minister has given a glowing report of the tract of country between the two lakes. Personally, I know nothing of it, and I believe that personally he knows nothing of it either, because the report from which he read is in a pamphlet which was written eight or ten years ago by a gentleman who passed throught that country. The country has never been surveyed, and, therefore, the hon. Minister cannot have any field-notes to guide him in forming an opinion of it. The country to the west of Lake Manitoba and Lake Dauphin has been surveyed; it is a good country; and several townships in it are so well settled that to-day you cannot find a vacant section. But the people there are a hundred miles from any railway communication. They went there with the prospect of railway accommodation, which has not yet been furnished to them; and the Government appear willing to allow the Hudson's Bay Railway to be constructed in another part of the country altogether. I am rather surprised that the hon. Minister of the Interior, who represents the district of East Assiniboia in the North-West, should not insist, in the interest of his constituents, that that railway should be built to the west of Lake Winnipegoosis; because he can easily understand, as can any member of this House by looking at the map, that if this railway is built to the west of Lake Winnipegoosis and through the Dauphin settlement it will afford accommodation to the greatest number of settlements in the North-West Territories—to the Regina, the Brandon and the Prince Albert settlements. By the proposed route the distance to Grand Rapids, the hon. Minister states, will be 242 miles. If that is the case, it must be at least 300 miles to the crossing of the Saskatchewan west of Cedar Lake. I should like to see this House insist that the Hudson's Bay Railway Company shall carry their road either across the Narrows of Lake Manitoba or to the south of Lake Manitoba, to accommodate that settlement, which, as the hon. Minister knows, is a good country. There are probably a dozen townships of six miles square each where you will hardly find a vacant section, and notwithstanding that the odd sections are reserved for railway purposes, the land is so good that the people have squatted on them, with the chance of getting them at a fair price when they are disposed of by the railway company. Notwithstanding the hon. Minister's statement that this is only a colonization railway, a great many people hope that it will be continued to Hudson's Bay, and will become a competing line for the wheat and cattle trade of the North-West. With all these reasons before us, it is only fair that the Government should give some assurance that the people in the Lake Dauphin

district will receive some accommodation from a company which was the means of preventing their getting that accommodation a year ago. I think that before this Bill receives its third reading the Government should, in all fairness, give us this assurance.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent.) Before this debate closes I want to say a word or two. When the resolutions on which this Bill is founded were before the House some two weeks ago the arguments then addressed to the House in support of the resolutions were in favour of the Hudson's Bay Railway as an additional outlet for the grain and cattle products of the North-West. But I fancy that the speech of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), in which he showed the impracticability of that water way, has induced the hon. Minister of the Interior to change his mind on the subject; and he has told us now that the Government have no intention at all of making this railway a part of the Hudson's Bay Railway, but that it is to be purely a colonization road. Therefore, all the arguments addressed to the House the other day have fallen to the ground. In considering the question of the advisability of aiding this railway as a colonization road, several questions arise. In the first place, a colonization road should only be built in a country fit for settlement. Upon that point there seems to be quite a difference of opinion. It has been stated by the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) that the country through which this road will run is altogether unfit for settlement, and it has been stated by the hon. Minister of the Interior that it is a good country, heavily timbered with spruce, poplar and other kinds of wood, some of which are as much as four feet through. Of course, if the country is fit for settlement and heavily timbered it ought to be a great deal easier to construct a railway through it, and it will pay much better than if it passed through a country from which no local traffic could be derived; and if the country is as good as the hon. Minister states there ought not to be much difficulty in constructing the railway with the amount of aid which has already been given to it by the Manitoba Government, amounting, I believe, to $1,500,000, which would be equal to about $2,400 a mile.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Manitoba Government are giving nothing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand they have guaranteed $1,500,000 when the road is completed to Hudson's Bay. Am I right?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent.) That would be a grant of $2,400 a mile to the road. Then this Parliament has already made a grant of 6,400 acres of land per mile within the Province of Manitoba. Outside the Province of Manitoba, I believe the grant is 12,000 acres per mile. Now, supposing the land is valued at $1 per acre—and if it is heavily wooded, as the hon. Minister of the Interior says it is, it will be worth double that amount; but even taking it at $1 an acre, then the land grant would amount to $6,400 a mile, and the grant by the Manitoba Government would be $2,400 a mile, which would make $8,800 a mile already pledged to the building of this road. Now, the hon. Minister of the Interior has produced a contract, under which the whole road is to be built at $11,000 a mile, so that it seems to me the amount already pledged to the building of this road is quite sufficient to ensure its completion, and if we go on and grant this $80,000 for the next twenty years, or, in round numbers, $1,600,000, we will be giving an additional $7,600 a mile cash bonus to this road. So that when the Manitoba grant, our land grant made, and the bonus proposed to be given in this Bill, are considered, this road will receive altogether about $16,400 a mile, and the contract now let for its completion calls for only $11,000 a mile. In other words, the Government propose to give this road $5,000 a mile more than it will cost to build it, and then the company will own the road and we will have no control whatever over it. It seems to me that is a poor way of doing business. If we have $1,600,000 to invest there are a thousand ways in which we can invest it with far more benefit to the people of the Dominion than in voting money to this scheme; and if the road is to run through such good country as described, the grant we have already made, of 6,400 acres per mile, ought to be sufficient, without our being asked to give $1,600,000 more. For these reasons, I think this Bill should not receive the support of this House.

On section 1,

Mr. WATSON. Can the hon. Minister give some assurance that the road will pass a point not further north than the Narrows of Lake Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not in a position to make that promise.

Mr. WATSON. Do you think you will be in that position before the third reading?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am afraid not.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the gross amount of the various subsidies, Dominion and Provincial, cash and land, per mile?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not made the calculation. We have not taken into consideration the bonus given by the Manitoba Government at all, because it is perfectly distinct fom this proposition. If the estimate made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is correct, I shall be very glad, because he considers that, with the bonuses, there will be no difficulty building the road. I hope he will prove correct in that regard, but I have not such a glowing opinion of the scheme as he has in that respect. I do not think the northern portion, that is, from the Saskatchewan to Hudson's Bay, is going to be built at anything like the figures proposed from Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the present value of $80,000 a year for twenty years?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is estimated at $1,600,000.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the gross amount; but what sum of money should be invested by the Government, say at four per cent., to produce this amount net per year? That is the way to ascertain the present cash bonus we are giving.

Mr. FOSTER. About $1,100,000.

Mr. MULOCK. These things ought to be worked out, and we ought not to be giving guess work.

Mr. WATSON. What provision does the hon. Minister expect to make for the people west of Lake Manitoba and in the Lake Dauphin district? I introduced a Bill last year to give railway accommodation to these people, but it was defeated

on account of the objections raised by the promoters of the Hudson's Bay Railway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was not aware that the opposition came from the Hudson's Bay Company; I understood there was a rival company running alongside the one for which the hon. member applied for a charter, and the opposition came from that company. One of those companies was chartered last year, the Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, and that charter exists to-day, and the company has a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, and I have no doubt that in a short time that railway will be built and will accommodate the whole country mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. The reason given last year by the late First Minister was the fact that this charter, if granted, would interfere with the construction of the Hudson's Bay road. The same reason was given in the Railway Committee, when in that committee it was moved and seconded by the hon. members for Lisgar and Selkirk that this Bill should not be reported to the House because it would interfere with the Hudson's Bay road. Surely the Government ought to see that the people who were deprived of railway communication a year ago on account of the Hudson's Bay road should receive the benefit they ought to derive from that road. That road will run up between the two lakes, and will be of no benefit at all to the people of Lake Manitoba and the Lake Dauphin district. If the reason given a year ago be correct, the Government must have had some policy at that time for the purpose of accommodating these people.

Mr. McMULLEN. I heard the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior with regard to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) as to his calculation of the subsidies, and I consider that the statement presented to the House by my hon. friend is quite correct. If you will take the $1,500,000 granted by the Manitoba Government, and calculate the proportion due on this extent of road, now proposed to be built, some 640 miles, you will find that will give $2,043 a mile.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is right.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then you grant a subsidy in land of 6,400 acres to every mile of the road that is built and 12,800 acres outside of the province. Take that at $1 an acre, which is a very low estimate, if you include the land and the timber and everything else which is on it, that would amount to $6,400. Then take the grant which is made by this resolution of $1,600,000 for 210 miles, which is the extent supposed to be built by this grant. That amounts to $7,619 a mile for the 210 miles. Of course, I am aware that it is only payable in instalments extending over twenty years. I do not suppose the question of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) can be answered off hand, but I suppose that this grant of money will amount to $1,300,000, or somewhere about that. That gives $16,362 a mile for the 210 miles which are supposed to be built under the grant now being made under this Bill. If the Minister will carefully look over the figures I think he will find that statement correct, and it is rather singular that we are asked to consent to this grant, when the Minister states that the contract is already let for $11,000 a mile, which I understood includes rails, ballast and stations, and everything necessary to complete the line, with the exception of one bridge. That would leave a very large margin to be divided amongst the promoters.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say, in the first place, that this has to be earned and has to be paid back. In the next place, the hon. gentleman is not quite correct as to the cost of the construction. It is true that the $11,000 includes the amount required for station grounds and rails up to the standard of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it was estimated that the rolling stock when the road was in working order, and some other matters, would make the total cost $15,000 a mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is the completed line, rolling stock and all. Supposing they are unable to pledge this grant, and this Act allows them to do that, even if the cost is $15,000 a mile, it gives them $1,362 a mile over and above the cost of the line.

Mr. MULOCK. Apart from the financial features of the scheme, there is another matter about which I would like to have some assurance. I would like to know what precautions have been adopted, if any—if the Government sees fit to adopt any—to prevent this road becoming part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It may be considered by some people desirable that it should be, but I think we are arriving at that state of affairs in the development of the North-West when it is not wise to place any more power than is necessary in the hands of one corporation. I rejoice to know that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been able to extend its line from ocean to ocean, but I think it has acquired as many lines by subsidies granted to it by this Government, directly or indirectly, as is in the public interest. I understood that the Hudson's Bay Railway came into existence as a rival road, an independent road, and that it was especially intended to afford some relief to the people of the North-West from the monopoly of which they complained. If that is correct, it is now due to the people who brought this Hudson's Bay Railway into existence with that hope and that expectation that some precaution should be adopted. Otherwise, there will be disappointment. I think there can be too much power vested in one railway company, and I would venture to prophesy that, if we place the great North-West, limitless in its size, and, as we hope, almost limitless in its population and its power in the future, if we place that vast territory, almost that great empire, in the grip of one corporation, we will lose control of our cherished institutions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It may save the time of the House and possibly may save the hon. gentleman a long speech if I read to him clause 30 of the charter of 1887, which is to this effect:

"The Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway shall not, nor shall any of the branch lines thereof, or any line of railway leased by the company or under its control, be at any time amalgamated with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any of its branch lines, or with any branch lines leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or under its control; and such amalgamation and any arrangement for making a common fund or pooling the earnings or receipts of the said two railways or their or any of their branch lines, or of any railway lines or parts thereof leased by the said companies, or either of them, shall be absolutely void; this provision, however, shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council."

Mr. MULOCK. The saving clause, if they can call it such, gives the whole case away. The Governor in Council can consent to a traffic arrangement, which is the same as a pooling arrangement. I object to this Parliament delegating more powers to the Governor in Council than are absolutely necessary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Why did you not oppose that?

Mr. MULOCK. It is one thing to give corporate existence to a company, and it is another thing to give money to that company. If the Minister of the Interior contends that that gives the guarantees which the people expect, why did he not oppose it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was not here.

Mr. MULOCK. He was not here, but was he not a citizen of Canada; was he not in the North-West at that time? Why did he not send representations to his colleagues here, and point out to them that the proper guarantees should be given? I am surprised that the Minister of the Interior, instead of sympathizing with this contention, should give such a flippant reply as he has. It is not worthy of him, it is not worthy of the subject under discussion, it is not worthy of the people who have fanned this railway into existence in order to create a rivalry with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and now the only ground they have to stand upon is the strength of the Governor in Council to resist the importunities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I would not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for trying to bring about traffic arrangements with this new company. They have a right to try to do that if possible, but we know that the Executive is weak, as no doubt all executives are likely to be weak, and it will be left in a very awkward position. There should be another condition put in, providing distinctly that this road shall not fall into the lap of the Canadian Pacific Railway, directly or indirectly, except by the consent of the Parliament of Canada, which brings it into existence. In two other cases of a somewhat similar nature, what have we seen? The Parliament of Canada gave subsidies to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and to the Regina and Long Lake Railway. Where are these railways to-day? I understand that they are being operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is not that correct?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They had six years running arrangements, but they have none now. That is ended.

Mr. MULOCK. There are no precautions adopted here, and it will not do for the Minister of the Interior to deal with this matter except in the best interests of the people. He must understand that he and his Government while in office are going to be held responsible. They cannot escape responsibility by attempting to throw it upon somebody else. They are now negotiating legislation, and it is of the first importance in connection with the scheme, in my judgment, that the perfect independence of this road shall be secured, so far as its independence can be secured. If it is left as it is proposed to leave it, under the law the Minister has read, to the Governor in Council, then it is practically leaving it to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that whatever conditions we may have seen fit to impose in connection with the granting of the charter, we are now at a very different stage in the matter; we are now giving out public money, and giving out public money for the benefit of the people of the North-West, and, we hope, indirectly, for the benefit of the whole Dominion; and we now, representing the people as a whole, are bound to impose proper conditions in connection with this gift. Therefore, I think that the Minister ought to give us pledges that before the House is asked finally to give effect to these proposals there shall be guarantees of the character I have mentioned, and if he will not move them, perhaps somebody else will; perhaps some gentleman representing the North-West or Manitoba will take upon himself the responsibility of seeking to engraft a section, such as I have suggested, upon this obligation. No matter what terms we imposed in granting the charter, we are now granting something of a very much more substantial character. I would like to know whether the Minister of Interior proposes to take any steps in this direction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not.

On section 2,

Mr. DEWDNEY. There was a controversy between the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the hon member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in reference to the land grant, in which it was stated that there was no provision made by which a-third of the land grant could be retained to guarantee the settlement of any arrears which may occur at theend of the 20 years. Consequently, I propose this amendment:

In contracting with the company for the aid given in accordance with the first section of the Act, the Governor in Council shall take from the company an obligation for the transport of mails, supplies and materials for 20 years on the company's line between Winnipeg and its terminus on the Saskatchewan River, in consideration of the said aid, and the Governor in Council shall stipulate that in case land so earned by the company by the transport, as aforesaid, shall not amount to the sum to be paid by the Government, the deficiency is to form a lien on the line for one-third of the land grant which may be earned by the company on the line between the end of the 40 miles of said railway as now constructed and the Sasktchewan River.

Bill reported.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, the 23rd of June, be read the second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). When the House adjourned on Friday evening we had just listened to a very interesting speech from the hon. member for Queen's, N. B. (Mr. King). That hon. gentleman, I may say at the outset, in discussing the questions to which he directed our attention, dealt with them in a very fair and practical manner. I am glad to know that that hon. gentleman is a practical business man, and a successful business man, and, as I would naturally expect, he discussed these question which relate to trade matters in the Province of New Brunswick in a practical and business-like manner. The hon. gentleman told us at the outset of his remarks that he did not intend to deal generally with the subject referred to in the resolutions we are considering, but that he intended

to devote his attention exclusively to matters in which the Province of New Brunswick was particularly concerned. I may say that the hon. gentleman redeemed his promise, and I would desire to commend the very wise discretion which that hon. gentleman used in the selection of the questions to which he directed our attention. The object of the hon. gentleman's speech appeared to be to impress on the House the views, first, that reciprocity with the United States was desirable for New Brunswick, and second, that the National Policy had been a serious injury to that province. The hon. gentleman, I say, very judiciously selected those few among the branches of trade in New Brunswick which gave some colour to the views he endeavoured to give to the House, and he very judiciously avoided making any reference whatever to the great variety of subjects which would entirely have upset his theories and proved that his conclusions were entirely erroneous. The hon. gentleman devoted a great deal of attention to the lumber trade of New Brunswick, to the export trade in lime, to the trade in freestone and granite. He gave the House a number of valuable statistics regarding these various industries, and the object he seemed to have in view, from the statistics he presented to the House and the arguments he based upon them, was to show that it would be of advantage to the Province of New Brunswick if we had reciprocity with the United States and had free admission of those articles to the American markets. Well, I may say at the outset, that so far as that portion of the hon. gentleman's speech was concerned I am not disposed to disagree with him. I am not aware that anyone on this side of the House has ever disputed this proposition. I believe, on the contrary, it has always been the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party to obtain a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States, that we have always advocated reciprocity with the United States in natural products. The articles to which the hon. gentleman referred are all natural products of the Province of New Brunswick. They have been included in every proposition for reciprocity that has ever been made, so far as I am aware. In all negotiations that have taken place these very articles have stood at the head of the list. The hon. gentleman himself frankly admitted that this was the policy advocated by the candidates in the interests of the Government in the late elections, and he frankly admitted also that he was fully in accord with the Government in this part of their policy. He told us that the only difference between himself and the supporters of the Government was that we thought we could get reciprocity and he did not believe we could. I do not know why the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion that we cannot get reciprocity. I, for my part, have not reached that conclusion. The hon. gentleman may, of course, be correct. I cannot say positively that we will get reciprocity: but I will say this, that in my opinion we have a better prospect of obtaining reciprocity on fair terms at the present time than we have ever had before since this question was discussed. It is the first time since 1866, when the old reciprocity treaty was terminated, we have had an invitation from the United States to go there and discuss this question. It is the first time the Government of the United States have expressed any willingness to discuss with us the terms of a treaty for reciprocal trade between the two countries. The hon. gentleman goes further. He tells us, in relation to the negotiations which are going on, that he hopes hon. gentlemen opposite may succeed in their efforts, and "I am here to-night," he says "to admit that if hon. gentlemen can secure from the United States reciprocity in natural products I, for one, will be willing and anxious to accept it." It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman on this question is perfectly in accord with the Government of the day. The only inconsistency I discover in the hon. gentleman's position is the position he occupies in this House. I think he should on this question be giving the Government a cordial and generous support. The hon. gentleman tells, and tells us frankly, that he desires the negotiations in October next to succeed: and yet by his conduct in this House he is doing all he can to prevent that success. He tells us he will be satisfied if the negotiations are brought to a successful conclusion, and yet he is doing all he can to defeat the Government and prevent those negotiations coming to a successful termination. There was another matter to which the hon. gentleman referred, and which I desire briefly to notice. He referred to the present position of the Grand Lake coal mines, and the hon. gentleman told us that the coal at those mines could be produced for $1 per ton. He told us that if the 75 cents duty, which was the duty imposed at the present time in the United States, were removed, this coal could be taken in considerable quantities and sold in Bangor, Maine, and no doubt other cities in the State of Maine. Knowing the hon. gentleman to be a shrewd, practical business man, I can hardly give him credit for seriousness when he submitted that statement to the House. The hon. gentleman knows he has already a better market than Bangor, Maine, or any other city in the United States can give him, for all the coal they can produce at the Grand Lake mines. The city of St. John is not more than half the distance from the Grand Lake mine that Bangor is. He has communication with St. John, not only by rail, but cheap communication by water, and yet those mines are not worked to any great extent: and St. John, which requires coal both for its factories, railways and steamboats, and for domestic purposes, and for forge purposes as well, for which the hon. gentleman says this coal is specially adapted, is supplied altogether by mines at a much greater distance than this one—from the Spring Hill mines, Pictou mines, and mines on the Island of Cape Breton. If I am correctly informed, a company was organized not many years ago for the purpose of developing these mines. I am informed they spent a great deal of money in that district, but for some reason or other the project was abandoned. The hon. gentleman probably knows better than I do why that company abandoned the proposal to develop these mines—whether it was because the seams were so thin that the coal could not be produced in sufficient quantities to make it pay, or whether it was due to the quality of the coal, I am not prepared to say: but this, at all events, is evident to any intelligent man, that the same reason which prevented the Grand Lake coal being sold in the market of St. John and other markets in New Brunswick to-day, where there is a large demand for it, would prevent it being sold in Bangor or any other American city, even if the duties were removed. I do not think, as I said at

first, that the hon. gentleman could, with these facts before him, seriously present this argument to the House as an argument in favour of reciprocity with the United States. Let me say a few words with respect to the effect of the National Policy upon the Province of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman says he opposed the National Policy twelve years ago ; he has opposed it since, and I believe he says that he is more opposed to it to-day than he ever has been. The hon. gentleman further volunteered the statement that he did not think any one of the thirteen members from New Brunswick who were supporting the Government in this House would venture to rise in their places and express the opinion that the National Policy had been beneficial to New Brunswick. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may be very much surprised, but I wish to inform him that I, for one, have risen in my place, and one of my objects in addressing the House is to assure him, and to assure the House, and to assure the country, that I, for one, am prepared to say that I believe the National Policy has been a benefit to the Province of New Brunswick, as well as to all the other provinces of the Dominion. I further say that I believe every one of these thirteen members who represent constituencies in New Brunswick and who support the Government in this House will endorse the statement which I have just made. The hon. gentleman, in order to impress upon the House the view he takes on this question, selected those industries which he conceived would best support his theory. In addition to this, he endeavoured to leave the impression upon the House that in some way or other—although he did not, I confess, make it very clear to my mind just how—but that, in some way or other, the National Policy prevented the free admission of the articles to which I have referred into the United States' market. How the hon. gentleman can establish that is something that I have not yet been able to comprehend. Every person in this House knows that the duties upon lumber, the duties upon lime, and the duties upon stone, were imposed by the Congress of the United States at the termination of the old reciprocity treaty, and have been in existence ever since, with, I believe, but very little change. The National Policy was not introduced here until 1879, and I cannot see how the National Policy is in any way responsible for the imposition of the United States duties to which I have referred. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss this matter a little further with the hon. gentleman. I claim that, taking the very industries, the very trades to which he referred, he did not succeed in one single case in showing from the present condition of any one of these branches of trade that the National Policy had been an injury to New Brunswick. I will ask the indulgence of the House while I take up these very branches of trade which the hon. gentleman selected from all the industries in the Province of New Brunswick, to best support his theory ; and I trust I shall be able to show to the House that even in these branches of trade the National Policy has not only been no injury to the Province of New Brunswick, but that it has been a material benefit in many respects, even in those branches of trade. I will first ask the House to consider the condition of the export trade in lime to the United States. I can hardly see, and I think this House will not be able to see, how it is possible that the National Policy could have injured the export trade in lime to the United States. I have only to remind the House that our export trade in lime has been brought into existence, and has enjoyed all the prosperity which the hon. gentleman claims it has enjoyed during the last few years, under the National Policy. If any member of this House chooses to go back to the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1878 he will find that in that year—the year preceding the introduction of the National Policy—we not only had no export trade in lime to the United States, but, on the contrary, we actually imported lime from the United States into the Dominion of Canada ; and perhaps the House will be surprised to learn that in 1878 we imported, even into the Province of New Brunswick, over 10,000 barrels of lime from the United States. The National Policy was introduced in 1879, the duty on lime was somewhat increased, and the effect has been, not only to shut out the imports of lime from the United States, but the industry in St. John has greatly increased since that time. The manufacturers of lime in St. John have been able to gain possession of the home markets under the National Policy, and they have greatly extended their operations, and greatly increased their exports to the United States, until last year, as the hon. gentleman said, the exports of lime, after supplying all the home demand, amounted to the value of $140,000. With these facts before us, I think the intelligence of this House will admit that, at all events, the condition of this industry does not furnish the least shadow of proof that the National Policy has been an injury to New Brunswick. With regard to the granite trade—I am not so familiar with it as the hon. gentleman is—from all the statistics I have been able to obtain I believe that the statement I have made in regard to the export trade in lime applies in a very large degree to the granite trade. I desire further to ask the attention of the House to the effect of the National Policy upon the lumber trade in New Brunswick. The duties upon lumber were, as I have already observed, imposed long before the National Policy was thought of, and they have not materially changed since then. The National Policy has not affected in the slightest degree the export trade of lumber to the United States, but it has in other ways benefited that trade in the Province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), when he addressed the House a few days ago, pointed to the fact that in years gone by we imported large quantities of furniture from the United States; he pointed to the fact that after the National Policy was introduced these imports of furniture ceased, that furniture factories were started in the Province of New Brunswick, and that the demand for our native woods was in that way greatly increased. I may say that the effect of the National Policy has not only been to establish a number of manufacturing industries which use the native woods of the Province of New Brunswick as raw material, but that there is scarcely an industry in the whole Maritime Provinces, there is scarcely an industry in the whole Dominion, which has been established under the National Policy—and there are many of them—which do not to a greater or less extent require, directly or indirectly, to use the lumber which is produced in the provinces of this Dominion.

So that while the National Policy has not in the least affected the export trade to the United States either for better or worse, it has vastly improved the condition of the lumber trade, by greatly increasing the demand for our lumber at home. Let me next ask the House to consider the condition of the trade in stone, to which the hon. gentleman also referred. Every person who knows anything of that trade knows that before the introduction of the National Policy the duties which were imposed upon stone in the United States had practically closed our stone quarries in the Province of New Brunswick. I was surprised myself when I turned to the Trade and Navigation Returns, after listening to the hon. gentleman's speech, to find that in the year 1878 we were not even supplying our own wants. I find that in 1878 we actually imported from the United States into Canada nearly 40,000 tons of stone, and to my great surprise, in the Province of New Brunswick, where stone is so abundant in every section of the province, we actually imported, in 1878, 4,600 tons of American stone. At that time we had no duty on imported stone. The National Policy was introduced in 1879, and duties were then imposed. The present Government said to the people of the United States: we are willing to trade with you in stone, and if you admit our stone into your markets free we will admit yours into our markets free; but if you refuse this offer, and shut us out of your markets, we will do the same: we will at least give to our manufacturers the advantage of their own market. And what has been the result? Not only have the imports of stone been entirely stopped, but the quarries which for years were closed have been in almost every case opened, and are to-day being profitably and successfully worked, and are supplying the demand which exists in the Maritime Provinces. And let me here say that the effect of the National Policy has been to build up in every section of the Maritime Provinces large, important, flourishing and prosperous manufacturing towns, and in this way to create a large home demand for building stone. But I am glad to find that the quarries are doing even more than supplying the demand in the Maritime Provinces. I need only remind the House that we have here in the city of Ottawa, on Wellington street, a beautiful public building, the stone for which was quarried on the banks of the Miramichi, in the Province of New Brunswick; and I may tell the House that we have in the County of Westmoreland, within five miles of my own home, a stone quarry which has been opened and successfully worked during the last few years, which is prospering to-day, and which not only finds a large demand for all the stone it produces in the cities and towns of New Brunswick, but also shipped last year 1,900 tons of stone to the city of Toronto, and is shipping this year double that amount. By a telegram which I have just received I am informed that this year the shipments to Toronto and other cities in the west will reach 4,000 tons. I may say further, for the information of the House, that I have in my possession letters from stone manufacturers in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, leading men in that industry, who are asking, not that duties shall be reduced, but that they may be increased, so as to give them still greater control of the markets of the west. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with every branch of trade and industry to which that hon. gentleman referred in order to support the position he took in this House; and I trust that I have made it plain to the House that not only has the hon. gentleman failed to prove that the National Policy has injured these industries in the Province of New Brunswick, but I have shown, from the very illustrations which he himself brought to our notice, that the National Policy has, even so far as they are concerned, been of great benefit, both directly and indirectly, to the Province of New Brunswick. But, Sir, I might refer in addition to a number of industries which have grown up under the National Policy as illustrations of the great benefits which have resulted from the adoption of that policy. The hon. gentleman himself referred to the cotton mill on the bank of the Nashwauk River. I may say in regard to the owner of that mill, Mr. Alexander Gibson, that there is no more practical, successful or broad-minded business man in the Province of New Brunswick. That gentleman is successfuly carrying on the manufacture of cotton in the large mill which he has built. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) stated that Mr. Gibson did not fear competition with the United States. I believe that gentleman possesses unusual facilities for carrying on his business. He may or may not be able to compete successfuly in the United States; I am not in a position to decide that point; but I do know that that gentleman, who has a practical knowledge of business affairs, and is as good a judge as we can find in New Brunswick as to what would be most advantageous to that province, is an advocate of the National Policy, believes in its principles, and is a supporter of my hon. friend who represents the constituency in which he lives. I might also refer not only to the cotton factories and the sugar refineries which have been established in the Maritime Provinces as a direct result of the adoption of the National Policy, but I might include as well the rolling mills, the nail factories, the carriage factories, the furniture factories, and numberless other industries, which are prosperous to-day in that province as a result of the policy of the present Administration. I might also direct the attention of the House to the fact that we have a number of manufacturing towns in the Maritime Provinces. I might point to Moncton, to Amherst, to Truro, to Windsor, to Pictou, to New Glasgow, and to a number of other thriving manufacturing towns which owe their prosperity to-day to the adoption of that policy—towns which, since its adoption, have doubled their population, and more than doubled and trebled their wealth. I might also point to the enormous increase in the output of our coal mines. I believe that, with the exception of the Grand Lake mines to which the hon. gentleman referred, there is scarcely a coal mine in the Maritime Provinces which is not in a prosperous condition to-day. I might also remind the House that the trade of the city of St. John has increased within the last ten years at least 25 per cent., and is to-day greater than the trade of every other seaport on the Atlantic coast between New York and Eastport, with the exception of the city of Boston. I might also remind the hon. gentleman that the inter-provincial trade between the east and the west, in which the Province of New Brunswick has a large share, has doubled, and in many instances

trebled, since the adoption of the National Policy. I can point to all these as clear and conclusive proofs of the enormous advantages which have resulted to the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia through the adoption of the policy of the present Administration. I am willing to admit, and I regret to have to make the admission, that in one respect, perhaps, the Province of New Brunswick is not as prosperous as we might desire it to be. It is a fact, as everyone knows, that the ship-building trade, which was once the principal industry of that province, has declined. We know that steel and iron have taken the place of wood. We know that the steamships of to-day have taken the place of the old sailing ships, and that the ship-building industry has declined in consequence, and we cannot hope for its revival. We know, too, that the lumber trade of New Brunswick has been one of the most important, perhaps the most important, industry in that province for many years; but we must admit, if we look honestly at the condition of that trade, that it is not a growing trade at the present and it cannot be in the future. The forests of the country are being cut down and the operations of our lumbermen are becoming every year more and more circumscribed, and that industry, though it must, for many years to come, retain a very important place among the industries of New Brunswick, can never again have the importance it had in days gone by; it never can become a great and growing industry: it never can furnish employment for the increased capital and the increase in population of the country. We must look to other sources for our prosperity in the future. It is the industries which have been established in the Province of New Brunswick as a result of the National Policy, it is the growing foreign trade of the country, it is the great inter-provincial trade that is being developed, which are the chief sources of the prosperity we enjoy in that province at present, and to which we must look for our growth and prosperity in the years to come. The hon. gentleman made some references to the speech which was delivered by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). He referred, among other things, to the fact that some of our population had left the country and made their homes in the city of Boston. He told us that 70,000 or 75,000 Canadians could be found in the city of Boston at present. He reminded the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that many who were born in the County of Albert would be found at present residing in the city of Boston; but the hon. gentleman did not tell us why those people had gone from Albert to make their homes in the city of Boston. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. It was because they desired a change of employment. Every person knows that young men brought up on a farm become, many of them, dissatisfied with farm labour, and determine to engage in manufacturing or commercial pursuits. Those young men who, in days gone by, desired a change of employment, were obliged to go to Boston and to the manufacturing cities of the New England States to obtain the change of employment they sought. The National Policy has for one of its objects the correction of that evil. If that hon. gentleman could have told us that the farmers of the County of Albert had gone to the New England States to improve their condition in farming there might be some force in his argument; but he may search the New England States through, from one end to the other, and he will not find half a dozen farmers there who have gone from New Brunswick to improve their condition by farming. On the contrary, those who go there and work in factories or engage in commercial pursuits, when they desire a change of employment and to return to farming, invariably return to their native homes in the Maritime Provinces. The National Policy has for one of its objects the prevention of this evil, and to a large extent it has been successful. The hon. gentleman may go to the manufacturing towns in Canada to which I have already referred, and he will find scores and hundreds of people employed there, who, if it had not been for the industries established under the National Policy, would have been obliged to go, as those to whom he referred were obliged to go, to the New England States to obtain the change of employment they desired. The hon. gentlemen made some other references, which were not so fortunate as those portions of his speech in which he dealt with the business matters in which he is so well versed. The hon. gentleman referred to the member who formerly represented the city of St. John, in this House. We all remember Mr. Weldon, to whom he referred, whose genial face we have been accustomed to gaze upon across this House for so many years, and we regret to think he is absent at present. The hon. gentleman, when he reminded us of that fact, gave the very best answer that could possibly have been given to his whole speech. Why is it that that hon. gentleman, who represented the city of St. John in this House for so many years, is absent to-day? He knows that the city of St. John is the centre of the export trade in lime to the United States. He knows it is the one place of all others in New Brunswick which is most deeply interested in the export of lumber to the United States; and if the theory of my hon. friend is correct, why was the gentleman who represented the city of St. John in this House three years ago buried in the last election under a majority of something like 1,000 adverse votes. In 1887 we had three representatives of New Brunswick in this House supporting the Liberal party of the day, and but one of them is here now. That is my hon. friend who usually sits in front of me (Mr. Skinner), and he is here simple because, when that absurd and impracticable policy of unrestricted reciprocity was proposed in 1888, he had the wisdom and the courage to refuse to accept it, and to sever his relations with hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no argument which so completely answers the theories set up by my hon. friend as the fact that we miss the old familiar faces we have gazed on for so many years. I see before me to-day but two remaining, and I am not so very sure we will have them very long. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) himself holds his seat to-day by a majority of something less than fifty votes; and with regard to my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), with whom we know we would not like to part, for there is no gentleman on that side for whom we have greater regard than my venerable friend, even that hon. gentleman, if I am correctly informed, esteemed and respected as he is throughout the county from which he comes, holds his seat in the present Parliament on a promise given his constituents that he will never run again.

Mr. GILLMOR. I made no such promise, and you will find me ready to run when the occasion presents itself.

Mr. FOSTER. Which way?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I will apologise to the hon. gentleman if I have not been correctly informed. I had the information that he made that announcement on the hustings. However, if he succeeds in getting back here I am sure no gentleman on that side of the House will be more welcome. I have only one point further to refer to in connection with the hon. member's speech, and that I think was by far the most important allusion which that hon. gentleman made. He referred to the patriotic speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the city of Boston. I have noticed that hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House from the other side have carefully and studiously avoided, as a general rule, any reference to that speech. The hon. member for North Norfolk, in replying to the attack made by the hon. member for Albert, offered the very best apology he could, but my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B., has been the first man so bold as to venture to endorse that speech. The hon. gentleman tells us that he has read the speech three times, has read it from beginning to end—that he only regretted that time did not permit him to read it in this House. No doubt the House would be glad to hear that speech, but the hon. gentleman can have it printed and circulated throughout the country. I will give the hon. gentleman another suggestion. He may perhaps have read the whole proceedings at that meeting, he may have read the speech delivered by Governor Bullock on that occasion, when he said that the object the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was advocating could best be accomplished by making that hon. gentleman a Senator for the State of Ontario. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should incorporate Governor Bullock's speech in his pamphlet. There was another speech delivered on that occasion to which I would also invite the hon. gentleman's attention, as it may have escaped him. That is the speech delivered by the chairman of that meeting. The chairman said:

"Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley in Nova Scotia, Davies in Prince Edward Island, Mercier and Laurier in Quebec, Cartwright in Ontario, look to us; the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer."

I desire, as one of the representatives of New Brunswick in this House, to congratulate that humble little province on the fact that there is not the name of any public man from that province mentioned in the company of patriots who are described in that speech, and I venture to hope that my hon. friend from Queen's, N. B. (Mr. King), who I believe to be a loyal and patriotic man, will join me in that congratulation. I have but one other suggestion to offer to my hon. friend. While he is circulating the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I would call his attention to the remarkable letter which that hon. gentleman addressed to his constituents after the late general election. In order that my hon. friend may not mistake the one I mean, I will read a portion of it:

"Our opponents' array, on the other hand, is mostly, literally, a thing of shreds and patches, made up of ragged remnants from half a dozen varied provinces, the great majority of whom do not even pretend to be actuated by any principle save that of securing a good slice of booty for themselves and the sections or constituencies they respectively represent, and who know besides that popular feeling in those very provinces is strongly and distinctly in favour of our policy, though actual cash in hand or in the shape of railway subsidies has proved too much for the virtue of a majority of the voting population in many instances."

I would suggest to my hon. friend, if he desires that these speeches should be read, that he should have them printed in pamphlet form and circulated broadcast throughout the whole Dominion. I do not wish to belittle the services of my hon. friend in this House or in the country, but I think, if he will do that, it will be the most important service he has ever rendered to this country, and the crowning act of his political career. Now, having said that much in regard to the speech of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King), I desire to make some reference to the Budget speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which is now under consideration. And first, let me ask the indulgence of the House for a short time if I make a brief reference to the sugar question. This was one of the prominent features—indeed, the most prominent feature—in the Budget speech of the present session. This question has received more or less attention from nearly every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House in this debate. At the outset I desire to correct an error which my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and myself also, fell into the other evening. That hon. gentleman, whom I am sorry not to see now in his place, was endeavouring to show that the protection to the sugar refiners under the present tariff was greater than the protection they enjoyed under the former tariff. To do this the hon. gentleman, while he admitted that, under the former tariff, the refiners had a protection of 1 cent a pound and that under the present tariff they had only a protection of $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per pound, contended that, if we took the *ad valorem* duty, the protection was increased, and he took the duty-paid price in New York at 6 cents, and made out that the *ad valorem* duty under the old tariff was $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., while it amounted to 20 per cent. under the present tariff. I ventured at the time to suggest to him that he should take the price of sugar in bond in the United States. I inadvertently said that that was the price upon which the duty would be charged when the sugar was imported. In that I was wrong, for I had at the time forgotten the change in the law; but I was correct in saying that he should take the bond price in the United States in order to calculate the *ad valorem* protection which our refiners had to pay at that time. If he were here, I believe he would admit that my contention is right. If a dealer in Canada was purchasing sugar under the former tariff he would not pay 6 cents a lb. but 4 cents, the bonded price. In Canada the duty would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents specific and 35 per cent. on the duty-paid price in New York. If the hon. gentleman had made that calculation he would have found that the *ad valorem* protection, instead of being $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., amounted to from 40 to 50 per cent. I see that the hon. gentleman has now come in, and I will, therefore, add this. The hon. gentleman was wrong in going to New York to prove the theory he was advancing. Under the old tariff no

sugar dealer would go to New York to purchase granulated sugar, because, if he did, he would have to pay the duty in Canada upon the duty-paid price in New York. The Canadian dealer would go to Glasgow or London, where there was no duty upon the sugar. They would purchase at a price equal to the bond price in New York, and the specific duty would be the same, and the *ad valorem* duty would be estimated upon 4 cents, instead of upon 6 cents, if it came from New York. If the hon. gentleman had calculated his *ad valorem* protection on that basis he would have found that the protection under the old tariff was 25 per cent., or about that, whereas now it is, as he says, 20 per cent. It might, I think, have naturally been expected that when the Government of the day were able to reduce the expenditure of the country and to reduce the taxation which the people were paying by so large an amount as $3,000,000 or $3,500,000 annually the proposition would have merited the unqualified support of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. We were, however, disappointed in our expectations in this regard. Hon. gentlemen are not satisfied with the reduction in taxation. They demand that the Government should go further, and remove the protection which enables the sugar consumed in the country to be refined in our refineries. The hon. gentlemen use the same arguments which they used when the National Policy was first introduced. They told us that the effect of this protective policy was to make a few people millionaires at the expense of the consumers of sugar in the country. Hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House upon this subject have merely satisfied themselves with the bald statement of that proposition. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), it is true, went into a calculation in order to support that theory. In this calculation, however, the hon. gentleman fell into a more serious error than he did in the other calculation to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman told us that he had taken the price of sugar during the last six months of 1889 and the first six months of 1890 from the *Journal of Commerce*; that he had taken the price of granulated sugar and he had taken the price of yellow sugar; he had assumed that we used half of each; he had added the two together and divided by two, and the average price of the sugar which the refiners received, he found, was $6.64 per hundred. He made the average cost of the raw sugar, duty-paid, $4.40 per 100 lbs. In that he was correct, but in the other calculation he made these two serious errors: In the first place, he was wrong in assuming that we used half granulated and half yellow in the Dominion of Canada. I can tell him on the authority of the refiners of the Dominion, on the authority of the sugar dealers of the Dominion, and on the authority of the *Journal of Commerce* itself, if he will refer to the *Journal of Commerce* of the 3rd of July last, where he will find it stated that the relative proportions of sugar used in the past have been two barrels of yellow to one barrel of granulated. That is one of the errors which the hon. gentleman made. The other was apparently merely an error in calculation, and he will see it when I point it out to him. He told us that he found the lowest average price of granulated to be 6$\frac{5}{8}$ cents per pound, but he made the average price of granulated and yellow together $6.64 per 100 lbs., or 1$\frac{1}{2}$ cents more than the price of granulated. This is evidently a mere error in calculation, for the hon. gentleman sees that the average price of the two could not be higher than the price of the highest—the granulated sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is my hon. friend who is mistaken, not I—I think so.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Well, I cannot see where I am mistaken; perhaps the hon. gentleman may afterwards point it out. The hon. gentleman, in that calculation, however, made the difference between the cost of raw sugar, duty-paid, in the Dominion of Canada, and the price which the refiners receive, $2.24 per 100 lbs., or something over four millions on the consumption of the country. Now, if the hon. gentleman will correct the two errors to which I have referred he will find that the amount will be reduced by just about one-half: he would have something like two million dollars, which would be about 1 cent per pound upon the sugar consumed in the country. Moreover, the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford, although he did not go into the calculation, bear out my statement. He made the difference just about the same, $2,000,000, or 1 cent a pound upon the sugar consumed in the country. Now, taking that to be a correct calculation, in order to find out the profits of the refiners we have first to take from that the freight upon the sugar. Hon. gentlemen spoke of this as an unimportant item. Let me tell the House that a large portion of our sugar comes from Germany, and that the freight varied from 10s. to 15s. per ton; that a still larger portion comes from South America, and the freight upon that varies from 17s. 6d. to 22s. 6d. per ton; something over 10 per cent. of our sugar comes from the East Indies, upon which the freight is as high as $6 to $8 per ton. If hon. gentlemen choose to go into that calculation they will find that the freight charges for the sugar used in Canada, from the port of shipment till it reaches our refineries, are something over a quarter of a cent a pound. That is by no means an insignificant item in this calculation. Then we have to add to that the other costs of importation; we have to add the insurance on the voyage, we have to add the insurance during the process of refining, we have to add the insurance while the sugar remains in the warehouse until it is delivered to the consumers in the country. We have also to account for the loss in weight from drainage, and every hon. gentleman knows that upon the low grades of sugar this is a very important item. We have to take into account the cost of the packages which contain the sugar, and all the expenses of refining, and if any man will add those together, and take them from that 1 cent a pound, they will see that the margin of profit which the refiner enjoys is a very small one upon the large amount of capital invested in these industries. Then there is another and a complete answer to the arguments of the hon. gentleman upon this point, and that is the experience of the past. If their arguments have any force they must have had more force under the old protective tariff than they will have in the future; because, as I have already shown, the protection to the refiners has been reduced from 1 cent to $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent upon high grades, and upon grades under No. 14 Dutch

standard it has been taken away altogether. But what are the facts? Sugar refineries have been established for several years. Have they been the means of making millionaires at the expense of the consumers of the country? Every person who is acquainted with that business knows that during that time no excessive dividends have been declared, that the stocks of the refineries have, on a number of occasions, been placed upon the market and have seldom sold above par; they have, in the great majority of cases, sold below par, and in two cases at least in the Maritime Provinces the original capital invested has been entirely lost, and the business has passed into other hands.

Mr. GILLMOR. The National Policy has done harm all around, then.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). No; not at all. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that because one refinery fails and another refinery under the same conditions succeeds is not a proof that the National Policy is responsible for the one that fails. The responsibility lies in the difference of the business management, and it is there alone. Let me call the attention of the House to another fact. The gentlemen who invest their money in these industries are, as a general rule, men of wealth; these industries are managed by gentlemen of more than ordinary business ability. They devote to that business their whole time, they bring energy and business ability to these industries, which would achieve success in any business in this country. And yet with all these circumstances in their favour the facts are that no large dividends have been declared, and that the gentlemen engaged in this business have not made any excessive profits; and any fair-minded man, who will consider the facts which I have stated and the condition of the business in the past and at the present time, must admit that the statements which are made in this House and made throughout this country, that a few persons are becoming millionaires at the cost of the consumers of sugar in this country are utterly false and unfounded. The article of sugar perhaps illustrates more clearly than any other article in our commerce the difference between the policies of the two political parties in this country. I know of no article to which I can refer which more clearly exhibits the contrast between the policies which govern the two parties. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been to have the sugar used in this country refined in New York, London or Glasgow—to give the profits of refining, the profits of merchants, the profits of railway companies, the profits of handling, and the profits of manufacturing to a foreign people; and while they gave to the people of our own country none of these indirect advantages, they placed a direct tax on our consumers of $2.37 per 100 lbs. for every pound of sugar purchased by the consumer. Under the policy of the present Administration that condition of things has entirely changed. We have the benefit of the import trade, which brings to our seaports many thousands of tons of shipping annually; we have created a demand for 800,000 barrels annually, all of which are manufactured in our own country and from our own lumber; we give to our own railways the carrying traffic; we give the handling of this great traffic to our own people; we give to the people of Canada all the indirect advantages, and they are very important, which result from this great industry, and at the same time we reduced the absolute taxation which the people of the country pay from $2.37 per 100 lbs. to $1.63 per 100 lbs. in 1890, and in 1891 we have removed it altogether. I say that is a record of which any Government may feel proud. It is a record on which we may safely challenge adverse criticism, and it is a record on which we may safely appeal either to this House or to the country for approval and for support. I desire to ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I refer to the resolution which we are considering. That resolution consists of two parts. The first portion says that "the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers." I for one am not disposed to find very serious fault with that portion of the hon. gentleman's resolution. I think the Government, and the Conservative party in this House, may feel generally satisfied with the tone of this debate. The presentation which the Minister of Finance was able to make to the House should be satisfactory to every hon. member, and I for one experienced unusual satisfaction in listening to the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have had the honour of a seat in this House for nine years. I have had the privilege of listening to that hon. gentleman during nine sessions criticizing the Budget speech and delivering his opinions upon the financial condition of the country. I have always listened to him attentively, and many of his speeches have made a deep impression on my mind. I have always regarded him as a man of great ability, and I have always admired the skill with which he discussed financial questions. During the earlier sessions I had the honour to have a seat in this House I was in some cases particularly impressed with the hon. gentleman's remarks. I can recollect to-night the speech he delivered in 1885. It was, in my opinion, one of the most forcible speeches he ever delivered in this House. I remember very well in what language he described the enormous debt, the very large expenditure which had been made, the enormous taxation the people were called upon to bear, and the very great alarm he expressed at our prospects for the future. The opening words of the speech and the closing remarks made a deep impression on my mind, and I have never forgotten them. The hon. gentleman said that "this country had lost more in six years from evil government, relative to population and its resources, than the people of the United States did in the four years of dreadful civil war which immediately preceded the formation of our Confederation." I admit that I felt then, and I remember my feelings well to-day, that I really trembled when I heard the hon. gentleman deliberately make that statement; for I felt, in view of his large experience and great ability, we might then be standing on the very verge of ruin. But six years have passed since then, and when I listened to the hon. gentleman on this occasion I could not but contrast his tone with the tone of that speech delivered six years ago. The hon. gentleman does not usually speak in very flattering terms of the policy of the present Administration or of any suggestion that comes from the Minister of Finance, and I for one felt exceedingly gratified when

that hon. gentleman commended the action of the Government in reducing expenditure and in reducing taxation by the removal of the sugar duties; and he even went so far as to offer his assistance and co-operation in our efforts at reform in this direction. As the hon. gentleman proceeded, before he reached the close of his address, on that occasion, he said: "If, unhappily, the present harvest should prove inadequate, we would be within a measurable distance of a great financial crisis." I confess, when he made that statement I experienced a feeling of relief. I did not see any prospect of a failure of the harvest, and felt we could not be in any immediate danger. And, when reflecting upon it afterwards, and recalling the fact that, if after six years of Conservative Government in 1885 we had sunk so low that we were in a worse condition than the United States at the close of the civil war, that we were on the very verge of ruin, and if, after six years more, we had so far recovered our position, we had so far regained what we had lost, that, unless we had a failure of the harvest, we were not even within measurable distance of a financial crisis, I thought, according to the hon. gentleman's own estimate, we had at last reached a position of safety; and, Mr. Speaker, that statement did inspire me with hope for the future. I believe that we can look forward to six more years of Conservative rule, and if we can advance in the future as we have, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, advanced in the last six years, we will reach a position where our prosperity will stand upon so solid a foundation that not even a bad harvest or any other ordinary calamity can seriously affect us. Now, with regard to the first portion of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as I said, I, for one, do not feel disposed to find very much fault with it. The present Government have never had as a part of their policy the imposition of high taxation upon articles of prime necessity, or upon articles which our artizans, and miners, and fishermen, and farmers usually consume; on the contrary, their policy has been just the reverse. Their policy has been to reduce that class of duties, and it was in pursuance of that policy that years ago they removed the duties from tea and coffee; and that policy has its consummation this year in the removal of the sugar duties. Let me ask the attention of the House, and I will do it very briefly, to the sources from which our revenue is derived. Our taxation consists of Customs and Excise duties. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year that the revenue from these sources amounted to $31,500,000; of that sum $10,500,000 was derived from liquor and tobacco; $4,000,000 more was derived from taxes on articles which may fairly be classed as luxuries; and about $4,000,000 more was derived from a class of articles which, if they cannot be considered as luxuries, cannot, at all events, be said to be articles of prime necessity or articles which are commonly used by people of this country. We have remaining $13,000,000, and in this $13,000,000 are included duties upon provisions and breadstuffs, duties collected on cotton, woollen and hardware manufactures, and a variety of others, including the duties upon sugar and molasses. By the action of the Government this session $3,000,000 of that $13,000,000 is swept away by the removal of the sugar duties, and any gentleman who examines the returns will find that we can make another large reduction on the $10,000,000 remaining by taking out this expensive class of woollen and cotton goods, and some classes of hardware, and a good many articles included under the head of provisions, which are consumed exclusively by the wealthier classes of the people, and are not in general use among the class of the people described in the resolution of the member for South-Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And, Sir, if my calculation is correct, half of even that $10,000,000 would be taken away by eliminating the articles to which I refer, and that would leave about $5,000,000 of a revenue which is raised upon articles of prime necessity, and upon articles which our artizans, and miners, and fishermen, and farmers ordinarily consume. Hon. gentlemen will observe that this is about $1 per head of our population. They may say that I have made too low an estimate; it is possible that I have, but I have made it as near as I could to the correct estimate. Let us suppose that this is a $1.25 or even $1.50 taxation per head of our population, and I do not think there is any fair-minded man in this House who will say that this is an excessive amount of taxation for even the poorest classes in this country to pay. I will remind the House that there is an offset even to that, for it must be remembered that from our Dominion treasury we pay back to the treasuries of the different provinces 80 cents per head of their population, to be used in keeping up their roads and bridges, maintaining their schools, and for other local purposes; so that anyone who will go into a fair examination of the sources of our revenue at the present time will find that the classes of people referred to in this resolution, our artizans, miners, fishermen, and farmers, contribute a mere insignificant fraction upon articles of prime necessity and common use to the revenues of this country, and that the poorer classes of the people contribute almost nothing to the interest on our public debt, to the cost of maintaining our Federal Government, or to the construction of our public works. I, therefore, do not object very much to the policy proposed in the first part of the resolution of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because I say it is the very policy which this Government have been pursuing for the last twelve years. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), if he wished to introduce that policy, might have introduced it fifteen years ago. He might have introduced it in 1876-77 or 1878 with very great advantage to the country, but in these years the hon. gentleman had a different policy. The state of the country was such, to use his own words, that it was necessary then to increase the duties on tea, and coffee and sugar, upon woollen manufactures, and cotton manufactures, and hardware manufactures, and upon every article you could name which our artizans, our miners, our fishermen, and our farmers commonly use in this Dominion. It is gratifying to know that the hon. gentleman is able at this late day to come to the conclusion that the circumstances of the country at last justify a change of policy. It is gratifying to know that after twelve years of experience the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has at last arrived at the conclusion that the policy which this present Government have been pursuing for the last twelve years is the correct

policy to be adopted for the future in this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish before I close to ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's resolution. This deals with our trade relations with the United States, and it is, I suppose, the most important question, the most live issue, which we have to discuss at the present time. As my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) pointed out the other day, this portion of the resolution is rather indefinite in its character. It may mean the unrestricted reciprocity which the hon. member for South Oxford has been advocating since 1888, or it may mean the more restricted reciprocity which my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King) expressed himself anxious and willing to accept. However, taking the language which the member for South Oxford used in the speech delivered in connection with this resolution, we are perhaps safe in assuming that the hon. gentleman still adheres to the policy of 1888, and that this resolution means the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to express the surprise which I felt in 1888, and which I felt from that time to the present, that gentlemen occupying the position in this House which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) do should submit to this House a proposal so utterly absurd and impracticable as is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. These hon. gentlemen have on more than one occasion defined their position on this question. They tell us that their policy is for these two countries to have free and unrestricted trade in natural products and manufactured articles; and my answer to them is: that two countries situated as Canada and the United States are, living under different governments, having different laws, having different tariffs, with each free to regulate and change its own tariff as it wishes, could not possibly, under any considerations, adopt unrestricted reciprocity or free trade. I can perhaps best illustrate my view of this question by referring to the effect of unrestricted reciprocity upon one or two leading articles of commerce between these two countries. Take, if you will, woollen goods. Every person knows that the United States imposes high duties upon wool—upon some classes 11 cents, and upon other classes 12 cents a pound. Upon washed wools the duty is double that amount, and upon scoured wools it is three times that amount. The duties on woollen yarns are also very high, varying from 125 to 140 per cent. The duties on knitted and other classes of manufactured woollen goods vary from 100 to 150 per cent. The United States import annually upwards of 100,000,000 pounds of wool. Now, we all know that in Canada wool is imported free of duty. Wool is a natural product of both of these countries. If under the circumstances I have described unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada were adopted, it must be evident to anyone that that 100,000,000 pounds of wool, instead of being imported directly into the United States, where it would pay a duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound, would come into Canada free and be here converted into woollen yarns or fabrics, which would pass into the United States free of duty. What would be the result? The United States would lose the import trade in wool, they would lose the revenue they derive from it, their manufacturing industries would be injured, and the whole trade of the country would be disturbed. I could give other illustrations of the same thing. I might refer to the article of flax, which is a natural product of both countries. The United States import annually 8,000 tons of flax, on which there is a duty of 1 cent a pound, or $20 a ton on undressed, and 3 cents a pound, or $60 a ton, on dressed. In Canada undressed flax comes in free, while dressed pays a duty of 1 cent a pound, or $20 a ton. It is evident that in that case the result of unrestricted reciprocity would be precisely the same as that which I have already described in the case of wool. I might give other illustrations, but I do not wish to weary the House. The same results would follow from a change in the tariff duties of either country at any time. To illustrate this, let me point to the iron industries of the two countries. Iron is a natural product of both Canada and the United States. We have manufactures in this line established in both countries. The duties in the United States are much higher than they are in this country. The American duties are 75 cents a ton on iron ore, $6 a ton on pig iron, from $16 to $20 a ton on bar iron and 40 per cent. on steel ingots. The Canadian duties are $2 a ton on ferro-manganese, $4 a ton on pig iron, $13 a ton on bar iron, and 30 per cent. on steel ingots. Suppose unrestricted reciprocity were adopted by these two countries, and either country removed these duties; suppose Canada removed the duties entirely, what would be the result? Iron would be brought into this country from Europe; it would be converted here into different classes of hardware; then it would go into the United States free of duty; and the result on the import trade, the revenue, the manufactures and the domestic trade of the United States would be precisely the same as in the other cases to which I have referred. Now, it must be apparent to any intelligent man that the United States, a proud and independent people, would never be willing to place themselves in such a position with respect to this Dominion that their import trade could be cut off, their revenues reduced, their manufactures injured, and their domestic trade affected by a change in the tariff regulations of this country. And, Sir, I claim that it is equally absurd to suppose that we in this Dominion, though we are the smaller and the weaker people, would ever be willing to place ourselves in a position so humiliating in relation to our neighbours to the south. Why, Sir, it must be apparent to any intelligent man who has given even the most superficial study to this question that we can have unrestricted reciprocity or free trade between these two countries in natural products and manufactured goods on one condition, and one condition only—that is, on the condition of uniformity of tariff. That is the opinion expressed by every intelligent statesman in the United States who has ever expressed an opinion on the question. That is the opinion expressed by every leading newspaper in the Republic. It is the opinion expressed by Mr. Goldwin Smith; it is the opinion expressed by Mr. Wiman; and it was, at all events at one time, the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). It is not necessary for me to read the opinions of these men, for they have been read at different times by those who have addressed

this House. Now, Sir, what does uniformity of tariff involve? The first question that presents itself is, how are the tariffs to be assimilated, and how is this uniformity in the tariffs to be maintained in the future? That is a question to which hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet given a definite answer; it is a question which they have not discussed, for they very wisely avoid its discussion. When they reach this point in their argument their more serious difficulties begin. We have had, however, suggestions on the subject. We have been told by Mr. Wiman and Mr. Hitt that the only way in which this arrangement can be brought about is to have a joint commission which shall assimilate our tariffs and regulate them in the future, and on which the two countries shall be fairly represented. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? The United States have 65,000,000 people and we have 5,000,000. That means that they will have thirteen representatives on this commission and we shall have one. I would like to ask any member of this House if he would be willing to leave any matter in which he is personally interested to any commision on which the other side would have thirteen representatives and he would have one. Does he think he would get justice from such a tribunal? With such proportions, whose opinions would prevail? If this commission is to assimilate the two tariffs, does any man think that the tariff of the United States would be assimilated to the tariff of Canada, or the tariff of Canada to that of the United States? Why, Sir, the result is too obvious to admit of argument. It simply means that this country must adopt the tariff of the United States, that we must for all future time submit the regulation of our tariff to a tribunal in which that country would have the controlling interest. I do not believe that that proposition would ever be seriously entertained by the people of this country. If the people of this country would ever consent to any such arrangement as that, I confess that the spirit of liberty must indeed be dead among us. The power to regulate our tariff is the power to regulate our taxation. This is a right which every free and independent people prize. It was to secure this very right that the people of the United States themselves, more than a hundred years ago, took up arms against Great Britain. They demanded, fought for, and secured their independence, simply because the British Government, without their authority and against their will, sought to impose a tax upon their commerce and restrictions upon their trade; and we, who live in this Dominion, have in the past years not been less jealous of this sacred right than our neighbours across the line. The battle for self-government was fought out in this country just as it was there—not, it is true, in the battle-field, but in the halls of our own Provincial Legislatures, in the press, upon every platform and from every pulpit in this country; and as the result, we have in this country to-day the fullest measure of liberty and freedom which any proud and independent people could desire. We have the perfect and absolute control of our own affairs; we have a constitution framed by our own statesmen we make our own laws, regulate our own tariffs, and we fix for ourselves both the methods and the measure of our taxation. These are rights, these are privileges, which no free or independent people would barter away for any trade privileges or any commercial advantages, however great they might be. Why, Sir, rather than place ourselves in that position, annexation itself would be preferable. Under annexation we would, at least, have some voice in making the laws by which we would be governed; whereas, under this arrangement, we have absolutely none. Hon. gentlemen may endeavour to conceal it as they will, but the sure and inevitable result of adopting this policy, in any form you wish, whether as unrestricted reciprocity, or free trade, or commercial union, must be the political union of the two countries. Unrestricted reciprocity without uniformity of tariff is a practical absurdity. Unrestricted reciprocity with uniformity of tariff means that we must adopt the tariff of the United States and submit the regulation of our tariff for the future to a tribunal in which they would have a controlling influence. That would place us in a position, in relation to our neighbours to the south, so helpless and so dependent that we must sooner or later yield to the inevitable fate and become part and parcel of the great Republic. I feel that this argument alone is sufficient to condemu the proposal of my hon. friend. I believe that such a policy is utterly repugnant to the feelings of the true and loyal people of this country. If the House will indulge me, although it is getting very late, I would like, before I close, to offer a few observations upon the commercial aspects of this question, and I will endeavour to make my remarks as brief as possible. If this policy of unrestricted reciprocity or free trade is practicable, is it desirable? What would be the effect of adopting it upon the great and important interests of this country? Take, first, the manufacturing interest. Under the policy of the present Administration our manufactures have had great growth and prosperity. I do not wish to enlarge upon this point, for it can be proved by the growth of our manufacturing towns, by our imports of machinery for manufacturing purposes, by our increased consumption of coal, and by the increased traffic on our railways. It can be most conclusively proved by the increase in the imports of raw material. The imports of raw material in 1878 for manufacturing purposes amounted to $5,000,000; in 1890 they reached $16,500,000. I have already referred to the sugar trade and the 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar we consume, nearly every pound of which is refined in our own country and distributed by our own merchants to our own consumers. All the wool grown in the country we manufacture, and we import 8,000,000 lbs. besides. We manufacture annually in the country 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 lbs. of raw cotton. Last year we imported of raw cotton $3,760,000, and we imported manufactured cotton goods to the extent of $3,840,000, after deducting the exports. These amounts are practically the same; and if you will allow for the difference between the values of the raw material and the manufactured goods you will find that three-fourths of all the cotton used in the country is the manufacture of our own cotton mills. We manufacture all the hides produced in the country, and $1,000,00 worth besides. Our imports and exports were about the same, so that practically we manufacture all the leather goods consumed in the country. We manufacture nearly all the tin goods consumed in the country. We

manufacture all the iron produced, and besides import upwards of 150,000 tons of pig iron and scrap iron and steel for manufacturing purposes. These are great and important industries, and very many, if not all of them, owe their existence and prosperity to the National Policy. They can only continue to exist and prosper while that policy is maintained. Unrestricted reciprocity, or free trade, and the National Policy are directly antagonistic. If you have the one you must abandon the other. If you adopt unrestricted reciprocity you strike a death blow at all those great and important industries which owe their very existence and prosperity to the National Policy, and will undo all that has been done in this direction during the the past twelve years. The effect upon our trade and upon our manufacturing industries will be equally disastrous. I will not enlarge upon this point, as I have already spoken too long. Our sugar trade gives us a direct import trade with sugar-producing countries. Previous to 1879 the tea consumed in Canada was bought in London and New York. Under the policy of this Administration, of the 18,000,000 lbs. we consumed last year more than half came direct from China and Japan. The cotton we use came direct from the southern cotton fields. The raw materials imported into this country for manufacturing purposes, under the policy of the present Administration, bring to our seaports thousands of tons of shipping annually, which is the direct result of tariff legislation. Free trade with the United States would simply transfer this trade from our own seaports to New York and Boston. The hon. member for South Oxford, in that speech which he delivered in Boston, said this :

"You lie within very easy distance of our chief cities and of the most populous portions of our Dominion."

This was addressed to the merchants of the city of Boston—

"In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position, in some respects, of a frontier city, with no great extent of territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you."

The hon. gentleman perhaps never uttered a more unpatriotic sentiment, but at the same time he never made a more truthful statement than he made in the city of Boston. Adopt unrestricted reciprocity or free trade with the United States, and in less than ten years you will transfer the great import trade of the river St. Lawrence, and also a large portion of the export trade, to New York and Boston, and you will leave the seaports of the Maritime Provinces as bare of shipping as the seaports of the New England States are to-day. Let me ask attention to the effect of this policy upon the development of our mineral resources. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred the other day to the great value of the mineral resources of this country. He did not over-estimate them ; it is impossible to over-estimate our mineral resources. It is impossible to estimate the great wealth that lies buried beneath our soil in every portion of this Dominion. Our mineral resources should be one of the greatest sources of our wealth, if not the greatest source of our wealth, in the future. It is of the utmost importance that our mineral resources should be developed in such a manner as to contribute to the wealth of the country, and that wealth does not consist only in the value of the ores which lie beneath the soil, or the labour of those who dig the ores from the bowels of the earth, but the chief value of this mineral wealth lies in the labour required to convert that raw material into articles of use and articles of commerce. How is that to be accomplished ? It is desirable that manufactories should be established in this country for the purpose of converting the raw material into manufactured goods, and that can only be done by maintaining the absolute control of our tariff legislation. Adopt the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, and you at once place it in the power of American capitalists to come here, to purchase our valuable mines, to obtain control of the means of transportation, to dig our valuable ores from the bowels of the earth and carry them away as fast as rail and steam can carry them, and furnish the raw materials for the manufactures of other countries. That may be the policy of hon. gentleman opposite, but it is a policy to which I, for one, am entirely opposed. Under that policy we would be placed in the position that we would be so bound by the terms of a solemn treaty that we could not place an export duty on the raw material or an import duty on the manufactured goods. Now, let me say a few words as to the effects of this policy on the agricultural interest of the country, and I admit that in treating this branch of the subject I am coming to what hon. gentlemen consider their great stronghold. They appeal to the farmers to support their policy because they say the farmers will be greatly benefited by it. Many of them admit that our manufacturing industries may be injured and our trade disturbed by the adoption of such a policy, but they contend that the benefits which will result to the farmers, that great and important class of the community, will be so great as to more than compensate for any loss which may otherwise take place. I propose to test the soundness of that argument. They tell us that the United States is the natural market for the natural products of this country. How do they prove that ? They point to our export of agricultural products to the United States. It is true that we export some sixteen millions and a-half of dollars' worth to the United States. Of that, barley is nearly one-half, and the rest is comprised of horses, sheep, eggs, potatoes and hay. These articles embrace nearly all our exports of agricultural products to the United States. Now, let us see what there is on the other side. In 1889 we imported upwards of 15,000,000 lbs. of pork against a duty of 1 cent. a lb. ; of bacon and hams we imported 3,653,000 lbs. against a duty of 2 cents a lb. ; of beef we imported 3,795,000 lbs. against a duty of 1 cent a lb. ; of lard we imported 8,287,000 lbs. against a duty of 2 cents a lb. ; of tallow we imported 615,000 lbs. against a duty of 1 cent a lb., and of butter we imported 492,000 lbs. against a duty of 4 cents a pound. If, from those figures which I have read, it can be fairly argued that the United States is the natural market for Canadian barley, eggs, potatoes and hay, by the same reasoning it can be proved that the Dominion of Canada is the natural market for American pork, beef, butter, lard and corn. Hon. gentlemen tell us that if the duties were removed the increased exports of agricultural products would benefit our farmers. By the same reasoning, the increased imports of the American

agricultural products to which I have referred would injure our farmers; and it must be remembered that any arrangement which obtains for us free access to the markets of the United States opens our markets to the products of the United States. Last session this Parliament increased the duty on American beef and pork, and I believe that met the approval of the agricultural portion of the community. If we had free trade with the United States, American beef, and pork and corn would come in here free, and would destroy the advantages which our farmers enjoy in that regard at the present time. I may be told that we produce here all the beef we require for local consumption, and that we export large quantities of it to Great Britain, and that therefore we are in a position to compete successfully with any other country in that article. I admit that as a general rule that theory is correct, but I contend that there are exceptional circumstances in regard to this article. The production of beef for Great Britain and the production of beef for our local markets are two different things. Those who are engaged in raising cattle for export to the English markets are the wealthier and the smaller portion of the farmers of this country. I believe nine-tenths of the whole farming community depend, not upon the English market, but upon the local market for the sale of their productions, and a very large proportion of those farmers would be injured if these duties were removed. It is true that the removal of the duties between the two countries would increase the trade between them. The fair way is to take on the one hand the advantages which would result from our having free access to the American markets and the disadvantages which would result if we gave the Americans free access to our markets, and then to decide upon which side the balance of advantage lies. I admit that in deciding that question there would be great diversity of opinion. If I may be allowed to express my individual opinion, I believe the balance of advantage, if there were any, would be very small indeed in favour of the farmers in this country; and I believe that if this policy is ever adopted no class of people in this country will be more bitterly disappointed with the result than those who expect that greater advantages and more prosperity will result from its adoption. It is true that trade would increase, but that trade would be in the nature of an exchange. We would sell them barley and we would buy their corn. There would be a large and, no doubt, a profitable business done in the small classes of agricultural products, such as eggs, fowls, vegetables and some other articles of that kind, but the trade would be merely in the nature of an exchange, and the advantage, if any, might be in favour of either one country or the other, according as favourable crops or other local circumstances affected the relative supply and demand in the two countries in different years. The United States can no more be said to be our natural market for the agricultural products of this country than Canada can be said to be the natural market for the agricultural products of the United States. Every person knows that Great Britain is the natural market for the surplus products of both countries. Now, it would appear to me that if we cannot obtain a reasonable arrangement with the United States for the exchange of agricultural products it is of the very greatest importance to our farmers that, in the first place, we

should retain control of our own markets. Our own markets are our most important and our most valuable markets at the present time. The home market of this country to-day takes the great bulk of all the agricultural produce of this country; it is not only a large market, but it is a growing market, and every year in the future it will be larger than it is at the present time. I say I believe it is for the interest of the farmers, if they cannot get a fair treaty with the United States, to retain control of their own markets first, and then to devote their attention to the cultivation of such classes of agricultural products and securing such means of communication with Great Britain and other foreign countries as will enable them to place their surplus products in foreign countries where there will be a permanent demand at remunerative prices. There is no doubt that the McKinley Bill, in its operation at the present time, is injuriously affecting some of the agricultural interests of this country, and I desire to say a few words in regard to the operation of that Bill. In my opinion, at least, it is a Bill of a most extraordinary character. If I may be allowed to express an opinion here, I will say that I believe the provisions of that measure, so far as they affect the agricultural interests of this country, reflect no credit either upon its author or upon the Congress which made it law. That Bill professes to be a protective measure; in very many respects it is a most highly protective measure. It surrounds many of the manufacturing industries of the United States with a wall of protection over which it is absolutely impossible for any foreign competitor to climb. But when it deals with the agricultural products of this country it assumes a different character; it cannot be said in any true sense to be a protective measure; it is rather a prohibitory measure. The American farmers, under the old tariff, had all the protection that was of any advantage to them. They had almost the absolute monopoly of their home markets under the old tariff, and the increased tariff cannot give them any better markets than they had before. There is, perhaps, one exception, and that is the article of barley. And what are the facts with regard to that article? There is no reasonable man in this House who will not say that 10 cents a bushel duty upon barley, as under the old tariff, was not a sufficient protection in any country for one farmer against his neighbour. The reason, if I am correctly informed, that they continued to import barley under a duty of 10 cents a bushel into the United States was, because the quality of Canadian barley was superior to that of American barley. Now, Sir, the increase of duty cannot improve the character of the American barley, and if it has the effect, as it probably will have, of shutting Canadian barley out, it simply compels the American brewers to use an inferior grain and the American consumer to drink an inferior class of beer. But when we leave that article, and take the article of wheat, we find that the Americans not only controlled their own market, but they exported 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 bushels besides. Their total imports only amounted to less than 130,000 bushels. In horses their imports were less than 20,000; in sheep their imports were less than 400,000; in potatoes there were only three-quarters of a million bushels imported, and in hay about 100,000 tons. Now, as the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pointed out

the other evening, these imports are so small they are utterly insignificant, compared with the productions of the United States, and compared with the enormous consumption of 65,000,000 of people, that they could not affect the market prices. If these articles are shut out altogether, as they may be under the McKinley Bill, the prices of these articles generally will not be affected in the markets of the United States. That additional protection is of no advantage to the farmers; it does not increase their prices in ordinary years; it does not tend in any way to develop the agricultural interests of that country. Of course there will be exceptional years, when crops may fail, when the supply may not be equal to the demand; but in those years, what will be the result? The American consumer will be obliged to pay the Canadian price, and the enormous duty added. The only result would be to tax the country heavily, and the only other effect would be to reduce the consumption by this insignificant amount, and to that extent injure the trade of this Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I felt curious to know what motive could induce the Congress of the United States to adopt such extraordinary legislation, and I confess that I have not been able, up to the present time, to find a satisfactory answer to that question. I have taken the trouble to read the speech of Mr. McKinley, who was the author of that Bill. I find that he defended his measure in many cases with very great ability, and I believe with very great success, where he could show that by the increase of duties he would be able to encourage the establishment of new industries in the United States and give employment to more capital and more labour, and that the people generally will be benefited. But when he came to the part of his Bill which dealt with the agricultural products of this Dominion, those arguments failed him, and I find that he dismissed this part of the subject by simply quoting an extract from a speech delivered by Professor Goldwin Smith, and several extracts from the speeches delivered in this Parliament by "the Hon. John Charlton, a member of the House of Commons of Canada." Even those speeches furnished him with no arguments to show that the American people could be benefited by this increased duty. The extracts which he read merely showed that if our farmers were shut out from the American markets they could be injured by this increase of duties. Now, Sir, it has occurred to me, although I am not in a position to prove it, that Mr. McKinley had been reading from that remarkable pamphlet which was written by Mr. Farrer. We all know what Mr. Farrer, in a pamphlet which he addressed to some of the prominent men in the United States, advised as the means by which this country could be forced into annexation—that Congress should place very high duties upon everything we produce. Well, Sir, it may be that Mr. McKinley has had access to that pamphlet, or he may not; I cannot say. It may be that Mr. McKinley is acquainted with Mr. Farrer, or he may not be; I do not know. It may be that Mr. McKinley is desirous of seeing this country annexed to the United States, or he may be indifferent on that subject; I do not know his opinion. But it is at least to my mind a significant fact that what Mr. Farrer advised in that pamphlet was precisely what Mr. McKinley did. Before leaving this branch of the subject I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, at all events, I do not believe there is any necessity for the Dominion of Canada to sacrifice any of its important interests to obtain relief from the provisions of that Act. I believe we can look for relief from a different source. I believe we can rely upon the common sense and sound judgment of the American people themselves. I believe the great mass of the American people are honest, honourable and practical men, that they desire to be governed in their commercial dealings and in their legislative actions towards this country by honourable and generous motives, and not by selfish motives. I do not believe that the great mass of the American people, when they come fully to consider this subject, will consent to allow to remain on their Statute-book the provisions of an Act which, while it cannot benefit their own farmers or any interests in their own country, simply has the effect of injuring to some slight extent the trade of a neighbouring and a friendly people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech the other day, said that:

"If there be any truth in the indication of popular sentiment in the United States, there is a very strong probability that the United States are more likely to reduce their tariff a great deal than to raise it, and here the difficulty which hon. gentlemen opposite fear is likely to a great extent to disappear in the course of the next few months, or, at furthest, in the course of the next year or two."

If I understand the view which the hon. gentleman has expressed in these words correctly, I fully agree with him. I believe there already are indications that this result will very soon be brought about. It must be remembered that the elections which have taken place in the United States since the passage of that Bill have entirely changed the political complexion of the legislatures of that country. It must be remembered that the people of the United States have told Mr. McKinley, and those who supported him in passing that measure in Congress, that they do not believe in that policy, and that they will dispense with their services in the future, for their usefulness as legislators has gone. I do not wish it to be understood from my remarks that I am opposed to extending our trade with the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is well you said that.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am very glad the hon. gentlemen opposite endorse that statement, and I hope they will endorse the few remarks I have yet to make. I say to the hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that I do not oppose, I never have been opposed—the Government which I am supporting, I believe, have never been opposed to extending our trade relations with the United States. On the contrary, I am desirous, and I believe the Government is desirous, of seeing our trade extended to the very fullest possible extent.

Mr. McMULLEN. You are disloyal.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman will change his opinion if he hears me through.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You talk like Farrer.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). To the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) I say that I desire to see our trade extended to the fullest possible limit, provided it can be done on fair, equitable and mutually advantageous terms. I should be glad to see our trade extended to the very fullest possible limit, provided it can be done on fair,

equitable and mutually advantageous terms. I should be glad to see our trade extended to the very fullest possible extent consistent with the preservation of our own interests and the maintenance of our own independence as a people. I do not object to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite because it proposes to extend our trade with the United States. That is not the reason that I object to it. I object to the policy because it proposes to give to the United States the absolute control of the trade and commerce of this country. Hon. gentlemen claim that if their policy were adopted our trade with the United States would be increased. I admit it. There is nothing more certain than that, if they place us in that position, we will be compelled to buy everything from the United States, and compelled to go there to sell every single article we have to dispose of. Hon. gentlemen propose to give us free admission to the markets of the United States, but on what terms? At the same time they raise around this country a wall that practically shuts out the trade of Great Britain and of all the world besides. If we are to have free trade, I say let us have free trade with Great Britain and all the world. Let us, last of all, adopt a policy of free trade that, while it has none or very few of the advantages of absolute free trade, has all its disadvantages and imposes on us all its burdens. Hon. gentlemen opposite think I am sympathizing with their policy in this matter; but I may tell them that I have always, and so do at the present time, very strongly sympathize with those who advocate free trade principles. Let me tell hon. gentlemen more than that. I believe free trade principles are perfectly sound, and that the arguments or many of them by which they are supported are perfectly unanswerable, but at the same time I do not believe that free trade principles can be applied to all countries, at all times and under all circumstances. I can say to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I entirely differ with him when he says that free trade can be safely applied in the Dominion at the present time. I believe free trade is applicable to a country like Great Britain, a country which after years of protection has concentrated within itself great wealth, mechanical skill, the most improved machinery, and has placed herself in a position that she can, as she has done in the past, maintain for years to come her commercial and manufacturing supremacy against the world. I believe free trade might be adopted in the United States to-day with very much greater safety than it could be adopted here. If there is one country among the three to which this principle is not applicable at the present time it is this Dominion, a young country with a large territory, with great resources yet undeveloped, with limited capital and with a sparse population. Under these circumstances it would be, in my opinion, utterly foolish for this Dominion at the present time to adopt free trade either with the United States or with Great Britain. If we wish in this country to develop our resources, and to utilize them to our own advantage; if we wish concurrently to settle our agricultural land, to develop our mineral resources, and to establish manufacturing industries in this country; if we wish to give to the farmers of this country the largest possible home market, and the very best market which they can have; if we wish to develop to the fullest possible extent our internal trade, to promote the largest exchange of commodities between the different classes of our people and different sections of our own country; we can only do it by adopting and by maintaining the protective policy. And, Sir, at the same time, if we wish to extend our foreign trade; if we wish to direct it into those channels where it will be of the greatest advantage to ourselves; if we wish to use it to build up our own seaports in preference to those of a foreign country; if we wish it to be the means of building up in this country great commercial cities, of enlarging and extending the transactions of our wholesale merchants, of furnishing traffic to our railways and employment to our working classes, we can only accomplish these results by judicious tariff legislation. That, Sir, has been the policy of this Government in the past, and it has been eminently successful. We have, during the past twelve years, under that policy, enjoyed a prosperity which has been almost a marvel to ourselves, and which has commanded the admiration and called forth the praise of every civilized nation on the face of the earth. That policy has been called the National Policy, and it has been well named, for it has not merely contributed to our material prosperity, but it has created our national life. It has given birth to national hopes and to national aspirations; it has created in this country a national unity, a national independence, to which we were utter strangers a quarter of a century ago, and of which we are justly proud to-day. There are, Mr. Speaker, two courses for this country to pursue in the future. We can go on in the same course that we have been travelling in the past. We can continue to develop our resources, to establish new industries, to extend our trade according to our own methods and for our own advantage, and we can build up on the northern portion of the continent a great, powerful, prosperous and independent people—a portion of the British Empire owing allegiance to the British flag, and enjoying its protection. Or, Sir, we can take the opposite course. We can adopt the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advise. We can abandon the policy which we have pursued for the last ten years, and hand over the enormous wealth of our mines, our forests, our fields, to build up the manufacturing industries of a foreign country, to build up great manufacturing cities, to furnish both food and employment for their people, and, ultimately, we can sever the ties that bind us to the mother country, and losing even our identity and independence as a people, become a very insignificant fringe upon the outskirts of the neighbouring Republic. I trust, Sir, that this House of Commons will not hesitate in deciding which of these two policies they will adopt. I trust we will on this occasion pronounce, as the people of this country have already pronounced, a most emphatic condemnation upon this policy, which is both unpatriotic and impracticable, and fraught only with the greatest danger to every important interest in this country.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS presented the third report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates.

MR. McLEOD, OF PORT MULGRAVE.

Mr. FRASER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice with reference to a question I raised on Monday respecting Mr. McLeod, of Port Mulgrave, and to say that my information is that the information given by the hon. Minister is not correct. I had no opportunity of saying anything about it at the time, but the gentleman referred to is quite willing the fullest investigation should be made, and he asks that one should be had to see whether or not the statements made are correct.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not speak from my personal knowledge, but from what I regarded as very good authority, coming from a number of sources. I think it is desirable there should be an investigation into the charges made.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that up to the present the correspondence with reference to what has been done at Washington has not been printed or put into the hands of members, and I do not see any reason why that has not been done. When papers of this description are brought down they should be printed at the earliest date; a considerable number of newspapers published them within a few hours after they were laid on the Table. If not printed, their printing ought to be attended to without delay.

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as papers of this kind are laid on the Table they are sent to the Printing Committee, and, for my own part, I have been looking for them as well as my hon. friend, and the Clerk informs me they have been sent to the Printing Committee.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE WEST INDIES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have not seen the correspondence yet relating to the hon. gentleman's mission to the West Indies, which we have been promised. It is important we should have it.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed the correspondence had been brought down, and will look into the matter and have the papers laid on the Table.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that amendments made in the Committee of the Whole to Bill (No. 119) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company, be concurred in. He said: Yesterday, when this matter was up, we had some talk as to the urgency of this Bill. I then stated we would pass the Bill through a stage, and then go on with the Budget debate *de die in diem*, but I understand there will be no objection to our taking it up now and disposing of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not so understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. I was led to understand that by the leader of the Opposition.

Amendments concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd instant, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. BORDEN. In the very carefully prepared speech to which this House listened last night from the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), I was sorry to find that he began with a statement which is not borne out by the facts. I think, if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the papers which have been laid upon the Table of the House, and which contain all the correspondence relating to the negotiations with the Government at Washington in relation to the question of reciprocity, he would not have stated that this Government, for the first time for many years, had received an invitation from the Government at Washington to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity. We all know that that statement was given a certain official character just before the late elections by a statement which emanated from the Government to the effect that negotiations had been invited from Washington—that this Government had been invited to negotiate a treaty with the Washington Government; but this session we have learned from the correspondence which has been brought down that, so far from the invitation emanating from the Government at Washington, we would never have heard anything of these reciprocity negotiations had it not been for the accident that there happened to be negotiations going on between Newfoundland and the Washington Government for a reciprocity treaty, and that this Government, having heard of those negotiations, interposed and asked the British Government to secure for them a hearing at Washington. That I understand from the papers themselves, and I will give the Minister of Justice credit by saying that, in his speech which I heard before the election in the Province of Nova Scotia, he stated nothing to the contrary. But the official statement was made that the invitation came from Washington, and that has been stated on every hustings in the country, and has been repeated in this House, and it was repeated again by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), that the negotiations were initiated there. Now we learn a very important fact from the discussion which took place last night, and from the speeches which have already been made on the other side of the House, and that is, while hon. gentlemen who support the Government

repeat over and over again that they are in favour of a reciprocity treaty in natural products—and that was the statement of the hon. member for Westmoreland—the whole of their arguments tend to prove that reciprocity of every kind and description would be inimical to the interests of this country. The speech of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) pointed clearly in that direction, and the speech of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) corroborated that in every respect. They say, forsooth, that they are favourable to a reciprocity treaty in natural products. When are they favourable to that? Just at the time of a general election—then, and at no other time. Then they go before their constituents and pose as friends of reciprocity. The hon. member admitted that thirteen members came from New Brunswick who had stated that they were favourable to a reciprocity treaty. We have heard from one of those thirteen members, and I hope we shall hear from more of them, and, if they will state in this House what that hon. gentleman has stated, I venture to predict that, when the people have another opportunity to pronounce their opinion, they will declare that they have gone back on their pledges in endeavouring to prove how that reciprocity of every kind, including reciprocity in natural products, would be the worst thing that could happen to this country. These gentlemen have found the word reciprocity an excellent word to conjure with at elections in this country ever since 1878. In that year the people were told that the National Policy was to be brought into effect for the purpose of forcing a reciprocity treaty from the United States. We were told that we were allowing the United States to make this country a slaughter market, and that we must exclude their productions, and so bring them to terms and induce them to agree to a reciprocity treaty later on. We find now that the National Policy, which was called into existence for the purpose of wringing from the United States a system of reciprocity, is made an excuse by these hon. gentlemen for our not getting reciprocity. The National Policy was to be the means to an end: it was to be the means by which we were to secure that great boon of reciprocity to this country. Now we are told that because we have a National Policy we cannot have reciprocity with the United States. The whole of the arguments of these hon. gentlemen point to this one conclusion: that, whatever may be the professions they make on the public platform, they are one and all opposed to reciprocity of every kind and description, and that we have between the two parties in this country to-day this distinct issue—on the one side the party favours reciprocity, and on the other side the party is strongly opposed to reciprocity. We do not complain of these gentlemen being opposed to reciprocity, or of their being prepared to stick to their National Policy; but we say that they write upon their banners at the time of an election the word "reciprocity," when in their hearts there is a determination to drag that banner in the dust. While they pretend to be in favour of reciprocity they do it in order to delude the electors of this country and to enable them to retain their official positions a little longer. The hon. gentleman devoted a portion of his time to a criticism of the very able speech delivered by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), and it is only proper that I should allude to one or two points in his criticism of that speech. He failed to show that any of the figures or arguments presented by my hon. friend were not well founded, but he complained that my hon. friend had charged against the National Policy that it was responsible for the fact that certain industries, such as the lime industry, the lumber industry and the building stone industry, had not prospered. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King) made no such charge against the National Policy, but he pointed out that under a system of reciprocity those industries would enormously increase, and I think he made a perfectly good point in reference to that. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) said he would show from the Trade and Navigation Returns that, whereas in 1878, the last year before the inauguration of the National Policy, there were 10,000 casks of lime imported into New Brunswick, immediately afterwards we became exporters of lime. So, he said, with reference to building stone, that in the year 1878 4,600 tons of building stone were imported, and after the inauguration of the National Policy, which, he says, gave protection to that industry, we had a large export of building stone. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the fact? I am certain that that hon. gentleman did not intend deliberately to mislead the House; but has he forgotten that in the city of St. John, in the year 1877, there was that memorable fire which destroyed nearly the whole of the city, one of the greatest disasters that ever befell any city on this continent; and did he not know, or might he not have known, that these imports which he has pointed out to us were the result of the unnatural demand which was created in the city of St. John for lime and for building stone in the year 1878, which could not be supplied by the home market? Yet the hon. gentleman seriously presents that statement to this House to show that the two industries of lime and building stone had been greatly improved and developed by the National Policy. The hon. gentleman did not point out, nor will I detain the House at any length upon that subject, that the great natural industries of that province not only receive no benefit by the National Policy, but they are possibly injured by that policy. It only requires a single word to show that. How can you protect the great natural industries of this Dominion? Why, by enabling those who are engaged in them to live as cheaply as possible and by means of the National Policy that hon. gentleman's party has enormously increased, to the persons engaged in developing those industries, the cost of living, and therefore have diminished to them the result of their labours. Now, the hon. gentleman told us that his province had received great benefits from interprovincial trade, but he failed to point out, and I do not think he can point out, one single article that his own province exports to any other provinces of this Dominion. Then, where is the benefit from interprovincial trade? Trade, to be beneficial, must be in both directions. I grant you that by this policy the people of that province have been forced to purchase, at a loss, goods from the other provinces; but he cannot point out that that province has gained a corresponding advantage. He says that we must rely largely upon our foreign trade to build up this country. Well, I agree with him there; but I think he failed to point out, and I

think it will be very difficult for any hon. gentleman on that side of the House to point out, how the National Policy can increase our foreign trade. In order to have an extensive foreign trade we must have large imports, and the very object of the National Policy is to curtail our imports. It is impossible to sell largely unless we buy largely. He pointed out that one of the prime objects of the National Policy was to prevent the exodus, but he did not bring any figures to prove that it had succeeded in that object. My own opinion is, that when the census returns are laid on the Table of the House they will reveal to this country the fact that the exodus has been greater during the time of the existence of the National Policy than it ever was during the same number of years before. I do not think that any previous census which has been taken in this country has shown a falling off in the population to any considerable extent, or in any number of districts in this country; but I fear very much, from what I have heard, that when we come to see the census which was taken a few months ago we will find that in a very considerable number of counties of every province in this Dominion there has been a large falling off in the population. And then, notwithstanding the fact pointed out by the hon. gentleman, that interprovincial trade had been fostered, that the foreign trade of the country had been fostered, and that the exodus was being prevented—notwithstanding all that, the hon. gentleman had to conclude his references to his own province by the admission that New Brunswick was not as prosperous as might be wished. Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman referred for a moment to the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance. He took up the question of the sugar duties, and he said, what was quite true, that there had been a reduction of over $3,000,000 in taxation, and he felicitated the Government and the country upon the fact. Well, Sir, this is an extraordinary change in the doctrine preached by those hon. gentlemen. I have been engaged in a number of elections in this country, and in every election I have had to meet this argument upon the public platform: that the National Policy had resulted in cheapening all the great commodities of life; that sugar was cheaper than it used to be, flour was cheaper than it used to be, that every single article was cheaper. Why? Because of the imposition of the taxes under the National Policy. Surely, there is a very great change of base. If hon. gentlemen have been right in this House and in the country during past years, then they are wrong now; I apprehend that they are right now, and that they have been attempting to delude the people of this country, and they have succeeded in doing so during the last thirteen years by telling them that the imposition of taxes made the goods they consumed cheaper. We have heard a great deal about a free breakfast-table. A free breakfast-table!—free, I presume, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that there is nothing free on it, or in connection with it. What is there about a breakfast table which makes it free? There are the articles of tea and coffee free, and no other article can be mentioned that is free, either upon the table or in the room, or that is on the persons of those who sit at the table—everything else is taxed by this National Policy.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Bread and butter.

Mr. BORDEN. Bread is not free; there is a tax of 75 cents upon every barrel of flour, so bread is taxed. Now, my hon. friend from Inverness has treated this House before during the present session to that very able argument which he presented here last session, I believe, and the dialogue which took place between that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Halifax at that time, and another hon. member from New Brunswick——

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Was he wrong?

Mr. BORDEN. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to inflict it again upon the House, and if he does, I would beg him to take some other opportunity, and to allow me to get through the few brief remarks I am going to make. Now, Mr. Speaker, the free breakfast-table that these hon. gentlemen talk about is free only in respect of the articles of tea and coffee. They say that sugar has been made free. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) stated last night that the tax upon sugar had been reduced to *nil*. The only obnoxious and objectionable tax upon sugar still remains, and that is the tax which discriminates against the consumer in favor of the refiner, and enables him to take $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent out of the pockets of every man who uses a pound of sugar. A free breakfast-table! Why, the table itself is taxed 35 per cent., the table cloth is taxed, the dishes are taxed, the knives and forks are taxed, the chairs are taxed, and, as I have shown you, the sugar is taxed, and the bread is taxed; the coal which makes the fire upon which the breakfast is cooked is taxed 60 cents a ton; the stove itself is taxed, everything in connection with it is taxed; and the breakfast table is called free, I fancy, from the fact that, as I have said, there is nothing free in connection with it. The hon. gentleman then came to the consideration of the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in amendment to the motion of the Minister of Finance that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means. The amendment reads as follows:—

"*Resolved*, That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers; and further, the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open up at Washington in October next should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products."

The hon. gentleman began his criticism of this amendment by saying that the first part of it was the Government's policy, the part which declared that the duties on articles of prime necessity, more particularly on those most generally consumed by the artizan, miner, fisherman and farmer, should be lowered. The hon. gentleman probably does not recognize the fact that there are two kinds of taxation—the kind of taxation that goes into the treasury, and the taxation which goes into the pocket of the combines, and of those in whose behalf the National Policy has largely been created. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that about $10,000,000 of taxes which goes into the treasury are drawn from the various interests referred to in the resolution which I have just read—the artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers. His estimate of $10,000,000 out of $31,000,000 paid into the revenue is ridiculously small. When those dif-

ferent classes of the community comprise nineteen-twentieths of the whole population, the hon. gentleman will not pretend to say that only $10,000,000 out of $31,000,000 are collected from them. If he had said over $20,000,000 I would have been more inclined to agree with him. I would, however, ask him to add $20,000,000 more, which go into the pockets of the manufacturers, and do not appear anywhere in the Trade and Navigation Returns. It is in order to relieve this class of the community from this tax, as well as some of the taxes which go into the treasury, that the amendment of my hon. friend was framed. I have already pointed out what some of the taxes are. I have pointed to the sugar tax, not one dollar of which goes into the treasury, but millions go into the pockets of a few favoured individuals. I have pointed to the flour tax, scarcely any of which goes into the treasury, but hundreds of thousands of dollars go into the pockets of the millers. I point now to the tax on agricultural implements, a large tax which goes not into the treasury, but into the pockets of the manufacturers, and is, therefore, a direct charge on agriculture. I might go on through the whole category, taking woollen and cotton goods and various articles to be found on the list of goods protected by the National Policy. These are taxed, and these taxes form a heavy burden on the artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers, and it is with a desire to remove these taxes that my hon. friend has moved his resolution. That resolution is entirely opposed to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) then came to the second part of the resolution that relates to reciprocity, and the hon. gentleman said that the policy of the Liberal party on this question was indefinite. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the definition of his policy? The hon. gentleman says that they are in favour of reciprocity in natural products. What natural products? Does the hon. gentleman include coal as one of them? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries would object to coal being included; yet we know there is a letter from the late Premier in the archives at Washington which directly signifies his willingness to enter into a treaty with the United States to make coal free. Thus, hon. gentlemen opposite are the last men to charge upon this side of the House indefiniteness in our policy. The hon. gentleman next proceeded to say that unrestricted reciprocity, which is the policy of the Liberal party, is absurd and impracticable. He says it is impracticable because we cannot have reciprocity in natural and manufactured products with the United States without having uniformity of tariff. I ask the hon. gentleman if we can have reciprocity in natural products without having uniformity in tariff? Can you not have duty on English coal and admit American coal free? I see precisely the same difficulties with regard to natural products that present themselves in respect to manufactures. What was the fact under the old treaty? In the very province from which the hon. gentleman comes, the Province of New Brunswick, under the old reciprocity tariff American coal was admitted free while there was a tax on British coal. The hon. gentleman will not deny it. If he does not credit my statement, I refer him to the Trade and Navigation Returns for New Brunswick for 1866, where it is distinctly stated that there was discrimination on the tariff of New Brunswick in favour of American coal and against English coal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was that anthracite coal?

Mr. BORDEN. All kinds of coal. The hon. gentleman later on, I think, was a little disingenuous in his observation that the resolution proposed by Mr. Hitt in the House of Representatives at Washington was a resolution under which commissioners were to be appointed to arrange and administer the tariff of the two countries. If he will read that resolution he will find that all it means is this: It is suggested that commissioners should be appointed by the United States Government to meet an equal number of commissioners to be appointed by the Canadian Government to arrange a plan by which reciprocal trade arrangements might be had between the two countries, and to report each to their respective Governments, and their power ceases when that report has been made. The hon. gentleman then took up the commercial aspect of the reciprocity question. He said our manufacturers would suffer. I grant that in certain instances our manufacturers would suffer. He says they could only continue under the fostering influence of the National Policy. I deny that absolutely. I believe the better class of our manufactures can be more successfully carried on under a system of reciprocity with a larger market than at present. Of course, they would have to change to a large extent, their system of manufacturing. They would have to limit themselves to certain lines, instead of attempting to do what they attempt to do now, namely, manufacture a large number of lines; and they would have to adopt the modern methods of manufacturing. I have in my hand what I think is the very best evidence in support of the position which I take with reference to the attitude of the manufacturers, and as to the effect of a reciprocity treaty with the United States upon the business of this country. It is a letter written by a gentleman engaged in the manufacture of clothing, which I will trouble this House by reading, because I think it is a letter very strongly to the point. It is as follows:—

"It is, I presume, generally supposed that those who are conducting manufacturing industries in Canada are protectionists, and the supposition is no doubt correct, especially in regard to manufactured goods coming from Europe; but I, for one, would welcome unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which is the policy of the great Liberal party of Canada.

"Permit me to state that in the manufacture of clothing—a leading industry—we have at present to work on some three hundred different lines, and spread our travellers over a vast territory, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which entails on us at present extraordinary labour and detail, and enormous cost in obtaining orders.

"Our present system of long credits is a source of weakness and great anxiety.

"My object in writing this is to explain my views as a manufacturer as to why I should favour reciprocity, as, should this take place with the United States, my firm would immediately devote ourselves to the manufacture of a few special lines. Instead of three hundred, it could be less than thirty; and instead of spreading men over an immense territory containing a small population, there would be no reason why our factory should not be fully employed in filling the orders of a few large buyers, who could keep us at work on a few special lines, thereby saving at end of each season the disposing of the large number of remaining lines unsold at a loss. For these few special lines we would receive payment in cash or on a thirty days' basis, thereby enabling us to figure on smaller profits.

"This system cannot be adopted by us in our present restricted position, and can only be attained through open markets with the United States.

"At present our firm gives employment to about 300 persons, and I fail to see why—should we have reciprocity

—we should not supply double that number, as it must be admitted by all that we have a cheap labour market.

"Reciprocity in this industry would, therefore, in my opinion, be of benefit to Canada.

"The secret in cheapening production is to be found in the manufacturers working on a few special lines—the fewer the better, provided the market will allow it; hence, I venture to believe that there are other industries in Canada that would benefit through a free market with the United States.

"G. F. BURNETT,

Of G. F. Burnett & Co., Clothing Manufacturers."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is valuable testimony as to what effect unrestricted reciprocity, and the consequently enlarged markets, would have on the manufacturers of this country. I think it proves, on the part of one who has practical experience in business, that unrestricted reciprocity would benefit our manufacturing industries. If the statement made by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) be true, that the manufacturers of this country can only be upheld by a continuation of the National Policy, then that means that the manufacturers of this country are at present getting more for their goods than these goods are worth; for if the manufacturers of Canada are able to sell as cheaply as the manufacturers of other countries, what can they be afraid of? Is it because they want an advantage, which advantage must be given to them out of the pockets of the people, and at the expense of the people of this country? The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) also pointed out that our ships were largely engaged in bringing raw materials to this country for manufactures, and he said that unrestricted reciprocity—I believe he said that reciprocity of any kind—would cause us to lose that valuable trade. We all know, the hon. gentleman knows, and no one knows better than he, that it is a part of the policy of the Liberal party to obtain free coasting privileges between the United States and this country, and he knows that no greater boon could be given to the owners of our vessels which are sailed about the shores of our Maritime Provinces than to give them free coasting privileges with the United States. He knows that our large ships, when they are built, sail away from Canada, and that they are probably never seen by their owners again; or, if they are seen again, it is when they come back for repairs after ten or fifteen years trading to the various parts of the globe. The hon. gentleman has referred to the effect which reciprocity would have upon our natural products, and he says that it is true that trade will be increased by reciprocity; but he contended that it would only be a trade which would be in the nature of exchange. I was under the impression that all trade was exchange, that the very essence of trade was exchange, and that the most profitable kind of trade is to sell certain products that you have to another country, and to bring back some other products which that country, has and which you have not. That is the most profitable kind of trade; and yet the hon. gentleman brings that forward as an argument to show why the agricultural industry of this country would be injured by free trade with the United States. Although the hon. gentleman says he is in favour of reciprocity in natural products, yet his list of articles is limited. Those hon. gentlemen opposite are restricting their list of restricted articles, in which they are willing to have restricted reciprocity, down to a very restricted limit. It is so restricted that they call it restricted reciprocity, and I think they could not get a better name for it. Their policy is, in fact, becoming so restricted that it is difficult to discover one single item on which these hon. gentlemen are willing to trade with our neighbours to the south of us. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) went on to say that our home market was the best. Let us see why our home market is the best. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) pointed out to this House why the home market was the best. He told us that the home market is the best because it is the nearest; and if that principle is correct, then the next best market to the home market must surely be the market in the country which is nearest to us—that is, the market of the United States. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) also made some allusions to the McKinley Bill, and he said that Mr. McKinley, in introducing his Bill, had quoted the speeches of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I understood the hon. gentleman to say so, and to-day I went to the library and looked through Mr. McKinley's speech, as reported in the *Congressional Record*, but I failed to find the allusion to which the hon. gentleman referred. It may be there, but I could not find it; and as I understood him, his object was to attempt in some way or other to fasten upon the Liberal party the responsibility for the McKinley tariff. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to accept that statement, because I think it would be very much nearer the truth to say that the McKinley tariff was due very largely to the tinkering interference of hon. gentlemen opposite with our tariff. What do we find are the real facts? The year before the McKinley Bill was passed these hon. gentlemen opposite withdrew from their standing offer three or four very important articles which they had hitherto said they were prepared to have reciprocity with the United States in. Long before the McKinley Bill became law the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches brought down to this House a tariff Bill which was hostile in very many of its provisions towards the United States, and which invited the United States to retaliate in just the kind of legislation which is contained in the McKinley Bill. But, Sir, I do not say that the McKinley Bill is the result entirely, or to any considerable extent, of the policy which has been adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think it is; but I think it was very uncandid and unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman to attempt to charge on the Liberal party the slightest responsibility for that Bill. What are the facts? Why, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance himself last session stated in this House that the McKinley Bill had no reference whatever to our legislation on this side of the line. He pointed out that that Bill was introduced for the purpose of carrying out the deliberate policy of the United States, regardless of the policy of any country in the world, and I believe that is largely the case. The party to which Mr. McKinley belongs wished to get the friendship of the agricultural class in certain States of the Union, and wished also to get rid of a certain portion of the surplus. These are the reasons why Mr. McKinley brought down his Bill and carried it through Congress. Now, the hon. gentleman said that he hoped that later on better counsels would prevail

in the United States, and that when a change of Government came about there, or perhaps without a change of Government, the United States would reduce largely their taxes against us. Then it seems that the hon. gentleman, notwithstanding that he has been arguing for two hours against the United States being a market for our products, is still anxious that their tariff should be reduced in order that our products might go there. Mr. Speaker, running through the whole of my hon. friend's speech there seems to be this one idea, that he is willing that we should trade with the United States if we can get the advantage of them. If we can keep up our tariff to the highest point, and get the United States to take down theirs, he is willing that we should trade with them. He is willing to have a jug-handled reciprocity, such as we used to hear so much about. It seems to me that that is not the statesmanlike way to approach a great subject like this. We must be prepared to give as well as to take; we must be prepared to give as much as we take; and every fair-minded, honest man in this country will, I believe, be prepared to enter into trade relations with the United States on that basis. What, then, is the position of the two parties in this country? It seems to me to be this: the policy of the Liberal party is reciprocity; the policy of the Conservative party is the National Policy without reciprocity. The lines are distinctly and clearly drawn. But it has suited the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite to conjure with the word reciprocity once more for the fourth or fifth time, and to come back to this House upon the reciprocity cry. What is the result? The result is that the vast majority of the members of this House to-day are pledged to reciprocity of some sort or other. Now, the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is reciprocity of no kind whatever; and I ask those hon. gentlemen who have come here pledged to do their utmost to obtain reciprocity—and I know that numbers of the members from the Maritime Provinces have done so—how they are going back to their constituents to justify their course. I believe that a vast majority of the people of this country favour freer trade relations with the United States. In fact, you can scarcely mention a single industry, except the manufacturing industry, that is not in favour of reciprocity with the United States. The great mass of the people are unquestionably in favour of it. But there are certain interests which seem to be opposed to it. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a great interest—I do not know as it can be called an industry—and it is opposed to reciprocity; the combines of this country are opposed to it for very obvious reasons; and the Government oppose it, as we know from the speeches of their leaders. Well, I admit that this is a very formidable array—the combines, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government. We might almost speak of those as the Canadian trinity—the three in one, and the one in three. It is certainly difficult and almost impossible to separate them, and up to this moment, at any rate, they have been all-powerful in this country. Now, what is the policy of the Opposition? Our policy, as I understand it, is to have the freest possible trade relations with the United States that can be obtained. We propose, however, that they shall be obtained with the retention by this country of absolute control of its own tariff arrangements.

Mr. BORDEN.

My hon. friend argued last night that it was absolutely impossible that we could have reciprocity with the United States and retain control of our own tariff. Where is the impossibility? I cannot see it. I cannot see why two countries cannot agree that they shall trade together freely, so far as the different products of each country are concerned, while retaining power to tax the imported products of other countries. I cannot see where the difficulty is. The hon. gentleman says that certain articles would come into Canada and pass through into the United States free of duty, and that by that means the United States would be defrauded of their revenue. Why, the hon. gentleman knows very well that to-day the United States have a means of tracing the point from which every one of the articles imported into that country proceeds. Every package which passes into the United States from this country has to be stamped or labelled to enable the officers on the American side of the line to trace its origin. Now, as it is not intended to sweep away the Custom-houses, the same opportunity will exist under reciprocity that exists now for the United States to prevent themselves being defrauded. But the hon. gentleman has spoken of discrimination, and, like many of his friends, he is greatly shocked that it should be proposed to discriminate against the mother country. Now, I have already pointed out to the hon. gentleman that in the old treaty of 1854 there was discrimination against the mother country in his own province; and I propose now to show that in the recent negotiations between Newfoundland and Great Britain the principle of discrimination was involved. I would call the attention of the House to the following passage in a despatch from Lord Knutsford, on behalf of the British Government, to Sir Terence O'Brien, the representative of the Newfoundland Government:

"Her Majesty's Government have raised no objection in principle to a separate negotiation with a foreign power on behalf of one colony only. It may be in some cases possible so to define the limits of the proposed commercial arrangement as to procure what the particular colony desires, without prejudicing the interests of those other portions of the Empire which are not included in the arrangement. It will be within your recollection that this subject was discussed with much attention at the Colonial Conference held in London in 1887; and, although the balance of opinion in the conference was against such separate arrangements, it was admitted that Her Majesty's Government could not, having regard to the precedents which had been established, refuse to consider the merits of a commercial arrangement desired by one colony only, and the effect which it might have on other British and colonial interests."

What do we find, further? We find that after this Government had interfered in the negotiations between Newfoundland and the United States for a separate treaty, provision was made that this Government should negotiate a separate treaty also; and mark these words:

"And it also became apparent that the United States Government was not disposed to extend to Canada the same limited arrangement as it might be willing to adopt in the case of Newfoundland alone. It was, therefore, determined to consider whether, *pari passu* with the Newfoundland negotiation, an arrangement for reciprocity on a broader basis between Canada and the United States could be negotiated."

These two separate treaties, the one for the colony of Newfoundland and the other for the Dominion of Canada, were to go on *pari passu*, being different treaties conceding different advantages to the respective negotiators:

"And until it has been more definitely ascertained whether this latter negotiation can now proceed, the Newfoundland convention must remain in abeyance."

Again, I find further in this despatch that the Government of England were prepared to ratify this treaty with Newfoundland, which discriminated against Canada and against Great Britain. In a telegram to Lord Stanley, our Governor General, sent 23rd January, 1891, Lord Knutsford says:

"I have to inform you that Her Majesty's Government have given fullest consideration to the representations of Canada against the proposed Newfoundland convention. As Canadian negotiations with the United States could not, even in the absence of the further delay arising from the dissolution of the Dominion Parliament, be commenced before March, and may not be carried through this year, Newfoundland's interests should not be indefinitely postponed."

And then Lord Knutsford says, in a later telegram to Sir Terence O'Brien:

"If Canada assents, the difficulty now standing in the way of the ratification of the convention with the United States would be speedily removed."

I think I have proved that Great Britain, at any rate, has recognised the principle that the colonies may negotiate separately with the United States, and may discriminate against another colony, or even against the mother country herself. Now, the hon. gentleman has not referred to the question of loss of revenue. He did seem to be somewhat anxious, because he felt that the Government of the United States might lose revenue through goods being imported improperly or fraudulently through the Dominion, in the event of a treaty being arranged. Most of the speakers who preceded me laid great stress on the fact that, under our system of unrestricted reciprocity, even supposing it could be carried on with the United States, or that the United States would agree to it, it would entail an enormous loss of revenue. They claimed that we would lose $8,000,000 of revenue now collected on American goods; and it was argued by, I think, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that we would lose in addition the revenue now collected upon a large quantity of goods imported from other countries. I deny that there would be much loss in that respect, because we find that the United States, with an average duty upon manufactured articles of 45 per cent., import enormously from Great Britain now. Our average duty upon manufactured articles is about 20 per cent., and if the United States, with their high tariff, import about one-half of their manufactured goods to-day from Great Britain, surely, under unrestricted reciprocity, we, retaining control of our tariff—assuming it will not be increased, and it will very likely be diminished—would continue to import from other countries as much as now. Yes, I think we would import more, because under unrestricted reciprocity our people would flourish and gain so much increased wealth that they would be able to buy much more largely than they do now those goods which come from Great Britain and Germany, and that there would be sufficient revenue received from this source at least to make up for the loss in other respects. Still, there are other ways in which this loss of revenue can be made up. A very obvious way is by economy and by honesty. Judging by the revelations we have had in the investigations now going on before a committee of this House, nobody will deny there is the greatest need for honesty as well as economy. But we have been charged with disloyalty. Those charges have not been pressed so formidably here as they were on the public platforms during the elections; but I was surprised and pained to find that my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) should have exceeded the limits within which all the gentlemen on that side have kept in referring to this question of loyalty. I was surprised at this attack coming from him, a gentleman of well-known ability; but, somehow or other, my hon. friend from South Oxford seemed to have inspired my hon. friend from Albert with the idea that some very dangerous conspiracy was going on.

Mr. WELDON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend says "hear, hear," but I can scarcely believe he is serious. My hon. friend said that if time had permitted him he would have read to this House the speech delivered at Boston, which was apparently the speech which contained all the iniquity he described. Well, I am certain that if that hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read that speech before he came in he would never have made the remarks he did. But I venture to say no more statesmanlike, no more patriotic ideas were ever put forth by any statesman in Canada than are to be found in the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Why was it such an iniquitous thing for the hon. gentleman to go to Boston, by invitation, I presume, to deliver an address before a mercantile association in that city? Is this the first time a Canadian gentleman has done this? Does not my hon. friend remember when the Hon. Joseph Howe went to the Detroit convention in the interests of this country, and made perhaps the greatest speech ever delivered on this continent? And I will show the hon. gentleman, before I sit down, by reading from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford and from the speech of the Hon. Joseph Howe, that these speeches were made very much on the same lines. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not deny that Mr. Howe held the foremost place among the statesman of this country; and, in my estimation, he is generally considered as having held that place among our statesmen. Now, I have here the speech of my hon. friend from South Oxford, and as my hon. friend from Albert did not read it to the House, and I honestly believe he never has read it——

Mr. WELDON. I have read the entire speech as reported in the Boston papers.

Mr. BORDEN. Then I am sorry you did not take it in. At all events, for the benefit of those who have not read the speech, and to enable them to judge of the fairness of the criticism of my hon. friend from Albert, I propose to put on the records of this House some of the remarks made in that speech by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); and I will leave it to the people of this country to say whether they are the utterances of a parish politician or a traitor, or the utterances of a statesman and a patriot. He was speaking to an audience in Boston, and with the object of showing to the people there that Canada had something to give to that country in exchange for what Canada might receive. This is the disloyal and unpatriotic argument of the hon. member for South Oxford, and this is the language which he used:

"Sir, this matter has unquestionably two aspects, the business aspect and the political one. And, speaking to an assemblage of business men, it is with the former I would deal to-night. As to the advantages which perfect free trade with the United States would confer on Canada it is not necessary for me to speak here. It is pretty certain you all entertain a wholesome belief that it would be a very fine thing for Canada, and I will not dispute the fact—on the contrary, I recognize it fully and frankly. Only, while I admit it will be a good thing for us, I think I can show that it will also be a good thing for you.

"Sir, I have no wish to mislead you. The trade of the United States is certainly worth more to us collectively than ours is to them. That is a manifest truth. But so is this also—free trade with Canada will benefit quite as many of the people of the United States as of the people of Canada, and to quite as large an extent. Man for man, you will gain quite as much as we will; and Canada does not come as a beggar, asking for the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. Canada offers and Canada desires only a fair exchange and no robbery, and I for one am as anxious as yourselves that in such exchange you make dollar for dollar, because I know well that thus, and thus only, can any lasting and permanent arrangement be secured. Moreover, I believe, indeed I know, that free trade with us would be of great value to the entire northern portion of the United States, and trebly so to the people of New England and to the good city of Boston.

"Even as it is, your trade with Canada is not to be despised. Per head you sell more goods to Canada than to any other country. Absolutely we buy as much from you as France does, and more than any other country except Great Britain and Germany. I think, in fact, we stand third on the list of countries to which you export your productions, and we alone, 5,000,000 as we are, buy from you as much as 50,000,000 of Mexicans and South Americans do all put together. Surely, if we do this in the teeth of two hostile tariffs, it is no idle word of mine to say that you cannot measure or bound the possibilities which lie before both countries if only these artificial walls were thrown down.

"And now, sir, a few words as to our political future. I would despise myself, and you as true men would have a right to despise me, too, if I were to tell you that it was my purpose to advise my countrymen to offer themselves for sale to the best bidder or to barter their independence for trade privileges. But I will tell you frankly where we Canadians stand and what it is many of us do desire very sincerely. Ours is a very peculiar position. We are free to do as we see fit, and no British statesman at this time of day would ever dream of attempting to coerce us. Now, we have our past history as you have yours. We stand in a fashion midway between the two great English nations; we admire and respect the United States, and we also admire and respect the mother country of both of us as well. There are many among us who have long thought that the time has well-nigh come to heal completely the great breach which took place 120 years ago between England and her greatest offspring. We entertain no idle visions of political reunion or of a vast Anglo-Saxon empire, but we do think that on certain conditions and for certain common objects a firm and cordial alliance might well be created between the several nations which speak the English tongue, which should, humanly speaking, make it impossible that they should ever again come into hostile conflict; and we have further ventured to hope that the peculiar position of Canada, especially if close trade relations were established between her and you, might enable her to play some part in bringing about this consummation. Now, all this may prove only a devout imagination, but it surely is no unworthy one, and I do not hesitate to tell you that it is one which I greatly desire to see brought about.

"I know well enough there are obstacles. I have long felt that England needs above all things to secure these two objects—first, to regain the good-will of the United States, and, secondly, to conciliate the people of Ireland, and that these two most desirable ends can hardly be attained in either case without the other. Sir, I speak under the shadow of Bunker Hill, and it may be to the descendants of some of the very men who fought there, as I myself am the descendant of those vanquished Loyalists who chose to go into exile rather than haul down the British flag: and looking back across the gulf of that 120 years we may venture to express the hope that as Massachusetts led the van then in the resistance to what the best minds in England of that day, to what Chatham and Burke alike characterized as unjust oppression, so Massachusetts may again lead the way in restoring that friendly alliance between the United States and the mother country which the best minds in both countries would so greatly desire to see.

"However this may be, gentlemen, be sure at least of one thing, that every true Canadian does and must sincerely desire the prosperity of the United States: that we recognize that to a very great extent our prosperity is bound up with yours; that we are powerfully affected by your example for good or ill, and that in spite of all mischievous legislation can do to interfere with it, the progress of science and the mere fact of our geographical position are daily and hourly forcing us into ever closer communication, even in spite of ourselves."

I think the House will agree with me that in these utterances we have what is not unworthy of a Canadian statesman. Now, one more point in reference to this matter. My hon. friend from Albert is a student of history, and he knows well the history pertaining to the negotiations of the old Treaty of 1854. He knows well how a gentleman of the name of Andrews, from the United States, travelled for years through the different provinces which now make up the Dominion of Canada, and interviewed the different Governments, and familiarized himself with the productions of Canada. He knows that Mr. Andrews laid before the American Congress important papers, which threw light on the trade between the two countries, and he knows that it was largely and, in fact, almost entirely, due to the labours of that gentleman that the Treaty of 1854 was negotiated. If that Mr. Andrews had lived in these days, and had come to Canada on such an errand, I suppose he would have been classed as a spy or a traitor and driven out of the country; but in those times we find no whisper or suspicion that that gentleman was doing anything except serving the best interests of his own country and of ours. I have said that I would read a short extract from a speech delivered by the Hon. Joseph Howe on the memorable occasion of the Commercial Convention at Detroit in 1866. Referring to reciprocity, Mr. Howe said:

"What is that question? Sir, we are here to determine how best we can draw together, in the bonds of peace, friendship and commercial prosperity, the three great branches of the British family. In the presence of this great theme all petty interests should stand rebuked—we are not dealing with the concerns of a city, a province, or a state, but with the future of our race in all time to come. Some reference has been made to 'elevators' in your discussions. What we want is an elevator to lift our souls to the height of this argument. Why should not these three great branches of the family flourish, under different systems of Government, it may be, but forming one grand whole, proud of a common origin and of their advanced civilization? We are taught to reverence the mystery of the Trinity, and our salvation depends upon our belief. The clover lifts up its trefoil leaves to the evening dew, yet they draw their nourishment from a single stem. Thus distinct, and yet united, let us live and flourish. Why should we not?

"For nearly two thousand years we were one family. Our fathers fought side by side at Hastings and heard the curfew toll. They fought in the same ranks for the sepulchre of our Saviour—in the earlier and later civil wars. We can wear our white and red roses without a blush, and glory in the principles those conflicts establish. Our common ancestors won the great Charter and the Bill of Rights—established free Parliaments, Habeas Corpus, and Trial by Jury. Our jurisprudence comes down from Coke and Mansfield to Marshall and Story, rich in knowledge and experience, which no man can divide. From Chaucer to Shakespeare our literature is common inheritance. Tennyson and Longfellow write in one language, which is enriched by the genius developed on either side of the Atlantic. In the great navigators, from Cotterel to Hudson, and in all their 'moving accidents by flood and field' we have a common interest. On this side of the sea we have been largely reinforced by the Germans and French, but there is strength in both elements. The Germans gave to us the sovereigns who established our freedom, and they gave to you industry, intelligence and thrift; and the French, who have distinguished themselves in arts and arms for centuries, now strengthen the pro-

vinces which the fortune of war decided they could not control. But it may be said we have been divided by two wars. What then? The noble St. Lawrence is split in two places—by Goat Island and by Anticosti—but it comes down to us from the same springs in the same mountain sides; its waters sweep together past the Pictured Rocks of Lake Superior, and encircle in their loving embrace the shores of Huron and Michigan. They are divided at Niagara Falls, as we were at the Revolutionary War; but they come together again on the peaceful bosom of Ontario. Again they are divided on their passage to the sea; but who thinks of the divisions when they lift the keels of commerce, or when drawn up to heaven they form the rainbow or the cloud? It is true that in 85 years we have had two wars; but what then? Since the last we have had 50 years of peace, and there have been more people killed in a single campaign in the late civil war than there were in the two national wars between this country and Great Britain. The people of the United States hope to draw together the two conflicting elements to make them one people. And in that task I wish them God speed! And in the same way I feel that we ought to rule out everything disagreeable in the recollection of our old wars, and unite together as one people for all time to come. I see around the door the flags of the two countries. United as they are there, I would ever have them draped together, fold within fold, and let 'their varying tints unite and form in heaven's light one arch of peace.'"

Mr. MASSON. Considering the importance of this subject, I beg permission of the House to make a few remarks bearing more particularly upon the question of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Borden) has charged the members on this side of the House with being in favour of reciprocity in natural products generally, when seeking re-election before the people, and with being opposed to it when in this House. Now, Sir, that is certainly a very serious charge. If any party should be guilty of going before their constituents and presenting one set of opinions and asking the support of the people upon that policy, and then when they came back to this House were deliberately to advocate an entirely different policy, they would deserve severe condemnation. The hon. gentleman made the bold assertion, but I failed to see in the whole course of his speech any evidence to prove it, that we favoured reciprocity while seeking the suffrages of the people, and that we favour a different policy here. Now, Sir, if there is one thing that the Liberal-Conservative party, that has so long held the reigns of Government in this fair Dominion, has reason to be proud of, it is the consistency with which it has adhered to one policy. We lay down no cast-iron rule as to reciprocity, we lay down no cast iron rule as to tariff, but the policy as enunciated by our late leader in the resolution he presented to this House in 1878, is the same policy that we support to-day on this side of the House. For the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite who, perhaps, never read that resolution, who, perhaps, never heard of it, I will read an extract from it, and at the same time I would call the attention to it of those hon. gentlemen, some of whom made speeches in favour of that resolution, some of whom made speeches in favour of the policy enunciated the session before, some of whom spoke in favour of it then, and who speak in an entirely opposite sense to-day. That policy did not declare a desire not to trade with the United States, but in plain and explicit language it set forth:

"That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining, manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion."

Without reading the whole resolution, let me call attention especially to this paragraph:

"And moving in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand."

There was the policy enunciated in 1878, and there is the policy of to-day—"reciprocity with our neighbours so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand." Such was the policy enunciated in 1879 when the Liberal-Conservative party came into power, such was the policy placed upon the Statute-book, where it has since been retained; such was the policy presented to the country and endorsed by the country in 1882. There was the same desire to trade with our neighbours on a fair basis, a desire for reciprocity where the interests of Canada required it. Such was the policy presented again in 1887, and such was the policy endorsed by the people then. But we are told that a change has in some way come over the Government of this country, that a change came over the grand old chieftain who led the party to so many victories, and that, whatever the rank and file of the Liberal-Conservative party may have thought, the Government and its leader had changed their policy and were seeking for unlimited reciprocity. Where is there any evidence that our late leader sought reciprocity, or that his Government sought reciprocity, or that his supporters have spoken in favour of reciprocity except on the basis laid down in 1878? Let me refer to the official despatch, one line of which has been quoted, I suppose, by every speaker that has spoken on that side of the House in this discussion: First, "A renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854." That line has been quoted and dwelt on, but, whether wilfully or accidentally, hon. members stop short there, they do not read on through the whole clause, which reads as follows:—

First, "A renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries, with the extension deemed by the commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States."

There was a reference to the Treaty of 1854; there was the same principle of reciprocity in trade with our neighbours, so far as the interests of Canada should require or demand. There was no giving away of our vast inheritance, no giving away of the benefits of twelve years of National Policy, but an adherence to the same old policy. There was no other language used. We sometimes have heard quoted the proposition of reciprocity in named products. This had the same meaning, a readjustment by arrangement. Such is the proposal made by Mr. Blaine to the people of Brazil, Columbia, and the Central and South American Republics. Such, I repeat, is the reciprocity which Mr. Blaine proposed with these countries, not unrestricted reciprocity, but reciprocity in the named products, the articles to be agreed upon to be for the mutual advantage of both countries. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) also referred to our advocacy of reciprocity in natural products, and especially to reciprocity in agricultural products. I am free to admit that in 1878 a very large proportion of the people, especially those engaged in agriculture, believed that reciprocity in farm products would be the very best thing that could happen. I am free to admit that such was the universal belief, and it is not to be wondered at that in the speeches delivered here by the leaders of the

Opposition of that day such expressions were used as have been quoted by the hon. member, "that it was a means to an end," "that it was not a thing to be permanent," "that it was to bring about reciprocity in trade." How did it come about that the people of the country had that idea at the time? It is easy to understand why they entertained it. They had during four or five preceding years passed through very hard times. They had been placed in a position of one-sided free trade. The reciprocity treaty, which prevailed from 1854 to 1866, had been abrogated. We had had all the evil effects that followed the reaction that set in from the high prices which prevailed during the great American war. We had had this series of hard times, and it was not unreasonable for the agriculturists of the country to look back to the good times of the past, and say that while we had reciprocity we had better times, and to at once jump to the conclusion that if we had reciprocity again we would have the same good times. It does not at all follow that because we had good times between 1854 and 1866, during the period of the old reciprocity treaty, the same good times would be renewed if we framed a similar treaty. We have to consider the different circumstances in which the country is situated, and the different state of affairs that prevailed at home and abroad. Any person looking back thoughtfully over that period and at the high prices of farm products, and the high prices of wheat, which was then the special product of Ontario, will not hesitate to agree with me that it was not the reciprocity treaty which enhanced the price of our farm products at that time and gave us high prices for our wheat during those twelve years, but it was due to other and outside influences entirely. During the first few years of that reciprocity treaty the great Russian war prevailed. It was the great Russian war we had to thank for the high price we obtained for our farm products and for our wheat, not the reciprocity treaty with the United States. Immediately after the Russian war closed we had the year 1857, a year that has only to be recalled to cause a shudder to run through most hearts in Canada, a year written in the darkest letters of all the years in the financial records of Canada, and that year occurred in the midst of the reciprocity treaty. In that year we had the Indian mutiny, and later the great American civil war; and these great wars enhanced the prices of farm products, and especially the price of wheat, then a large product in Ontario. But, in addition, we had throughout Ontario and Quebec, and throughout Ontario especially, large public works under construction. We had the Grand Trunk Company constructing its road with great energy and with a large expenditure. The Great Western Railway was also built during that period, and the enhancement of the value of farm products made good times for the farmers of Ontario. I am, therefore, satisfied that no hon. gentleman opposite will question that but for those outside influences the times in Canada would not then have been so good as they were. But we must also consider the condition of the country when reciprocity was entered into. At that time we had not one mile of railway by which to carry our farm products to the sea. We had not our canals enlarged. We had only our river navigation in summer. We were then in such a position that we could truthfully say the United States constituted our natural market. In fact, we could truthfully say that the United States formed our only market during half the year, as we were entirely shut out from any other market. Even during the other half of the year our means of transport were such that the expense of moving the products was entirely out of the question. Moreover, we had not then our great line of transatlantic steamers plying to our ports. All these things have changed. We have communication, not by one, but by two great trunk lines to the sea. Our canal and river navigation has been improved, and while we continued up to 1866, when the treaty was abrogated, to send our farm products by way of the United States to other markets, the embargo they placed on them in the shape of duties materially interfered with such trade, and we have since opened up other markets and established other communication with them. It is alleged by hon. gentlemen that the United States is our natural market. In what way they can contend that it is the natural market, I have always been at a loss to find out. If it is not because that a market is alongside of us, in what other way can they make their claim? My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) told us this afternoon that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Wallace) stated that the home market was the best because it was the nearest, and that is absolutely true in fact; but the deduction which the hon. gentleman sought to draw from that was incorrect. The best market for the producer is the consumer's market. The consumer pays the highest price for any product, and the producer sells at the lowest price, and the producer benefits by the home demand for what he has to sell; and every system of legislation, or any policy which tends to bring the consumer nearer the producer has a tendency to benefit both. Therefore, if we carry out a policy in this country which establishes a home market, and which increases the number of consumers, that home market is the very best market that the producer can obtain, and it is all the more beneficial because of its proximity.

Mr. LISTER. Suppose you produce too much?

Mr. MASSON. I will deal with that question immediately. We hear hon. gentlemen on the other side put forward the argument, that if you have one bushel of agricultural produce to export, that one bushel has got to govern the price of the whole. The export market is all desirable, ready access to the export market is very desirable, and the more expeditious and cheaper the communication with that market, the better for the producer. But the export market never does govern the prices of our products until it takes a large share of them. I will deal with that question more in detail when I take up some of the articles which we export, but I will at present lay down this principle for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, that the market which secures the bulk of our produce governs the price; other markets have got to compete afterwards, but they do not regulate the price. Now, so far as Canadian products are concerned, our exports, except in a few articles, have been very small, and although they have been increasing during the last few years they are still, especially with reference to our grain products, comparatively small. I shall call the attention of hon. gentlemen to some of these points later on, but I will

now follow up the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), so that I may cover as nearly as possible the points which he sought to make. After accusing the Liberal-Conservative party with preaching one policy at the polls and another policy in this House, he charged my hon. friend from Westmoreland with having claimed that the National Policy had benefited the export trade in lime and stone and other such articles. What my hon. friend from Westmoreland did say was: That prior to the National Policy the trade in these articles did not exist, and that it was after the duty was imposed that our home markets were protected from the inroads of the American products of the same kind, that these industries sprung up, that the placing of a duty on our goods going there, when we had not the trade established in those articles, did not develop the trade in Canada, so long as the American articles were allowed to come in free. He contended that the placing of a duty on American imports coming into this country established these industries in Canada, and therefore my hon. friend from Westmoreland truly argued, that it could not be urged that the National Policy had had a tendency to depreciate the trade in these products because it was under the National Policy that such trade had been developed. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) stated further, that the development of that trade created a home market which was to the benefit of all classes concerned. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) has also charged the Liberal-Conservative party with a change of base by saying that in former years they had contended that the placing of a duty on goods decreased the price of articles. That is putting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking him down, because the Liberal-Conservative party never contended that the placing of a tax—I think the hon. gentleman used the word tax—would render an article cheaper. What they did say was, that protecting an industry would render the products of that industry, in many cases, cheaper; and we have practical evidence of the fact that the protected industries are now giving their products cheaper to the consumers of this country than the consumers could obtain these articles before. The hon. gentleman applied this argument to the duty on sugar, and he said that the removal of this duty was urged by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in order to make sugar cheaper. Now, let me ask, was the duty on raw sugar a matter of protection at all? It never was, because it was not imposed for the purpose of fostering that industry. The duty on raw sugar was imposed long before the National Policy, as a matter of revenue and as a tax direct upon raw material which was not produced in this country, or which was not produced, at all events, in sufficiently large quantities for our necessities, and, consequently, had to be imported here. We had to seek a foreign market for our raw sugar, and, as we were the seekers of the market and brought that commodity here, in that way we paid the duty. We hear a great deal of loose talk, on both sides of the House, perhaps, as to who pays the duty. At one time you hear it said that the consumer pays the duty, and, in the same breath, almost, hon. gentlemen turn around and urge that the producer pays the duty. I consider that the drawing of hard and fast lines between the consumer and the producer in this respect, is all unavailing. The person, or the nation that seeks a market, pays the duty and has to overcome all obstacles between him and that market, whether he seeks to buy or to sell. If we produce in this country in such abundance that we have got to get our produce out, and to find a market for it, then we have got to seek a foreign market and without question we have to pay the duty, and we would have to pay the whole duty unless the nation that we were sending to was also in turn seeking a market in which to purchase. In that case, as in many other cases, the duty would be divided, both parties, as it were, meeting half-way. Then, in regard to raw sugar, if it is bought in the outside market, there is no question that in the first place the manufacturer, who buys it as his raw material, pays the duty, and it is afterwards added to the price of the manufactured article which the consumer has to pay, but that duty was imposed in revenue-tariff days; it was an inheritance handed down to the present Government for the purpose of producing a revenue, and it was left for the purpose of sustaining the revenue; and it is only now, when the Government, feeling itself financially strong, can afford by a stroke of the pen to sweep away $3,500,000 of taxation, that that duty is removed and returned to the pockets of the consumers. There can be no more fallacious argument than the statement that we are changing our base because we now claim that the removal of the duty on raw sugar is a benefit to the consumer. It is exactly on a par, we claim, with the removal of the duty on tea and coffee. The hon. gentleman says there is no free breakfast-table, because there is still a duty on sugar; but we claim that the duty on the finished article does not enhance the price; if it does, it will only be very slightly and for a very short time. Our manufacturers will reduce the prices of sugar in Canada, as they did before, to a point as low as they are in the United States, and there is nothing in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that would tend to bring the price of sugar in Canada to a lower point than it is in the United States. Now, we are told that our tea is not free, because there is still a duty on what does not come direct from the country of growth. While my hon. friend was arguing that the breakfast table was not free, that there was not a free article on it, I looked at the returns and found that during the last year we imported 17,500,000 lbs. of tea direct, and three-quarters of a million pounds indirect, on which a duty was paid. Now, will any person presume to say that the three-quarters of a million pounds enhanced the price of the 17,500,000 lbs., or did the 17,500,000 lbs. force those who brought in the three-quarters of a million pounds to compete with it, to reduce their price accordingly? We find that the larger quantity governs; and whether in importing or exporting, the rule is the same. Then, the hon. gentleman stated that there were two classes of duties—one class that goes into the public treasury, and the other that goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he did not object to the duties that went into the public treasury; but he alleged that duties on articles manufactured in Canada went into the pockets of the manufacturers. Well, that would be so if the manufacturer sold in Canada at the price charged in the outside market

with the amount of the duty added. But in what line of manufactured articles do you find that to be the case? Take woollen goods. Do you find that the price of woollen goods in Canada is the price of those goods in the United States plus the duty? Why, the hon. gentleman knows that it is entirely different. He knows that these goods are cheaper in Canada to-day than they are in the United States. Almost every class of goods into the composition of which wool enters are cheaper in Canada than in the United States. The same is true in other fabrics; I will not weary the House with going over them. But the hon. gentleman, posing as the farmer's friend, singled out one article in particular. He declared that agricultural implements were a class of goods the tax on which went into the pockets of the manufacturers. That would be true if the price of agricultural implements in Canada were the price in the United States plus the duty. But what are the facts? Go anywhere you like in the United States and compare the retail prices paid there by the farmers with the prices paid by the farmers in Canada. I do not want any such comparison as an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House gave two years ago, when he compared the wholesale price of the American manufacturers with the retail price in Canada. Shortly after that speech was delivered, I happened to be in Western New York; and with that speech ringing in my ears I made enquiries, and I found, what I was not surprised to find, that the hon. gentleman had been quoting the manufacturers' prices as against the retail prices here, and that the retail prices of agricultural implements in Western New York were from 10 to 15 per cent. higher than they were in my own constituency of North Grey. I found further, that if a farmer were unable to pay cash and had to ask for time, whereas in Ontario he could get credit for one or two or three years at 7 per cent., in that empire state, where hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe the farmers are so well off, he would have to pay 10 per cent. for one, two or three years. I found on enquiry that the rates in New York State were the lowest that prevailed in any state in the Union—that in many states as high as 15 per cent. was charged. If, then, our agricultural implements are cheaper in Canada than they are in the States, and the duty prevents the Americans making this country their slaughter market now and again in order to wipe out our manufacturers, so that they may have the field to themselves—as it is well known many large manufacturing establishments in the United States would not hesitate to do—there is no such tax going into the pockets of the manufacturers as the hon. gentleman would have us suppose. The hon. gentleman also stated that we were making a great cry about unrestricted reciprocity involving a uniformity of tariffs as against the rest of the world. When he said that that was done with reciprocity in natural products, he gave away his whole case, and admitted, as far as he is concerned, that unrestricted reciprocity would involve a uniformity of tariffs as against the rest of the world. The hon. gentleman also stated in that same connection, in dealing with our manufactures, that the manufacturers must be looking for that tax, and they must want it, that they were afraid to enter on a fair field of competition, and for that reason the tax was maintained. Now, the hon. gentleman surely knows that it is no uncommon thing in the United States, with which he seeks unrestricted reciprocity, for weak establishments to be crushed out by the stronger. He must have been aware, when talking about combines, that this nation with which he seeks unrestricted reciprocity is the very mother of combines, and that combines flourish there to a greater extent than anywhere else. And he must know that the reason why agricultural implements and manufactured products in the United States are so high, as compared with Canada and the rest of the world, is because of these combines. No person living so near the border, as does the hon. gentleman, can fail to learn that these combines are all powerful on the other side, that they fix the quantity of production and the prices of all they manufacture; and when it is said that our manufacturers do not wish to enter into trade competition with them, those who say so know that our manufacturers would not have to compete with individual manufacturing establishments, but with a combine of the manufacturing establishments of the whole United States. The hon. gentleman would place it within the power of the United States to crush our manufacturers,——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, protection has not made things cheap over there.

Mr. MASSON. Protection, as administered in the United States, has, in many cases, tended to make things dear. Let the hon. gentleman note my words exactly: protection, as administered in the United States, if you can call the tariff of the United States a protective tariff, has had a tendency to make things dear. The tariff of the United States never was a protective tariff, in the true sense of the word. It started as a high tariff for the purpose of raising extraordinary revenue, and it has been continued, irrespective of whether it was required for the protection of native industries or not. But we find that in many of the articles, with reference to which their duties are adjusted in such a way as to give honest protection, the prices have decreased. But I shall deal with that when speaking of the McKinley tariff, and will point out some articles on which duties have been placed without protection being required. The next point I wish to notice is the hon. gentleman's statement that the McKinley tariff was due to our tinkering interference with our tariff. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman intended to impute or intended the House to understand, but it would seem that he thinks this Dominion should not arrange its tariff without consulting the statesmen across the line, and that, because we dare to deal with our own tariff——

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented what I have said. I said that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) had charged that the McKinley tariff was the result, to a certain extent, of the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); and I contended that we have as good a right to claim that the McKinley tariff was the result of the tinkering on the part of the Government with our tariff, but I went on to explain what my views with regard to the McKinley tariff were, and that it had nothing whatever to do with Canadian politics.

Mr. MASSON. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation of what he intended to say.

Mr. BORDEN. What I did say.

Mr. MASSON. I took down the hon. gentleman's words, and after saying he might as well charge the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with being the cause of the McKinley Bill, he went on to show that the motive power, in his opinion, was due to the tinkering interference with our tariff, which invited retaliation. What were those tinkering interferences? I think, from the references the hon. gentleman made, the interference consisted in this, that there were small fruits and other articles taken from the free list and put on the other. So that if we find a certain industry languishing because of the unfair competition it has to contend with through the Americans being able to glut our markets with their produce before our own has reached maturity, and we take means to prevent that unfair competition by making a change in our own tariff, the hon. gentleman calls that a tinkering interference. I claim that, as British subjects, as a free and independent people, we have a right to frame our own tariff, and that is a right we on this side are determined not to surrender. The hon. gentleman says it is unfair to charge the Liberal party with having had anything to do with the McKinley tariff. Well, it does seem strange, if they had nothing whatever to do with it. It does seem strange that the very thing which was counselled by the gentlemen who were acting as go-betweens in this matter, between the statesmen on the other side of the line and those on the other side of this House, was adopted by the American statesmen. That, indeed, is very strange.

Mr. CHARLTON. To whom does the hon. gentleman refer as go-betweens?

Mr. MASSON. I will try and enlighten my hon. friend. I do not wish to weary this House with very long extracts, and in fact I intended to limit myself to passing references; but since the hon. gentleman has challenged me to give the names, I shall ask the indulgence of the House while I read a few extracts. We find that Mr. Farrer, now connected with the Toronto *Globe*, and to whom the hon. gentleman who has made this challenge referred, only a few days ago, as the best political writer in America,——

Mr. CHARLTON. British America.

Mr. MASSON. My hon. friend says British America. He excepts his American friends and countrymen. Mr. Farrer, writing to Erastus Wiman, the gentleman who, on the 1st July, 1887, made the pioneer commercial union speech in Canada, and who may, therefore, be looked upon as the father of commercial union, says that he believed a very large number of people "are inclined to think that we had better make for annexation at once instead of wasting our time in making two bites of a cherry." He said further:

"Then, again, the truth is that every man who preaches commercial union would prefer annexation, so that the party is virtually wearing a mask."

From the same pen we find the statement that "whatever course the United States may see fit to adopt, it is plain that Sir John's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a movement towards annexation, and that a leader will be forthcoming when the time arrives." That letter is addressed to Erastus Wiman. It would appear that he sent that letter to Mr. Hitt, or that a similar letter was written to that gentleman, for we find, under the date of the 20th April, 1889, that Mr. Hitt writes to Mr. Wiman:

"There is some logic in what Farrer says, of not making two bites of a cherry, but going straight for annexation at once."

But Mr. Hitt was a more cautious gentleman than "the best political writer in British America." He advises a little more prudence and patience and a more indirect movement. He says:

"We must be patient with the slow-moving popular mind. If the Canadian public of farmers, artizans, lumbermen, miners and fishermen can be argued up to a point of voting commercial union, it will be a great progress."

The same Mr. Farrer, in the pamphlet which apparently he thought only would be seen by the favoured few, urged that steps should be taken to force the Canadians in, and that, by not moving in the direction of reciprocity but by a policy of indifference, slightly tinged with retaliation, this pressure could be brought to bear on Canadians in such a way as to force them to come to time. We find that through all this time these gentlemen have been acting in accord. I will go further. Mr. Ritchie, of Ohio, speaking of the Canadian House of Commons, says, in reference to commercial union, that "there is not a single one of the Opposition against Mr. Butterworth's Bill, and every man who is in favour of annexation in Canada will tell you that is the proper way to bring it about." The Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, who is the father of the scheme on the other side, says:

"We will be practically one people for all the proper purposes of this life, and when the time shall come and an attempt be made to tear us asunder, that attempt will be futile."

We might quote still further from Mr. Erastus Wiman, who says that "commercial union will change the political complexion so entirely that nothing could contribute so much to bring about annexation." We will take other friends of the hon. gentleman. The Hon. Mr. Carlisle says:

"Commercial union, in my opinion, means ultimate political union."

Chauncey M. Depew, perhaps the greatest orator in the United States, said in November last:

"The protectionist who believes that tariffs should be levied upon the principle of protection, the revenue reformer, who believes that they should be exacted only for revenue, the free trader, who thinks that they should not be imposed at all, could all agree upon the principle that whatever tariff laws existed in the United States should be adopted by the Canadian Parliament and become applicable alike along all the coasts of this republic and Canada, as against the rest of the world.

Then, still further, we have Mr. Goldwin Smith's statement, where he says:

"The proposed assimilation of tariffs on the seaboard is simply an arrangement to prevent reciprocal smuggling. * * * * Let me say once more that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity mean the same—the removal of the Customs line between Canada and the States."

These are statements made by the friends of the hon. gentleman. But to refer to the opinions of the American press. Take the New York *Mail and Express*, which says:

"If Canada agrees to a commercial union, she must face a probable abandonment by Great Britain and then annexation with the United States. So it is really annexation that is involved in this commercial union discussion."

The Philadelphia *Record* says:

"No scheme which would give Canada an equal voice in the determination of taxation could be tolerated. She would have to accept the position of a state in the Union."

The Buffalo *Commercial* says:

"So far as all practical trade relations are concerned, Canada would become a state in the American Union."

The Detroit *Evening News* has this:

"No real friend of political union can intelligently or honestly oppose commercial union, for a very slight consideration of the certain and speedy results of commercial union must show that it must be followed in a very short time by political union."

The Cleveland *Leader*, speaking of the effects of commercial union, says:

"We would swamp their (Canadian) markets with manufactured goods and wipe out their manufacturers in many branches at one stroke."

The Chicago *Inter-Ocean* says:

"We protest against any except the most complete, inclusive and identical tariff conditions in both countries."

The Chicago *Tribune* says:

"There can be no middle course between allowing things to remain as they are and adopting a common tariff against the rest of the world."

All these extracts, from statements made by public men on the other side and by newspapers favouring this scheme, tend to show that unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union mean the same thing, and that same thing is annexation. I have here a telegram from Mr. Horace E. Crawford, of Winnipeg, who was brought up in Ontario, and he says this:

"I had an interview with Erastus Wiman in New York, March, 1890, in which he told me they would force Canada into commercial union by raising the tariff. That he, Butterworth, Hitt and others met Cartwright in Washington and changed name to unrestricted reciprocity for election purposes, and they had fully agreed on policy to carry elections in Canada. He said that he knew he could not carry it so long as Sir John remained in power. It is a scheme for annexation."

Now, I think it is only fair to say that I understand that the hon. member for South Oxford stated that he was no party to the arrangement mentioned in that telegram his denial; I believe, was published during the time of the election. If the hon. gentleman is not a party to it we find, however, that the statement is made by the friends of these men who are negotiating this commercial union; that statement is made by this man Wiman who is the father of the scheme in Canada, and whose leadership they are following to-day as to the means to bring about that object. I will further say that I have no doubt in the world that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford remained at the banquet after he delivered his great speech from which we have heard so many quotations. Without attempting to discuss the merits of that speech, without going into an analysis of it—for I, like other hon. gentlemen, have read the whole speech, and not merely the choice sentences repeated here to-day—without attempting to analyze that myself, I say we have got to take the opinions expressed by those who heard that speech as to what it really meant, and whether it was patriotic or otherwise. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman was present when the President of that Chamber of Commerce said:

"The ready road to reciprocity with our neighbours would be to accept Sir Richard Cartwright as Senator for the State of Ontario."

I have no doubt that the member for South Oxford heard those remarks, and if the President of the Chamber of Commerce had in any way misconstrued his meaning, it was then his place to have explained to the meeting that he had been misrepresented; but we have no record whatever that the hon. gentleman complained of the praise that was given him in that speech. But the concluding part of Mr. Bullock's address must certainly have brought a blush of shame to the hon. gentleman's face, because he says:

"Until the lines of division existing between nations are obliterated and the whole world becomes one, each nation must guard the best interests of her people."

Now that is the policy enunciated in the presence of this hon. gentleman by those who heard him speak, and I contend that no patriotic man could have listened to words which imputed that he was not guarding the best interest of his own nation without a protest. Sir, was the hon. gentleman looking after the best interests of his country when he heard without protest his host making use of those words, saying that the surest way for Canada to get reciprocity was to make Sir Richard Cartwright a Senator for the Province of Ontario, that is to say, when Ontario was annexed. Why, Mr. Blaine tells us that the only way for Canada to obtain reciprocity is to give it a voice in the Senate, and that without political union commercial union would not be possible. The hon. gentleman, on the occasion referred to, went on to speak of the benefits to be derived by the United States, how it would give to the United States another tier of Northern States, how it would make Boston the entrepot for all this vast territory behind—by which, no doubt, he meant Canada; that it would give them the trade of that vast Dominion, and once they had it, he assured them, no man would be able to take it from them, no power on earth would ever wrench it from them. Now, that being the case, was it patriotic, was it statesmanlike, to speak of giving our trade to another country, to give it to them in such a way that if ever we rued the bargain and wanted to get out of it, no power on earth could break the bargain? Was that the act of a patriot? It is a misnomer to apply the words statesman and patriot to one who advocates the giving away of the entire trade of the country for the benefit of a neighbouring state, and to get what in return? The privilege of being hewers of wood and drawers of water for the states, the privilege of sending our raw material to the states and buying from them the manufactured article, increasing the trade of the neighbouring states and destroying our own industries, destroying them absolutely and irretrievably. The hon. gentleman then went on to say that they had a great triumvirate here opposed to reciprocity, namely, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the combines and the Government. Well, as to the Government, they certainly are opposed to unrestricted reciprocity, we certainly have a Government opposed to giving away all the trade of our country to the Americans, the closing of our industries for the sake of building up the large manufacturing cities on the other side. As to the combines, if we have combines in Canada to any great extent, I have no doubt they also are opposed to it, because their interests would be to encourage and foster the industries they are combined to carry on, and they know that opening the door to the manufacturers of the United States, to those great and wealthy corporations, would destroy the interests which they are combined to preserve. The combines in this country would be destroyed, of course, by those huge corporations in the United States which extend their sway over the 60,000,000 people in that

country, and wield such a power as they have never been able to wield in any other country; therefore, I have no doubt that the combines of Canada would be against such a treaty. But what about the combines of the United States? Are the combines of the United States in favour of it? Certainly they are, because it would be for their benefit. I could give you many newspaper statements in reference to that, how they would have the power, how they would crush out the Canadians, how they would add a population of 5,000,000 to the number of their customers, but I will not detain the House reading these extracts. When the hon. gentleman drew near the close of his speech he said that he would give us the policy of the Opposition. Well, I listened attentively to him, but I failed to learn the hon. gentleman's view of the policy of the Opposition. He certainly did not give it so that any one could understand it. He was almost as explicit as the hon. member for South Oxford was, when asked how he would raise a revenue, and he answered by saying: "Wait till we get over on to that side of the House." I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman would prefer not to give us his policy until he and his party got over on to this side of the House. He says his policy does not mean the sweeping away of the Customs wall. During the election campaign we had a statement of the leader of the Opposition thrown in our faces on every hustings, we had it printed in large type that the Liberal party was going to sweep away all Customs walls, and there was a gentleman on the hustings explaining to us exactly the names of the different Custom-houses along the line that were going to be wiped away, and we had a statement of what a great saving it would be to the country. He says that we are going to send over there our raw material and allow the finished article to come in free. For what purpose have those Custom-houses to be retained? In order to obtain systematic returns, to keep track of the trade passing backwards and forwards, not for the purpose of collecting money for the treasury, but for the purpose of taking notes of the greatly increased trade between the two countries. I will not further follow the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), for I think I have dealt with nearly all the subjects to which he alluded. I will now briefly refer to some points in the speech of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). The hon. member a few days ago delighted this House with a five hours' speech, or nearly so. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the length of his speech, and also on the amount of preparation he gave it, because he certainly did gather together a great many facts and figures. I am sorry I cannot congratulate the hon. gentleman on the use he made of those figures. I was a little surprised to hear him in his opening remarks refer to Imperial Federation, or closer alliance with Great Britain. He told us in very positive language that we could not expect it to be brought about, and that England would have none of it. Ten years ago we were told that such a scheme was not to be mentioned, that it was impracticable and impossible, and that England would have none of it. We are quite prepared to hear such statements. But the hon. gentleman went further, and said that the farmers of England would not be benefited by such a scheme, that discrimination in favour of the colonies would not help the English farmer, that the landlords would obtain increased rents, the labourers would strike for higher wages, and the farmers would get nothing. If there are those three classes to be benefited, they must all be benefited if any advantage is to be obtained. If it be admitted that the value of farm products would be increased and would cause the agricultural labourers to strike for higher wages, would that really be an injury to Great Britain? Would it be a very grievous matter for the underpaid labourers of Great Britain to have their wages increased? I do not think the hon. gentleman intended to say that it would be. I will now deal with the hon. gentleman's calculations and figures with respect to the prices of grain, which he has gathered for 5th March for fifteen years, and these figures certainly displayed a great amount of industry. Why the hon. gentleman selected the 5th March I am at a loss to know. Certainly, it was not because that is the one market day to the Canadian farmer, a day of all days in the year when the price of grain is most important. If one day was to be selected, I would have advised a day in October, or November, or December, which would have been far more important to the farmers of Canada than 5th March. The hon. gentleman, however, took the price of grain for a number of years from 1874 to 1878, and from 1878 to 1889, and the prices are tabulated in the report of his speech in the Debates. The hon. gentleman argued that because the prices were higher in the first period than in the second, the National Policy had had the effect of reducing the price, and consequently diminishing the profit to the Canadian farmers. As a lawyer, I like to refer to authorities, and I do not know that I could give the hon. gentleman a better authority than the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). Last session we had a debate of this nature, and some hon. gentleman on this side adopted a similar line of argument to that followed by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) and claimed that because the prices were in favour of the National Policy during a certain period, this result had been accomplished by the National Policy. The hon. member for North Victoria disposed of this question in a very summary manner. He said:

> "We are told that because the prices of some articles which the farmers consume are less to-day than in 1878, protection must be a good thing. That is a most fallacious argument. It has been said, I believe, by the hon. member for East Durham, but it is perfectly preposterous, as all such articles are cheaper to-day in foreign markets."

The hon. gentleman says that because certain articles are cheaper to-day than they were then, that is, the products which the farmer has to sell, the National Policy caused it, or was to blame for it, as the case might be, and therefore the National Policy should be condemned. If the hon. gentleman had remembered the strictures of the hon. member for North Victoria, he would have known that his argument was false, that if those articles were cheaper in foreign markets they would necessarily be cheaper here, with or without the National Policy. It would appear that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) went on a search for evidence against the National Policy as a detective would search for evidence to condemn a prisoner. The hon. gentleman has searched on one narrow line, he has not searched for the truth or for general information, but, I

repeat, he has searched for evidence to condemn the National Policy; and when he stumbled on the fact that certain products were cheaper to-day in Canada than they were years ago before the National Policy was introduced, he declared that this was *primâ facie* evidence that the National Policy was wrong. Like a detective, the hon. gentleman has shut his eyes to other facts which must have stared him in the face, because on the very page on which he obtained his prices there appeared the prices in New York, Chicago and Liverpool. I will not follow the hon. gentleman over the whole of his figures, because I have already given to the House on a previous occasion the prices in Toronto, Chicago, New York and Montreal, not for one day in one month, but for the three selling months in the year, commencing 15th September, and giving the average prices of the various farm products in New York, Montreal, Toronto and Chicago before the National Policy and after it. If the hon. gentleman would look at the price of wheat on the 5th March, 1879—that is, the last 5th March before the National Policy came into force—he would find that the price of wheat in Toronto was then from 80 to 93 cents for the different qualities, while in New York the price of the same kinds of wheat was from $1.08 to $1.20 per bushel. He will notice that there was a difference of 28 cents in the price then, and if he takes a week back of that he would find that there was a difference of 27 cents per bushel, and a week back again a difference of 22 cents in favour of New York as compared with Toronto. Now, if the hon. gentleman would look at the price of wheat on the 5th March, 1889, he would find that wheat in Toronto was quoted at from $1.07 to $1.20 and Manitoba "No. 1 Hard" at $1.40, while the price in New York at that date was from 95 cents to $1.06 a bushel. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to that comparison. On the 5th March, 1879, New York had the advantage over Toronto by at least 22 cents per bushel, and on the 5th March, 1889, Toronto had the advantage over New York, in the lower grades of wheat, by 12 cents per bushel. I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider this question a little further, and he will find that while wheat was quoted at from 80 to 93 cents at Toronto on the 5th March, 1879, at Liverpool the price was from $1.18 to $1.31, and if he comes down to the 5th March, 1889, he will find that while wheat was $1.07 and as high as $1.40 in Toronto, the average price in Liverpool was $1.14. I will not detain the House by going through many details, but I wish also to refer to one or two other articles which the hon. gentleman mentioned in his speech. He referred to the question of oats. In 1879 if he had only looked he would have found the difference in the price of oats in favour of New York, but if he had looked up the price in 1889, ten years afterwards, he would have found the difference in favour of Toronto. I will now take the much-questioned item of barley. On the 5th March, 1879, the price of barley quoted in Toronto was from 45 cents to 74 cents, while in New York it was from 85 cents to $1.10, while on the 5th March, 1889, the difference of price in favour of New York was barely 30 cents. That shows us that while the difference in favour of New York in the former period was 40 cents between the lowest grade in one and the lowest grade in the other, and 36 cents between the highest grade in one and the highest grade in the other, yet in 1889, ten years after the National Policy, the price of barley is scarcely affected, and if it is affected at all, it is in favour of our home markets. The hon. gentleman referred to the prices for dressed hogs, and I will make a comparison in the prices of pork, because we have the best market returns for that article. We find that in March, 1879, pork was $10 and $11 per barrel in Toronto, $11.50 in New York, $10 in Chicago, or the same as the lowest price in Toronto. Now, on the 5th March, 1889, we find that pork was $13.50 in Toronto, $11.40 in New York, and $11.20 on the Chicago market. While the hon. gentleman, by the fallacious and preposterous argument that he resorted to, would insinuate, if he did not deliberately assert, that the National Policy had caused a reduction in the price of our agricultural products, if he had carried his researches further, he would have found that during these many years under the National Policy, the price of agricultural products had increased in the home market to the benefit of the producer. If the hon. gentleman, instead of seeking for the prices on a particular day when the markets were unsettled and when the produce was in the hands of speculators, had searched carefully through the price lists during the season when the farmers sold their produce, he would have found that in 1879 the prices were all in favour of New York, and that New York was paying a larger price for these products than Toronto. If he takes the prices from that year to the present time he will find that difference in price in favour of New York gradually diminished, until he finds the tables turned the other way, and in the article of pork especially he will find that it is higher to-day in Toronto than in New York, while the prices in other articles have become on a par with New York. Now, what does this change show? It shows that our home markets have improved as compared with the other markets of the world; that they have improved as compared with the great market of Liverpool; that they have improved as compared with the great market of New York, because it is undoubtedly a great market and it consumes a great deal, but it has in its almost boundless western country resources from which to draw, and from which it has drawn, and drawn so cheaply that we find in later years that the prices have been gradually reducing. Why has the price of our agricultural products increased in the home markets? It is because we have adopted the National Policy, and from that National Policy many benefits have accrued to the country. We have adopted the National Policy, and we have created a home market which consumes nearly all our products in these various lines I mention. By the adoption of the National Policy we have created a home market, and we have sustained and stimulated that market; we have encouraged our industries, created new ones, and we have encouraged, sustained, stimulated, and increased these industries that were in existence before. But hon. gentlemen say: The population is decreasing. I do not believe any such statement as that, and, at all events, the home market is not entirely a market depending on numbers. The power to buy in the market does not depend entirely upon the number of purchasers; the power to buy depends upon the means the purchaser has

at his command. The wages the labouring man earns limits or increases his capacity to buy according as these wages be great or small, and therefore in saying that the home market has increased, we do not merely say that the number of consumers has increased, but that their power to purchase has increased as well.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) to amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 130) to incorporate the Chatsworth' Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wilmot.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. MASSON. At six o'clock, I was referring to what constituted a home market. I was explaining that a home market consisted, not only in the numbers of consumers, but in the means the consumers had to purchase. Now, the means of purchasing, especially among the working classes, depend upon the wages they earn. If they are well employed, at full time, and earning good wages, their purchasing power is strong, the market they supply is a good market; and it is in establishing such a market and in protecting it from outside competition that protection is beneficial. Had my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) not limited his investigation to merely finding what the prices of products were in Canada at a certain time before the introduction of the National Policy and at corresponding dates in the years that followed, he would have found that the home markets had become, under protection, so increased and developed, that instead of being far below the markets created by protection in the United States—the great market that had grown up in New York, while New York had been gradually improving its condition as compared with Liverpool and other outside markets—they had steadily improved and now compared favourably with the American market. Taking the average of five years before Confederation—the period taken by the hon. gentleman, starting at the 15th of September and continuing on to the end of the year, I found that in these the selling months—taking, not one day in the year, but every fifth day of each month—that the average price during these years was 18½ cents, in the case of wheat, in favour of New York. Starting from that point the difference became less and less, until within the last two years we have reached this proud position, that the market of Toronto is higher than the markets of New York. I made the comparison also with Chicago, and I found that in the former period, which the hon. gentleman took as his first period, that Chicago and Toronto quotations were about on a par. The fluctuations were greater in Chicago than in Toronto, but the average during the selling months—not the speculative months such as March and April—but the selling months in the fall of the year, in Toronto and Chicago, was about the same. But what do we find since the National Policy was introduced and our home market protected and developed? We find the difference increasing in favour of Toronto, until we have on an average, for the last ten years, a difference of 10 cents in favour of Toronto in wheat, and from 10 to 12 cents on oats, and we have a difference in the last year of from $2 to $3 a barrel on pork in favour of Toronto, and those changes have been brought about by the protection given to our home market by the National Policy. One reason why protection has tended to produce that gratifying result is this, that prior to the duty being placed on farm products, the American products of the soil came in before ours, the harvest of the American growers being earlier, and they being thus enabled to put their grain on the market before we could market ours, so that all our great milling establishments were filled with American western wheat before our wheat was ready for the market. The same may be said with regard to their pork. The Americans filled our lumber institutions with pork. In the early part of the year, during the season of navigation, while transport was cheap, they poured in their cheap pork of the West and glutted our Canadian markets, and when the Canadian farmer came to sell his pork, he found a glutted market and he had to take the export prices. He was thus deprived of the best of all markets, the home market. Now, in the matter of grain we know that millions and millions of bushels—I will not detain the House by going over the details—came into Canada, while we had, on the other hand, to export sometimes more and sometimes less, but, on the average, very nearly the same quantity. Now, what was the result? That gave us a carrying trade; that was all right; but was the carrying trade for the benefit of the farmers? Now, Sir, it placed the farmers' market, an export market, below the New York market, and far below the English market, and the result was that we had to seek a foreign market; and no matter how well our grain might stand as compared with the grain of other countries, we had to seek an outside market for it. The farmer had to sell to the grain buyer, who looked forward to shipping it to England, directly or indirectly, by way of Montreal or by way of New York. That buyer had to take the Liverpool or New York price and deduct the expense of getting his grain there, he had to deduct the duty the Americans placed on it, and the cost of carrying across the Atlantic. The facts will prove to any hon. gentleman who will investigate the matter, that our grain was below the price of other markets. Now, with a home market developed, we are in the proud position of saying that we are on a par with New York in many things. Now, I said that I have contrasted these things from year to year before the National Policy had been adopted, and I want to point out

hon. gentlemen that there is but one exception to the statement I made that our markets have been improved, as compared with the American markets, since a good home market has been protected and developed. I want to point out that exception clearly to hon. gentlemen, so that they may apply it to prove the rule that I have laid down. Last year the harvest in the states, especially the harvest of corn, was so much below the average that the price of corn for the last season's growth has been nearly double the price of the season before. The great production of corn in the Western States has rendered corn the staple and standard of prices for the coarser grains, and the products of the coarser grains in the United States. Hon. gentlemen will see that the high price of corn for the last year's crop in the United States gave us, during the latter months of last year and the first months of this year, the position of being below the American markets in those respects. That is the first time in fifteen years that a general failure of the corn crop has taken place in the United States, that general failure brought about that home demand, and increased the home price, and the consequence was that we, though having a protected market, had not as high a home market as the United States. It was not the effect of the McKinley Bill. A strong supporter of protection might argue that this change of prices between Canada and the United States had been brought about by the McKinley Bill; but that would be following along the fallacious line of argument that hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted, the line that it was the McKinley Bill that gave us the high prices in the United States last year. But high as those prices were, they never yet reached the height of allowing us to sell to the Americans, considering their high duty. Notwithstanding the fact that United States prices were high, the *Globe*, in dealing with the subject about the 1st of January, treated that matter very clearly, and showed our prices here were too high for export. It stated then, quoting from a Chicago paper, that the amount of corn visible was not over one bushel in ten compared with what it was the year before. They gave that as a reason why these grains were commanding such high prices then, and dealing with it as a commercial, not as a political matter, they gave the real, honest interpretation of the reason the market was so high. Then hon. gentlemen will say if such is the case, reciprocity in farm products would not be advantageous to the farmers. I most emphatically say that reciprocity in farm products as a whole, even including barley, would be very much otherwise than beneficial to the farmers. I want first to point out two distinct views of the matter. Let us admit in the first place that we have to pay every cent of the duty on barley, that barley has been reduced down to a price that we virtually cannot sell it, and that we have got to find another market for it. A duty of 30 cents a bushel is prohibition, and that means that we shall have to look for other markets, and that will cause a depreciation in the price. We have, then, to set off our nine or ten million bushels of barley against our wheat, our pease, our oats, and in that way we are setting off ten bushels to one. In Ontario alone, the only province that has furnished these statistics, the produce of those four grains amounted to from ten to twelve million bushels on the one side, and the total of the other three amounted to about one hundred million bushels. Now, it is not to be expected that farmers are, for barley alone, going to depreciate their whole sale of wheat, their whole sale of oats and pease, because the depreciation in pease will be enormous; if corn is allowed to come in, it will be as great in oats and pease as it is in the states. Two years ago we had oats selling in Chicago for 17 cents; corn was at 20 and 22, and oats bore a relative position according to weight, and 17 and 19 cents was the average through that year. The introduction of corn free into this country would have brought our oats down from 12 to 13 cents below what the price was before. We had oats here selling at 33 and 34 cents in Owen Sound and other places in Ontario, while they were selling in Chicago at 17, 18 and 19 cents. Now, it was the competition of free corn that brought them to that low ebb. If we look through the American papers, if we look at the Amerian markets for quotations for pease, we do not find them. All the Eastern, Northern and North-Western States were in a position to grow pease as well as Canada. The imaginary line does not prevent the growth of pease on one side or the other; besides, we know that these states already grow pease, but circumstances have changed, the growth of corn in the Western States has developed so greatly that the circumstances have entirely changed, and those who in former years could, as a Canadian farmer can to-day, grow a profitable crop of pease, now find that pease are driven from the market and they grow them no more. Such would be the loss sustained in corn. But reciprocity in natural farm products would go further still; it would let in all the cheap American pork, and we would have to stop entirely our raising of pork. If pork came in free our farmers would have to close up that industry altogether. Reciprocity in farm products would also bring in free cattle and free beef, and that would destroy an industry that has been developed by the National Policy, and is being developed year after year to the great benefit of the Canadian farmers. We are told, on the other side, that our farms are being depleted, that they do not grow the amount of grain they used to grow, that the prices of grain are low, and, for all these reasons, the farmers are hard up. There is no doubt that the product of grain has depreciated, there can be no reason to doubt that the price of wheat has greatly fallen. It has fallen the world over. The best we can hope to do by the National Policy is to keep the price relatively high, and that is all we ever promised to do, and that promise we have absolutely fulfilled; but if the grain yield and the grain price are falling, it behooves the farmers to look for some other sources of revenue, and they look for that in live stock, in cattle, in sheep and in hogs, and if reciprocity in farm produce were adopted, it would be ruinous to them. If the hon. gentleman had followed his researches a little further, instead of being satisfied when he dropped on to what he thought was a little piece of evidence against the National Policy, he would have come to the conclusion that the National Policy had relatively kept up the prices. Was it for lack of knowledge that he made his statement, or did he reserve the evidence which he obtained? He must have exercised a good deal of ingenuity in following up the articles in regard to

which he made the comparison. He says in regard to the article of eggs that it was unfair to compare one year with another. We are told that eggs are as high this year as they were last, but he says that proves nothing. He may be right there, but why does he not apply that to wheat, to oats and to pork? He would apply that to eggs, because he said the McKinley Bill, that friendly Bill which was passed on the other side of the line to aid certain gentlemen to get into power on this side of the line, had a detrimental effect upon eggs. He should also compare the price of barley on this side with the price of barley on the other side, and he would find that there had been an increase of 20 cents on the bushel, and that barley was 30 cents higher on the other side than on this. Wherever it was to the advantage of the hon. gentleman, he had ingenuity, forethought and knowledge enough to make the comparison, but where such a comparison would score a mark for the National Policy, he very carefully avoided making the comparison. The hon. gentleman would also make a comparison in regard to horses, and he led us to believe that this McKinley Bill was knocking the horse trade sky high—I think his expression was "as high as Gilroy's kite." As a matter of fact, there is very little change in that matter. I know that in my section of the country horses are selling as well as they were before. I find that our export of horses is so small, compared with the number of horses we produce, that the American duty, even if it shut out the American buyers entirely, would not appreciably affect our farmers. It might affect them for a time, it might have an effect of short duration, but, on the whole, it could not materially affect us. We are told that we send 16,000 horses to the United States. How many do we produce? We produce far more than that. The estimate a few years ago was that 200,000 were produced in Ontario, and later than that, 225,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made an estimate that we were losing $30 a horse on 1,000,000 horses. That might be a fair estimate of the number we produce, but the farmers are not selling 1,000,000 horses, and when they sell the 200,000 horses, they find a home market in our cities, towns and villages for the great proportion, and when the American buyer, the English buyer, the foreign buyer, wherever he comes from, comes into Canada to buy horses, he has got to go one better every time than the Canadian buyer or he does not get the horse. He must go $1 better and then he will get the horse, but if the duty was thrown off, surely my hon. friend is not going to say that the farmer would get $30 more for his horse. He is not surely so impressed with the generosity of the American buyer that he would argue that the American buyer would voluntarily pay $30 more than he, by competition with his home buyer, would be forced to pay. Where there is a small percentage of 8 or 10 per cent. of the produce sold abroad, the remaining 90 or 92 per cent. will govern the price. I want to point out another feature of this. The Americans wish to get the better class of horses, and they are not importing very many horses. They are by no means hungry for horses. The Americans only imported, according to their own Trade and Navigation Returns, 17,000 horses the year before last from Canada, and only 38,000 all told. Of that number 20,000 came from Mexico, and those came at an average of $10 a head. We find, then, that the Americans are not, according to these figures, so terribly hard up for horses, and it is only the better classes of horses they want. The duty on a $150 horse is no higher under the McKinley Bill than it was under the old tariff. The same thing is true as to lambs. There is no doubt that all the lambs we export go to the United States, and, looking at their Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that nearly every lamb and sheep they import comes from Canada. They want the better lambs, and the duty on a $3.50 lamb is just the same as it was before. So, on these two articles the McKinley Bill has been particularly guarded, so as not to hurt the American consumer too much. The hon. gentleman went on to say that the National Policy was to be condemned because it discriminated against the poor man in favour of the rich, and he waxed eloquent on the subject of pictures. He said the millionaire could buy a picture in high art at $20,000 and bring it in free, but the poor man had to pay a duty of 25 or 30 per cent. on the chromo, or the cut, or the steel engraving he might purchase. Is there anything discriminating against the poor man in allowing high class art pictures to come in free at a price of $20,000, or $10,000, or $5,000? Does the poor man pay any more for his pictures because these valuable works of art come in free? Unless it can be proved that he pays more than the farmer of the United States pays for his chromos and small pictures there is no point made against the National Policy, and certainly there is none in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Further, the hon. gentleman said that 45 per cent. was charged on Canadian tweeds, and only 25 per cent. on the finer cloths. Does he argue that the farmer pays that amount of 45 per cent.? If the hon. gentleman were advocating absolute free trade, or free trade with England, he might have some figures which he could quote to show that the price of tweeds was higher here than it would be if that duty were taken off, but if he compares the price of tweeds in Canada with the price in the United States he will find that the price is from 20 to 25 per cent. less here than it is there. If he wants proof of that, let him go to any seaboard town and watch seamen landing from a vessel. What do the crews do when they come ashore? Immediately each man buys a suit of tweed, some underwear and coarse boots, for they know where they can buy them the cheapest. No doubt tweeds are cheaper in England and Scotland than they are here, and free trade, it might be urged, would benefit our people in the tweed line. But does the hon. gentleman propose free trade with Great Britain? Not by any means. He and his party propose to erect a tariff wall double the height we have it now against Great Britain, and at the same time have free trade with the United States, where tweeds are higher than they are in Canada. The same remarks apply to shirtings. They may be cheaper in some countries, but not in the country with which it is proposed to arrange reciprocity. The hon. gentleman waxed very eloquent on the subject of organs. I do not know where he got his figures, but that part of his speech was no doubt prepared four or five years ago, when the duties were different to what they are now. The hon. gentleman told the House that the duty on organs ranged from 50 to 70 per cent. The duties are $10 specific and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. What price

of organ would that make 50 or 70 per cent. ? On a higher class the specific duty is $15 and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; on a still higher class $20 specific and 15 per cent. ; on a still higher class $30 specific and 15 per cent., and on the highest class, more expensive than ordinary pianos, $30 specific and 15 per cent. I should like the hon. gentleman to explain how he can obtain 50 or 70 per cent. out of these duties ? No doubt he was referring to an old tariff. But the hon. gentleman said that the rich man's piano was allowed to come in at a greatly reduced duty. A comparison of the duties shows that the hon. gentleman is again astray. The duties on pianos are $25 and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, on an extra quality $30 each and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and on a still higher quality $30 each and 20 per cent. So the hon. gentleman's contention that there is a discrimination against the poor man in regard to organs and pianos is an entire mistake. In regard to the organ and piano question I may say that the National Policy has developed in Canada one of its finest industries, an industry that employs hundreds of men, pays them good wages and exports its products to all quarters of the world. The hon. gentleman referred to blankets, to the blanket of the poor man, to the shoddy blanket, on which there was a duty of from 50 to 80 per cent. Were blankets ever cheaper than at present? An affirmative or negative answer would prove nothing I admit, but we may fairly ask, are blankets cheaper in Canada than in the United States? They are decidedly cheaper ; I am told they are 40 per cent. cheaper. Are blankets cheaper to-day as compared with England than they were formerly ? In making this comparison it appears that blankets were never cheaper in this country than they are to-day, in comparison with the English prices. I would not weary the House with the calculations, but the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) was very specific. He hunted all over the list of articles the farmers buy, and he claimed that they were paying a higher price on account of the duty than the American farmers had to pay. Yet the American farmers, mechanics, miners and lumbermen pay more for these very articles mentioned by him than the same classes of our people do in Canada. But he discovered in going through the long list of articles that farmers do occasionally purchase, that a certain clothes wringer could be bought in Detroit cheaper than in Windsor—an article which a farmer does not buy more than once a year or once in five years. He also made a statement that spades could be bought cheaper in the United States. I am informed that the spade which the hon. gentleman said could be bought at retail for $1.16 could actually be bought at from 90 to 95 cents. However, it is a small matter to cavil about, and I am quite willing for the sake of the argument to admit his figures, but I have no doubt the clothes-wringer is protected by a patent, and but for the patent laws the difference would disappear. Our spade industry is a new one. It has been fighting against strong competition, and the tariff amendment in its favour was only passed recently. If we have not yet developed it so as to be able to compete favourably with American spade-makers, we certainly will soon do so. We have heard the old story about barley and barb wire. We have heard it during election campaigns year after year, and I will not touch on the matter in detail. I will just say that I have always contended that the greater part of the barley duty was paid by Canadians, but when it has come to 30 cents, the additional 20 cents being added by the McKinley tariff, I see that this has proved that such is not the case. No doubt the farmers were afraid of it, and had reason to be so, and accordingly they marketed their barley before the McKinley Bill came into operation, and immediately afterwards there was a sudden change. But how long did it remain ? We find barley again higher than it was before, and I want to point out why it was so. It was not on account of the McKinley tariff, nor on account of the National Policy, but it was because the production of barley in the United States has so developed, and the American brewers have been able to utilize the western grain in such a way that the prices have sunk so low, that not for the last year only, but for the last three, or four, or five years, perhaps, the Canadian barley has been reduced down to a feed basis. It does not owe its existing price to the matter of brewing and malting at all, but to its value as a coarse grain for feeding purposes. No change in the American tariff, no change in any tariff, will sink it below that price, for if it goes below that price as an article for feed, pease and oats will go down also. Now, with reference to the question of oil, I shall not enlarge upon it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a dangerous subject.

Mr. MASSON. Did the hon. gentleman say it was dangerous ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes ; for you.

Mr. MASSON. Not at all. I had something to do with law suits in which the wholesale price of oil came up, and I know that Canadian oil can be bought wholesale as cheap, or nearly as cheap, as the American oil ; but the great difficulty seems to be that our retail buyers have, I have no doubt, formed a combine in every town ; and, of course, we know that the oil combine is entitled to the defence of some hon. gentlemen on the other side. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) gave us a sample of a combine that should be defended, and he very eloquently and very warmly defended the salt combine. He gave very reasonable arguments in favour of the salt combine as a proper and legitimate transaction. He was complaining of the reduction of the salt duty, but he might have gone further and shown that the manufacture of salt had dropped into a monopoly, that it had dropped into one man's hands, and that that one man was paying the manufacturers but a trifle more than they were getting before, when they were competing with one another and cutting one another's throats, as the hon. gentleman said. This man steps in and he takes the salt from them at their price, and he, and he alone, gets the extra profit and the great benefits of this combine. I congratulate the Government on the firm stand they have taken on this question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No one man had ever control of the salt interests in this country. I know that to be a fact, and you are entirely mistaken, so that you had better get on to another subject as quickly as possible.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman makes the assertion that no one man ever controlled the salt interest in Canada, but I make the assertion just

as boldly as the hon. gentleman makes it, that one man did control the salt interest, and the product of the salt wells of Ontario. I will say, further, that the grangers of Ontario started into the salt business, and that they succumbed to the influence of this man, and one well after another was swallowed up by this man, until the last well which was opened was allowed the privilege, that the patrons of that well in the immediate vicinity could buy in bulk at what prices they choose, but the rest of the output was to go to him. That is a pure business and a legitimate transaction which the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) would defend. This man went to the manufacturer and said: I will buy your total output, and in this way, by going from one to the other, he succeeded in getting the total production. The hon. gentleman said that the Government was not honest when they spoke of getting a reciprocity treaty on the lines of the treaty of 1854, and that if the Government had made the bold statement that that is what they offered they would never have got the support of the agriculturists of Ontario. I may say that it was from adyed-in-the-wool Reformer that I got the first hint to make researches in the direction of how the National Policy was benefiting the country, and how wrong it was to keep the statutory offer of reciprocity in farm products on the Statute-books. Now, in all these articles which I have mentioned, I say that we have to admit the fact, that no matter what the supposition was in 1878 or in 1854, the experience of the last twelve years has taught us that our markets for farm produce have relatively improved—not actually increased in price, because we remember what the *Globe* said about the National Policy in 1882. When some persons were clamouring and using the fallacious arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite that because wheat reached again to a dollar a bushel that the National Policy had done this, the *Globe* said that "it was no more possible for the National Policy to raise the price of wheat than for a common house fly to raise a saw log." A common house fly—I have no doubt a very much smaller class of fly than that aristocratic kind of fly which sat on the Government wheel for five years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you aware that it was Sir John Macdonald who called himself a fly on the wheel?

Mr. MASSON. I would refer hon. gentlemen opposite to this statement which was made by the *Globe*, and I would ask them to consider that if the National Policy cannot raise the price of wheat it cannot lower it; hon. gentlemen opposite cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. What we say is, that the National Policy has relatively raised the prices; we do not say that it will make the price of wheat a dollar here if it is selling in New York for 80 cents, but we do say that it will increase the prices relatively. The hon. gentleman specially referred to our trade in eggs, and we must remember that we have a new market opening for us in this trade, a market which I feel certain will develop, and will be a substitute for the American market. If we cannot find a market for the "six-rowed" barley which the farmers are now raising, beyond the price which they could get for it as coarse grain, the farmers will grow a "two-rowed" barley which they will find a ready market elsewhere for. They will do in regard to these matters as they did some years ago, change their mode of farming to suit the necessities of the time. We remember that when the American duty was placed on cattle, we were exporting our cattle to the United States for $13 and $15 per head, and we had no other market but the United States for that class of cattle. Our farmers then did a wise thing, and they commenced raising a class of cattle which would find a market elsewhere. The result is that one of the most profitable lines of industry in the Dominion is our export cattle trade to Great Britain, an industry which has grown up in consequence of the Americans abrogating that treaty; and, therefore, the policy of the United States which was considered as a menace to us, which was intended as a menace by the Americans, and which was looked on with dread by the Canadians, has turned out to be one of the greatest blessings to the Canadian farmers, because it has started them in a new and profitable industry. Then, we have the growth of the trade in swine and pork, as a new departure for the Canadian farmer to enrich himself and to compensate himself for his reduced grain product. We have in cattle and their products an enormous export trade with Great Britain; and we have also in hogs and their products an enormous trade with Great Britain. Yet we are told that the United States is our natural market. Now, I trust that I shall not weary the House by referring to some of the returns in this connection. The United States, according to their own returns, imported from Canada last year the enormous number of 9,016 horned cattle, valued at $61,000; our returns put the value at $104,000. But at the same time they were exporting to Great Britain of cattle and their products no less than $29,000,000 worth. Now, let me give the returns with regard to grains. The United States, according to their own returns, imported from Canada under their old tariff 155,000 bushels of wheat out of a total importation of 157,000 bushels. Yet we are told that these very energetic Americans, who are not afraid to tackle the rest of the world, are so afraid of a few thousand bushels of Canadian wheat that they are forced, as a measure of protection to their own agriculturists, and not for the advantage of one political party in Canada, to increase the duty from 20 to 25 cents a bushel. At the same time they were exporting to Great Britain alone—not taking into consideration at present what they exported to other countries—38,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 7,500,000 barrels of flour, equivalent, when reduced to wheat, to 36,500,000 bushels more; or a total of about 75,000,000 bushels of wheat exported by the United States to Great Britain alone. In the face of these figures, how can it be reasonably said that the United States are the natural market for our wheat? No more than it can be truthfully said that England is the natural market for our Nova Scotian coal. Then, of oats, we find according to their own returns, the United States imported from Canada 18,000 bushels, while at the same time they exported to Great Britain, 6,912,000 bushels of oats, and 24,000,000 pounds of oatmeal. How can it be reasonably said that a country which thus exports to Great Britain about 7,000,000 bushels of oats and the product of oats is our natural market for oats? The United States do not deal in pease, for the reason I have stated. We

find that they export to Great Britain no less than 54,500,000 bushels of corn, and about nearly an equal quantity to other countries, making a total export of corn of 101,973,000 bushels. Can such a grain-producing country as that be for a moment claimed to be the natural market for our grain? As another proof that the United States are not our natural market, compare their export price with ours. Taking their Trade and Navigation Returns on one side and ours on the other, you will find that their export price for grain is about 2 cents a bushel lower than ours. But we are told that our cattle trade has become so largely developed that that would not be injured by unrestricted reciprocity. We know that the United States have not been exporting many cattle to Canada on account of the quarantine regulations, not on account of the duty; but they manage to get over the quarantine regulations by sending their cattle here in the shape of beef, in spite of the duty, to the extent of some 8,000,000 lbs.; they also send pork, bacon and hams to the extent of 29,711,000 lbs.; and if you add lard, you will find that in beef, pork and lard they send to Canada no less than 44,500,000 lbs. in spite of the duty. But let us see what they are doing with the rest of their cattle and hogs. According to their own returns, they sent to England and Scotland $29,750,000 worth of cattle, and $21,750,000 worth of the products of cattle in the shape of fresh beef, canned beef, salt beef, &c; or a total of cattle and their products to Great Britain alone of $51,000,000 worth. While they are sending such a large surplus to Great Britain to compete with us in our natural market, how can the United States be claimed to be the natural market for Canadian cattle and beef? I think no one can for a moment argue that it is our natural market. Then, coming to the question of hogs, we find that they sent a few, not many, live hogs, but they sent in bacon and ham and pork to the extent of no less than 532,000,000 lbs., besides over $10,000,000 worth of lard, amounting to a total value of $52,000,000 worth, to Great Britain alone, besides the great quantity they sent into Canada. And they sent into Canada, in one shape or another, 34,500,000 lbs. of pork, bacon and lard. That is the total that was sent in, of which 26,750,000 lbs. went into consumption in Canada. Thus, in spite of the duty, they encroached on our home market and supplied our lumbermen and others with pork, bacon, lard and so on, to the extent of 26,750,000 lbs. of the product of the hog. On the face of all these imports, can it then be for a moment contended that the United States is the natural market for our farm produce? But besides that, we have the products of the dairy. We find in that we hold the proud position, so far as cheese is concerned, of exporting to Great Britain more than the United States all told. We find our cheese is sought for in the English market, where it commands 1 to 1½ cents a pound more than the American cheese. What about cheese? Do we send cheese to the United States? We send a few thousand lbs., I believe. But do they send any to Canada? They sent to Canada last year over 13,500,000 lbs. True, that did not all enter into consumption. True, a very small portion of it entered into consumption, the greater portion having been sent here for the purpose of shipment from Canadian ports, to get the benefit they acknowledge they can get by having it pass in England as Canadian cheese. Considering the reasons for the good times that did exist while the reciprocity treaty of 1854 lasted, it was not unnatural that our people generally, at first sight, in 1878, when the renewal of the treaty was proposed, should suppose it was the best thing they could get; but, looking at the facts and figures staring us in the face and dealing with them as practical men, our farmers have, time after time, and especially in the last election, declared they believed it in their interest to support the party and the policy that gives them protection. But it is said, then you are departing from your own policy of the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with modifications to meet the changed circumstance of Canada. Not at all. Take for instance, the question of coal. There is no doubt the people of Nova Scotia at one time firmly believed that reciprocity would be for their benefit in the matter of coal. Do they think so to-day? No; because during the interval the production of coal has increased to such an extent, and the price of coal in the United States has sunk so low, that the United States market is no longer any benefit to us. So in the matter of farm produce. The time was when the farmers of Ontario did think the United States was their natural market, and their only market, but these times have changed. The progress made by this country in the matter of railways and river and canal navigation have changed the circumstances, and given us direct access to the market we were actually bidding for before, but to which we had to send through the United States. And while these circumstances have been changing here to our benefit, other changes have been taking place. The production of farm products in the United States has increased to such an extent, and the prices have sunk so low that the United States market is no longer any use to us. These are things which must be taken into account in the adjustment of any tariff or the making of any treaty. We are bound to consider what effect the tariff, as it now is, is having on the people, and not what ten or twelve years ago they expected it would have. What is the result the change would bring about now? Men have to deal with this question practically and not theoretically. They have to deal with things as they are, and they have to consider what effect a change would have on farm produce. Would it increase the price of any of our other products? If it would, these products are either few or the quantities we have to export are small. In the matter of horses, it would practically not affect us at all, but even if it did, the number we export is small compared with the total product. It amounts to a good round sum reduced to dollars, $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 a year—$2,000,000 may perhaps be taken as the average for the last four years—but, as compared with the total product, the amount exported is small, and besides it has to be borne in mind that when the Americans come here to buy in such small quantities we have to compete with our home buyers. In the matter of grain, barley excepted, it would be prejudicial to us. But, it is said, you claim as a party that you are in favour of extended trade relations. There are many subjects reciprocity in which would not only benefit Canada, but also benefit the United States. In some things it would benefit us and be no benefit to the United

States and perhaps no loss. In other things it would benefit the United States and be no loss to us, but when the time comes for making that readjustment we will have to get, on the one side, what will be beneficial, and to give, on the other, what will not be a loss. And if a loss has been suffered for a gain, let it be carefully ascertained that the loss does not exceed the gain. Do not, for the sake of getting a benefit on barley, give away all the benefit we have on wheat and oats. Do not give away more than we are getting. These are the things to be considered. I have occupied more time than I intended, but the subject is a large one and worth the time spent discussing it. We have to consider this question as fully as possible, and it is well that both sides of it should be put in a plain and straightforward manner, and that hon. gentlemen should make researches, not with the purpose of condemning or upholding one particular line, but of placing the matter fairly and squarely before the public. If my hon. friend, in his researches on grain, had gone further than he did, he would have found an exception in last year's crops. He would have found, in to-day's papers, that wheat in Toronto brings $1.02 to $1.03 for No. 2 White; No. 2 Winter, $1.01 to $1.02; No. 2 Hard, $1.07; and No. 1 Northern, $1.08; and then if he would refer to New York he would find the price quoted there at 99½ cents., and in a fuller return he would find that No. 2 Chicago was quoted there at 89 cents, and the highest price quoted for No. 1 was $1.02. He would find that Toronto had again recovered the advantage she lost in regard to that. Then again, if he referred to Chicago he would find the same discrimination of 10 cents. He would find that while wheat was $1 and $1.07 in Toronto, it was only 98 cents or 99 cents in Chicago. I will not trouble you with any further details. I congratulate the Government upon the grand financial statement they have presented to the country, and upon the power which that financial statement gives them. I congratulate them upon being able from their financial standing to put their hands in their pockets and strike off, in the interest of the country and of the consumer, no less than $3,500,000 of direct taxation, as direct taxation as it is possible to have under the tariff system. I might express a regret that some other changes were not made in the tariff, but considering the lateness of the session and the hurry that no doubt was felt by Ministers in preparing their new schemes on the Budget for this session, I will not dwell on the details which I would like to have seen changed. I congratulate the Government upon the measure they have adopted to recoup some of the revenue which is given away on the sugar duties, and, on behalf of the constituency I represent, I express my confidence in the Government as a Government of progress and development, as a Government whose aim and object has been to advance the interests of the country in every conceivable shape. It is the same spirit of progress and development which, at the commencement of Confederation, set forward with a determined hand to bind together by means of the Intercolonial Railway the provinces which then formed the new Confederation. It is the same spirit of progress and development that gave strength to the Government of the day to proceed with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to bring in the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and to unite the Atlantic with the Pacific by a continuous line of railway. This policy of progress and development is based upon faith in the country. They believed, as has been expressed in the words of Mr. Bullock, quoted to the hon. gentleman opposite, that, as long as the lines of division between nations exist, until they are actually obliterated, until the whole world becomes one, it is the duty of every nation to guard well the interests of its own people. They have acted on that patriotic principle of guarding well the interests of their own people, and they have shown that they have faith in the resources of the country. What have we presented to us on the other side? Have we a policy presented to us that is worthy of confidence, a policy that would invite the old Canadian or the young Canadian to adhere to the banners of that party? What is that policy? It is indefinite. One says it means this, and another says it means that, but read in the light of the speeches of their associates, and of the statesmen with whom they are negotiating to carry out the schemes they would propose, we find that it is a policy that would give to a foreign state an advantage that would be denied to England. The late leader of that party, upon visiting Washington to negotiate a treaty in 1866, had something of the same kind propounded to him, and his statement was that he would scorn to consider any proposition that would give to a foreign country an advantage which was denied to Great Britain. On a later occasion, the same late leader of that party stated that he would scorn to lay before a Canadian Parliament any measure that would discriminate in favour of a foreign country against the mother land. We have now for the first time in the history of Canada the would-be leaders of that once great party not hesitating to propose to us to give to a foreign country the privileges which they deny to Great Britain, or to lay before a Canadian Parliament a policy that would discriminate in favour of that foreign country against the mother land. We find on one side the views of Mr. Farrer, who says to the Americans: Coerce, increase your tariff; and we find the Americans, whom these gentlemen choose to quote and to associate with, increasing that tariff, and resorting to coercion. We find an American statesman telling the Canadians and the Canadian party who are in accord with him and that he admits are in accord with him, that they must argue up the popular vote of the farmers, mechanics, miners and fishermen to vote for commercial union, that that would be great progress; and we find that in the campaign which began on the 1st July, 1877, when Mr. Erastus Wiman, the pioneer of commercial union, addressed a meeting at Dufferin Lake, in the Province of Ontario, the same effort was made to argue up the popular vote of Canada for commercial union; and we also find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) starting on a tour of education, to educate the public mind, to educate the farmers, the mechanics, the miners and the fishermen of Canada, as he had been instructed by the gentlemen from across the line, to vote for unrestricted reciprocity. This may be accidental, but we find these gentlemen acting exactly in accord with one another whether it be accidental or not. We have to judge from all these circumstances what is the policy of gentlemen on the other side of the House, and we may take the language of Goldwin Smith,

one of the professors and solons of that party, when he said that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity meant the same thing. We find the same statements made by American statesmen, who add that annexation must be the outcome directly or indirectly. What is the policy of those gentlemen opposite? Is it a single plank? Is it simply one pole on which they would erect a flag. And, if they did erect a flag, what would be the flag? Would it be the Union Jack? Would it be a flag with the maple leaf and the beaver, but one from which the crosses of St. George, St. Patrick and St. Andrew had been torn? Would it be the Stars and Stripes? To judge of their policy more in detail, and as shown by them during the late campaign and throughout their whole career, it may be said that it has been a policy of trying to set province against province. At the beginning of the late campaign, in the early skirmishing of that campaign, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) visited my constituency. There, he could not, in the face of a flourishing town, in the face of the number of well-off farmers who assembled to hear his oratory, say that the National Policy was ruining them. He told them that they were prospering in spite of the National Policy, but, he said, you are more favoured than others. Then he goes on to say how terribly hard up were the people down by the sea, how much this National Policy was abusing them. He referred to them in this language:

"Bear in mind you now pay more than your share of taxes to assist the pauperized provinces in the east."

There was a bait held out for the Province of Ontario to rise in arms against the eastern pauperized provinces. Later on he refers to them as "impoverished communities"; he says, "these impoverished communities are asking you to pay a still greater share." Now, such has been their policy, a policy of setting race against race, creed against creed, trade against trade, capital against labour and labour against capital; one story to one class and another story to another. By trying to set every man against his brother, every province against the other, every race against the other, they have, out of these various broils, tried to win some. Now, is there anything in such a policy that would encourage the people to flock to their standard? They may say that in the last election they won some seats. It would be wonderful indeed if, after four years of arguing the people to vote for them, they had not succeeded in making some converts. But hon. gentlemen opposite must remember, and they must frankly admit, that while they were busily engaged in educating the public mind on that question, for one reason or another the Government supporters were not equally diligent, they were not going about the country, they were not even active in their own constituencies, so that the Opposition had had an open field for nearly four years and, to use an expression which those hon. gentlemen are fond of using, they "loaded up the people one way." But in the short space of a few weeks the Government were strong enough, and their supporters in the country were strong enough, to "load them up the other way," and they succeeded in doing so in a great many constituencies. We have won many constituencies, and some we lost, but those that we lost are what hon. gentlemen opposite call border constituencies. Wherever a constituency had for its market town an American city right at its door, no doubt the influence would be very strong; but there were other border constituencies that did not change their mind, that remained true to the old policy, conscious of the fact that they were being benefited by it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will apologize for having occupied so much of the time of the House. The subject is a large one, and in attempting to follow some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I have been led into many subjects that I had not intended to touch upon. I have many other figures that I would like to present to the House, but considering the lateness of the hour and the time that I have already taken up, I will not trespass longer on your attention. I may, however, before concluding, say that Canada has nothing to be afraid of, either from the McKinley Bill or from any other source. Let me quote a few sentences of encouragement from an address delivered by the Hon. George Brown in 1874:

"Neither politically nor commercially does Canada need to change her position to secure a high degree of prosperity. In all that conduces to personal comfort and happiness, in the steady development of home and foreign trade, in the extension of public enterprise, in the flourishing condition of our farmers, in the unlimited scope for the employment of a vast population, Canada has all that a nation can desire."

However, as the Hon. George Brown has long been laid to rest, it is possible that some hon. gentlemen may prefer to read the opinions of a living leader of the Liberal party, and I will read a short extract from an address delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford, speaking in Prince Edward Island when he held the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown:

"They say we must have reciprocity, and we cannot live without it as a Dominion. I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships, and will carry the war into Africa. We will find new markets for ourselves and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us into their own terms."

Such was the statement of the hon. gentleman when unquestionably he breathed the language of a patriot, when he told the Americans, when he told the world, that while reciprocity was desirable we could live without it, that we could find new markets for ourselves and cut them out. Sir, we have a country that we all might be proud of. We have resources that are for us to develop, and all that is necessary is a determination to develop them, and a confidence in the resources of our country, a confidence in the nation we belong to, and a determination that, come weal or come woe, we will stand by the flag under which our fathers fought and bled and died, and we will build up in this great Dominion a country that we may all be proud of.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not going to attemp to follow my hon. friend in his long speech. He made a few points that I shall reply to, but, if I were to devote sufficient time to make a full reply to all his remarks I fancy that it would be about daylight to-morrow morning before I should get through. I may say here and now to the Finance Minister, that if we are to have as long speeches on that side of the House until the close of this debate as we have already had, my impression is that it will be about the season of the year when the

snow will begin to fall before we get out of Ottawa. I shall not, therefore, follow the example of the hon. gentleman in taking up much time of the House. I think it is quite clear from the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friends, as well as from the remarks that have fallen from a great many on that side of the House who have spoken on these trade questions which are of vital importance to this country, that they are not now, they have not been, and they will not be in favour of reciprocity of any kind. I think it is quite clear from the remarks that we have heard dropped on this point, not only from a member of the Government last year who is not now a member of this House, but from the fact that his sentiments have been reiterated by hon. gentlemen opposite in the addresses they have delivered, that we have evidence that will clearly satisfy any unbiassed mind, at least, that they are not in favour even of reciprocity in natural products with the United States. I contend in that case they have perpetrated a gross fraud upon the people of this Dominion. In what way? Last year when an appeal was made to the people for a renewal of that confidence which the Government had enjoyed for so many years, what was the ground of their appeal? The First Minister came to Toronto, the most central and important city of Ontario, and he there stated that the Government were appealing to the people to grant them authority to send a delegation to Washington to negotiate trade relations with the United States. The Minister of Justice in addressing the citizens of Toronto, stated at the same meeting that the Government intended to obtain reciprocity with the United States along the lines of the reciprocity treaty which prevailed from 1854 to 1866 in natural products. Hon. gentlemen have endeavoured to show by their arguments, that even in natural products it would be injurious to our farmers to enter into such trade relations, that in the matter of pork and other commodities we produce, it would inflict a very serious blow on the farmers. It is quite clear from this fact, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not in favour of reciprocity of any kind with the United States. The reason why they are not in favour of it is simply this. The manufacturers or a very large percentage of them have been enjoying very large and lucrative profits under the present policy, and so long as they can persuade hon. gentlemen opposite to uphold them by their votes and grant them assistance of that very desirable and valuable kind which is generally given at elections, the probabilities are that hon. gentlemen opposite will pursue the course they are now following. At the same time they are leaving the farming community to struggle with their difficulties, and are allowing them to drag along with the inconvenience arising from the lack of large and lucrative markets for their products and are attending solely, only and simply to the interests of those who are largely interested in the existence and operation of the National Policy. My opinion is this, that the farming community are being educated. The last general election showed very clearly they are becoming educated. When you refer to the border counties of Ontario, and when you look around this Chamber and observe many well known faces absent, there is evidence furnished to every reasonable man that there has been a decided change among the border counties. They have had there an object lesson of the operation of the pernicious National Policy. The people, for instance, in Lincoln, which Mr. Rykert represented for so long, have sent a man of a different political stripe to represent the county here. Where are the Fergusons, the Wigles and the Pattersons who represented the border counties in Ontario? They have been left at home, simply because the border counties have come to the conclusion that under the operation of the National Policy they were not prospering to the extent they should prosper, and they have changed their minds with respect to their representatives, and have sent other men here. Just as the agricultural districts become educated on this great and important question you will find they will send men here, not merely to effect a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty, but to advocate reciprocity on a broader and more extended basis than we have ever before enjoyed. The hon. gentleman said something with respect to the consistency of the Conservative party. If they have been consistent in any thing, it is in their inconsistency. They have ever since the inception of the National Policy taken unscrupulous advantage of the simple-minded electors of this country, and have endeavoured to mislead them. They have done so. They did so with respect to the introduction of the National Policy. Did they say they were going to raise the tariff on everything from year to year and continually change it? No. What did the First Minister telegraph to the Maritime Provinces? He said they were merely going to readjust the tariff and not increase it. Has that promise been fulfilled? No. It has been increased every year. The late Premier also stated that the Government would find a home market for the most important portion of the commodities that farmers produce, and they would obtain increased prices for these commodities. Have the farmers realized the fulfilment of that promise? No. Then, when in 1882 the Government were again appealing to the country, they became scared that in the agricultural districts, where the National Policy did not benefit the condition of the farmers, the farmers would rebel, and in order to bring together the friends of the Government in some constituency, the First Minister gerrymandered the ridings so as to secure representatives to keep the party in power. From one period to another, by one dodge to another, from 1878 to the present time, the people have been fooled, humbugged and misled, and they are beginning to realize, the farming community more particularly, that their interests have been sacrificed to the interests of the manufacturers, and whoever may reap any advantage under the operation of the National Policy the farmers do not at all events. That has been the policy in the past, it is the policy of the present, and it is to be the policy of the future. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell the House that they have followed the same policy, that they have not made any change, that they are going to adopt the same line and grant the same protection to manufacturers that they have enjoyed from the first, and will support them in every advantage they have enjoyed. The Minister of Finance visited Jamaica for the purpose of trying to open up trade relations with that colony. He offered, no doubt, very important and very desirable concessions to the people of Jamaica. He led them to believe that we were willing to open our

ports and admit commodities which they might be willing to send us, and we in return would send them commodities which they required. A gentleman came to Montreal recently for the purpose of opening up trade between Jamaica and Canada, he being a very large sugar producer. He was no doubt led to understand from those who attended to our exhibition on that island that every inducement would be offered to open up trade with that country. What does he now find? He finds that the grade of sugar produced in Jamaica is, by the tariff adopted by the Minister of Finance, shut out of Canada for the purpose of giving an advantage to the refiners in this country, for the purpose of pleasing the senior member for Halifax who is largely interested in the refining of sugar. I have on my desk a sample of that sugar. It is a raw sugar, unrefined, merely cleaned. The people of Jamaica ask that Canada should accept this as raw material from their hands, in exchange no doubt for what they require from us. But the Minister of Finance has framed his tariff in such a way as to shut the people of Jamaica out of our market in the matter of raw sugar. I say that the attempt he has made has been an attempt in vain, because the tariff he has introduced has virtually closed the door in the face of those people, when they come here and ask to do trade with us. It is the general rule followed by gentlemen on the Treasury benches that every change made in connection with the National Policy is a change in the interest, not of the people generally, but of the manufacturer. Let us take, as an example, the sugar refineries. We are told that we must have a duty, and that the tariff is necessary to provide money to meet the demands upon our treasury. But, Sir, not one single farthing of the tariff levied on refined sugar coming into this country, and which has to be paid by the people, will go into the Dominion treasury; for every single dollar of it will go into the pockets of the Canadian sugar refiners. The average quantity of sugar consumed by the people of this country is about 200,000,000 lbs. a year, and the duty of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound on the refined sugar would amount to about $1,600,000. That sum has to be paid by the consumers of sugar, and it is a very important question for us to consider where that $1,600,000 goes. Not a cent of this money goes into the Dominion treasury, but every single farthing goes into the pockets of the sugar refiners. We have many other items in our tariff which tend in the same direction, and are shaped for the same purpose; and the result is, that through the operations of this pernicious tariff the people of this country are not only compelled to pay taxes to meet the demands upon the Dominion treasury, but they are paying an enormous sum which is also extracted from them, and which finds its way secretly into the pockets of the manufacturers. Our people have, from year to year during the last twelve years, been subjected to an enormous drain on their resources, and the result to-day is, that a very large portion of the people of this Dominion are beginning to realize that they are getting poorer every year, and that a change has got to be made in our fiscal policy. I have been rather amused at some of the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to our going into partnership with the American farmers. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) entered into a very extensive argument with regard to the indebtedness of the United States, the indebtedness of the several states and counties, the mortgages and the enormous *per capita* debt, which he maintained the people had to pay in that country. He also went on to show that in many countries in the world farmers were worse off than they are in Canada. He brought us across the Atlantic, and he pointed to Germany and to France, and he said: "Are not the farmers in these countries in a worse condition than our farmers are?" Does my hon. friend not know that the people of these countries live under the same pernicious policy that we live under here? Does he not know that they have been robbed under the operation of a protective tariff as we have been robbed? He did not refer us to a country where there was no protective tariff, but he always compared the farmers of Canada with the farmers of a protected country who have been for a longer time subjected to the same system of robbery that we have been. I have often been amused at the manner in which the *Empire*, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, has held up to ridicule the idea of asking our farmers to associate with the farmers of the United States in the matter of an interchange of trade. That paper says: Do you want to go into partnership with a people who are a hundred per cent. worse off than yourselves; they are in an impoverished condition across the border, and you had better have nothing to do with them. Let me ask why are the people of the United States in an impoverished condition, why are they mortgaged to the extent they are, why are the farmers of the United States to-day, Republican and Democrat, joining hands to cast off the shackles of restriction to which the protective tariff subjects them? That protective policy is the secret of their impoverished condition, and if the Canadian farmers are subject to the operation of the tariff which has been in force in this country for twelve years, for another eighteen years as the Americans have, I contend that our condition then will be worse than the condition of the American farmers to-day. The longer you have got that policy in force the more impoverished will become the people who have to live under its operation. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) made a very unfortunate comparison when he compared the farmers of France and Germany with the farmers of Canada, because they have been subject to the same extortion and restriction that we have experienced in this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do you propose to remedy it?

Mr. McMULLEN. We propose to remedy it by casting off these shackles of restriction; we propose to remedy it by taking the duties off commodities which are necessary to the people, and which duties do not find their way into the Dominion treasury; we propose to remedy it by giving to the people of this country every commodity they require at the lowest possible price: we propose to remedy it by declaring that we will not uphold the pernicious law which takes the money out of one man's pocket and puts it into the pocket of another man without value. That is the way we propose to remedy it, and until we abolish that abominable law which inflicts such extortions on

the people of this country, we will not have a happy, contented and prosperous people. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson) found fault with my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald), by saying that that hon. gentleman had taken a wrong period of the year in order to quote his prices. If the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) wished to challenge the statements of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), it would be quite in place for him to take another period of the year rather than the month of March, but he did not do so. I contend that my friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has presented to this House a very valuable tabulated statement of the experience of the people of this country for many years under the operation of this tariff law, and I think that statement will bear the investigation of men of brighter ideas and better minds than those who undertake to criticize it. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson), however, made a very candid and a very sensible admission when he said that all the restrictions that were placed between the producer and his getting his products to the consumer, had to be paid by the producer. That is quite true. We contend that all the restrictions, whether it be freight or duty, which is placed between the purchaser and the consumer, have to be removed by the producer, and that he has got to pay every farthing on account of these restrictions, until he reaches the consumer. That is the principle which we have declared in the past and which we hold to at present, and we claim it cannot be successfully contradicted. Therefore, on every article sent to the United States, under the operation of their tariff, the Canadian has to pay the duty in order to reach the consumer. Now, Sir, we know quite well that the Americans, if at all disposed to enter into trade relations with us, are not disposed to do so on the basis of the treaty of 1854-66. My hon. friend who spoke last tried to persuade the House that we were attempting to interfere with the success of the efforts which hon. gentlemen opposite promise to put forth, in October next, to secure a reciprocity treaty. I do not think the hon. gentleman can produce a single tittle of evidence to show that any man on this side of the House has made any such attempt. For my part, I should rejoice to know that they were able to secure a treaty even in raw commodities. But, Sir, from what Mr. Blaine has said in his letter to Mr. Baker, it is nonsense to talk of approaching the American Government with the expectation that we are going to get a treaty on the old lines. I think it is futile to make such an attempt in the face of that statement, and if hon. gentlemen enter into negotiations determined to keep within those lines, their efforts will be in vain. There is no man on this side of the House who desires to throw any obstacles in their way; we would be glad to see them succeed; but under these circumstances we cannot help expressing our doubts. The Americans in the course they have pursued on this question have virtually said to us: We are not prepared to treat with you for reciprocity in the products of the forest, the fisheries, the field, and the mine, for the simple reason that we have not the products of the forest to send to you in exchange for your products of the forest, nor have we the products of the field to send to you in exchange for your products of the field, nor horses to send to you in exchange for your horses, nor lambs to send to you for lambs, nor cattle to send to you for cattle; we cannot exchange with you on that basis; but if you are prepared to take from us such commodities as we have in abundance in exchange for the commodities which you want us to take from you, we are prepared to consider a treaty on those lines. That, virtually, has been the position of the Americans on this question, and we contend that any attempt to get a treaty from them on different lines cannot succeed. Now, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was able to mention one item in which we had developed an export trade; that was lime, of which he stated that we had exported about $150,000 worth last year. I am glad to hear that we have been able to develop an export trade in lime to that extent; but there were many other articles in which we had an export trade before we heard of the National Policy. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson), speaking of woollen goods, said that they were sold at a lower price in Canada than in the United States. I am very glad to learn that under the proposed unrestricted reciprocity we would have such a market for the woollen goods of this country opened to us. What an impetus would be given to the manufacture of woollen goods in Canada, if what the hon. gentleman says is true? We would have an outlet in the United States for all the woollen goods we could manufacture in this country, and we would be able to sell them to the Americans cheaper than they could get them in any other way. The hon. gentleman also said that blankets were cheaper in Canada than in the United States. If so, what an advantage it would be for us to manufacture our coarse woollen blankets and send them to the United States? If we could only teach hon. gentlemen opposite what we mean by unrestricted reciprocity, what a system of trade we would inaugurate with the United States had we the opportunity, I think we would lead them into a great light while they now appear to be in almost absolute darkness. I really cannot think hon. gentlemen opposite are so blind on this question as they claim to be. I believe they assume the course they take for the purpose of mystifying the public mind, and leading people to believe that we intend, by the changes we propose, to bring about annexation with the United States. Well, Sir, it is a gross injustice to the Reform party of this country to charge them with any intention of that kind. I think I have had a good opportunity of knowing the true sentiments of the leading men on this side of the House, and I have never heard an utterance public or private that could give the slightest indication of such an intention; and I say that it is an open insult to charge men on this side of the House with being disloyal and trying to sell their country to the Americans under the pretense of bringing about better trade relations. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to Mr. Farrer. We heard a great deal during the election campaign about that gentleman and about a pamphlet he had written and sentiments he had expressed to Americans. Why, Sir, that pamphlet was written and those sentiments were expressed when that gentleman was in the ranks of the Conservative party, when he had not discarded the pernicious views of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the operation of the National Policy. He was only a newly-born babe in our

ranks when the party of hon. gentlemen opposite discovered this pamphlet, which had been written by Mr. Farrer while he was still in the Tory ranks where he had been for twenty years before. They alleged on the stump that he was in league with the leaders of the Reform party for the purpose of selling this country to the United States. I heard that charge frequently myself. Well, Sir, I do not know how we would be able to accomplish that end even if we were the traitors that hon. gentlemen say we are. We could only do it by means of a treaty with the United States, which would have to be ratified, not only by this House, but by the Senate, which has a large Conservative majority; and I am sure that if those Senators thought we were handing this country over to the United States, they would not give legal effect to any such disloyal measure. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) said that the duty would not increase the price of sugar. Why, that is contrary to all our past experience. We know perfectly well that the duty has increased the price in the past. We know that up to the very day my hon. friend announced he was going to take the duty off raw sugar, the price was kept up to the highest notch to which the duty enabled the manufacturers to keep it and compete successfully with the imported refined sugar; and I have no doubt that, under the operation of the present tariff, the refiners of this country will extract out of the pockets of the consumer the highest price the tariff will enable them to extort. They have done that in the past. They have done it in the article of binding twine; and with respect to this article, I would like to ask the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) what is the price at present? I see that on the American side the Government have done the farmers the kindness of allowing binding twine to come in free. The manufacturers there made a determined struggle against this change, but the feeling of the farmers had been aroused to such an extent that the Republican party became convinced that unless they took off the duty they would suffer very seriously at the next elections, and, under the influence of that fear, they decided to make binding twine free. If the hon. Finance Minister of this Government had followed the American example in twine as he did in sugar, he would have given a great boon to our farmers. My hon. friend has taunted us with the idea of allowing the Americans to control our tariff. But do they not control it at present? I wonder whether our Finance Minister would have come down this year, as he has done, and allowed us free importation of raw sugar, had the Americans not taken the duty off first? The Americans having taken off the duty, our Finance Minister saw that the Government would not be able to stand the ridiculous exhibition which they would produce, all around our border, when our people saw they had to pay $1 for twelve pounds of sugar, when, just on the other side of the line, twenty pounds could be got for the same money, and he felt himself reluctantly compelled to place raw sugar on the free list. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, if you make any such arrangement as the one you contemplate with the Americans, they will have the making of your tariff. But, Sir, they are doing that to a considerable extent now. They have compelled our Finance Minister to make his tariff suit theirs on sugar, and I have no doubt that in a short time he will be under the necessity of following a similar course with regard to binding twine, because, I am satisfied, if our manufacturers, who at present are protected, will put on the screws to the full extent and extract from the farmers every farthing they can, the farmers will rise in their might and say to the Government, you must take the duty off binding twine, and the Government, realizing that the farmers are in earnest, will be compelled to yield to their just demand. But they will not do this until they are obliged to do it, because they will give to the manufacturers the advantage as long as they can. My hon. friend compared the price of agricultural implements in Canada with the prices in the United States, and he said that, in making that comparison, he had taken the prices here and the retail prices there. He may have done so, but the protection given to the manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canada enables them to extract out of the pockets of the people enormous profits every year. I know for a certainty that there is a manufactory in this country which turned out 4,000 binders last year, and I know that the cost of manufacturing them was about $72 to $74 apiece. They were sold to the farmers in this country at $110 to $120 apiece, and I know that you can in Chicago today buy a binder for $70. If, however, you should do so and enter it for import into Canada, instead of being charged duty on the price paid, $75, you will be charged a duty on the price of the article in this country, as, under the operations of the Customs Act, our Minister of Customs revalues that binder and you have to pay the duty on his valuation. He will not accept the price at which you bought it, but will value it in proportion to what you would have to pay in Canada. Not only does he protect the manufacturer in this country legitimately, under the operation of the tariff, but gives him additional protection by this system of revaluing and charging a duty on a price higher than that at which the article is purchased. Now, to show how the farmers of the United States have been robbed, under the operation of their tariff I will read to the House the cost at which the American manufacturer produces these articles and also the prices he charges the American consumer and those at which he sells for export. There is a manufactory in Ann Arbor, in the State of Michigan, owned by a very large joint stock manufacturing company, which turns out, I believe, the largest lot of agricultural implements of any establishment on the continent. They have two prices—the one for export and the other for the American consumer, and the following is their list:—

	Price to For'gn'rs.	Price to Amere'ns.
Advance plough	$ 9.00	$18.00
Advance plough	4.00	8.00
Hay tedder	30.00	45.00
Mower	40.00	65.00
Horse rake	17.00	25.00
Cumming feed cutter	60.00	90.00
Ann Arbor cutter, No 2	28.00	40.00
Ann Arbor cutter, No 1	16.00	28.00
Clipper cutter	9.50	18.00
Lever cutter	4.25	8.00
Cultivator	22.00	30.00
Sweep	60.00	90.00

It will be seen by this list that the American farmer under the operation of their tariff law, have to pay the prices the manufacturer chooses to demand, simply because they cannot obtain the articles and

pay the duty at a less price. We are placed in the same position in this country. Our farmers are compelled to buy from the manufacturers and to pay the price they demand, simply because they cannot import and pay the duty at less cost.

Mr. IVES. Did the hon. gentleman give the price of self-binders exported and the price to the American farmer?

Mr. McMULLEN. The price for export of binders is $70, and to the American farmer $120. That is the result of the operation of their law, and it is the very same law which is applied to our people. As I said a few moments ago, the manufacturers of binders in this country produce their binders at an average cost of $72 to $75, and they are placed in the hands of the user at $110 to $120. One factory in this country turned out four thousand last year. Say they make a clear profit of $20, which would bring the price to $94, but they are sold at $110 to $120. However, taking a clear profit of $20 per binder, that would make $80,000 profit in one year on four thousand binders. And I say that is a very decided advantage for those people to enjoy in that industry. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson) said that the change in the tariff would not affect barley. I was rather amused in my riding last year to hear those in sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite make a similar remark. I know one man who is a very large dealer in barley, but, notwithstanding the fact that he was preaching that doctrine, when it came near the 6th October, he was urging the railway companies to give him cars so that he might get his barley into the United States before the duty was put on. He would try to persuade the farmers that the consumer paid the duty, that, as soon as barley went up in the United States on the 6th October, the Canadian would get the same price as before, but at the same time he was trying to get his barley into the United States before the duty was raised. He thus showed that he was not sincere because he did not practise what he preached. I was rather amused at the manner in which my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague)—although I must compliment him upon his speech—went into a repetition of so many stale arguments which have so often been produced in this House. In fact it seems that hon. gentlemen opposite have to go back into the old political history of this country whenever they address the House, and rake up items which have been so often brought before us and to which our ears are so well accustomed, that it would be a relief if they could bring forward some new material. He referred to the course of the Mackenzie Government from 1874 to 1878, and said that they never could congratulate the House on having a surplus, that they were always in financial embarrassment, and so on. Well, if they were not able to use those congratulatory remarks which hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of using, no matter whether they increase the duty or take it off, they, at all events, did not increase the duty, they did not increase the exactions which existed upon the people.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is exactly what they did.

Mr. McMULLEN. We claim they did not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But they did.

Mr. McMULLEN. I stated a few moments ago that the people were deceived in regard to the promises made when the National Policy was introduced. They were led to believe that the incidental protection which would be given to native industries would never work the pernicious results it does now, or lead to the extortions which the people have to submit to. If merely incidental protection had been given to those industries that were in need of it, and no attempt had been made to collect from the people more revenue than has been needed for the service of the country, we would have a very different condition of affairs in Canada than we now have, but from year to year every change has been in the direction of extorting from the people more money in the way of taxation than is necessary to meet the demands of the Dominion treasury. Hon. gentlemen deserted the principle they laid down that they would simply redistribute the tariff, and that what they were seeking to do was to protect our manufacturing industries in that way. The fact has been that every advantage which the manufacturers have chosen to ask for has been granted, whether the sum collected was more than was necessary to meet the demands of the public service or not. Thus, one year, they had a surplus of six millions and another year of four millions, and the Minister of Finance did not hesitate to state that the Government had a large revenue which was not obtained by increased taxation. Where did they get the money from? Did they contribute it themselves, or was it not money which they took from the people by the operation of the law which they put on the Statute-book? I was rather amused last fall to see that, at a meeting held in Toronto by the manufacturers of this country, when they undertook to deal with this question, and they professed to have given this question of unrestricted reciprocity great consideration, they passed in solemn earnest a resolution stating that it would be injurious to the farmers of Canada to adopt any such policy; and immediately afterwards, in order to show the hollowness of their professions they passed another resolution declaring that unrestricted reciprocity would be a serious blow at the manufacturing interests of this country. If this was to be a blow at the manufacturing interests of this country it would reduce the price of manufactured goods and the consumers would get the benefit of that, so that, while they said the farmers would suffer by that policy, they acknowledged that the manufacturers would suffer very seriously, and, undoubtedly, if they did, the farmers would have derived the advantage from that. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) tried to show that an exchange of natural products would injure the farmers, that American pork would be admitted free to this country, and that would interfere with our pork. If we take the price of corn, we find that the average price in the United States is not above 23 cents a bushel. If that is admitted free into Canada, I want to know why our farmers cannot produce as good pork as the Americans. If we are able to send in our eggs and horses and other articles which we can conveniently send to them, and can bring back corn, we can produce pork as cheaply as they can in the United States, because labour in this country is as cheap as it is there, and the cost of living is as cheap, and I have no doubt that we can compete successfully with them. Hon.

gentlemen opposite would try to make us believe that the English market was the market for everything, that we should look to England entirely, and shut our eyes to any further relations with the United States and should give up any expectation of sending them any more of our commodities, that we should look across the Atlantic for a market for our produce. Well, we send potatoes to a very large extent to the United States. We did so last year, and later on I shall show that for six months after the McKinley Bill passed, we shipped more potatoes to the United States than we did in the corresponding period of the previous year. It is a fact that England and Scotland have shipped enormous quantities of potatoes to the United States last year and this year. Surely we could not send our potatoes to the Liverpool market and have them reshipped to the United States with any advantage to us. The fact is that the American market is the only market for us to send our potatoes to, and, if we can get the existing embargo removed, it will be of very great advantage to Canada. They harp considerably upon our discriminating against England. Well, it is late in the day to talk about discrimination of that kind. England has more than once remonstrated with Canada with regard to the pernicious results of the policy we have introduced. The ironmongers in England, when we introduced our law increasing the duties on iron, presented very strong resolutions against the policy of that tariff. But hon. gentlemen opposite paid no heed whatever to those resolutions, they gave them not the slightest attention, they allowed the duty on iron to remain, and it is in force to-day. Now, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said something regarding tin-plates. I do not know whether to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with not having given unrestricted reciprocity fair, reasonable and intelligent consideration, or whether it is that they really do not want to know what we mean by it. But he asked, what would we do with tin-plate? He said we were manufacturing tin-plate in Canada, it was largely imported from England, and they were now manufacturing tin-plate in the United States. Well, I was rather amused when he put that question; and the Minister of Finance also put the question: What were we going to do with woollen goods, and how would we arrange with regard to their introduction from Canada to the United States? Every man knows that under the operations of unrestricted reciprocity, you would have, in the first place, to enter your woollen goods as the product of Canada, you would have to satisfy the Customs officer that they were the product of Canada; and you would have to satisfy him that the tin-plate was a product of Canada; not only would you have to make that statement, but undoubtedly you would have to testify to the fact under oath. Now, when you import goods into Canada you have got to make the same statement, you have got to present to them the invoice, you have got to prove it is a correct invoice, you have to fyle a duplicate of that invoice, you have got to attest to it before you can get your goods out of bond. On the same principle you would have to pass your tin-plate and woollens into the United States; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to be able to get that idea into their heads, and I have no doubt that the doctor himself will have to perform a surgical operation on the heads of some of his hon. friends before they will be able to see through unrestricted reciprocity. Possibly he sees it himself, but I do not think that he does. I have no doubt he will have some difficulty in opening the heads of those people to enable them to see what it is. The hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon) made some statements with regard to farm lands. He challenged the statement we had made on this side of the House, that farming lands were reduced in price. Well, Sir, I would like very well to exchange experiences with my hon. friend; I would like very well to turn over to him some of the farms that I have on hand in western Canada—and he will see by the papers the authority under which I hold those lands, the price paid—I should be very much pleased, indeed, to transfer them to him without interest for the last number of years. I am afraid that he would hesitate to take them. That there has been a very serious reduction in the value of farm lands, I think will be admitted by every money loaning company in the Dominion of Canada. There is not a money loaning company in Toronto to-day that is not carefully investigating and criticizing every investment in real estate and farming lands; they have to ascertain whether they are safe on those investments or not. Undoubtedly farm lands may be improving, it is a good thing for the investors that they are. The farmers are not idle, they are a very industrious class of people; they are always making new fencing, or improving their houses and barns, or making new ones, and all this tends to keep up the value of the property. But I say that, as a rule, where farms are allowed to stand without improvements, a very serious reduction has taken place in their value. I am satisfied that the cause of that reduction is largely owing, if it is not altogether due, to the results of the National Policy that has been in force in this country. Farming has not paid, our farmers have been restricted in the advantages that they might have enjoyed. My hon. friend from Albert also spoke with regard to shipping eggs to England. He went on to show that England imported not less than 93,000,000 dozen in a year, and that there is in that country a market to any extent and for any quantity of eggs. My hon. friend seems to forget the difficulty of packing eggs so as to enable them safely to reach the English market. If he will enquire of any man who has made the experiment, he will find that it will cost, at the very least calculation, about two cents a dozen more to pack eggs to send to the English market, than it will cost to send them to the American market. You have got to put them up in boxes, with 12 or 24 dozen in each, and you have got to make strong shelves inside, so that you can build layers of eggs on top of each other. Then, when the box reaches the English market, it must be made in such a manner that you can saw it in two and sell half of a box to one man, and the other half to another. They have got to be put up in that way, you cannot ship eggs there in any other way, nor can you successfully handle them in the English market in any other way. They do not count upon opening every box, and you have to take your own risk to some extent. You have not got to do all that to ship to the American market. Then we have to consider the point raised by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), with regard to the stale condition of the eggs. After

having remained in the hands of the first retail merchant, they are bought up by the egg dealer, and repacked, all which operations take time and cause delay in the transport of these eggs, so that when they reach the market they are not in a condition to be classed as of first quality, and you have got to take a reduced price.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Turned into chickens.

Mr. McMULLEN. Very possibly chickens in some cases. However, they cannot unquestionably arrive in the same condition as they could if sent to a market very much nearer. Now, notwithstanding the fact of the increased duty under the McKinley Bill, my present impression is, and I believe it is the impression of egg dealers in this country, that we will still have to seek a market in the United States for these commodities. Why, Sir, when you come to consider the advantage of trading with those enormous centres of population, such as New York, Boston and Philadelphia, reaching there within 24 hours from the time the train starts from any station, almost, in the Province of Ontario, any person will easily understand what an advantage unrestricted reciprocity would be to our farmers in respect to those commodities. I do hope that the hon. gentlemen opposite, in their efforts to secure an extended trade, will at least secure the free admission of these things that we have got to sell there, if they make any trade relations at all, and I shall congratulate them on the result of their efforts if they accomplish that. Now, I was rather amused that the hon. member for Albert did not know the difference between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. I will not endeavour to give any more explanation to the House upon that question than what has already been given. The Conservative organs have generally tried to mystify the public mind upon the whole question, they have tried to show that it is annexation in disguise, they have tried to show that we intend to procure annexation under the operation of unrestricted reciprocity; but it is not so. Now, I will give you the amount of potatoes that we have shipped into the United States since 6th October, 1890, when the McKinley Bill went into force. We shipped into the United States 1,850,190 bushels, upon which the duty paid under the operation of the McKinley tariff, amounted to $462,547.50. To all the rest of the world we only shipped 275,446 bushels, or we sent seven bushels to the United States, over a tariff wall of 25 cents a bushel, as against one shipped to other parts of the world. Now, the Minister of Finance in making his statement to the House, said that the iron bounty had had the expected result, that it had secured in some measure at least the fulfilment of the promises that were made to this House when Sir Charles Tupper introduced his iron duties. He pictured to us in the most glowing terms what the result of the increased duty on pig iron would be. We are now paying $2 a ton as a bounty for the production of pig iron in Canada, and there is also a duty of $2 per ton, which gives the producer $4 per ton in bounty and duty. Under the operation of that protection and that duty I should like to know from the Minister of Finance if more tons of pig iron were produced last year than the previous year as a result of the change in the law. I do not think there has been any increase. Our importations of pig iron are about the same as before. Our farmers, however, have been subjected to an enormously increased tax under the law. The Minister of Finance uses, no doubt, very little iron, only the iron in his pen; the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) uses very little iron, except that in his instruments, but the farmer uses more iron in his plough than a doctor does in everything in a year. The result is that a heavily increased burden is placed on the farmers by the increased duty imposed on iron, which the farmers have to pay. When Sir Charles Tupper proposed the iron duties I said that if we were going to attempt to produce iron in Canada, the Government should do so by means of a bounty and not by a duty, for if it is done altogether by a bounty every man in Canada contributes to it. In such a case, every man who wears a coat or a hat contributes a certain amount to the general taxes, and it was very desirable that this assistance should be given in the shape of bounty, as in the United States. The Minister of Finance said that the people of this country so far have stood the strain of the McKinley tariff well. No doubt he and his associates were afraid the people would not stand it very long, and if they are subjected to the operations of that Bill and are compelled to find other markets for their horses and many other commodities which have hitherto been sent to the United States, they will begin to rebel, and they will rather surprise hon. gentlemen opposite when they get an opportunity. The hon. gentleman also told the House that he has sent a man to England for the purpose of working up the egg trade. I was amused that, notwithstanding the large staff in England—I could hardly expect Sir Charles Tupper to undertake such a small matter as the working up of the egg trade, but his very expensive staff might have found a man to attend to that very particular duty—there was no man capable of performing that particular duty, and the Finance Minister must send, at the expense of the country, a man to England to ascertain if our farmers can send their eggs profitably to the English market. The Minister of Finance also spoke with respect to fostering trade with the West Indies. I have endeavoured to point out what a muddle he made with Jamaica, and if he does not foster any other trade better than he has fostered hitherto he will not accomplish very much. He will, no doubt, be compelled to make some changes in the tariff before the House closes in order to open up our ports to Jamaica for its raw sugar, and I shall be very glad if he does that, in order to carry out the promise he made when in Jamaica with respect to our disposition to trade fairly with them. The hon. gentleman said that a steamship line should have been established between Canada and the West Indies long ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been twelve years in power and have not introduced the question of a steamship line to the West Indies, and if there has been any delay it has been their fault. The Minister of Finance also spoke of establishing trade with the United States on a broad basis. I am at a loss to understand what hon. gentlemen opposite mean. Some of them rise and declare that trade with the United States in any shape would be injurious, others rise and say we should make a trade arrangement in natural products, and the Minister of Finance says we must trade on a broad basis. Yet they challenge us with respect to our

policy. I would recommend hon. gentlemen opposite, before engaging to criticize the policy we propose to inaugurate, to set their own house in order, and come to an understanding among themselves. They do not appear to understand themselves the question, for one member talks one thing and another member talks another thing, and the Minister of Finance takes a different view from all the rest. The hon. member said something with respect to the public debt. We are very sorry to think that we are subjected to such an enormous debt; I do not know any country enjoying the full privileges of responsible government which is subjected to such an enormous debt as is Canada. It is high time we should stop increasing the debt, and I hope hon. gentlemen will not add to it any further. We have added $120,000,000 during the last 12 years, and in many cases the money has been squandered and spent on projects that have not yielded any revenue. The hon. gentleman stated that we are now paying $1.65 per head for annual interest on the debt. I cannot find out the basis on which this calculation is made, for the present census has not been completed. The hon. gentleman stated that the amount paid for interest was $8,898,000. The Auditor General says the amount is $9,567,410. Undoubtedly we have some revenue from investments, but, on the other hand, the hon. gentleman said nothing about the cost to this country of handling our public debt. Placing that with the interest we pay we obtain the sum of $9,887,250. Taking that and the *per capita* amount of $1.65, we would require to have in this country 6,000,000 population within a few hundreds. I shall be glad to know that we have that number of people in the country, but I believe such is not the case. We have an annual expenditure of $38,000,000, and investigations with respect to unnecessary expenditures that I am very sorry indeed to witness in some of the departments are in progress. I have taken the trouble to go over the expenditure with respect to the North-West. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when we were asked many years ago to consent to an increased grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a glowing statement was made with respect to the amount of money we would be drawing from that country by 1891. Sir Charles Tupper presented a statement to the House that was very enticing. He calculated that a certain number of farmers would be occupying a certain number of acres of land, and then he figured up the grain crop. The First Minister declared we would have $58,000,000 at least to our credit by 1891. I take the items as shown by the Auditor General's Report for this year under the head of the Department of the Interior, and they show the following facts: We have expended altogether in the North-West, including the Land Board at Winnipeg, registrars, sheriffs and all officials there, including homestead inspectors, and colonization inspectors, also expenses at Ottawa in connection with the Interior Department, inside and outside service, last year, $445,521. Our net receipts from the North-West for last year, including our receipts for the sale of lands, payments on land, coal mines, timber limits, grazing grounds, the Banff Park and all other sources, are $462,302.26, and we have therefore a net sum out of the entire North-West for last year of $16,780.88. Now, Sir, that is a deplorable condition of things so far as the great North-West is concerned. Let us now take the condition of our railways. We find that we have spent about $50,000,000 on railways—and we will add to that about $2,000,000 this year—the interest on the $50,000,000 at 4 per cent. would be $2,000,000; the loss on operating Dominion lines last year was $640,000, so that the net loss to the country on railways is $2,640,000. To show the difference in the earnings of our Dominion railways, compared with other lines, I will quote the per mileage earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Dominion railways. The Grand Trunk Railway earned $1.11 per train per mile for every train, and the Canadian Pacific Railway earned $1.17 per train per mile, while the Dominion railways only earned 63½ cents per train per mile, which shows very clearly that our railways are operated at rates far below what they should be. The Grand Trunk Railway operates 3,122 miles of railway; its gross earnings were $18,300,606; its earnings per mile $5,861; its gross operating expenses $12,842,046; its operating expenses per mile $4,113, and its profit per mile $1,748. The Canadian Pacific Railway operates 5,085 miles of railway; its total gross earnings were $15,572,985; its earning per mile $3,062; its gross operating expenses $9,424,166; its expenses per mile $1,853; and its profit per mile $1,209. Now we come to the Government railways. We have 1,181 miles of Government railways in Canada. The gross earnings were $3,173,711.65; earnings per mile $2,685; operating expenses per mile $3,263.50; leaving an absolute loss in the operation of $578.50 per mile. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway carried 591 tons of freight per mile; the Grand Trunk Railway carried 2,533 per mile, and the Government railways carried 1,202 per mile, or a little over double the amount of tonnage per mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway; but, notwithstanding that fact, the Canadian Pacific Railway earned $1,209 per mile profit, while the Government railways lost $578.50 per mile. I think that fairly shows that there is some very bad management in connection with our Government railways. It is quite clear that it would be highly in the interest of the people of this country, if the Intercolonial Railway was sold out to a syndicate or got rid of in some way so as to relieve the people from the enormous drain which it subjects them to. But in spite of the experience which we have had for years, the Government have given their aid to the building of lines which virtually duplicate the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, and instead of improving the prospect of that line being able to pay running expenses, the policy of the Government has jeopardized all hope of the country being relieved of the burthen of maintaining this railway. Now, another very deplorable fact is, that the Government is spending $500,000 a year on immigration, and I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year that we shipped out of this country $79,346 worth of household effects; the goods of people leaving this country and going to the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised, when they introduced their policy, that they would put a stop to this condition of things. They blackguarded and abused and vilified my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) for the manner in which he had handled the affairs of the country,

because, as they said, the population was going out of the country. But, Sir, to-day, after their twelve years in power, we have a deplorable exhibition of the exodus from Canada. The emigration from our country at present is double what it was when the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) occupied the Treasury benches. I shall not take up the time of the House in referring to many matters which could well and properly be brought into this debate, further than to say that we are now investigating a condition of things which I am exceedingly sorry it should ever have been necessary to bring before Parliament. Until the reports with regard to these investigations are brought down, and until members have an opportunity of reading and studying them, I shall not venture to deal with these matters. But, Sir, I say that the whole thing tends to show with what looseness the affairs of this country have been handled, and how very desirous it is that a change should take place, and that the people of this country should be relieved from the burthens they have had to bear for many years. I will not refer either to the extraordinary manner in which we have subsidized many lines of railway. We have in the past absolutely thrown away a great deal of money in introducing railways into several parts of this Dominion, which railways are useless. They stand as monuments to the folly of hon. gentlemen opposite in endeavouring to keep in power by subsidizing railways which to-day are not paying their running expenses. I shall now refer to the proposal of the Minister of Finance to grant a bounty for the production of beet root for one year. I consider that, if we are to offer a bounty for anything at all, the poor farmers of this country should be granted a bounty, to meet the enormous duties they are subjected to in sending their products to the United States. I urged this question last year, and I contend that, after the enormous sums which have been taken out of the pockets of these people under the operation of the iron duties, the Government should divide some of that money, in the shape of a bounty, among the exporters of barley, and horses, and lambs, and articles of that kind. If that were done, it would in some way compensate them for the enormous duties they have to pay, until such time as the Government can find a better market for their products. If the bounty were given to the poor farmers who have lost their market in the United States, through the conduct of the Government, it would be a step in the right direction. But, Sir, we could not persuade them to do that. But in order to meet the views of those who are attempting to raise beets in this country for the purpose of manufacturing sugar, they have granted them a bounty. I do not think it is right that a bounty should be granted to one industry of that kind, which is not so much entitled to it as the farmers of this country are to be relieved from their present burdens and disadvantages. Now, Sir, when we carefully examine the condition of our trade with the outside world, and compare the value of what we send to the United States with the value of what we send to all other countries, we cannot fail to come to the conclusion that this country is suffering very seriously from our hampered trade relations with that country. We find that our exports, the produce of Canada, to all countries, are as follows:—

Great Britain	$41,499,149
United States	33,291,207
France	277,827
Germany	461,011
Argentine Republic	763,121
Australia	471,028
Belgium	41,421
Brazil	352,046
British Africa	22,552
China	32,143
Italy	81,059
Newfoundland	982,154
Norway and Sweden	380,696
British West Indies	1,460,668
Spanish West Indies	1,162,507
To 31 other countries	2,037,075
In all	$82,335,514

This shows very clearly that the American market is a most important market for this country, and that in place of doing anything that would irritate and annoy the American people and prevent them entering into closer trade relations with us, which would be advantageous to them as well as to us, we should attempt to cultivate a friendly spirit towards them. The year before last the hon. Minister of Finance brought in a Bill, imposing duties which tended to irritate the Americans. Had the hon. gentleman waited until after the passage of the McKinley Bill, perhaps it would not have passed entirely in its present form. The probabilities are that the people in the United States who are in favour of extended trade relations with Canada, would have been able to get it framed in a more friendly spirit. The hon. Minister was remonstrated with at the time, but he would not consent to alter his course. Hon. gentlemen opposite insinuated that hon. members on this side of the House were perfectly aware that the McKinley Bill was going to be introduced, and encouraged its introduction. It is a gross injustice to this side of the House to make that insinuation, and not a single tittle of evidence has ever been produced to show that there is any truth in it. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen opposite are quite aware that they refused to take the duty off small fruits coming into Canada from the United States. By means of those duties they exasperated and annoyed the Americans until they were challenged across the floor of this House, and eventually agreed to put small fruits on the free list. But they did not do it until for shame's sake they durst not refuse any longer. Now, Sir, I have endeavoured to show how important it is that we should, if possible, secure the markets of the United States. We know perfectly well that from the position we in Ontario occupy, it is most desirable that those markets should be opened to us. Now, the commodities we exported in 1890 were as follows:—

Products of the Mine	$ 5,126,131
do Fisheries	8,524,508
do Forest	27,289,264
Animals and their products	26,630,672
Agricultural products	17,245,575
Manufactures	6,388,064
Miscellaneous articles	183,061

Now, it is gross injustice to the agriculturists of this country to ask them to submit to the extortions to which they are subjected, while they are the principal exporters of commodities in this country. They produced last year nearly $45,000,000 worth of products for export, while the manufacturers who are receiving the entire attention of hon. gentlemen opposite exported only about $6,000,000 worth. Last year the Province of

Ontario exported altogether $25,736,617 worth, of which we sent $20,414,304 worth to the United States. The Province of Quebec exported to the United States $4,659,308 worth; the Province of Nova Scotia $2,936,656 worth; the Province of New Brunswick $3,100,188 worth; the Province of Manitoba $330,070 worth; the Province of British Columbia $3,125,176 worth, and the Province of Prince Edward Island $595,252 worth. In other words the Province of Ontario exported to the United States $20,414,306, and all the rest of the provinces $14,746,650; so that Ontario exported to the United States $5,667,656 more than all the rest of the provinces together. This clearly shows that the McKinley tariff strikes more directly at the farming community of the Province of Ontario than at any other community in the Dominion. When we come to consider the articles which we send to that country and the duties to which they are subjected, these become a very serious consideration to our farmers. Of barley last year we sent to Great Britain 27,132 bushels, valued at $12,017, while we sent to the United States 9,939,743 bushels, valued at $4,582,562, on which we paid a duty of $993,974. Under the McKinley tariff the duty on that same quantity of barley would be $2,981,922, or an increased duty of $1,987,948 which our people will have to pay if they send the same quantity of barley to the United States this year. We sent to the United States 251,640 sheep, valued at $761,565, on which a duty was paid under the old tariff of $152,313. Under the McKinley tariff the duty upon the same number of sheep would be $188,730, an increase of $36,417. We sent horses to the number of 16,118, the value of which was $1,887,895, and on which a duty of $377,579 was paid. Under the McKinley Bill, if we should send the same number of horses to the United States next year, we will have to pay a duty of $483,540, or an increased duty of $105,561. The Americans use up a very large quantity of horses in the year, about a million, and there is no other outlet apparently at present for our surplus except the United States.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many horses do the United States import in a year?

Mr McMULLEN. They import 16,118, and they use up about a million each year. The entire stock of horses in the United States is about 10,000,000, and the average life of a horse there is about ten years. They import a very large number from other places as well as from Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many from other places?

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the figures just now, but I have no doubt some one on this side, who will follow me, will be able to give the hon. gentleman the information he desires. Last year we exported to the United States 1,053,230 bushels of potatoes, valued at $308,915, on which we paid a duty of $61,783. Under the McKinley Bill, if we should export a similar quantity next year, we will have to pay a duty of $263,307 or an increased duty of $191,524. We sent to the United States 101,713 tons of hay, valued at $922,792, on which we paid a duty of $2 per ton, or $203,426. Under the McKinley tariff we will have to pay a duty of $4 per ton, which on the same quantity, will be $406,852. Now we come to the commodity of eggs, which we shipped to the United States last year to the extent of 12,825,735 dozen, valued at $1,793,104, and no duty was charged; but should we be under the necessity of sending the same quantity of eggs to the United States next year, the farmers of this country will have to pay in duty, under the McKinley tariff, $641,286. This becomes a matter of very vital importance, and however hon. gentlemen opposite may belittle our remarks with regard to the increased duties, under the operation of the new tariff, they will realize, when the farmers become fully aware of the results of its operation, that they will have a hard job in persuading them that they should patiently and willingly submit to these exactions. Now, taking the increased duties under the McKinley Bill and the duties I have mentioned, the result sums up as follows:—

Barley, increased duty		$1,987,948 00
Sheep	do	36,417 00
Horses	do	105,961 00
Potatoes	do	191,524 00
Hay	do	403,426 00
Eggs	do	641,286 75
		$3,166,592 75

The entire duties under the McKinley Bill on the above commodities sent to the United States, should our shipments be in equal quantities next year, will be as follows:—

Barley	$ 2,981,922 00
Sheep	188,730 00
Horses	483,540 00
Potatoes	263,307 50
Hay	406,852 00
Eggs	641,286 75
	$ 4,965,628 25
Old duty	1,789,075 00
Showing an increase under the McKinley tariff over the duties previously imposed, of	$ 3,176,543 25

This shows the exact extent to which this tax is going to affect the resources of our farmers. I would be exceedingly pleased indeed, and I give the Minister of Finance credit for any little efforts he has made to try to secure a new outlet for a number of those commodities; but I am afraid that, after beating all around the bush, after going to Jamaica and Australia and China, and travelling all over creation, he will be compelled to return to his own country and foster closer trade relations with the United States. Should he fail and in default of being able to carry out his promising statements that he had every confidence of securing better markets, he will have to come back and say to this House: Gentlemen, I made that statement in a moment of weakness, and have not been able to accomplish what I anticipated. We sent last year horned cattle to Great Britain to the extent of 66,965 head. Great Britain is our best market for horned cattle and I earnestly hope that the kindly relations existing between us and the mother country with regard to the admission of our cattle will long continue. If any embargo should be placed on them, it would undoubtedly be a serious matter for our farmers, and I hope every effort made by the Government will be successful to promote the continuance of the free admission into that market of our cattle. To the United States we sent of horned cattle 7,840 head, valued at $104,623, on which we paid a duty of $20,925. Now, I have not by any means ex-

hausted the list of commodities we send to the United States. Last year we sent berries to the value of $36,117, and canned fruits to the value of $24,022. We sent beans to the United States last year to the extent of 183,638 bushels, valued at $249,323, on which a duty of $24,900 was paid. Under the McKinley Bill that duty would amount to $73,455.20. We sent pease largely to Great Britain, our export amounting to 1,857,970 bushels, valued at $1,890,836, and to the United States we sent 437,735 bushels, on which we paid a duty of 20 cents a bushel, or $87,565. We sent split pease to Great Britain to the extent of 148,960 bushels, valued at 95,209, and I notice we sent quite a quantity also to the United States, namely, 90,277 bushels, valued at $74,215. My reason for quoting these items is to show that, not only in the articles of horses, sheep, barley, hay and eggs have we had a large and desirable outlet in the United States, but also for a great number of other commodities, and that therefore the American market, which has taken so much of our surplus, is one we should cultivate as much as possible. Last year we sent 237,000 bushels of rye to the United States, on which, under the McKinley Bill, we would have to pay 10 cents per bushel. We also sent 13,600 barrels of oatmeal to the United States, on which the duty under the McKinley Bill is raised from 1 cent to 2 cents per pound. Of malt we sent 258,891 bushels to the United States, valued at $150,000, on which the duty, under the McKinley Bill, will be 45 cents, or $116,500. In the article of maple sugar, our export to the United States amounted to 233,958 pounds, valued at $16,644. This shows that many things, for which otherwise we would have great difficulty in finding a market we have been able to dispose of in the United States. I am glad to see that we are increasing very largely our export of cheese to the English market, and that we obtained good results. To the United States we sent but a small quantity, about $6,500 worth. We sent also hides to the English market to the value of $28,082, and to the United States last year we sent $470,466 worth and paid a duty of $94,093. Last year we sent poultry and game to the United States of the value of $49,233, under a duty of $9,846. The duty on that is also increased. Of sheep pelts, we sent to the United States 33,096, of the value of $7,103, on which the duty would be $1,420.60 under the new tariff. We sent a very large quantity of wool to the United States, no less than 1,046,894 lbs, of the value of $233,466, and the duty on that has also been increased. We also sent flax to the United States of the value of $175,566, and we also sent 61,927 barrels of apples, of the value of $149,479. I am glad to see that we also sent a large quantity of apples to England, amounting to 313,684 barrels, valued at $835,545. We thus find that many commodities which we send to England, we also send to the United States, which shows that there is there a very large market and outlet for the commodities we have to spare. There is another matter that has not been touched upon. There is no country in the world that carries freight at such a low rate as the United States. The railways of the United States carry freight from point to point within their own territory for about one-third the price charged in England, so that once we get our commodities across the border and reach the American railway system, we get freight rates one-third the amount of those charged in any other country. We have a large population at our doors. In the State of New York there are some six millions of a population, who are consumers of the very best commodities we produce and are willing to pay a good round price for them.

Mr. GILLIES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is reading his speech, and has been for the last half hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to send my notes to you, Mr. Speaker, for your inspection. It is highly desirable that we should retain the people of the United States as the consumers of the commodities we have to sell. I will not delay the House much further. I have considered it my duty to present these statements to the House because I represent an agricultural district, and I do not think I would be discharging my duty if I did not point out the unfortunate results which the tariff put in force in the United States will have if it should remain on their Statute-book. I think the farmers of this country have been misled, and especially at the last election. I will give hon. gentlemen opposite every credit for any attempt they make to obtain reciprocity, but I have no hopes in that direction; and I agree with the views that have been expressed that there is no prospect of hon. gentlemen opposite being able to make satisfactory trade relations with the United States in the face of the statements they have put in black and white in regard to reciprocity in natural products. It is clear that they are not ruled by any desire to benefit the farmers, but will be guided only from the manufacturers' standpoint, and, as long as the manufacturers can manage by their wily manœuvring to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmers, and to persuade them that reciprocity is not in their interests, but that they should keep the present party in power, I fear we shall have the same state of affairs as we have had in the past. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the best opportunity given to any Government to inaugurate one of the happiest and best and most comfortable nations on the face of the earth. Had they started in 1878, when they got the reins of power, had they economized with the care and attention they should have displayed in public affairs, had they kept down our expenditure instead of increasing it from $23,000,000 to $38,000,000, had they not increased our public debt by $120,000,000, had they secured in each department of the service that economy, that attention to duty on the part of all the officials which is desirable, and had they abstained from inaugurating the unfortunate policy they have adopted in the North-West, an exhibition of which is fully presented to the House in the figures I have quoted here, they had the most glorious opportunity of making a record for themselves which would be handed down to coming generations as a credit to the Liberal-Conservative party. But they have abused their opportunities. They have recklessly handled the finances of the country. They have deceived the people, and they have deceived the farming community. They have done nothing in regard to trade relations but what is contrary to the interest of the farmer; and to-day they have brought the affairs of the country into the most hopeless condition of any country that is a dependency of the British Crown.

You cannot put a finger on any other portion of the British Empire which presents the unfortunate position which Canada does at this time. We have an enormous debt, amounting to about $50 *per capita*. We have an outlay of $38,000,000. We pay $10,000,000 of interest, $8,000,000 of which is sent across the Atlantic. Here, at the end of twelve years of the administration of affairs by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the condition in which we find this country at present is so bad that, if we were to go on in the same line, in the same course of extravagance, in the same reckless administration of public affairs for the next twelve years, we would be in the most hopeless condition that any country ever reached which enjoyed the privilege of a free government and the right of the people to exercise the franchise. I hope the people will wake up to the condition they are in, and will take action in order to prevent a perpetuation of the recklessness which has characterized this Administration, and that they will not permit hon. gentlemen opposite to go on in the direction they have for the next twelve years. I have been rather amused to notice with what a degree of comfort and consolation a number of manufacturers on the other side have accepted the changes which have been made in the tariff this year. We find this amongst those who are interested in the sugar refining business, and who, no doubt, dictated the changes which should be made in the tariff if the Finance Minister desired to secure their adherence. To-night we have the fact before us that, notwithstanding that the Finance Minister went to Jamaica in order to open up trade with that country, no sooner does he return and re-adjust his tariff, but he closes the door fast in the face of the sugar producers in Jamaica, and says: You shall not send your sugar into Canada without paying duty on it. That has been done for the purpose of meeting the wishes of the refiners of this country. The refiners of this country knew that if Jamaica sugar was permitted to come in here in a condition which is virtually raw it would strike a very serious blow at the volume of the consumption of white sugar in this country, it will virtually be closing the door upon the importations of Jamaica sugar, and when the representative of Jamaica comes here and finds that our doors are practically closed against him, he has nothing to do but to step across the border and he finds the doors of the Americans are open to him. There they only exclude what is over 16 Dutch standard, here we exclude all over 14 Dutch standard. I hope that the Minister of Finance, before the House rises, will alter the duty upon sugar and will allow the people of Jamaica an opportunity of sending in those commodities. I wish to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that unless they make a treaty that will secure to the farmers of this country a better condition of things than they are enjoying at the present time, that will secure to them better prices than they are now getting for the products they have got to sell, that unless they relieve the farmers from the necessity of paying high duties under the McKinley Bill, by which they are now hampered, and allow them the opportunity of selling in the best market and buying in the cheapest market—I say that unless the Government procure these advantages for our farmers there will be nothing left for the farming community but to look forward to a hopeless struggle to get out of the financial embarrassments in which they are involved. I say they are standing to-day in a condition which is, as has been proved by statements presented to this House, a deplorable one. The hon. member for Huron pointed out the number of chattel mortgages that the farmers have given upon their effects. Now, there is no evidence in the world pointing more truly to the financial embarrassments, either of individuals or of communities, than the fact that they are reduced to the necessity of giving chattel mortgages. Now I say that unless some effort is made to improve that condition, the outlook for them will be a hopeless one indeed. I am sorry that in the efforts that have been put forth to bring settlers into this country, there has not been a proper effort made to bring in such a class of settlers as will take up our lands in the older provinces, which can be bought cheaply by a proper class of tenant farmers from the old country, and allow our Canadian farmers that are embarrassed to go to the North-West and people that country. Our Canadian farmers would make the best pioneers and the best settlers in that country, and while I should be rejoiced to see a large influx of population into the North-West, I would prefer to see some effort made to bring tenant farmers from England into this country who would buy out many of the improved farms in the older provinces, thus making comfortable homes for themselves, and let those that are financially embarrassed sell out and go to the North-West and take up new homes for themselves. I believe that would be a better system to adopt than to bring people from the old country and send them directly to the North-West. Now, I will not detain the House any further. I considered it my duty to present this statement on behalf of those who sent me here, who are chiefly farmers, and who are the ones suffering the most from the policy of this Government.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.50 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Mr. CHARLTON presented the first report of the Special Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, providing for a reduction of the quorum to eleven, be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENT TO G. A. BOURGEOIS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved:

That leave be given to the Committee on Public Accounts to enquire about the payment of $600 made to G. A. Bourgeois, late Post Office Inspector of the Three Rivers division, as such payment appears in the Auditor General's Report for 1889, page F—25, and that permission be given to said Committee to ask for papers, vouchers, &c., and to cite the said G. A. Bourgeois to appear before them, and such person or persons as will be necessary to investigate the circumstances of this payment, with power to examine these persons under oath if deemed necessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that motion will have to remain for the present until we know something more about it. The documents in connection with this matter are not on the Table of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Justice will find that objection is hardly ever taken referring to the Committee on Public Accounts an item belonging to a previous year. No doubt this motion is in an unusual form, and some of those things which are asked belong to the Committee on Public Accounts as a matter of right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection having been taken, I must rule the motion out of order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is, that motions are very frequently made to refer a particular item belonging to previous years to the Committee on Public Accounts. Would it not be better to allow the motion to pass? I think the latter part of the motion is unnecessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. Objection having been taken, the motion is out of order,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not want to oppose any objection to this motion, but I think in the meantime it should stand till to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice asks that this should stand as a notice of motion until to-morrow. If it goes on the Notice paper as a notice of motion, it can only be reached in its proper order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that the hon. gentleman had better let it stand until to-morrow. We have not yet seen the motion, but after we see it we may allow it to pass.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand that there is any objection to the motion, except to the last part, which refers to the parties being summoned and examined. That follows as a matter of course.

Mr. MULOCK. If this is made a notice of motion in the ordinary way, it will hardly be reached this session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I could only hear half of the motion as it was read.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that this discussion should be renewed at the same time to-morrow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will waive any objection to this being taken up to-morrow.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have already given notice of a motion for the production of the papers.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: I would like to make a short explanation as to the four Bills that stand in my name on the paper. They are introduced somewhat out of the usual course, because, if I were introducing Government measures on these subjects, I would have introduced them at an earlier period in the session. The House will perhaps remember that there were several Bills to amend the Dominion Elections Act, the Controverted Elections Act, and the Franchise Act, all of which were referred to a Special Committee. That Committee had instructions to amalgamate one or more of the Bills, or parts of one or more of the Bills, and it seems that in reporting their Bills back to the House a slight irregularity occurred. It would have been more consistent with the practice of the House if they had, by way of report, introduced new Bills on these subjects, instead of which they have amalgamated them, and the old Bills remain undisposed of on the Order paper, while the amalgamated Bill has not been introduced. Instead, therefore, of transferring all these old Bills to the Government Orders, as the Committee wished me to do, in order to expedite their passage it seems better and simpler for me to introduce these four Bills on the subject myself. The Bills, therefore, that I have introduced will embrace the principal features of those Bills which were referred to the consideration of a Special Committee. I desire, however, as a matter of precaution, to say that, in introducing the Bills in this way, I have not followed entirely the conclusions arrived at by the Committee. There are two or three points in respect of which, I think, it would be impossible for the House, considering all the difficulties, to concur in; nevertheless, by introducing them in this way and bringing up these subjects, an opportunity will be given to the hon. gentlemen who have had charge of the original Bills, or who sat on the Committee, or who have taken an interest in the subject, to call the attention of the House, at a subsequent stage, to any clauses I have omitted in these Bills, and to ask the sense of the House thereon. I do not wish, for the present, to take the responsibility of introducing certain clauses. I beg, therefore, to introduce the Bill to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. That is, I think, just as it passed the Committee. For the information of the House, I will explain that it amends the Franchise Act as to the putting on the list of persons qualified as being British subjects, by leaving out the words "by birth or naturalization," and requiring them to be British subjects at the time they are put on the list. Then it is proposed to extend the time for the preliminary revision by giving fifteen more days. At present the time expires on the 1st of August, and it is proposed to extend the time to the 15th. I understand that the Committee are satisfied that the change will not result in the extension of the time when the lists are finally completed. Then there is a provision that no person shall be removed from the list by reason of his qualification being incorrectly stated. There was such a provision made with regard to the preliminary revision, but it seems there is no provision applying to the final revision. Then there is a section providing that the revising officer, as a further security, shall state in the qualified list the number of names the list contains, and there is a final provision that section 1 of the Act, as regards a voter being a British subject,

shall not come into force until the 1st of January next, the reason of that being that at present forms have been prepared and filled in, and depositions and declarations made, all in conformity with the present law, which it would be very inconvenient to alter, and impossible to alter in many cases, and the work would have to be done over again if we changed that clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. May I ask if the provision for extending the time for the preliminary revision applies to the present year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill comprises nearly all the clauses which the Committee agreed to, except that I am suggesting a modification in the provision they made as regards the oath to be taken by an agent or officer whose vote has been transferred. It may be worth while to call attention now to the subjects dealt with in the Bill. There are several provisions in the Bill to enable all deposits that have to be made to be made in legal tender, or in bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada. Then there is a provision restricting the number of transferred voters as agents from one polling booth to another, and a special oath is provided for that. There is also a provision for adjourning the hearing for making the return of the returning officer in case the returns of his deputy officers have not been enclosed in the ballot boxes, or in consequence of their loss, in order to obtain more accurate information as to the number of votes that were cast and the number of votes which each candidate has received. There is also a provision, in case of the loss of ballot boxes, for taking evidence by the returning officer. There is also a provision for getting an order from the Superior Court judge to compel the County Court judge to make a recount, when any party aggrieved is entitled to a recount. There is also a provision that, upon the returning officer completing the returns and transmitting the name of the candidate having the highest number of votes, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, as I believe he always does, publish the returns in the order in which they come in.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: I have omitted from this Bill several of the provisions which the Committee thought it well to insert, and I will state now the reason why I did so. The Committee thought it well to follow as closely as possible the English Acts on these subjects, but in 1883 a special Act was passed relating to illegal and corrupt practices, and the draftsman had introduced into the Bill before the Committee many of the provisions which were taken from the Illegal and Corrupt Practices Act of England, of 1883, much of the language of which was arbitrary, subject to special interpretation clauses, and would not, I think, have been suited to our Act. In other respects I may say the Dominion Controverted Elections Act contained provisions on the subject which amounted in the end to the same thing as the clauses herein introduced. That is my explanation for a good deal that is left out of this Bill which the Committee seemed inclined to favour. Then, to state shortly the provisions of the Bill as I have introduced it, in order that the House may be warned beforehand, I will say that the Bill makes provision for the trial of all election petitions by two judges instead of one, as formerly—that is a new clause. The practice in some three or four of the provinces is, that election petitions shall be tried by one judge as in the case of federal election petitions. In the Province of Quebec, I think, three judges try them; in the Province of Ontario, two, and the British system is to have two judges. We propose that the petitions shall be presented not later than thirty days after the declaration of the return of the candidate. There is a further provision, in accordance with the English system, to extend slightly the exemption as regards the liability of the candidate for corrupt practice committed, not by himself, nor with his connivance, but against his will or order, by his agents, namely: The provision that no election shall be declared void if it is shown to the court that the candidate has proved that no corrupt practice was committed at such election by him personally, and that the offences mentioned in the report were committed contrary to the order and without the sanction or connivance of such candidate, and that such candidate took all reasonable means for preventing the commission of corrupt practices at the election, and that the offences mentioned in the said report were of a trivial, unimportant and limited character; and that in all other respects the election was free from any corrupt practice on the part of such candidate and his agents. These are all the important provisions of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice with respect to the declaration of the return of members, whether any provision is made in the Bill for uniformity of return? One member may be returned by default of a returning officer two or three weeks later than other members, and this has led to serious abuses in the past; and the provisions of the Bill do not seem to provide a remedy. I did not understand the Minister of Justice distinctly on this point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know how it is possible to do that when we come to consider all the difficulties that arise in the discharge of the duties by a returning officer. The most prominent causes are differences of distance, inclemency of the weather, the state of the roads, and so forth; other causes are loss of ballot boxes, and in cases of recount, which, of course, more rarely occur. I think it is impossible to secure uniformity as to the date on which returning officers should complete their duties, and, therefore, it is impossible to secure uniformity as to the date when petitions should be presented. In ordinary cases if we make it thirty days from the date of the declaration, we should have in the great majority of cases

the time for fyling the petitions expiring probably within thirty-five or forty days after polling day, but if we were to make the days to run from polling day it would be exceedingly unequal. In some counties there would be only one or two days left after the return before the time for the fyling of the petition, and in other cases there would be three or four weeks.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then, if I understand rightly, there is this change proposed to be made in the law: that the time will be calculated not as at present from the gazetting of the members, but from the declaration by the returning officer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If we were to fix a uniform time, say thirty days from the return of the last person elected, especially as we have one day for the elections, the returning officers would have no motive for keeping back the returns. In my own election this time, after the declaration had been made, the returning officer kept back the returns for a fortnight before he forwarded them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill would cover that case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But it would not cover the case where a returning officer made a declaration two, three or four days afterwards, and another returning officer not until the end of a fortnight. Seeing we have one day for the general election, the last declaration might be taken as the one from which the count should be made, and we would in that way adopt a uniform rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In consequence of the delay in some large districts, like Algoma, the time would hardly be expired yet for any of us.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The election in Algoma did not take place at the same time as the other elections. I am speaking of the districts in which the elections took place on the same day, and the time might be placed at something less than thirty days.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why should not the time be two months from the date of polling, in which case it would be uniform? By dating it from the day on which the members were returned, a returning officer on some technical error or some intentional error might adjourn the declaration from week to week, and it might not take place until two weeks afterwards. We would, therefore, have very serious difficulties to meet, as at present. A petition now can be fyled within thirty days from the gazetting of a member. If we make it thirty days after the date on which the declaration is made, it is left to the returning officer to extend the time of making the declaration. He may say, when all the polling boxes have been returned, that some irregularity has occurred with respect to one of them, irregularities that might have been done intentionally and for a purpose, and he then could adjourn the declaration for the purpose of getting that irregularity adjusted. When that irregularity was adjusted he would then make the declaration, but it might be one or two weeks after the time when the member in an adjoining constituency had been declared. The same difficulties and the same advantages lie at the door of the returning officer or the deputy returning officer under the provisions of this Bill as at the present moment. The measure simply transfers the work from the Clerk of the Crown of Chancery to the returning officer and his deputy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The explanation given by the Minister of Justice shows, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the Bill transfers the power of committing irregularities from the Clerk of Crown in Chancery to the returning officer. I believe the Minister desires to make this measure a fair one, and to remove the abuses that have existed under the present system for some time. If so, the time should be made uniform in all cases. If the time is left to the returning officer, an advantage will then be given to the party in power. It is well known that the returning officer may delay the return from day to day. In South Grey at the last local election the declaration was made the day after the polling. There is no reason why in the Dominion election it should not be made at the same time; yet in the last two Dominion elections the declaration has not been made until about eighteen days after the election. This system leads to fraud and tempts men to commit improper acts in order to obtain a verdict which the people have not given. If the Minister of Justice desired to make the people believe that he seeks to reform an abuse which has become a crying shame, he must frame the Bill so as to give a uniform time and thereby give no advantage either to a supporter or an opponent of the Government. It is desirable to cultivate a spirit of fair-play between parties, and if the Government control the returning officers and allow them to say when the declaration shall be made, they will find it very easy to hold back the declaration of opponents of the Government, and consequently do injustice. I hope this will be remedied, and that the system of making invidious distinctions between the parties will be wiped out. I think it is a crying shame for the Government to allow a system that places them in a position of probably being misjudged. If they desire to carry out the elections fairly, if they desire to act fairly between the parties, they will have the law so that it will be applicable to both parties alike, and then it will be satisfactory. As it is now, it is very unsatisfactory. Another matter I would like to speak about is in connection with the return of the ballot boxes. Under the present system, the returning officer sends out people, or goes out himself from place to place after the ballot boxes; whereas under the local law in Ontario, the ballot boxes are brought in by the deputy returning officers.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a Bill respecting the Controverted Elections Act, and not respecting the Election Act itself. I think the hon. gentleman is not discussing the Bill before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood from the manner in which hon. gentlemen were discussing it, that it had reference to the returning officers.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is with reference to the trial of controverted elections.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will not stick to that disposition which will leave in the hands of the returning officer the same power to which we have objected. The object of the Bill which I had the honour to introduce was to take away from the returning officer that discretionary power under which he may declare an elec-

tion carried by such or such candidate, and delay the transmitting of the certificate to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, when delay for the contestation will count only from the date of the publication in the *Official Gazette*. By the new law, the delay will date from his declaring the election carried by such a candidate, but he still remains at liberty to declare when he pleases, and to choose his own time for the declaration as to the election being carried by such a one. It is to that discretionary power we object. We want the time to be settled by the law, independent of the action of the returning officer. I understand the objection of the Government is that, in some counties, thirty days after the publication of the *Gazette* will not be sufficient. If it is not sufficient, let us make it forty days, or fifty days, or two months, if we like, but we want to have the same chances for every one, and I think we are in duty and honour bound to grant fair-play to all parties. The law, as proposed, would not materially change the existing system, and it will leave in the hands of the returning officers the powers which they have abused considerably already. In my own county, it is only about a month after the election that the certificate reached the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. We have been, I think, all satisfied this year with the way in which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has fulfilled his duty. He has published the returns as soon as they reached him, but what we complain of is very clear and distinct. We complain that there is not a uniform delay for every one, and we complain of the discretionary power left in the hands of the returning officer; and I am sure that the Government, if they desire to be really fair to everybody in the country, will understand our reasons and pass the Bill as the Committee reported. Let them extend the delay, if they like, but let them put everybody in the same position.

Mr. BARRON. As one of the Committee to whom this matter was referred, permit me to give my views briefly. It seems to me that the only difficulty in the way of fixing a definite time for the date of an election, is the possibility of a recount being had before a County Court judge. Now, if the recount is had, or refused, and any omission or neglect is made on the part of the County Court judge, the dissatisfied party has the right to apply to the Superior Court judge for redress under a mandamus, and that all causes delay. That, of course, might interfere with a fixed and definite time being laid down by statute within which from the date of the election the petition had to be fyled. If that is the only difficulty in the way, and it seems to me, from a consideration of the matter, it is the only difficulty, then I think the law might be made that in all cases a petition must be fyled within thirty days; but in cases where there is a recount before a County Court judge the petition must be fyled within thirty days from the final adjudication of that recount. If that is the only difficulty, and I think it is the only difficulty, in the way of a petition being fyled within a certain period from the date of the election, an exception might be made in cases where a recount is being had. The law might be made so that where there is a recount before a County Court judge, or application made for a recount before a County Court judge, then within a certain time after the final adjudication of that application for recount, the petition must be fyled. In all other cases the petition must be fyled within a period of thirty days, or whatever period Parliament fixes, from the date of the election.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Permit me to say a few words more by way of explanation, because it is well to have all the points urged at this stage of the Bill, so that they can be well thought over before this Bill comes to another stage. The difficulty which hon. members apprehend would arise altogether from actual misconduct on the part of the returning officer. Previously, the difficulty arose from many other causes and from several unintentional delays. The returning officer made his declaration of the candidate elected, and parties went about their business: the member was returned, and there was an end of it, so far as the watchfulness over the returning officer was concerned. After that, the return perhaps lay in his office, or he fell sick, or it was delayed in transmission to Ottawa, or after having arrived in Ottawa, there was delay in publication in the *Gazette*. The time for making the petition was dependent upon all these accidents and contingencies. It seems to me that if we say the period shall be thirty days from the day the returning officer makes his declaration, we get rid of a great many of the accidents which practically have made the trouble heretofore, and there can be no undue delay then, except by actual misconduct of the returning officer. During the time between polling day and declaration day the returning officer is under the eye of the candidates and under the eye of the constituents, who are on the spot to watch him and to insist that he performs his duty and performs it promptly. If we suppose the case of the returning officer desiring to act improperly and to delay the return and declaration in order that the time for petitioning may be extended, we find a set of facts which it is almost impossible to anticipate by legislation, and which ought to be dealt with by punishment. The hon. gentleman will see that if we fix the date at thirty days from polling day the following may occur: Suppose, as an example, in my county, the returning officer is a friend of mine and desires that I shall be returned and not petitioned against, he can make his return on the twenty-fifth or twenty-ninth day after polling day, and give my opponent but one for petitioning against me. If, on the other had, he is not a friend of mine, but an opponent, he declares me elected two days after the election and exposes me to be petitioned against for twenty-eight days. Therefore we do not secure uniformity by that at all. I am speaking of cases of intentional wrong-doing, but it seems to me it will secure practical uniformity except when there are cases of intentional wrong-doing, and these should be met by punishment. But besides that, the case is open to difficulty and want of uniformity from all the causes that make a difference of time in the declaration, such as the delays that I have mentioned as to recounting, the delays of bad roads and storms in some parts of the country, and not in others, and in some parts of the province, and not in others. These things would make a want of uniformity even if we declare the rule to be thirty days from polling day, because in one county two or three weeks would be consumed by unintentional delays and accidents in transmission,

and in another county there would be nearly thirty clear days for fyling the petition. The law will work unequally unless we fix a definite number of days. In that way we shall avoid all accidents, to which, generally speaking, are attributable the delays and inconveniences that have occurred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A great deal of the trouble which has arisen, and the complaints which have been justly made as to the actions of the returning officers, have been due to the fact that a former Government, in which the hon. Minister had not a place, chose to alter the position of the returning officers. In former times the same man continued to be the returning officer in election after election, having been usually an official such as a sheriff or a registrar, who was well known and had a serious responsibility. Now the system is practically that the Government candidate appoints the returning officer as a piece of patronage. He is consulted, and he appoints a man to suit himself. That practice is productive of a great many evils; and I would suggest to the hon. Minister, in addition to the other improvements which he appears to be honestly desirous of making, for the purpose of procuring impartiality in these matters between both sides, that he should see whether he cannot, in the major provinces at any rate, arrange to have a returning officer appointed who would hold office continuously. I think several similar suggestions could be made, which could be easily carried out, and the adoption of which would relieve the Government from the somewhat invidious position of appointing returning officers practically as nominees of the candidates, a practice which the Minister must see, and which the House on both sides will, I think, see, lends itself very easily to grave abuses both before, during and after the election.

Mr. FRASER. It seems to me that there is a good deal in the objection raised by the hon. Minister of Justice; but, I think, it could be met in this way: You have a certain number of days after the nomination in which to fyle your petition. Then you could also have a limitation as to the return. Suppose you provide that within forty or fifty days after nomination the petition shall be fyled; you could also provide that the return must be made within twenty or thirty days, unless there is a recount. In that way you would meet the difficulty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Bill as proposed——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken already.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I spoke on the other Bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is a very simple way in which the difficulty might be met. I think there ought to be a limit of time for the making of the declaration. Of course, it is impossible to have exact uniformity, but, I think, a limit should be fixed. I know of one case in which the returning officer, certainly from no desire to injure the candidate, but simply to suit his own convenience and in order that he might, at the least expense to himself, collect the ballot boxes, delayed the return for more than thirty days. He might as well have made it within ten or fifteen days. I should think fifteen days would be an ample limit, and that would prevent the returning officer doing harm to anybody. But as long as he has the power to delay the return as long as he pleases there is always a liability of his acting under improper motives.

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

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was going to say that the Bill as proposed will leave the law in precisely the same position that it is in at present—that is, the returning officer will be able to delay the declaration as he has done. Take, for instance, the practical operation of the law in the last election. The return in East Grey was gazetted seven days after the election. In North Bruce it was the same; in North Grey, I think, it was the same; while in my case the declaration was not made until eleven days after the election. In East Bruce it was about the same. Now, if you leave it optional with the returning officer to decide when the declaration shall be made the law will remain practically as it is now, and the hon. Minister of Justice will be placed in the position of being willing to allow the returning officer to continue the system which was fraught with so much fraud and disgrace to this country as occurred in the last election. I do hope the time will be fixed within which it will be necessary for the returning officer to make the declaration. In all the six elections that I have come through, until the last two elections, the declaration was made on the second day. On election day in 1874 there was a great snowstorm, one of the greatest of the season, and yet every poll book was brought in and the declaration was made on the second day. In 1872 the declaration was made on the second day; in 1878 it was made on the second day, and in 1882 it was also made on the second day; but in the election of 1887 the declaration was delayed for eighteen days; and it is my opinion that if we had an opportunity of looking at the ballots, which I believe were destroyed afterwards, we would find that the ballot boxes on that occasion were stuffed. Then, in the last election, with the same returning officer, the declaration was adjourned again and again for eleven or twelve days, and there was no reason for it, except to afford an opportunity to the returning officer to stuff the ballot boxes, and they were stuffed. If the hon. Minister of Justice wishes to remove from himself the suspicion of desiring that, he has to make this law applicable to both parties on the same basis. It will never do to give one party an opportunity of delaying the declarations, or leave open to people a temptation to do wrong. This should not be permitted by the hon. Minister of Justice, who I believe is anxious to make the law better than it is at present.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Grey is, making a most unwarrantable charge against the returning officer in South Grey. I do not think he is doing it without a knowledge of the facts or the situation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has imputed improper motives to the hon. member for South Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think he made it without knowledge. That is my opinion, and I certainly have a right to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not the right to express an opinion attributing

discreditable and dishonest motives to the hon. member. That is what he has done.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I only stated that in both cases the returning officer was the same, and that in 1887 the declaration was delayed eighteen days, and on this occasion it was delayed eleven days. I did not mention the returning officer, but the system.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said this detention took place for the purpose of stuffing the ballot boxes, and that they were stuffed. That was a direct statement, and an hon. member ought to have very strong evidence before making such a statement. My knowledge is, that the deputy returning officers had not made the return at the time the returning officer had set for making the declaration.

Mr. SPEAKER. A point of order has been raised. What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That the hon. gentleman has imputed dishonest and discreditable motives to an hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By declaring that the returning officer was not guilty of the charges which the hon. gentleman has made, and that the hon. gentleman knew it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. member relieved himself of that imputation when he said that the returning officer was not open to the charge which had been made, and that the hon. gentleman could not have spoken without a knowledge of the facts, and then went on to say that the hon. gentleman must have forgotten what the facts were—that he had had a knowledge of them but had forgotten.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That, I submit, does not make the statement orderly, which was before disorderly. The point of disorder is the motives which the hon. gentleman has attributed, and which, under the rules of the House, he has not the right to attribute.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware that I was attributing any motives when I spoke of the statements made. I said that the hon. gentleman made these statements, and that he knew the facts would not warrant them.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) had made an unwarrantable attack, and that he knew, from his knowledge of the facts, that the attack was unwarrantable, the statement was without warrant.

Mr. SPROULE. If the remark I made was out of order I withdraw it; but I must say my understanding of the situation was this: that when the time for making the return had arrived certain deputy returning officers had not brought in their ballot boxes. There had been a very severe snowstorm, and the roads were blocked up in different directions. Whether it was the cause or not of the delay, I am not prepared to say, but, at any rate, the ballot boxes were not forthcoming at the proper time. An adjournment took place until another day, and when that day arrived still a few of the returning officers' returns were absent, and the deputy returning officer telegraphed to the polling sub-divisions to get the returns, so that he might make his declaration, and the return was given in that way, on the assumption that the ballot boxes had not arrived. Before he could make his return the returning officer was obliged to leave his locality on important business and go to the city of Guelph, and he was detained there three or four days. When he came back to make the returns, the ballot boxes were not then forthcoming. Whatever law may be passed to compel returns being made on a certain day, you cannot compel men to do an impossibility. There may be storms which will prevent the deputy returning officers from getting through for a certain number of days. Some of these officers may be courageous and start out, while others, believing it impossible, do not start. As to the allegation that the ballot boxes were stuffed, I do not know on what grounds the hon. gentleman based that, for certainly I do not think the facts warrant it. If they do, the hon. gentleman can take advantage of the law. Why does not he or some of his friends prosecute? With regard to the time he gave for the returns of East Grey and North Bruce, I do not know anything of North Bruce, but I know he has not given the correct time with reference to East Grey. Perhaps the returning officer made the return before the time he should by law. There was considerable discussion on that point, and he still contends that he was carrying out the law as he understood it. But the return was not made as early as the hon. member said. No provision of the law here will prevent the same thing happening in South Grey again under similar circumstances.

Mr. MADILL. So far as the returning officer is concerned, he fixes the date of the declaration in the proclamation before the election, so that it is impossible for him to tell which candidate will be elected. You cannot impute improper motives to him. I am in the same position as the hon. member for South Grey. My election came off on the 5th March last and the declaration was fixed for the 17th March. I had to wait one day longer than he, and still did not impute improper motives to the returning officer.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that the proposition to make a fixed day for the declaration is one which would obviate nearly all the difficulties we have been discussing. Formerly the declaration was made publicly, and the electors were summoned to hear it made on the day fixed by law. If we had an arrangement of that kind now, if we had a clause in the law providing that a certain number of days after balloting declarations should be made, we would all start at the same point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would be in favour of having a declaration day not later than one week after balloting, subject to adjournments from causes beyond control.

Mr. CHARLTON. And have the same days fixed for all in all cases.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I think there is a difference between the law as it existed formerly and as it is now. Formerly, when a proclamation day was fixed and made uniform there was no objection to it, because we had the system of open ballot; but now, when the returning officer has in his possession all these boxes, it is very important that as soon as possible the declaration should be made. The day should be fixed for each county, according

to the time needed in each county to collect all the returns, so that, as soon as the returning officer is able to make his returns, he should send the whole thing to Parliament and secure the ballot boxes from being tampered with, or against any accident which might occur, if the boxes and contents were kept by the returning officer longer than necessary. I know that in my county there were over eighty boxes in one room which were not sufficiently protected, and I was very glad when the declaration was made and the return sent to Ottawa. I think the protection was much better, and I think if the law would fix that the delay would count from the declaration day, whatever that day might be, it would be far better; because, after all, it is impossible for the returning officer to fix in advance who will be the winning party; the proclamation fixes the nomination day and the polling day, and also it fixes the declaration day at the same time. Then there is no undue preference given to anybody, and I think the sooner the returning officer makes his declaration the better.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think one of the difficulties arises from the indefiniteness of the law as to the return of the ballot boxes to the returning officer by the deputy returning officers. There is no provision as to who is to collect the ballot boxes. The deputy returning officers are, of course, appointed by the returning officer, and the returning officer, in order to earn the mileage himself, instead of allowing the deputies to earn it, instructs them to retain the ballot boxes until he collects them, and that involves a considerable delay. If it were provided that the deputy returning officers should return the ballot boxes to the returning officer within a certain time there would be less delay than there is now. I mention this at present, because there will be an opportunity of considering this question when the Bill is before us again, but I think that the deputy returning officer ought not to transmit the ballot box by the hand of any other party. The ballot box should not be out of the possession of the deputy returning officer until it is in the possession of the returning officer. At present the returning officer may send A., B. or C. to collect the ballot boxes; he may send people who have no responsibility in the performance of that duty, and I know that, in my own constituency, the returning officer instructed the deputy returning officers to retain the ballot boxes until he collected them.

Motion to adjourn (Mr. Amyot) negatived, and Bill read the first time.

N.W.T. REPRESENTATION ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act. He said: This Bill is merely intended to make the deposits payable in bills of chartered banks, legal tender as well as Dominion notes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a provision which might be extended to the general law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; but we have made a similar provision in the other Acts.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the evidence now being taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts with reference to the payments made in the Department of the Interior for extra service be printed for the use of the members of that Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the first report of that Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should amend his report.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot amend a report.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, I would suggest that he would amend his motion. I think it reads, "with respect to payments made for extra service." I would suggest that he should add, "and in regard to the Langevin Block." We have commenced an enquiry in regard to that matter, and I spoke in the Committee about having the evidence printed, and I understood that it would be incorporated in the report. I suppose my hon. friend will have no objection to add that to his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not the report of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace); it is the report of the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it is perfectly in order for me to propose to amend the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion is in express terms made in accordance with the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, and if this amendment is made it will not be in accordance with that report.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I can move it afterwards.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood that the intention was that the evidence would be printed from day to day for the use of members, and not that the evidence is to be printed afterwards as a whole.

Mr. WALLACE. No; it is to be printed, of course, from day to day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the evidence taken, and to be taken, in regard to the Langevin Block, before the Public Accounts Committee, be printed for the use of members, and that Rule 94 be suspended.

Mr. WALLACE. That motion should be brought before the Committee first, and not before the House. It is not very respectful to the Committee to bring up such a motion here, and therefore I object.

Mr. MULOCK. I think I have cause of complaint. I was about to move an amendment, which was perfectly in order, to the motion of the member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He was moving a motion which, it is true, had the endorsement of a committee, and was based upon the report of a committee; but it is perfectly in order for this House to give instructions to any committee, whether that committee had reported or not. When Mr. Speaker asked me to defer my amendment and not present it as an amendment, but to move it as a substantive motion as soon as the hon. gentleman's motion was voted upon, now to have the point of order taken I consider is an unfair advantage to take. As regards respect for the Committee, I think I am not lacking in respect

for the Committee. I made the request of the Committee on a former occasion, and it was conceded by the Committee that it was a perfectly proper request, and I deferred proceeding with my enquiry because other enquiries were proceeding before that Committee: moreover, I was also engaged in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and there was no objection taken. I think that my request might very properly have been incorporated with this Bill, and I have no doubt it was an omission that the Committee did not incorporate it in the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the only reference the hon. member for North York made in this connection was a statement made after the Committee had adjourned.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that the evidence taken, and to be taken, before the Public Accounts Committee, in regard to the Langevin Block, be printed for the convenience of members, and that Rule No. 94 be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER. It can only be put with the unanimous consent of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These motions are inconvenient when they are not reported here by the Committee. When they are reported by the Committee the House knows that the Committee has considered the whole subject, and knows the necessities of the case. But the House knows nothing, without the report of such a Committee, about what is going on; we do not know what enquiries are proceeding about the Langevin Block. The motion will be adopted, of course, but there can be no objection to taking the sense of the Committee on the subject first. If the Committee, after consideration, do not recommend it, and the hon. member wishes afterwards to present his case to the House, it would be perfectly proper.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that objection is taken to my motion without notice been given?

Some hon. MEMBERS. We all object.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE.

Mr. LAURIER. I observe that the papers about the Washington Conference have not been presented.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the fault of the Government or the fault of the clerk. I believe they are to be distributed to-day. There was a delay in printing.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau is away. I would like to know whether he is away on leave of of absence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He has been granted leave of absence, on a medical certificate.

Mr. LAURIER. He has leave of absence at a very inconvenient season.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The business can be carried on just as well in his absence.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed consideration of the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, the 23rd ultimo, be read the second time," and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. IVES. Since the delivery of the Budget speech, which was unusually full and complete in its discussion and review of the whole question, several speeches have been delivered upon this side of the House which have been also exceedingly comprehensive and marked with great ability. Under that state of facts, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length, or to undertake to go over the whole field raised by the Budget, and by the motion in amendment. After referring to the hon. gentleman who immediately preceded me, I shall confine my attention exclusively to one branch of the discussion. The hon. gentleman who spoke last night, the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in rising, reproved us on this side of the House for consuming so much time by making long Budget speeches; and he proceeded to give us his idea of what was a fair length for a Budget speech at this stage of the debate by making a two hours' speech. While he was speaking some of my friends in the House took the trouble to count up from *Hansard* how many times the hon. gentleman from Wellington had addressed Mr. Speaker during the present session, and if an hon. gentleman asks me how many times, I can tell him that the hon. member for North Wellington has spoken 132 times. I think, therefore, that a gentleman who has spoken 132 times in 46 sittings of the House is better qualified than almost any other member of the House to judge as to the fitness of speeches in length or frequency. The hon. gentleman says that he has come to the conclusion, from the speeches he has heard from this side of the House, that we are opposed to any measure of reciprocity, and he thinks the reason is, that we are unwilling to deprive the manufacturers of their rich harvest. Well, I can inform the hon. gentleman that so far as I myself am concerned, and I think I am speaking in accord with the feeling of most of us on this side of the House, it is true that we are unwilling to approve of any measure of reciprocity, or of trade, or of convention, or of treaty, with either the United States or any other country, that would be ruinous to any important Canadian interest. While we approve of extending our trade with the United States and all other countries, while it is to the advantage of Canada and the Canadian people that it should be done, we do not approve, and will object, in spite of hon. gentlemen opposite, to this Government or to any other Government adopting a trade arrangement and a line of policy that will be destructive to any of the great Canadian interests. There are branches of trade where, I fancy, most of us will be quite willing—in fact, will hail with delight an arrangement for reciprocal trade. There are the forest products of the two countries; there are the fishing interests and products of the two countries; there are the bulk of the mineral interests of the two countries; there are certain agricultural products; there are certain productions which are the raw material of Canadian manufactures that might be brought from the United States, and *vice versa*, under a trade arrangement. But if we cannot have reciprocal trade relations with the United States or any other country upon any except such terms as will submit our people to unfair competition, such as would be destructive to

any important interest in Canada, then it becomes a question for serious consideration whether the advantages outweigh and overbalance the disadvantages or the disadvantages outweigh and overbalance the advantages. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said the reason why we take this course, which he thinks is an erroneous course, is that we are unwilling to deprive the manufacturers of their rich harvests. That is a statement which was made over and over again last session, and which was made over and over again by the hon. gentleman last night, a statement which had more or less effect on the people during the last general election, and a statement which we on this side of the House did not take the trouble to contradict frequently enough in the last Parliament. It would be impossible to conceive any body of men making a statement so frequently as that statement was made without someone being deceived by it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who repeated it last night, will be kind enough to tell us where the manufacturers of this country have reaped a rich harvest at the expense of the agriculturist or any portion of the population. It is exceedingly easy to deal in generalities, to make charges of that description, but hon. gentlemen opposite for years have not condescended to give us, and have not attempted to give us, any details to support the charges they have made. I say, without wasting the time of the House by going further into this matter, it is impossible, either for the hon. member for North Wellington or any other hon. member opposite, to show by facts and figures that the policy of protection, which we have extended not only to the manufacturing but to every other interest, has given a rich harvest to the manufacturers of this country. That the manufacturers have been fairly successful and fairly prosperous as a whole I admit. Does the hon. gentleman regret that fact? I am proud to say, on behalf of this side of the House, that our policy does not make it necessary for us to make an attack on any great interest of the Dominion. In the course of the last general election hon. gentlemen opposite pictured to the farmers that the manufacturers were leeches bleeding their lives out. Those hon. gentlemen threw the manufacturers overboard. They made up their minds that there were more votes among the farmers than among the workingmen, artizans and manufacturers. They said: We will make our selection and capture the agriculturist vote and throw the manufacturers overboard. We do not have to resort to any such course as that. Our policy is a policy of equal protection, equal fostering care given to all industries and all classes of the population. The hon. gentleman says that we have frequently taken advantage of the simple-minded electors, that we did so at the last election once more, but that the farmers are agitated now, and they showed it at the last election. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are in the habit of being complimentary to the different classes of the electorate of this Dominion. It was the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who referred to the people of this country as being "simple-minded." It was only a little while ago that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to the electorate of very important portions of the Dominion as having been bought and purchased by promise of subsidies and other improper influences. It is evident there were a large number of simple-minded voters among the electorate who sent to this House the hon. member for North Wellington. But were they simple-minded men who sent hon. gentlemen who sit with us on this side of the House, or did hon. gentlemen opposite, by frequently reiterating statements, which are not founded on fact, succeed in imposing on some simple-minded people in their own constituencies? The trouble with hon. gentlemen was this, and the reason why they did not succeed in carrying the country at the last general election was, that there were not simple-minded people enough in the country. The hon. gentleman says that the people are agitated. I think it it quite evident that the agitation is cooling down, and I have no doubt when the time for the bye-elections arrives we shall find that the agitation among the farmers has entirely disappeared, and any of them who were led away at the last general election will come back to their sober senses and approve of our policy, which has been so successful during the last twelve years. The hon. gentleman did what he could last night to allay the agitation. He said to the House, and I presume he was talking to the country, that even if the Liberal party came into power and were to recommend annexation to the United States it would be necessary to pass a Bill to carry into effect the convention; it would have to pass this House and the Senate, and receive the assent of His Excellency the Governor General; and the hon. gentleman, in order further to allay the agitation, stated that the Senate, which is Conservative, would most likely reject such a measure. I think the hon. gentleman contributes a valuable idea tending to allay the agitation which, he says, existed at the last general election. The hon. gentleman next proceeded to find fault with the hon. member for Haldimand for having compared the condition of the Canadian farmer with the farmers of France, Germany and the United States, where the farmers were cursed by a higher protection than the Canadian farmer labours under, and the hon. gentleman distinctly admitted that the United States farmers are in an impoverished condition, owing to the protective tariff of that country. If the hon. gentleman's admission is correct, as I think it is, perhaps either he or his friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will tell us whether those impoverished farmers of the United States have, or have not, access to that sixty-five million market which we are told would be such a relief to our farmers if they had access to it. Perhaps he will tell us also how it would relieve the difficulty of the over-production of agricultural products in this country to be united in trade relations with a country which already produces $532,000,000 of agricultural products for export every year over and above the home consumption, and a country in which the farmers are at the present time, as he says, in an impoverished condition. But if my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was wrong in comparing the condition of the farmers of Canada with the condition of the farmers in the United States, and in France and Germany, which are protective countries, would my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) be willing to have a comparison made between the condition of our farmers and the condition of the

agricultural classes in free-trade England, for example? If not, perhaps he, or some hon. gentleman on that side of the House, would like to point out some civilized country on the face of the globe where he would wish to have a comparison made between its farmers and the farmers of Canada. As I am speaking more upon the agricultural question than any other, I think it is important that the farmers of this country should have conclusive evidence laid before them that the agricultural classes in England are labouring under greater depression than they are, and that there is a greater falling off in the value of agricultural products, and in the value of rents, and the value of agricultural lands in England, than there ever has been claimed to be in this country. I hold in my hand the Fair Trade papers for the year 1888, and I propose to quote from a speech made by Mr. Bateman, the President of the National Association for the Preservation of Agriculture, and who, speaking only a short time ago upon this burning question, in the County of Essex (Eng.), said :

"When agriculture prospered, as a rule all the other industries prospered, and he thought there was not a man in the room would deny that, when £50 an acre land had gone down to nearly £10, and farms were going out of cultivation on every side, there was certainly something wrong in the state of agriculture in this country. The farmers of England were a very long-suffering race. When anything occurred to hamper or distress them, as a rule they did not even hold a meeting, but simply exercised the constitutional privilege of every Englishman to grumble, and grumble they did, but nothing more came of it. He was talking now about the days when he was a ten-year old. When free trade first took possession of this country, and they were chastised by King Solomon's whips in the shape of free importation of grain, the farmers did go a little beyond grumbling—they held a meeting or two, but nothing much more came of it. But when they had a transfer from the reign of King Solomon to that of King Rehoboam, and were chastised not with whips but with scorpions; when they found that the British farmer had not only to put up with unrestricted foreign competition, but that the foreign came into England almost absolutely free of freight, then he really did something more than growl, for he saw nothing but the workhouse staring him in the face, and he thought it really time to stir, and he (the Chairman) thought this movement of Mr. Poynter was the most promising way of stirring a real grievous question in the country. In this district of Colchester if they once reduced the land to such a state that it could no longer carry the farmer and the labourer—for the two things ran hand in hand—that the labourers were driven off the land, then that indeed would be a distressful time for Colchester. He had met and talked with many tradesmen of this town, and they complained one and all that the country people were not ordering the clothes that they used to do, or eating the dinners they used to do, or doing anything for the good of the town. They told him there was many a respectable farmer who used to have his thousands at the bank who now at the most went in for one new coat a year. And these tradesmen were beginning to wonder how it was.

"Mr. S. W. Poynter then delivered a lengthy and forcible address. He remarked that it was no new thing for one farmer to say to another that the condition of their business at the present time was one of unmitigated distress. He did not know any farmer who, if one spoke to him individually, could hold out one single ray of hope as to the condition of English agriculture, unless something were speedily done to rescue them from their difficulties. Those who knew nothing about agriculture, and who travelled about the country, would point to the glorious fields just before harvest and they would talk with farmers in the train and say that they looked pretty healthy and stout, and had a pretty good coat upon their backs, and that, take it altogether, they thought the farmers were doing fairly well. But if those men looked at the farmer's banking account and if they went to the managers of the different branches of the country banks and asked them how these farmers' accounts stood in comparison with how they stood ten years ago, they would not think the farmers were now in anything like a fairly prosperous condition. Further than that, if they took the trouble, as some of them might do, to go into the farmer's stock yard at the present time and take each stack, one after another, in rotation, and ask the farmer how many acres it came off, how many quarters, honestly, as a man, he thought he was going to gather off his fields, and as farmers say 'tottled' up the amount, if that man was not surprised and dismayed at the result of one year's business he would hardly be an Englishman with a heart in his body * * * * * * * *

"He only knew this speaking for himself—and he believed that every farmer would say the same—that the drop in prices during the last four years amounted to over £2 an acre on every acre of land on his farm. Indeed, he knew in some cases it had been £3 or £4 per acre, and not through any drop in the yield, but owing to the drop in prices * * * * * * * * * *

"They had to look these things fairly in the face, and they had to ask themselves, and to ask their opponents, who objected to the position they took up, they had to ask them if they were prepared to see the agriculture of England stifled, crushed and stamped out * * "

He continues :

"But he wanted to impress upon them this point, that the present rent on agricultural land was in a number of cases not three per cent. upon the value of buildings upon the land, let alone the value of the buildings and the land together. They could go and take plenty of farms with the houses, barns, sheds, stables and cottages upon them, and the rent that was paid would not amount to three per cent. of the money spent upon the buildings alone. Some gentlemen would say: 'Of course, if it won't pay five per cent. you must take one per cent.' They admitted that, to a certain extent. But remember, if the landlord found that he could not get three per cent. interest on his buildings, let alone the value of his land, what amount of buildings would he undertake in the next ten years? What amount of labour would he employ in doing those things which needed to be done? * * *

"He repeated that the landlords, the farmers, and the labourers had been feeding the population of this country under cost price for the last four years. If not, what was the meaning of this extraordinary fact that Mr. Giffen, the Board of Trade statistician, would tell them that the farmer's capital, not his capital at his bankers, but his capital invested in his stock, had actually been reduced to the extent of £360,000,000 in the last ten years."

And, gentlemen, you have not alone to depend upon the speeches of these gentlemen belonging to this society which has been organized, and which has been agitating the agricultural classes in England for some years, but you may take the final report of the Royal Commission that was issued two or three years ago, and over which the Earl of Iddesleigh presided. You have only to take this report, and in it you will find laid down by this Royal Commission in their report to the Imperial Parliament that the value of agricultural lands in England decreased by about 50 per cent., and that the result was that it was impossible for agricultural operations to be carried on profitably or successfully. This report gives the cause of this state of things to be : the enormous increase of production in different parts of the world, where grains of all kinds, and food products of all kinds, can be more cheaply raised than they can upon the lands of England. Now, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone in this House believes that agriculture is not in a more distressed condition in free-trade England than it is in this Canada of ours. If my hon. friend is not satisfied with a comparison with France, or Germany, or the United States, or free-trade England, perhaps he or some of his friends will tell us what country in the world they would have us compare the agricultural condition of Canada with. This great depression, admitted by my hon. friend to exist in the United States, in France and in Germany, admitted by us to exist to a certain extent in Canada, proved by the documents I have read to exist in England, what is its cause? It is evidently one that can easily be found out, and it should be clearly understood by the farmers of this

country that the depression which they feel is more acutely felt by the farmers of almost every other country in the world, and that it is from a common and natural cause, namely, the over-production of natural and food products. The development of the Western States, the opening up by railways of large areas of grain-producing lands in India, South Africa and South America, have worked together within the last few years to throw upon the consuming markets of Europe an enormous overstock of agricultural products. This has produced the depression; and no form of government, no form of policy, no convention that we could make with any country, much less with a country which produces a surplus of similar products, would possibly help that condition of things. My hon. friend then says that the great bulk of the goods which the United States have to exchange with us are manufactured goods, and that if we do not receive manufactured goods from them we cannot hope for any measure of reciprocity. My hon. friend is slightly mistaken in his statement, because from 78 to 80 per cent. of the exports of the United States are agricultural products; and my opinion is, that if the Congress of the United States could have their choice between a more extended market for their agricultural products and securing the same for their manufactured products they would, without a moment's hesitation, decide in favour of securing a wider field for their agricultural products. If, however, it can be proved that we cannot make any arrangement with the United States except by admitting their agricultural products and their views of the case, and if such an arrangement will be injurious to the Canadian people, then I say by all means let us make none. My hon. friend at this point made a sudden change in his style of speech. He made some reference to Mr. Farrer. He said that Mr. Farrer was a new-born Liberal convert, and that he was now only about six months old as a Liberal. I was rather pleased to observe that the first shout of a new-born Liberal convert is for annexation, and it struck me to enquire of my hon. friend what iniquity a fully-confirmed Liberal would be guilty of if a new convert shouts in that way for annexation. He says that Mr. Farrer was a Conservative when he wrote the pamphlet that figured so largely in the last general election. Well, he was rather an odd Conservative. He fought for my hon. friend from South Oxford and the Liberal party as far back as 1873. He was nominated at Lennox on the 24th November, 1873, as a candidate to help Sir Richard Cartwright, then running in Lennox as Finance Minister. After that he held office for two or three years as immigration agent in Ireland under the Liberal party; and on his return from Ireland, long before this pamphlet was written, he had succeeded in seducing a paper mill and a leading newspaper from the Conservative ranks to the Liberal ranks. Therefore, it is curious to observe that this Liberal, who is claimed by my hon. friend to be a convert of only six months, became Liberal about the same time as his bosom friend the hon. member for South Oxford, and I think it is only fair to say that they are twin and contemporary converts. It is rather mean, though, for my hon. friend from Wellington and all his colleagues on that side of the House to continue to heap all the dirt and blame of their defeat, and everything else, on poor Farrer and Wiman. If those gentlemen were human I should say they would be inclined to stand from under when the bye-elections come on; and possibly, if they could be received back in the fold they would be disposed to cross to our side of the House. My hon. friend said that we need not be afraid of annexation, because the Senate would not pass that measure. I am pleased to know that an additional reason has been given by the hon. gentleman why the Senate should be continued. The hon. gentleman having left the personal question, comes back to such plain matters as binders and mowers, and he tells us the prices of these articles at Ann Arbor, in Michigan, at that great manufactory which has combined with it all the agricultural implement works of the United States—the McCormack concern. He tells us what are the prices for export and the prices to the American farmer, and I was pleased that the hon. gentleman was frank enough to admit that the price at which the farmer secures his binders, and mowers, tedders, reapers, horse-rakes and other farming implements are as low in Canada as they are in the United States. And I was pleased to have from him the admission that, even if we had unrestricted reciprocity and were buying our binders and tedders from Ann Arbor instead of Ontario, we would not gain anything by it, but our farmers would pay the same prices, and the only difference would be that all the manufacturing of our implements would be done in Michigan instead of its being done in Ontario. The hon. gentleman says that the manufacturers passed two very ridiculous resolutions at their meeting before the last general election. They resolved first that unrestricted reciprocity would be a disadvantage to the farmers, and then, in a scond resolution, that it would be a disadvantage to the manufacturers. But my hon. friend coald hardly bring the charge of inconsistency, because it is our pretension that the interests of the manufacturers and the farmers are identical, and we see no reason why the manufacturers' association should not have passed a resolution recording their opinion as to the effect of unrestricted reciprocity both upon the farmers and themselves. My hon. friend said it would take a surgical operation to make us on this side understand unrestricted reciprocity. Well, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman and his friends that, in the first place, they should understand it themselves and agree upon its details, and that some of them should, once and for all, tell us what they mean by it. There is one thing, however, I can say, and that is that the people seem to have got some understanding as to what it is, whether right or wrong, and were able to get rid of it without any ipecac. The hon. gentleman then referred to the egg shipments to Great Britain, and it is curious to see how anxious he was to show that it will be impossible for us to get along without the United States markets. Why should the hon. gentleman try to make the farmers believe it is going to be so difficult for us to establish a market for eggs in England? Why should he magnify the difficulties? Why should he be so anxious to inform us that the boxes will have to be made in two parts, and be of such a size and such a shape, and that, with all these precautions, there is great danger of the eggs being broken or spoiled on the voyage? Is the hon. gentleman anxious

to prevent the development of this trade? Is he anxious to compel our farmers to submit to the operations of the McKinley Bill without any recourse or escape? Why should he, on the contrary, not tell us something to help us out of the difficulty? Why should he not encourage our farmers in attempting to open up this new market? Then, with regard to potatoes, he said that since the McKinley Bill, and in spite of the McKinley Bill, so natural a market are the United States for us that we have shipped seven bushels of potatoes there to every one we have shipped to all other countries in the world. What does that prove? Is it in his favour or against him? Does it not show that the consumer is paying the duty under the McKinley Act? Does it not show that, with a short crop of their own, they are bound to have our potatoes; and judging by the fact, which he must admit, that the prices since the McKinley Act came in force for potatoes have been as good as before during the same period of the year, and certainly far above the average year, is it not evident that, instead of our farmers paying the duty, the duty is paid by the American consumers? Our hon. friend goes on in his pitiful wail to enumerate what articles of agricultural production we exported to the United States in 1889-90, and placing the McKinley rates of duty on these, he tells the farmers that now they will have to pay some $3,166,592, which might be avoided if we only had unrestricted reciprocity. What does that mean? It means that he contends the Canadian farmer pays all the duty and the American consumer none. It means that we can find no other possible market for any part of our produce except the United States, and that our produce must go there free of duty, or the Canadian farmer must pay the whole duty; and he says this with a full knowledge of the fact that, since the McKinley Act came into force, our eggs and potatoes have been sold at higher prices than usual. Hay, also, has sold at better prices than usual; so that it is not the Canadian farmer, but the American consumer, who pays the duty. An hon. gentleman, in the course of the last election contest, told the farmers who have hay to sell that until the Liberal party was returned to power they would never be able to sell hay; and what was the result? It was, that some people were silly enough to believe that statement and sold their hay early in the season, before a foreign demand sprung up, at a nominal price; and to-day and for the last few months, owing to the foreign demand for hay, good prices have ruled, so that these people who were deceived by the orators of the Liberal party, will not likely be so simple-minded on another occasion. The hon. gentleman then, referring to the question of immigration, said we were spending too much money, and also that we had spent too much money, on railroads; but these objections have been so ably dealt with by the speakers who have preceded me on this side, that I shall not dwell on them as I intended to do. But, Sir, I will take for my text, if you will allow the expression, certain statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech on the Budget. I do so because they express the ideas which have been the leading ideas of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. I refer to his remarks on the agricultural question. He stated that the farmers are finding from day to day more and more difficulty in making both ends meet, and he added that in Ontario, in nine out of ten counties, the population is decreasing, and that, in forty-nine out of fifty, farm lands are worth from 25 to 33 per cent. less than they were twelve years ago. The reasons he gave were two: first, an inadequate home market; and second, the enormously increased burden of taxation under the National Policy. Before giving us the cure, he stated what would not be a cure. He said that no foreign market except the market of the United States offered any tangible prospect of relief, and then he states that the cure is unrestricted reciprocal trade with the United States. I am not going to stop—I have not the time to do so—to discuss the fairness or the truthfulness of the representations of the hon. gentleman as to the state and condition of the farmers in the Province of Ontario. I know that, for my own Province of Quebec, that statement is grossly exaggerated. In fact, there is no truth whatever in it. So far as the farmers in the Eastern Townships are concerned, there is only this that is true: There is not the same number of applicants for farms, and it is not so easy to sell farms or to obtain the price that could be obtained a few years ago, and the farmers know the reason. They know that they are not able to sell so readily because of the millions of acres of free lands, and cheap lands, and untimbered lands, that purchasers or would-be purchasers can obtain in the great West. But our farmers have been making money, and those of them who work and are industrious have been doing so constantly. On the whole, they have obtained better prices. They are not burdened with debt, as the hon. member represented, and, as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, we do not produce a surplus of the articles he referred to. But the hon. gentleman who drew this gloomy picture presented the other side of the shield, the silver side of the shield, not very long ago. I find, in a quotation from a Toronto newspaper which a friend here has handed me, that the hon. gentleman, as president of the Frontenac Loan and Investment Society, no longer ago than the 18th March last, stated that several properties in Manitoba had been sold at satisfactory prices, and that the values were continuing to improve. Referring to the whole country, he said:

"Land is in great demand, and at better prices than at any previous period."

That was the silver side of the shield, but he presented the bronze side when he was addressing the House on the Budget. I ask if farmers find it harder to make ends meet from day to day and hour to hour, and if they do, why? What is the comparative cost of what farmers have to buy now and eight or ten years ago? What is the comparative price received for what they have to sell? What is the comparative rate of interest, and what are the comparative facilities for the distribution of their produce, the comparative rate of freight and the comparative rate of taxation as between the present time and 1878? If I can succeed in showing to this House that the farmers of this country can buy what they have to buy as cheaply or more cheaply to-day than in 1878, that what they have to sell brings on the whole better prices than in 1878, that the rate of interest they have to pay has decreased while the facilities for the distribution of what they raise are infinitely improved and the

rate of freight is much lessened; and if I can show that the burdens of taxation they carry are very much less than they were in 1878 I think I will have made out a case which will call upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to prove his statement that the farmers find it harder every day to make both ends meet. In regard to what the farmers have to buy, every farmer who goes to a store and buys goods knows that they are cheaper now than they were ten years go. Take what he buys for his table, what he buys to eat and drink. The chief articles that the farmer buys for his table are sugar, and tea and coffee. Those are the articles which cost him the most money. As a rule, he raises his own vegetables and his own flour, but even if he did not he would find that as cheap as it was in 1878. However, he has to buy sugar and tea and coffee. How do the prices of those articles compare now with the prices of 1878? In 1878 Japan tea, choicest, was 50 cents, now it is only 43 cents a pound; Hyson tea, the finest, was from 50 to 70 cents in 1878, and now it is from 30 to 60 cents; the finest Gunpowder tea was from 65 cents to 75 cents, and now it is from 35 cents to 45 cents; the finest Souchong was from 50 cents to 70 cents, now it is from 35 cents to 60 cents. So much for tea—and there is a good reason for that. At that time both tea and coffee were heavily taxed for revenue purposes by the Liberal Government, but those taxes have since been removed. In regard to coffee, we find that green Mocha was at that time from 28 to 29 cents, and is now from 30 cents to 33 cents, and green Java was from 27 to 30 cents, and is now from 24 cents to 26 cents. There is a slight increase in the Mocha, but there is a decrease in the Java. Sugar is an item of considerable expense to the farmer, and we find that granulated sugar, which cost 9⅝ cents to 10 cents in 1878, was sold last spring for 6⅛ cents to 6¼ cents; yellow refined sugar, which was sold at 7½ cents to 8⅝ cents, cost last spring only 5½ cents to 6 cents. The change in the price of sugar owing to the new tariff means a reduction of 1½ cents to 1¾ cents per pound on yellow sugar and about 2 cents per pound on granulated sugar. I undertake to say that hon. gentlemen will find a reduction all through the list of what the farmer has to buy, and I defy the hon. gentleman opposite to point out any item which the farmer is not able to buy for his table cheaper to-day by a considerable percentage than he could in 1878. Then the hon. gentleman from South Oxford fails in that particular to show that the present system costs the farmer more than it would cost him under the system he advocates. Then, as to what he has to wear. Grey cotton, one of the things that farmers have to buy most frequently, which cost in 1878 7⅛ cents, now cost 5⅝ cents; those which cost 7¾ cents now cost 5⅞ cents; those which cost 8¼ cents now cost 6¼ cents; those that cost 8⅝ cents now cost 6¾ cents; those that cost 9⅜ cents now cost 7 cents; those that cost 9⅞ cents now cost 7¾ cents; those that cost 10¼ cents now cost 8 cents; those that cost 11¼ cents now cost 8¾ cents. When you come to wide sheetings, you find that those which, in 1878, cost 25½ cents now cost 19 cents; those that cost 28½ cents now cost 20¾ cents. Canton flannels, which cost 10½ cents in 1878 now cost 8½ cents; those which cost 11½ cents now cost 8¾ cents; those which cost 12 cents now cost 10 cents; those which cost 14 cents now cost 11¼ cents; and those which cost 17 cents now, cost 13½ cents. Cotton yarns, which cost 23½ cents now cost 18 cents; and cotton yarns, coloured, which cost 33½ cents, now cost 27½ cents. The bags the farmer has to buy to put his grain in have been reduced in the same proportion. Those which cost $24.50 now cost $20.50, and those which cost $22.50 now cost $17. I have here tables, which I will read, showing the reduction in prices since 1878, in several articles of cotton goods in universal use by the people:

Denims.		Tickings.		Ginghams.	
1878.	1891.	1878.	1891.	1878.	1891.
11c.	8¾c.	11½c.	8½c.	7c.	5c.
12½	10¼	14	11	8	6
14½	11¼	16½	12	10	7½
16½	13½	18	14	12½	9
...	...	19	14½	...	...

Bleached Shirtings.		Apron Checks.		Cheese Cloth.	
1878.	1891.	1878.	1891.	1878.	1891.
6¾c.	4½c.	13c.	8c.	5c.	3¾c.
7⅜	6½	12½	8¾	..	..
8¼	6¾	9½	6¾	..	..
9¼	8	...	..	..	..
10⅜	9¼	...	..	..	..
12¼	10¼	...	..	..	..
9½	8½	...	..	..	..
13½	11	...	..	..	..

In fact, the reduction has been all the way from 22½ to 40 per cent. upon everything the farmer has to buy to clothe himself and his family in the way of cotton or woollen goods of any description. In the way of prints, also, the reduction has been in the same proportion. When you come to woollen goods, grey flannels cost 35 cents a yard in 1878, and you can now buy them for 27. Lower grades of these goods not made then are now selling at from 15 to 17 cents.

Navy Blue Flannels.		Blankets.	
1878.	1891.	1878.	1891.
35c.	26c.	57½c. to 62½c.	42½c. to 45c. per lb.

Previous to 1878 a large quantity of English flannels were imported, especially English flannel blankets. They continued to be imported for some little time afterwards, but now the market is entirely supplied by our own mills. Now, coming to what the farmer wears himself, etoffes and tweeds, the following shows the difference in values of a few leading lines in tweeds:—

	1878. S cts.	1891. Cts.
Etoffes	50	35
Tweeds, 14 oz	70	50
Fine, 12 oz	1.10	85
" 9 oz	60	45
" 9 oz	70	50
" 9 oz	85	60

Thus, for every single article that the farmer has to buy for himself or family in the way of either cotton or woollens the prices are less by 22½ to 40 per cent. than they were in 1878. Now we come to furniture and house furnishing. Furniture is 50 per cent. cheaper now than it was in 1878. Wall paper, paints, oils, house furnishings of all descriptions, and house hardware, are from 35 to 50 per cent. cheaper than they were in 1878. Now I come to farm implements. An hon. gentleman last night gave us the prices that farm implements are sold for in the United States to the American farmer, and those prices, I was pleased to see, ranged over the prices at which the Canadian farmer at the present time can buy Canadian manufactured articles. I have been at the pains to ascertain

accurately and exactly the range of prices from 1878 to the present time upon mowers, self-binders, reapers, horse rakes, seed drills, top buggies, and farm waggons. The difference is seen in the following table:—

	1878.	1890.
Mowers	$85	$45
Self-binders	$225 to $250	$100 to $120
Reapers	$100	$65
Horse rakes	$30 to $35	$22 to $27
Seed drills	$90	$65
Top buggies	$100 to $125	$60 to $75
Farm waggons	$60 to $75	$45 to $55

Then, both as to what the farmer has to buy for his table, what he has to buy to clothe himself and his family, what he has to buy to use, all things are cheaper under the operation of the National Policy than they were in 1879. Now, how is it with regard to interest? We all know that the rate is reduced by about 2 per cent. from what it was in 1878, and you can get money at 6 per cent. now upon a class of security for which, in 1879, you would have had to pay not less than 8 per cent., and the farmer gets the advantage. Then take our railway facilities. Our railway mileage has been largely increased since 1878, and the number of tons carried has largely increased, while the freight rates upon agricultural products carried to market are not more than 50 per cent. now what they were in 1879, and any leading transportation company will tell you so. Mr. Speaker, the Government of this country, within the last thirteen years, has expended, under and with the consent of this House, over $96,000,000 to build railways and canals to carry the products of this country to market, and that policy has shown the results that were expected of it, in the reduction by 50 per cent. of the cost of transportation. Those gentlemen in this House who are in the habit of indulging in pessimistic speeches, and representing everything as going to rack and ruin, should read the first table in the Report of Railway Statistics of Canada for 1890, where the department gives the number of miles in operation, the number of passengers carried, the tons of freight carried, and the earnings and working expenses of Canadian railways from 1837 to 1890. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading these statistics, further than to say that the number of passengers and the number of tons of freight carried has more than doubled since 1878. The number of passengers carried in 1878 was about 6,500,000, and in 1890 it was over 12,800,000. The number of tons of freight carried, and that represents the condition of the country better than anything else, which was 8,348,000 tons in 1879, rose to the enormous total of 20,787,000 tons in 1890. The earnings of those railways were $20,500,000 in 1878, and last year they had reached the sum of nearly $47,000,000. The working expenses, which were a little over $16,000,000 in 1878, are now $32,913,000; so you see that the increased mileage of railways, which has run up in twelve years from 6,500 miles to 13,250, has had its effect in doubling the tonnage of freight, and more than doubling the number of passengers carried throughout the Dominion of Canada; and that tells you the story of what the National Policy has done, what the railway policy has done, in the way of creating an interprovincial trade between the various provinces of this Dominion. Now, as regards taxation, which is the only other question that arises, I undertake to say that every man may pay more or less taxation as he chooses; that unless it can be shown that Canadian-made goods, such as the farmers must use, are dearer than similar foreign goods can be laid down here, there is no ground for the idea that our taxation is a burden to the country. I have not heard any other hon. gentleman opposite go into any details on this point. They speak in generalities about the burdens of taxation; but they cannot play any longer with the people with this general talk. The time has come when the people desire to know and hear something more than mere generalities, and it is incumbent on hon. gentlemen opposite to give us details to show that a burden rests on the farmers resulting from the National Policy. What does a farmer have to pay? He has to pay for his coffee, sugar and tea. These are all infinitely cheaper now than in 1878. Everything else is cheaper, however, and I fail to see how it can be made out that the burden of taxation on the agricultural class is heavier than it was in 1878. On the contrary, it is lighter. It follows, therefore, that hon. gentlemen in stating that the farmers are finding it harder and harder to make ends meet are stating what is not founded on fact. In my opinion the whole difficulty in Ontario, or the chief difficulty at all events, namely, the drop in the price of farms and the trouble in finding buyers, is due to causes which no Government and no fiscal policy can possibly change. Is it due to the fact that since 1878 we have opened up enormous areas of territory and cheap lands, which the people purchase instead of buying farms at the prices charged in Ontario? As to the other premises of the hon. gentleman, I need not spend much time in discussing any of them except the last. The hon. gentleman says that our population is decreasing. Possibly it may be so; the census will tell us the story. The population is certainly not decreasing in the cities and towns. But I would refer the House and that hon. gentleman to an editorial in the *Globe* on the 26th of last month on the same subject, and from that article the hon. gentleman and the House will see that, in the opinion of the *Globe*, the decrease of population in rural parts is not confined to this country nor to any country which has such a policy as our National Policy. The *Globe* says:

"The United States census shows that whilst the population in the cities and towns increased during the last decade at the rate of 45 per cent., the farming population increased only 14 per cent. This in itself tells the story of the agricultural depression, though such statements as that the gold price of wheat in England averaged only 95 cents between 1884 and 1889 as compared with $1.64 in the year 1875 help one to perceive the causes. The Canadian census will furnish a similar tale. The rural districts have been almost standing still, and the smaller towns, or most of them, have suffered in consequence. Toronto, Montreal and other centres have drained these towns of their well-to-do inhabitants, and have profited also by an influx of store-keepers, farmers and farm labourers who have abandoned the struggle. It looks as if parts of the Province of Quebec were destined to be overtaken by the decay which has seized rural New England. The annual exodus from Quebec, which in 1865 was estimated in Parliament to amount to 12,000 persons, is now four or five times that much. In Ontario, where we have a better soil and climate, wheat-growing is giving place to all-round farming, especially to the production of cattle and cheese for the British market. But in Quebec progress in that direction is slow. The farmers as a body seem unable to get out of the old routine of coarse products, and as these are hit by the McKinley Bill their condition is steadily growing worse."

The next proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was, that no for-

eign market but the United States offered any tangible prospect of relief to Canadian agriculturists. The hon. gentleman did not vouchsafe to tell us why He did not explain why England, that imported $700,000,000 worth of food products in 1890, could not buy some of ours. He did not tell us why other countries besides the United States on the American continent, Mexico and the South American republics, who together have a population of 52,000,000, and who have a foreign trade of $1,201,000,000, largely importing breadstuffs, could not buy some of our products. He simply made the bald statement that no foreign country except the United States afforded any tangible prospect of relief. We have the evidence of our own efforts before us as regards Great Britain. We have in the matter of cheese established the fact that it is possible to build up a trade with Britain. If we have done it under great difficulties in the matter of cheese, why cannot we do it in the matter of butter and other products that are so greatly troubling hon. gentlemen opposite. It is estimated that the consuming population of Europe will require 100,000,000 bushels of wheat this present year to provide for their wants. The consuming population exists. We are as near it as is the United States. We have the same ocean to sail over; it does not belong to them, all mighty as they are, and we have the same air to fill the sails of our ships; we have the same route; we have the same facilities; we have a surplus and they have a surplus; they will not buy from us and we do not want to buy from them. Why not go to the common market? Will the hon. member for South Oxford give us his reason for the statement he so broadly made, that no foreign country except the United States offered any tangible hope of relief, or any tangible hope of a market for our surplus agricultural products? The hon. gentleman gave us no argument, no fact and no reason.

Mr. GILLMOR. The fact is, we do not send it.

Mr. IVES. The fact is, we do send it. We have been sending our cheese for years, and we have now built up that trade. We are sending our cattle by thousands. We have commenced to send our eggs, and we will build up that trade, and we will build up a trade in one branch after another until the hon. gentleman's round of complaints will be entirely removed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not want reciprocity.

Mr. IVES. We want reciprocity when it will be good for the country. I further point out that the United States, with productions similar to our own, raising a surplus in 1889 of $532,000,000 worth of food products, or 78 per cent. of their total exports, exported that surplus to foreign countries, to the markets in which we can sell our products, and all this talk about opening up to us a market of 65,000,000 people is balderdash. Gentlemen opposite talk about 65,000,000 people. Where are they? You have got about 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 in New England, which are within measurable distance of us, but what about the remainder? Are you going to send your wheat to Illinois, Ohio and Kansas? Are you going to send your cattle to Texas and Missouri? Are you going to send your fruit to California? The cost of the transportation of our products to 45,000,000 of the 60,000,000 which are outside your reach would utterly prevent our trading successfully with them. Why, Sir, the unfairness and the dishonesty of the statement of the Liberal party, in the public press and elsewhere, that unrestricted reciprocity would give us a market of 65,000,000 people, is enough to make a man blush. We know, and every body knows, that the cost of transportation would render it impossible for us to send our products outside of the New England States, and the States on the Atlantic seaboard. Even in these States chances would have to be taken in competition with the wheat from Ohio, Illinois and Kansas, and all these other States which have already succeeded in crushing out the New England farmer. Is it to be supposed that we could succeed better than the New England farmers? Now I want to give hon. gentlemen opposite an idea of the condition of the New England farmers who have had this market of 65,000,000 people. I hold in my hand a letter from Judge Charles C. Nott, of the United States Court of Claims, to the New York *Evening Post*. It is dated at Washington, and in this letter Judge Nott makes the following statements:

"A GOOD FARM FOR NOTHING.

"SPECIFIC INSTANCE OF NEW ENGLAND AGRICULTURAL VALUES—TWO-THIRDS THE COST OF BUILDINGS AND FENCES WILL BUY A FARM.

"In a late number of *The Evening Post* appears an advertisement of a Massachusetts farm, with the suggestive editorial comment that, as the buildings and fences are worth as much as the price asked for the farm, the land really 'must have no saleable value.' Inasmuch as neither the editor nor readers of *The Evening Post* know anything about the farm in question, I will now supply a specific illustration of the market value of the better class of the Massachusetts farms, giving names and places.

"There is now a farm for sale—the Foster farm, on the Cold Spring road, a mile distant from the most beautiful village in New England, Williamstown, Berkshire County, and within two miles of the station, at which twenty passenger trains a day stop. To the station runs one of the best Berkshire gravel roads, and upon an almost continuous down grade. The farm has, I believe, twice taken a premium as the best managed farm in the town, and the owner for more than twenty years has been 'putting on more than he has taken off'—that is to say, he has sold butter and bought grain. The price of all agricultural products in the neighbouring villages of Williamstown and North Adams are about the same as in the towns of Albany and Troy, excepting hay, butter and mutton. The farm contains 106 acres, and has upon it the well-known New England farmhouse (white, with green blinds, and two large maple trees before the door), and ten farm buildings. All of these buildings have been kept painted, and are in good condition. The farm is well fenced, chiefly post and board.

"This farm-house, these ten farm buildings, and the fences probably could not be replaced for $10,000. In their present condition I call them fairly worth $6,500. Yet this farm, to which a good farmer has given a lifetime of intelligent care, has been offered to me, and can be bought by anybody, for that amount. In other words, if you will pay the owner what the buildings and fences are reasonably worth, or two-thirds of what they actually cost, he will give you 106 acres of good land, in high cultivation, for nothing.

"If you ask my friend Mr. Foster why it is that he wishes to sell his farm at so low a price he will tell you that it is because he can't work himself as he once did, and can't get 'good help.' If you ask a young man of the neighbourhood why he does not buy the farm on mortgage, as Mr. Foster did, and pay the mortgage off by hard work and thrifty ways, and make for himself a comfortable home, as his fathers did, he will tell you that he can do better. If you tell him that he should adapt his agriculture to the changed circumstances of the time; that he has all the advantages that his father had and a thousand more besides; that the soil is actually more fertile, the stones picked up, the stumps dug out, the roads built; that statistics show that certain products bring better prices than they did a hundred years ago, while clothing and farm implements cost less; that two men with a mower and tender can harvest more

hay in one day than four men with scythe and pitchfork could formerly do in two, he will blandly reiterate that 'farming pays worst of all,' and that he 'can do better.'

"Yet, during this same period in which Mr. Foster has been trying to give away his agricultural land there has been an 'extraordinary boom in real estate' in Williamstown, and land within half a mile of the village, commanding fine views, has quadrupled in value. Tested by actual cash purchases, the encroaching cottager has paid $4,000 for ten acres without a building on them. Midway between Williamstown and Brattleboro', a few years ago, I saw on the summit of a hill against the evening sky what seemed a large cathedral. Driving thither, I found a huge, old-time two-story church, a large academy (which had blended in the distance with the church), a village with a broad street, perhaps 150 feet in width. I drove on and found that the church was abandoned, the academy dismantled, the village deserted. The farmer who owned the farm on the north of the village lived on one side of the broad street, and he who owned the farm on the south lived on the other, and they were the only inhabitants. All of the others had gone—to the manufacturing villages, to the great cities, to the west. Here had been industry, education, religion, comfort, and contentment, but there remained only a drear solitude of forsaken homes.

"And here I have placed before you the three distinctive and essential facts of this New England problem—the farm of Mr. Foster, the boom in Williamstown, the deserted village in Vermont.

"The deserted village was the old-fashioned 'Centre' of the town—on a high hill, remote from railways and mill streams, unknown to summer boarders—an agricultural village, dependent upon the agriculture around it and from which it sprang. The causes which operated upon Mr. Foster's farm and the surrounding agriculture struck it, and, indeed, seemed to strike it sooner, and a more effective blow.

"It should also be noted that these causes have been so overwhelming that their effects have not stopped at the seaboard, and that the term 'East of the Alleghanies' really extends to the English Channel. The ruin has not been as complete in England as in New England, and the chances of adaptation to the new order of things are there incomparably better; but, nevertheless, during the twenty years between our civil war, 1866, and the Queen's jubilee, 1886, one-seventh of the arable lands of the British Isles was abandoned to 'permanent pasture.'"

The letter gives the causes for this state of things, and goes on to say:

"The fourth and fifth are natural causes, which, unhappily, can never be averted. Nature has made the New England farm a small farm, and its owner is confronted by a winter seven months in length. That is to say, the hill-sides and narrow valleys, and broken table-lands are not adaptable to 'wholesale farming,' and the man who raises cattle must house and feed his stock through seven long months, or, if he changes to sheep, ordinarily for six. In all parts of the country some of these five causes are, of course, more or less operative; but there is no part of the country, save New England, where they form so complete and relentless a combination. It is the extraordinary combination which has produced the extraordinary and long-to-be-regretted result.

"What, then, shall the New England farmer do? He cannot compete in cereals with the West; in fruit and vegetables with Delaware and New Jersey; in cattle, with men whose herds run summer and winter on the free ranches of the Government; in wool, with the unhoused flocks of Texas and California, of New Zealand and Australia; in butter, with Nebraska and Iowa; in dressed beef, with Armour's syndicate. What, then, shall he do? The gentlemen who have kindly advised him have in the end come down to saying that he must work as early and late as his fathers did, and live on as little as the Irish or the French. He thanks them for their good advice, but answers that he can do better. And so he can. His industry, probity, intelligence, good sense and general handiness are in demand everywhere. The loss is not his, but ours.

"It is very sad that the highest, purest, noblest agricultural population that this world has ever possessed is being dissipated, and, as a race, merged and lost. As a race it has been rich beyond comparison in human products—in clergymen, soldiers, statesmen, scholars, poets, merchants, inventors, and men who believe in honesty and work. Such statesmen as Webster, such college presidents, past and present, as Mark Hopkins, Eliphalet Nott, and Stanley Hall, such poets as Whittier, such generals as Lyon, such merchants as Edwin D. Morgan, have been born and bred on these small farms, which to-day can hardly be given away. Worthless though they be, according to our material standard, they have done more for the elevation of American thought and character and intelligence and happiness than all the railroads and milionaires, and stocks and seccurities, and corn and hogs, that the great cities and the great West contain.

"Yet the last act of the New England farmer is not unworthy of his sturdy and upright lineage. He faces the situation, and closes his accounts and pays his debts like a man; it is the business which has become bankrupt, not he. When we remember how hard it is for any of us to give up an undertaking on which we have spent time and money, or to throw away a foolish purchase, instead of storing it in the attic; and when we consider how the poor of this world cling to their poverty, how the peasants and crofters of other races obstinately hold fast to their small holdings, and divide and subdivide their insufficient farms only to entail intenser misery on their descendants, we must acknowledge that there is something grand in the farmer of these mountain towns, who, rising to the heroic treatment of his case, turns away from the fields and fences upon which he has toiled through the better part of his life, and, by a decree as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, writes upon the closed door—ABANDONED."

In reference to the above, Mr. Whittier, the poet, sends the following letter:—

"DANVERS, MASS., December 1, 1889.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,—I thank thee for thy noble 'testimony' in regard to the sad decline of New England agriculture. Every year when I go to the N. H. hill country, I find more and more abandoned farms, and the sight takes away much of the pleasure of a sojourn in view of the mountains.

"I hope thy article, with which I fully agree, will be widely read. It should be published in pamphlet form and scattered broadcast.

"I am very faithfully thy frd.,

"JOHN G. WHITTIER."

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

After Recess.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, did time permit, I could prove, by official reports of commissioners appointed by State Legislatures, that the competition of the great West has produced the same results in the case of the farmers of the States of New York and Pennsylvania as I have described as having been produced by that competition in the New England States. I think it is incontestably established that in the size of the farm, in the scale upon which farming can be carried on, in the greater facilities for using machinery, in the greater fertility of the soil, in the absence of stones, and trees and stumps, the western farmer has advantages which enable him, in the production of food products, to drive the farmer of the eastern seaboard entirely out of the market, when they attempt to compete upon equal terms. Leaving this subject, I ask the indulgence of the House while I go back to a matter to which I ought to have referred before, dealing with the last subject to which I have alluded, that is, the relative prices of farm productions the day before yesterday and on the same date in 1879. I have dealt with the prices of the things they have to buy, the railway facilities they enjoy, and the burden of taxation which rests upon them to-day as compared with 1878. Now, on referring to the Toronto *Globe* of 14th July, 1891, and to the same newspaper of 14th July, 1879, I find that the prices of almost all the leading agricultural productions of this country are higher, and higher by considerable amounts in July, 1891, than they were in July, 1879. The market I have selected in both cases is the Toronto street market. As to beef, the price is much higher now than it was in 1879, and

higher than it has been at almost any time from 1879 till the present time. The prices of other leading productions compare as follows :

	July 14th, 1879.			July 14th, 1891.		
	$ c.		$ c.	$ c.		$ c.
Butter, creamery, per lb..	0 14	@	0 15	0 18	@	0 19
" dairy, per lb.....	0 10	@	0 12	0 16	@	0 17
Cheese (Ingersoll Market), per lb.....	0 05	@	0 05½	0 08¾	@	0 08¾
Eggs, per doz.....	0 11	@	0 12	0 12½	@	0 13
Wheat, winter, white, per bush.....	1 06	@	0 00	1 08	@	1 10
Wheat, winter, red, per bush.....	0 95	@	1 05	1 08	@	0 00
Barley, per bush.....	0 56	@	0 00	0 47	@	0 49
Oats "	0 40	@	0 00	0 53	@	0 54
Potatoes, per bag.....	1 10	@	1 15	1 05	@	0 00
Hay, per ton.....	9 25	@	12 50	16 00	@	18 00
Dressed hogs, cwt.....	5 50	@	6 00	6 50	@	6 75

I have also taken the prices of these same articles on the same date in 1890 ; and I find that the variation between 1890 and 1891, is, on the whole, in favour of 1891, showing that the operation of the McKinley tariff, so far at least, has not affected these articles of agricultural production. With regard to lambs, I find no quotations upon the Toronto Exchange, but everybody knows, both in Ontario and the other provinces, that the price of lambs is better, if anything, than it ever was before, so that I think I have successfuly controverted the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and shown that he was inaccurate when he stated that it is becoming harder and harder every day for our farmers to make ends meet. I have shown, I think successfully, by quotations and figures, that it costs the farmer less for what he has to buy, and that he is getting better prices for what he has to sell since the introduction of the National Policy. I have shown that his railway facilities for the distribution of his products are better, and that the burden of taxation is less than in 1878 ; and if we see evidence of depression, especially in Ontario, it is due to the fact that the demand for high-priced cultivated farms in Ontario is necessarily less than it was in 1878, owing to the opening up for settlement of the cheap and fertile lands of the North-West. Now, there remains just one further consideration. I have shown also that, although our market is inadequate, to a small extent, for the consumption of our agricultural products, yet it should not be forgotten that it is only a very small proportion of our agricultural products which we require to export at all, and that a small increase to our urban population would place us in the position of consuming all our agricultural products, with a very few exceptions. Further, it should not be forgotten that it is incontestably established that, instead of our not having any foreign markets available except in the United States, there are in England and other countries consuming populations which always import the very articles both we and the United States have to sell. I am, therefore, brought to the conclusion of my speech with the consideration of the same question with which the hon. member for South Oxford concluded his, and that is the question as to whether unrestricted reciprocity with the United States would be beneficial to our farmers and workingmen. Now, Sir, you must bear in mind that the climate, the soil and the conditions in New England are almost precisely similar to the climate, the soil and the conditions in the Provinces of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and that Ontario and the State of New York are also similar in these respects. The question, then, naturally arises: If the farmers of New York State, whose conditions are similar in every respect to those of Ontario, have not been able to hold their own in competition with the farmers of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois and Iowa, how can the farmers of Ontario sustain more successfully that competition ? And if the farmers of New England have failed in competition with the great West, how can the farmers of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec be successful under similar circumstances ? We claim to have the same intelligence, the same industry, the same economical habits, but I think it would be going too far to pretend that our farmers will succeed where those similarly situated have so signally failed. Coming to the question of how unrestricted reciprocity would affect our farmers, and passing by the consideration of how it has affected the farmers who have that market of 65,000,000 people, and whose conditions and circumstances are similar to those in which our farmers would be placed, we must look at this question from two points. First, from the point of our home market; and second, from the point of the market for our surplus productions. Because we must not lose sight of the fact that although we export some $35,000,000 of agricultural products our total production is over $300,000,000 worth, and that by far the largest proportion is bought, paid for and consumed by the Canadian people. Now, Sir, as to how it would affect our surplus. Our surplus agricultural production which we export averages $35,000,000. What proportion of that went to the United States ? A little over $13,000,000, or, in other words, a little more than one-third of our total exports of agricultural products went to the United States. Of what was that one-third chiefly composed of ? It was made up of these very articles upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly harping—barley, hay, potatoes, horses, eggs and lambs. What was the balance of our agricultural exports composed of ? It was composed of beef and cheese chiefly, and other items scattered over the whole list. The question then arises, how would the two-thirds be affected by unrestricted reciprocity ? How would the beef market, the butter market, the cheese market, the pork market, the bacon market, the ham market, the tallow market, the lard market, be affected by unrestricted reciprocity with the United States ? They would be affected precisely as they have been in New York, Pennsylvania and New England. What has been the effect in the New England States, and in New York and Pennsylvania ? So far as all the food products are concerned, the effect has been that Mr. Armour has erected his cold stores in every town, village and city throughout the length and breath of the Eastern and Middle States, and sent his products, first-class in every particular, butchered and cared for in a first-class manner, to those centres, where he has put them in his cold storage under charge of men with instructions to sell at all hazard, no matter at what prices, and they have been sold at prices which have driven the local butcher and producer entirely out of the field and given Mr. Armour full control of the market. What does he do then ? He puts up the prices and furnishes the green-grocer

with meat, and instead of meat being bought from the butcher, as it is here, it is bought from the green-grocer who sells tea, coffee and sugar. The same thing which has happened in regard to beef has happened in regard to pork, butter and cheese, and the result is that the farmers of that section of the country have had to stop raising cattle and pork altogether. The cow and her products are no longer raised for the market, except in the form of milk, butter and cheese, and that only to a limited extent. If a dairyman there wants to dry up a cow he sells her to the sugar refiner for what her bones are worth. In this country he sells her to the local butcher for beef, and gets his money. Here, if a farmer has more pigs than he desires to keep, he fattens them and sells them for pork, but that is entirely swept away on the other side by the policy of Mr. Armour. If you have unrestricted reciprocity the whole trade of raising cattle here for food would pass into the hands of the Chicago producer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." He may say that the consumer would get his meat cheaper in consequence, but would that suit the farmer?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What kind of reciprocity are you going to ask for in October next?

Mr. IVES. I am arguing this question from my point of view. In October we will get reciprocity in what we want, or we will not have it at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What do we want it in?

Mr. BOWELL. Manners, for one thing.

Mr. IVES. In anything that will benefit Canada.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The exportation of Grits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That would ruin Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that interruptions are entirely out of order.

Mr. IVES. Last session, when we put an additional duty on fresh meats, Mr. Armour was at that time supplying some of our leading hotels, to the exclusion of our own people, and if the protection had not been put on I believe the whole of this trade would have passed into the hands of Mr. Armour. Even in Sherbrooke an arrangement was made by the leading butcher to get his supply from Armour instead of from the local farmers. That is what would happen in regard to all the products of the hog and of the cow, including butter and cheese, if we had unrestricted reciprocity. With the example before us of what has happened in New England, New York and Pennsylvania, with the fact that two-thirds of what we want to export would be disadvantageously interfered with by unrestricted reciprocity even though the other third might be benefited, the question is, shall we injure and perhaps sacrifice the two-thirds for the sake of the one-third. That applies with greater force to the larger portion of our products which we consume ourselves. Then, there is the question of transportation, and other questions would come in, and the result would be, as it was before 1878, that our market would be supplied by the United States to the exclusion of our own producers, and that we would have to pay a commission to the American middle man to sell our products in the English market. I will be perfectly frank with the House. The hon. gentleman has asked me two or three times what I would be in favour of our having reciprocity in. I would be in favour of reciprocity in those articles which hon. gentlemen so frequently call our attention to. I would like to see reciprocity in horses, in lambs, in hay, in barley and in eggs. I would like to give the hon. gentleman's constituents in Prince Edward Island a good market for their potatoes, but we cannot afford to sacrifice the greater interest for the less, and I tell him that his market for his potatoes, even if he had it, is a most unreliable market for a farmer to expect to get rich upon. When the crop of potatoes is not good in the United States the hon. gentleman's constituents can sell their potatoes in the United States for a good price, but when there is a large crop of potatoes there the hon. gentleman's constituents cannot sell their produce in that market at a good price. Otherwise, with the McKinley Bill in force, the people in the United States will buy the potatoes and pay the price, as they have done this year. Then, as to lambs. The northern lamb is a choicer and better lamb than that which is raised in the west or in any other part of the American continent. The New York, Michigan and Canadian lamb is worth more on the market by long odds than the southern or western lamb. The flavour is better, the character of the meat is far better, and I tell the hon. gentleman that the Boston merchant and the Boston broker are going to have the northern lamb, no matter if Mr. McKinley does put an extra tariff on it; and if our people have the stamina to ask a proper price for their lamb, and are not fooled by speculators, who tell them that because of the McKinley Bill and because of the failure of the Liberal party in the elections last spring they will get just as much for their lamb as ever, the Canadian lamb will take care of itself in spite of Mr. McKinley and in spite of the Liberal party. As to hay, everyone knows it is a very poor crop to raise, and if we were to adopt unrestricted reciprocity, and turn all our farms to the raising of hay and potatoes, I should like to know what condition our farms would be in after ten years? If the hog and the cow were driven out of the country, what condition would your farm be in? I say that hay is an unwise and unprofitable crop to raise, but whenever the crop is short in New England towns the people there will come and buy our hay and pay the duty on it. The consumer and not the producer will pay the duty. When there is not a good demand, even without any tariff, so bulky a product as that could not be shipped at a profit. And so with regard to all these matters, I say if we can get reciprocity with the United States with reference to these articles, let us have it. I admit that for the present it would be an advantage to have it, but if we can only have it at the sacrifice of, or a direct injury to, the great bulk of our agricultural productions, then I say we do not want it. Now, so far as horses are concerned, let us not forget that the American market is rapidly lessening its demand for horses, and in a very short time it will not require our horses. The business of growing ranche horses is only in its infancy in the United States, for one thing; it is growing rapidly every year; and, in the next place, the use of elec-

tricity is reducing the number of horses employed in cities very materially. You must remember that the million of horses which the hon. member for North Wellington mentioned last night as the annual number of horses used up in the United States every year—if they used up 1,000,000 of horses they only imported some 18,000; and what is 18,000 horses in a year to 1,000,000 horses, which the hon. gentleman says they use up and destroy every year? They have nearly reached the limit of their demand for horses, and the hon. gentlemen in this House would endanger our beef, and butter, and cheese, and pork, and all those great staple articles, for the sake of getting the chance for a year or two more to sell cheap horses to the United States. Surely this would be a very foolish bargain. As for good horses, there is an ample market anywhere; the Yankees will have them, and they will pay Mr. McKinley's charge; the English people will buy them, and there is no trouble at all in disposing of good horses. Now, if anything is required to show what the course of trade would be with reference to some of our agricultural products that we export, it is shown by the imports and exports of agricultural products for the year ending 30th June, 1890. Now, we find that the United States import duty and ours was almost identically the same upon pork, bacon and ham, beef, lard, tallow, butter and cheese, wheat, oats, corn and flour. On pork the duty was 1 cent a pound both ways—I am speaking of the old duty; on bacon and hams it was 2 cents both ways; on beef, it was the same, 1 cent; on lard it was the same, 2 cents; on tallow, the same, 1 cent—and so on; the duty is almost identically the same. Now, if I can show you that the United States forced upon our market 50 times as much of those articles as we forced upon theirs, does it not show conclusively that there was a bigger surplus there, and a greater anxiety to sell, than there was here? Certainly it does. Now, what was the course of trade under precisely the same rates of duty? The course of trade was, that in pork they sent us nearly $900,000 worth, and we sent them $195; in bacon and ham, they sent us $323,000 worth, and we sent them $106; in beef, they sent us $258,000 worth, and we sent them $1,843; in lard, they sent us $301,000 worth, and we sent them $1 worth; in tallow, they sent us $34,718 worth, and we sent them none; in butter, they sent us $61,000, and we sent them $5,000; in cheese, they sent us $16,000 worth, and we sent them $6,425; in wheat, they sent us $149,994 worth, and we sent them $6,587; in oats, they sent us $97,970 worth, and we sent them $8,527; in corn, they sent us $1,170,000 worth, and we sent them $21; in flour, they sent us over half a million, nearly $600,000 worth, and we sent them $32,055. Now, under precisely the same duty on both sides, so great was the surplus pushing for export in that country that in spite of our duties they sent us that amount of produce. What would be the state of things if the duty was wiped out altogether, instead of being increased, as it was last session? I say we would be flooded, as we were flooded by American manufactures prior to 1878, I say we would be made the slaughter market. The member for North Wellington told us last night of the great difference that Mr. McCormick had made in agricultural implements between the home market price and the export price, and he took it for granted that the export price was the cost price. Now, the export price is not necessarily the cost price; the export price is the price at which Mr. McCormick will send his surplus to foreign countries to dispose of; it means that that is the price at which he will slaughter. I say that, so far as these agricultural products are concerned, if we cannot get reciprocity in what would do us good without getting reciprocity with what would ruin our farmers, then I for one would say, let us go without reciprocity altogether. Now, we hear very often from the other side that this Government has always been a Government for the manufacturers, and that they never have had a thought for the farmers; in fact, I found that to be one of the most frequently used arguments on the stump by hon. gentlemen opposite. They tell us that there is a sort of understanding between the manufacturers and the Government, that the Government are to put the farmers under tribute to them, in order that they might make money out of them, and in return these bloated monopolists would furnish the campaign funds to help to elect myself and my friends on this side of the House. These are statements that it is very easy to make, but we have never heard any proof of them, and I trust that somebody who will follow me will show in dollars and cents where the Canadian farmer is injured by what he has to buy by the National Policy. He may be able to show that a wringer may cost four or five cents more on one side of the river than it does on the other, but I undertake to say that the Canadian farmer at the present day, under the National Policy, gets his goods of all descriptions as cheaply as he could if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States; and if the contrary can be shown, I hope some gentleman will come down to the definite point and show it to us in dollars and cents. Now, it is said that the Government has done nothing for the farmers. Why, Sir, in 1879, when the National Policy was first adopted, we put a protection upon all grain and products of the farm: upon barley, 15 cents; upon wheat, 10 cents; upon Indian corn, 7½ cents; upon oats, 10 cents a bushel; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the duty upon oats is a protection, and if it was not for the duty upon oats and the duty upon corn neither oats nor corn, nor pease, would be raised in this country at all. Upon rye we have put a duty of 10 cents; upon wheat, 15 cents; upon beans, 15 cents; upon buckwheat meal and flour, 1 cent a pound; upon Indian meal, 40 cents a barrel; oatmeal, half a cent a pound; rye flour, 50 cents a barrel; wheat flour, 50 cents a barrel; rice and sago flour, 2 cents a pound; flax seed, 10 cents a bushel. Then upon apples, cranberries and all fruits, there is a protection; upon all vegetables, &c., a protection. Meats fresh or salted, bacon and ham, all have their protection. In 1880 changes in the direction of protection were made; in 1886 still other changes; in 1887 still other changes. In 1890, it being felt that Chicago beef was interfering with the legitimate market of the Canadian farmers, the duty was raised, and upon cattle and sheep 30 per cent. was imposed, instead of 20 per cent.; on hogs, living, 2 cents per pound; on mutton, 3 cents per pound; on pork, 1½ cent per pound; on bacon and ham, 3 cents per pound if fresh, 2 cents if salted; on beef, 3 cents per pound if fresh, 2 cents if salted; on

flour, 75 cents per barrel; and on fruits the duties were also increased. The Government have constantly endeavoured, and, as I claim, endeavoured with success, to give the Canadian farmers the home market, and if they have not done so it is because the protection has not been sufficiently high. Instead of departing from the National Policy, my idea would be, in negotiating for any reciprocity arrangement, to adhere to the National Policy, to protect Canadian industries, to sacrifice no important Canadian industry, and to make no trade when the balance of advantage is not in favour of the Canadian people. I think the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the burden of taxation is one of the reasons why the farmers are depressed, was a very dangerous one to make. Sir, what would become of the Canadian farmers, with respect to the question of taxation, if we had unrestricted reciprocity? What would that hon. gentleman do, I ask, as Minister of Finance of the Dominion, in order to provide for the necessary revenue, if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? He never yet has told us. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has not yet told us, and I challenge you, Mr. Speaker, if it is a proper thing to do, to state any case in history under constitutional government where the leaders of a great political party have asked the people of a country to change their whole fiscal policy and at the same time refuse, when challenged, to tell the people how they are going to provide the revenue necessary for government. The nearest the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) ever got to it, to my knowledge, was at a meeting he did me the pleasure and honour to attend at Sherbrooke, and when I asked him the question there he said: "The financial matters in our party are in the hands of Sir Richard Cartwright." I do not know what explanation Sir Richard Cartwright might have made. I heard the same hon. gentleman, speaking during the last campaign, state that they were going to economize the amount lost by taking duties off goods coming in from the United States, variously estimated at from $10,000,000 to $18,000,000. He said we had a surplus, and the Liberals were not particular about having a surplus and would economize. But still they failed then and have failed during this debate to tell us, as they are bound to tell us, how they are going to raise the money necessary to meet the public expenditure of the country. That is a most important matter, and we have a right to call on them to answer it, and to answer it clearly and distinctly.

Mr. McMULLEN. You will steal our clothes as you did before.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the reason why hon. gentlemen opposite do not give up their policy is because they are afraid we would steal it, for they have not yet succeeded in finding it. Sir, they would have to reimpose the duties on tea, coffee and sugar. The good work which the Minister of Finance did the other day with respect to sugar would have to be undone, and hon. gentlemen opposite would have to double that duty, while certain it is that the farmers would have to bear a larger measure of taxation to make up that deficit, because all the incidental taxation imposed would fail, and it would be necessary to impose heavy taxation on the necessaries of life as well as on the luxuries. Besides the heavy taxes on tea, coffee and sugar and the other necessaries of life which the public generally use, and which can create a large revenue, there would still be left several millions which would have to be made up by direct taxation. Let the farmers consider well before they propose to change the policy of this country, a policy under which they need not pay one dollar in the course of the whole year unless they choose, for a policy under which direct taxation would compel them to contribute to the revenues of this country. In apologizing to the House for the very long speech I have made I desire to say that with the prospect of good crops all over the Dominion, more especially in the great West, and with the prospect of a first-rate market for the coming year, with wheat certainly over $1 a bushel, the prospects of this country are good, and I think the prospects of the party are good—as good as wheat; and when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) goes back at the bye elections, which I believe he will have to go through, as is the case with other hon. gentlemen opposite, he and other gentlemen will find less and fewer simple people than they did on 5th March last.

Mr. McMILLAN. In rising to address the House on this very important question I must confess I was very much surprised to hear the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I was astonished at the arguments he brought forward and the statements he made with respect to the National Policy and its effect on the people of this Dominion, and especially on the farmers of Ontario. The hon. gentleman told us that one of the first effects on a young convert of a desire for reciprocity was the creation of a very strong feeling for annexation. I have been wondering if that hon. gentleman's breast in times past has been animated with that feeling, and if it was not called out by a residence and experience down in Mexico.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMILLAN. In Texas. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I am going to tell them something which they have not heard before. We must go to the United States with our agricultural products if we are to have reciprocity even in agricultural products, and we would suffer from that cause the same as we suffered in manufactured goods before the National Policy was introduced. Now I will tell them the effect of the free trade in 1878, the last year we had free trade between the United States and Canada in agricultural products. I will tell them that we imported from the United States in that year, 302,147 bushels of barley; we bought it at 45¼ cents per bushel and we sold it at 59½ cents, and we made $42,400 upon that transaction, or 14 cents a bushel. I think I will be able to prove the condition of the market then, from a report which was got up to show the effect which the tariff had upon the agricultural industry of this country. I will also be able to show that two years after the National Policy had been imposed the balance was on the other side, as far as barley was concerned, and that it was higher in the United States than in Canada. We will take now the Indian corn. We imported during that year 7,387,507 bushels of Indian corn; we bought it at

47¾ cents, and we sold it at 67¾ cents, gaining 20 cents per bushel, or $1,477,501 upon that transaction. That was the effect the free market between Canada and the United States had upon American grains coming into this country. We imported 2,162,294 bushels of oats; we bought it at 30 cents per bushel and sold it at 41 cents, and we gained $237,852, or 11 cents per bushel on the transaction. Oats at that time was 11 cents per bushel higher in Canada than in the United States, and before I sit down I will be able to show the change that took place in relation to the price of oats between 1878 and 1881. We bought in that year 5,635,411 bushels, and we paid $1.15½ and sold it at $1.36½ per bushel. I will be able to show from the returns placed in our hands by the Minister of Agriculture that this was the price of wheat in Canada at that time, and so we gained upon our import of wheat 21 cents per bushel. I believe I will be able to show also that the wheat was 21 or 22 cents per bushel higher in Canada before the National Policy was imposed than it was in the United States, but that since the National Policy was introduced the Canadian farmer has not had the good Canadian market to the same extent that he had before, and that now wheat has been as high, or higher, in the United States during the last year than it was in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the first arguments to which my attention was very strongly drawn during this debate was the statement from Conservative members that the price of land has not fallen in the Province of Ontario to the extent which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated. We got a quotation from the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), showing how far land in Ontario had improved since 1882. Now, Sir, I have the advance report of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario sent out by Mr. Blue annually, and that report tells me that in 1890 land in Ontario was valued only at $622,896,000. We have a perfect right to go back and take the year in which land in Ontario was valued highest at, and we find, according to the report of the Bureau of Industries, that land was highest in the year 1883. We find that in 1883 land in Ontario was valued at $654,793,025. We find, when we come to 1889, that it was valued at $632,329,433, but when we come to 1890 its value is only $622,896,000, or a reduction of $31,897,025 since 1883. But this does not tell the whole tale, and I would advise the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) the next time that he begins to examine details in respect to the value of land, or any other values, to examine them carefully and to give his statements correctly and honestly. In Ontario there were 1,364,019 acres more land settled in 1889 than in 1883. When you take that at the average price that land is at now in Ontario, of $29.64 an acre, it gives us another reduction of $39,809,063, making a total reduction since 1883 of $71,706,088; and yet the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) turned round and asked if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would go back and tell his constituents that the value of land had fallen in the Province of Ontario after his statement. I will ask the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) if he will have the honesty to go back to his people and tell them that he made a misstatement and that he did not give a correct statement of the facts? We find, Sir, that that is not the best criterion of what the value of land is. In all countries we find that the rental of land is considered a correct indication of what the value of land is, and I find that in 1883 the rental of land in the Province of Ontario was $2.75 per acre, while in 1889, the last year for which we have a return, the rental of land was $1.96 per acre. Here is a reduction in the value of land of 28¼ per cent., which is one proof that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a correct statement. I have another proof to give, and one which will show best the great reduction in the value of land, because we know that land is only valuable for what it can produce, and the value of land is regulated by the products that come from that land. Now, Sir, we find that in the year 1882 the crop of wheat, oats, barley, rye, pease and corn, was valued in Ontario at $94,235,379, but the value of these crops, both on account of shrinkage in price and shrinkage in quantity, has been going steadily, until 1889 the value was $57,548,802. Let us take this and see what reduction in the value of land this would give, and I hold this to be a correct criterion of what the value of land is. That would reduce the value of land in Ontario by 39 per cent. Will the hon. member for Albert go back and tell the people in his locality that the value of land has been reduced to that extent in the Province of Ontario? Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman also told us that there was a little cloud not much larger than a man's hand upon the horizon, and he told us that if we could only get discriminating duties of 5 or 7 cents per bushel on grain, what benefit it was going to be to Canada. I will give the hon. gentleman the views of one who is well fitted, from his experience or from his position, to give correct information upon such a question. When I mention the name of the Marquis of Lansdowne every hon. gentleman in this House will admit that, from his position as the Governor General of this country and his position as a landowner in the old country, he is well qualified to give a correct judgment upon this commercial union fad, as they call it. What did he say?

"There was another question which had lately engaged a great deal of public attention. That was the question of the defence of the Empire. Numerous proposals had been framed with a view to improving the defences by altering the amount of responsibility which at present devolves on the different quarters of the Empire. A great deal could be done in great colonies to strengthen Imperial defences. For example, there might be a more distinct understanding as to the division of the responsibility between colonial and Imperial forces; but if he was asked to go further, and to say whether the great colonies should bind themselves, in certain eventualities, to provide a certain force of men for the Imperial service, he would say that he doubted the wisdom of such a policy. He would prefer to take his chance of getting 50,000 men from Canada, spontaneously placed in line by the Dominion, than 5,000 men because the country is bound by the rigid terms of a covenant to supply them. There was another proposal on which he would like to say a few words; that was the proposal that the United Kingdom and the colonies should join hands to protect their own people by the collection of the necessary revenue from the pockets of foreigners. That was a very taking proposal at first sight, but those who talked about a fixed fiscal system for the Empire should remember that there is no such thing. It was at present in chaos, each part of the Empire having a different tariff. If he was asked if there was any possibility of evolving order out of that chaos, he would answer frankly that he believed the thing was impossible. In the first place, public sentiment in Canada had to be taken into account; in the next place, public sentiment in the old country. The United Kingdom did three-quarters of its business with foreign countries and one-quarter only with British possessions. Was it not to be feared that the people of the United Kingdom would look askance at a proposal to disturb their relations with three-fourths of their customers on

the chances of improving their relations with the remaining quarter? Then, again, England grew only one-third of the wheat required; of the remaining two-thirds, three-fourths came from foreign countries and one-fourth from British possessions. If the people of England were asked to tax the foreign wheat imported they would probably ask if it would be wise to raise the price of their bread on a chance of that kind. Nor would it be possible to persuade the colonies to adopt such an arrangement. However able a Canadian delegation might be sent to Westminster to arrange the Imperial tariff, he would not envy its feelings on its return to Canada."

These are the views of one of the leading statesmen in Britain; and I might refer to other leading men there to show the feeling that exists among the British people and in the British Parliament with respect to giving the colonies any special trade privileges over foreign countries. Hon. gentlemen are aware that some two years ago there was considerable feeling in the different countries on the continent of Europe with respect to the sugar sent into the British market, and a convention was held to which Great Britain sent delegates; and at that convention an arrangement was entered into that no more than one shilling per hundred pounds of bounty should be given by any country for the sugar exported from that country. But it was found that some countries, instead of taking a shilling for 100 pounds, took a shilling for 150 pounds, thus causing a disadvantage to those countries that were honest. Then it was agreed that if all countries did not give an equal bounty the British Government should be asked to impose a duty on sugar, so as to level up all the inequalities. When that proposition came into the House of Commons Lord Bramwell and the rest admitted that if the foreign bounty-fed sugar were excluded from Britain, Britain would receive more cane sugar from her colonies; but they asked why the British people should be pinched for the benefit of the colonies; and nobody, not even the Imperial federationists, could give a satisfactory reply. Now, Sir, when an attempt was made to bring into the British House of Commons a motion even with respect to this little cloud that appeared in the sky, what was the result? Mr. Howard Vincent, a federationist, placed on the Notice paper the following resolution:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the commercial union of the British Empire will be favourable not only to its permanent consolidation, but to the material interests of all its peoples, and that every practicable step should be taken to secure that end."

Mr. Vincent did his best to get a chance of bringing up this motion, and at last it was set down for a certain evening, but the members withdrew—the House was counted out. Commenting on this, a British paper remarks:

"Parliament has something more important on hand than to debate the dreams and vapourings of ill-informed enthusiasts."

So much for the fad of Imperial Federation. You were told also by the hon. member for Albert that in this country a great change had taken place—that long ago, before the National Policy was imposed, very large quantities of lumber had been sent out of the country, but that all that had been stopped, that now our young men were kept at home manufacturing our lumber into furniture in our own country, and that the importation had almost ceased. I am sorry the hon. gentlemen had not the forethought to examine the Trade and Navigation Returns before making such a statement. I will not deal with the question of the exportation of lumber from the Maritime Provinces, after the able address given by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King). I will only state that the importation of furniture into Canada in 1882 was $196,138, and that in 1890 it was $352,430. Verily that is a great shrinkage in the importation of furniture; and remember, there is a duty of 35 per cent. upon furniture coming into this country. I am afraid that if all the statements the hon. gentleman makes in the profession of law are as unfounded as the statements he made with respect to reciprocity, the people of his province will not think him a very able professor or teacher in that profession. Then, Sir, he told us that the export trade in manufactured goods was increasing. Let me go back to the time that our opponents are so fond of talking about, the year 1873. I find that in that year the manufactured goods exported from Canada amounted to $2,921,802 worth; but when we come to 1876, the year which hon. gentlemen opposite point to as that of our greatest depression, I find that our exportation of manufactured goods had increased to $5,353,367—a sum which, with all the prosperity, all the new industries, and all the tall chimneys which the National Policy was to have brought into existence, when a fair calculation is made, has not been reached yet; because, when we come to the year 1890 we find that there has been exported only $5,741,184 worth of manufactured goods. But what further do we find? I have examined the two years, 1873 and 1890, very carefully, and I could find no ice exported in 1873, nor in 1876; but I find that in 1890, $247,000 worth of manufactured ice was exported. I also find that $818,000 worth of household goods which the people leaving this country had taken away with them is put among the exports of manufactured goods. Sir, taking these two items from the amount of our exports of manufactured goods, we find that the true exportation amounts to only $4,676,139, or in reality $677,228 less than the exportation of 1876, during that desperate period when the Grits held rule in this country. Now, Sir, we were told this afternoon by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) that if we could show that large sums of money had gone into the pockets of the manufacturers and that the people of Canada had not received a corresponding benefit, then some importance might be attached to the statements we made. Now, I will take the question of iron. We all remember the boasting indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1887 when the duty was taken off anthracite coal. We were then told that the remission of the duty would cause blast furnaces to be erected in Kingston, in Toronto and elsewhere, and that it would add twenty thousand workmen and a hundred thousand souls to the population of Canada. Where are they? Echo answers, where! and our hon. friends opposite are unable to answer from the other side of the House. The following table will show clearly how utterly the policy of the Government, in protecting our iron manufactures by both duty and bounty, has failed in its purpose:—

Year	Duty	Pig Iron made—tons
1876	No duty; no bounty	4,000
1877	" "	13,500
1878	" "	16,000
1879	Import duty $2 a ton	16,500
1880	" "	23,000
1881	Duty $2 a ton and bounty $1.50 a ton.	18,550
1882	" "	21,500
1883	" "	32,000
1884	" "	29,389
1887	Duty $4; bounty $1.50	24,829
1888	" "	21,799

In 1889, with a duty of $4 per ton and a bounty, if I am not mistaken, of $2 per ton, we manufactured only 25,921 tons. So that we find that, from 1878 up to 1889, we increased the output not quite 10,000 tons. And what did that increase cost us? In 1878, when we manufactured 16,000 tons, we paid nothing in the shape of duty or bounty, but in 1890 we paid in duty $103,684 and in bounty $51,842, making a nice little total of $155,526, which went into the pockets of the iron manufacturers, and we only manufactured 10,000 tons of iron extra. When we take that 10,000 increase, we find that it costs us in duty and bounty $15.50 per ton. The iron that we imported into this country was then only worth $13.36 per ton, so that we could have bought that 10,000 tons, which cost us in duty and bounty $15.55 per ton, at $13.36 per ton, and had $20,000 in the treasury besides, if we had not given a single cent to that industry. That is the way in which the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite have been falsified; that is the way the tariff bears hardly upon the farmers of the Dominion and upon the other members of the community, because I hold there is no class of the community; which requires more iron to carry on its operations than farmers, as all their implements are made of iron. I find there has been a great deal said about the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of the Dominion generally not being in a depressed condition. I took the trouble to get up a little table, which I compiled from the statements sent in to the Bureau of Industry in 1877 by something like 190 farmers of the Province of Ontario, showing the cost of producing the different varieties of grain per acre; and I find that, in 1882, when we take the whole cost and the amount of production, there was a surplus of $2,946,104 upon fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats and pease, the principal crops that the farmer raises in the Province of Ontario, and that gave a nice little surplus to each farmer—counting 100 acres to each farm—of $15 over the cost of production; but when we take the average as given in the Bureau of Industry from 1882 to 1889, what do we find? We find that in fall wheat, costing $19.43 per acre for producing and marketing, there was a loss per acre of $2.23 during the whole eight years from 1882 to 1889. We find that the total loss in fall wheat was $2,081,061. How long, I ask, will a farmer continue to farm if it costs him more to raise his crop annually than what it is worth in the market? In spring wheat, we find it costs $15.50 to produce an acre of wheat, and that there was a loss of $1.64 per acre. We find that in fall wheat each farmer from the Province of Ontario, supposing them all to have equal amounts of cleared land—that is, on an average, 51 acres to the hundred-would lose $9.66 on fall wheat and $4.07 per acre on spring wheat. Then, with regard to barley, we find that the cost of producing an acre amounts to $14.83, and that there was 31 cents of a loss in producing barley. That is the crop which has come nearest, during that eight years, to paying the farmers; it is a crop that has been largely raised in the Province of Ontario, and one of which, I am afraid, the present condition of things will deprive the farmers of the benefit in the future. The farmers only lost on barley $1.38 on each farm, taking it as spread all over. These are statements sent in by the farmers themselves, Conservatives and Reformers, from all over the province, and my calculation is based on these returns. In oats we lost $2.30 per acre, or $3,710,878, or $17.41 on each hundred acres of land. In pease, the cost is $15.47 per acre, and we lost $2.91 per acre on pease, or $1,875,726, or $8.78 per farm. We find, when those are added up, that the annual loss upon fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats and pease, during the years 1882 to 1889, is $8,839,951. We find, then, that for eight years the total loss to the farmers of the Province of Ontario in growing these grains was $70,719,608. Is it possible, when such a condition of things exists, that the farmers of that province can be in as good a position as that in which they stood in 1878, when the National Policy was imposed? Is it possible they can be in the same condition to either buy or sell? When hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the National Policy has nothing to do with this, I answer that it has not given us the market we were promised. I claim it has not even enabled the Canadian farmer to hold his own market in his own province in the manner he did before the National Policy was imposed. Now, I come to the prices of grain, and we have been told that the price of grain is higher to-day in Canada, when compared with the United States, than at the time the National Policy was imposed. I go back, and I take a record which I think hon. gentlemen will not dispute. It was quoted yesterday, and I have no reason to dispute the statements made. Here I have statements with reference to the prices of fall and spring wheat, dated January 10, May 10, September 10, and December 10, 1877. This book is a Report of a Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons to enquire into the operations of the tariff on the agricultural interests of the Dominion of Canada. I find there that wheat was $1.38 in Canada in 1877, while I have another statement showing that it was only $1.16 in the United States. The same thing is shown in the year 1878. I have another book here showing the prices of grain in Canada and the United States. This is the Statistical Record for 1886, and to that I will appeal to show that we have not been able to hold the market in our own country in the same manner as we did before the National Policy was adopted. In the year 1881 wheat in Montreal was $1.33, while it was $1.11 in the United States, a difference of 22 cents per bushel in favour of Canada. In 1882 it was $1.30 in Montreal and $1.18 in the United States, a difference of 12 cents. In 1883 it was $1.14 in Montreal and $1.12 in the United States. Coming down to 1886, we find that wheat was 85 cents a bushel in Montreal and 87 cents in the United States. Here is a fall of 48 cents per bushel in Canada during the time that there was only a fall of 24 cents in the United States, and that is a document placed in our hands by the Minister of Agriculture. When I come to the year 1889 I find that wheat was 89 cents a bushel in New York while it was 88 cents in Canada. The last three years I have referred to in regard to Canada, 1887, 1888 and 1889, I have taken from the report of the Bureau of Industries, as I could not find the price of Canadian wheat in our records. There is a peculiar matter to be remarked in reference to the year 1888. In that year wheat was 85 cents in the United States and $1.02 in Canada, showing that there were local causes affecting the market. The reason was, that in 1888 we did not raise a sufficiency of wheat for our own purposes. We bought about 130,000 bushels of wheat in that

year, and that was the cause of the price of wheat going up above the price in the United States. From the *Empire* of 5th December, 1890, I find that the price of wheat in Toronto was 87 cents, when in Buffalo it was 97 cents; instead of our wheat being 10 or 20 cents higher in the United States than it was in Toronto. Another statement I have from the Port Hope *Guide*, that fall wheat on 30th April last was worth $1.20 to $1.22 in Rochester, when in Toronto it was only worth $1.12 to $1.13. Here was wheat 8 or 9 cents higher in the United States than in Canada; and yet hon. gentlemen will tell us that Canada has been able to keep her own in the markets of the world in regard to wheat. This shows that wheat has fallen over 20 cents a bushel in Canada more than it has in the United States since the National Policy was imposed. We had a market there for years, and I have shown that we made over $2,400,000 in 1878 by selling grain that we had bought in the United States and had sent out again. In regard to oats, I go back to the same record, and I find that in 1877 oats in Toronto were at 43 cents, while in Chicago they were 31¾ cents, or 11¼ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. In 1881 they were 39¾ cents in Chicago and 37¾ cents in Toronto, so that they were nearly of an equal price. When we calculate the difference between the price of oats in Canada and in the United States we must always remember that a bushel of oats in Canada is 34 pounds and a bushel of oats in the United States is 32 pounds. The difference was, therefore, 11¼ cents in 1877 in favour of Toronto, and, without allowing for the difference in weight, only 2 cents in 1881, showing that within two years after the National Policy was in operation we had lost something like 8 cents a bushel on oats. Let us compare the article of rye. The argument has always gone forth that if we were to allow corn to come in free from the United States it would destroy our market for coarse grains. We find that over 4,000,000 bushels of corn were imported in 1877, and over 3,000,000 bushels in 1878, and yet our oats were 11 cents higher in Canada than they were in Chicago, with free corn coming into this country, which hon. gentlemen tell us would destroy the market for our coarse grains. In 1877 rye in Toronto was 70 cents and in Chicago 62¼ cents, a difference of 7¾ cents in favour of Toronto. In 1881 rye in Toronto was 89 cents, while in Chicago it was 91¾ cents, or a difference of 2¾ cents in favour of Chicago, when there had been a difference in favour of Toronto of 7¾ cents before the introduction of the National Policy. Now, we will take barley. In 1877, in Toronto, barley was bringing 73¾ cents, in Chicago, at the same, time it was 58⅛, a difference of 15 cents per bushel between those two cities. But when we come to 1881 we find that barley in Toronto was selling at 95 cents, and in Chicago it was selling at $1.09. On June 1, in 1877, there was a difference of 15 cents in favour of Toronto, but in 1881 there was a difference of 18 cents in favour of Chicago, proving conclusively that the National Policy has not assisted the Canadian farmer to hold his own market among the nations of the world. These are arguments that cannot be set aside. I find, then, in a document that was published to prove to the farmers of Canada that the National Policy had been favourable to the agricultural interests, and I hold that when that document is closely examined it proves the contrary—it proves that the Canadian farmer has not been able to hold his own market against the United States, and I hold that the United States is the only country with which we can make a fair comparison. I have been astonished to hear some of the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite to show that our markets are more closely assimilated at the present time to the markets of Great Britain at Liverpool than they were at the time the National Policy was established. Why, Sir, do hon. gentlemen take credit to the National Policy for that? Surely they do not mean to tell us that it is the National Policy that has caused our markets to come so very close to the markets of the old world. I have a statement here taken from the *Contemporary Review* of April, 1888, which shows that in the year 1880 it cost 9d. to send a bushel of grain from New York to Liverpool, whereas in 1886 that same bushel of grain could be carried for a penny; yet hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to believe that the National Policy had brought about this change. We find that flour, per ton, was carried in 1880 for 25s., whereas in 1886 it was carried for 7s. 6d. We find that cheese was carried for 50s. a ton in 1880, and for 15s. in 1886; we find that bacon and lard were carried for 45s. in 1880, and now they are carried for 7s. 6d. Now, there is another argument that I have heard used, and it is this: They tell us how much cheaper we can get our agricultural implements now; they tell us that we get them cheaper now than ever before in the history of the world. But do hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to make the intelligent members of the House of Commons believe that it is all on account of the National Policy? Why, Sir, let me tell them that in 1874 the cost of producing a ton of steel in Great Britain was £12 1s. 1d., and when we come to 1887, a ton of steel could be produced for £4, yet hon. gentlemen take credit to the National Policy for bringing about this great change. Then we have been told about the price of cotton goods. Two hon. members have told us that never before could we get goods so cheap as at the present time. Is it to be wondered at that these goods are cheaper in Canada now than at the time the National Policy was imposed? But I want to ask those hon. gentlemen if goods are as cheap now as they would be under a tariff of 17½ per cent. Sir, there is not a single hon. gentleman on that side of the House who will have the assurance to stand up and tell me that our goods are just as cheap as they would be if we had the tariff that existed in 1878. Then, next, we were told how cheap cotton goods are now. The cotton, after it has been cleaned, is spun into threads by rotatory spindles; they used to be worked by manual labour, one man to each spindle, but now one man can work machines carrying two or three thousand spindles. In 1874 those spindles made 4,000 revolutions in a minute, but in 1886 they ran up to 10,000 revolutions per minute. Why, Sir, under the old system one man had to attend every loom, and they could only produce 42 to 48 yards per day; but under the new system one individual can produce 1,500 yards per day. In the last fifteen years, while the population of this globe has increased 15 per cent., the production of cotton goods has increased 86 per cent. Will hon. gentlemen take the credit of that to the

National Policy also? Will they tell us that it is the National Policy that has brought about all these changes? Will they tell us that it is the National Policy that has cheapened the price of cotton goods and woollen goods, when we see that one man can produce 1,500 yards now, while under the old system he could only produce 42? Why, Sir, I have been astonished at hearing such talk. I have been astonished that hon. gentlemen should dare to produce such arguments before the House of Commons of Canada. They are upon the horns of a dilemma; they must either confess to gross ignorance of the question they are discussing, or dishonesty with respect to the results. Now, Sir, we have heard a little with respect to the consumption of wheat. We have heard it stated, and I believe correctly stated, that we consume 27,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada annually. I think that quantity, when made into flour, will give us 7,999,670 barrels of flour. But when he told us that the last 25 cents additional duty had given the home market to the millers of the Dominion of Canada he did not tell us with what effect; he did not tell us that it was at the cost of an additional 25 cents a barrel, and he did not tell us what the millers themselves have said in respect to this. When the millers met in association before the new duty was imposed, the more honest gentlemen belonging to that occupation—and I am happy to say that there were honest gentlemen attending that association, and many of them—they said that if the Government would reduce the duty upon wheat and reduce the duty upon flour they would be perfectly able to compete with the United States, or any other nation on the face of the earth. They stated that one reason why the milling industry was depressed was that far too much money had been invested, that they could produce 18,000,000 barrels of flour annually in their mills, while the consumption was only 7,000,000, and they wanted the Government to reduce the duty on flour and wheat both; but the Government chose to increase the duty upon flour, and with what effect? I believe that hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces are beginning to find, even on the other side of the House, that they have been misled by this feature of the tariff. They say, some of them, on the floor of the House, that it was in the interest of the farmers of Ontario. As a farmer of Ontario, I say it has most certainly injured us; it has placed a duty upon the wheat that we raise and upon the flour that is placed upon our table; so that they can no longer say that we have a free table. Even taking the wheat of our own production, if we calculate the duty upon it we find it would give $5,999,761, provided all the wheat grown in Canada was ground in our own mills. But the farmers in some parts of Canada have found milling to be such a grievance that I have seen one little mill put up by farmers themselves, who formed themselves into a joint stock company and built a mill to grind their own grain, and thus not be called upon to pay such a large sum for milling. I hold that even the millers have been injured by the National Policy. In that industry large amounts of money were invested, even larger sums than the business would appear to warrant; but it is only one of the businesses that have been injured. I am happy to say that the statements I made with respect to the loss that the Ontario farmer meets in raising grain were confirmed by a communication that appeared in the *Empire* a short time ago, which shows that the loss is even more than I stated, I taking the years 1882 to 1889 and the correspondent taking the period from 1885 to 1889. As hon. gentlemen opposite are always willing to credit the *Empire*, I trust they will consider my statement was under and not over the mark. I hold that the duties we have had to pay have injured the farmer to a very great extent. I gave a statement last year of the duty paid on a set of implements used by every farmer. That statement was criticized yesterday, when it was stated that farm implements coming into Canada paid no duty. It was stated that binders were sold for export from the United States for $70, whereas from $110 to $120 was charged to farmers in the United States. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that harvesters costing $69 coming into Canada were estimated at $100. Is it correct that they sell for export cheaper than they sell to the farmers, and is it true that the Minister of Customs has instructed his officials to collect duty on a value of $100 when the invoice shows a value of only $70? If so, so much extra duty is taken out of the pockets of the farmers of Ontario. This goes further to prove that the statement I made was a correct one. I hold that the owner of every farm in Ontario lost $34 a year, or in eight years some $270; and if you consider that a farmer will be doing seventy acres of clearing during the eight years, he will lose $500 on each 100 acres of land. Truly the farmer is not in a prosperous condition. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we cannot show a statute to benefit the farmers that was placed on the Statute-book during the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). But we do not ask the Government to continue to place Acts on the Statute-book. All we ask is fair-play and the removal of legislation that is injurious to the farmers, and although we cannot show that the present Government have benefited them, we can show that the Government have adopted legislation that has injured them. During Mr. Mackenzie's occupancy of office a carefully prepared clause was passed providing that all agricultural implements required in this country for the encouragement of agriculture could be brought in free of duty through agricultural societies. This Government placed a duty on agricultural implements, and they have raised it to 35 per cent., which involved a payment by the average farmer of a duty of $32 annually. A full set of implements costs $1,000, and the duty, at 35 per cent., is over $300. These implements will not serve their purpose more than 10 years, and therefore the tax on the farmer is equal to $32 per year. And there is binding twine. If the Government of the hon. member for East York had remained in power I feel confident we would never have had this grievance. No less than 8,000,000 pounds of binding twine will be used in Canada during the coming harvest, and from quotations obtained from the other side the difference in cost is between 3 and 4 cents per pound; and while $1,200 will go into the treasury, from $240,000 to $250,000 will go into the pockets of the manufacturers and combines. Each farmer with 100 acres will pay $2.40 on binding twine; on flour, 6 barrels with a duty of 75 cents per barrel, $4.50; barbed wire, 40 rods of fence, $4.93, using 6 strands of wire, the prices in the United States

being $3.30, as compared with $4.86 in Canada. Coal oil is an article which farmers largely use. The average quantity estimated to be consumed by each family is placed at 15 gallons, and as gas and electric lighting is taking the place of oil in cities and towns, a farmer's family must consume more than 15 gallons, on which a duty of $2.50 is paid. The duty on furniture will amount yearly to $5. If the Government had thrown off these duties—that on agricultural implements, realizing $48,000; that on binding twine only $1,200, that on furniture $340,000, that on coal oil $200,000 or $300,000—the Government would have enabled the farmers to have held their own, notwithstanding the loss they have sustaind in the price of grain, because they would have saved to each farmer $51.33, while the loss on account of the reduction in the value of grain was only $34. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite a great deal about clothing, wool and other articles. It has been stated that clothing is higher in the United States than it is in Canada, and that on woollen goods the National Policy does not compel the farmers to pay higher prices than if that policy did not exist. I was astonished to hear such a statement. Do not hon. gentlemen remember that last session the duty on coarse woollen goods was advanced from 5 cents per pound and 20 per cent. to 10 cents per pound and 20 per cent., and I have reliable information from a merchant who imports goods from the old country and purchases goods here that it has had the effect of raising woollen goods, both of Canadian and English manufacture, from 5 to 10 per cent. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that we pay no revenue; we grant that we pay no revenue on goods of Canadian manufacture, but it is all the more grievous that large amounts of money are taken out of our pockets, and put into the pockets of manufacturers, for which we derive no benefit. Let me say, Sir, on the matter of wool, that there is a double injustice done to the farmer in the tax on woollen goods, and the state of the tariff on the wool which they sell. When I look at the Trade and Navigation Returns I find that we import over 8,000,000 lbs. of wool into Canada; over 3,500,000 lbs. come from the United States; over 3,000,000 come from Great Britain, so much from Germany, so much from France, and so much from Cape Colony, and it all comes in duty free—notwithstanding the fact that the Government have always said that if we cannot have reciprocity in trade we will have reciprocity in tariff. Why do they allow wool to come from foreign countries to displace the wool grown by the farmers of Canada to such an extent that our Canadian wool has to find a foreign market. That wool to-day going into the United States has to pay a duty of 11 and 12 cents per pound, while we have to pay 30 and 40 and 50 per cent. duty on the coarse woollen clothing which we, the farmers, wear. That is a gross injustice, and one which I hope the Minister of Customs will take into his consideration. It is an injustice that the farmers of Canada are beginning to feel keenly; and if I do not mistake the drift of their opinions, if they can get another opportunity, and if these evils are not redressed, the Government will hear from the farmers of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, in clothing every family uses $90 worth a year, and I have gone to the Bureau of Statistics again to get the average value of clothing used by each individual, and I find it to be $15 a year. The duty upon $90 worth of clothing will be $33.34, which the farmer has to pay; upon groceries he annually pays $3.20 duty; upon hardware $4.50 duty, and upon earthenware $2.50. The farmer therefore has to pay $102 a year on the articles I have enumerated, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the farmers are not injured by the duty they pay upon these things. Now, let us see what the duty is on that which the farmer sells, under the McKinley Bill. I will give a statement of what I believe the average farmer of the Province of Ontario with a fairly good clearance sells yearly, and then we will balance the books and see how the account stands. I will first for a moment refer to the condition of the horse trade in Canada. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that this is not a country for raising horses, and that the day is fast approaching when horses from Canada would not find a market in the United States. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, from my own experience and my own knowledge of breeding horses in Canada, and from the knowledge of what kind of horses they breed in the United States, that the day will never come when our best horses in Canada will not find a market there, and for the simple reason that Ontario is one of the best-fitted countries on the face of the globe for raising horses. We have a limestone soil, we grow oats to feed our horses, we build them up with plenty of bone and muscular system, and Canadian horses will always find a higher price in the States than horses bred on the western prairies. Our Canadian horses have more endurance than horses bred in the United States, and I heard an American horse buyer say, who was a great lover of the United States, and who believed everything that existed there was noble and good, that in taking a team of horses from the Province of Ontario worth $400 into the United States on the seaboard, and selling them there in competition with a team of equal appearance from the Western States, that the team from Canada would always command $50 more than the team from the Western States. Now, Sir, the whole evil about the duty on horses has not yet been told in this House. It is true that the duty is increased on horses, but it is true also that a very large number of horses that went into the United States for breeding purposes before the McKinley Bill was passed are prevented from going in now, and the duty has to be paid on them. There was a buyer from the United States who bought a carload of horses in Canada and took them down to Windsor. The duty was imposed, and he found the duty so grievous that he took the horses back, and paid 30 per cent. to the people he bought them from to take them from him again, rather than he would take them across to the United States and pay the duty. We are told that while the duty at the present time means $30 on every horse valued under $100, it does not make a great deal of difference on the horses from $120 to $149 value; but when you go over $149 there is a great difference. The horse that is bought at $149 pays $30 duty, but the horse that is bought at $150 pays $45 duty, and that is 30 per cent. increase upon a horse worth $150. When we come to the poorer class of horses the duty bears very heavily on them, because a horse worth under $100

has to pay the same amount of duty as a horse worth $149; the injury is doubled, so far as that is concerned, and the farmers of Ontario are greatly injured by this duty. Now, as a rule, each farmer in Ontario will sell one horse in a year on which the duty is $30; he will sell ten lambs—and, let me say, I was pleased to hear the gentleman who preceded me state that our lambs would always find a market in the United States; but he forgot to tell us that if the 75 cents duty was taken off our farmers would get that increased price for our lambs in the United States market. Well, each farmer sells ten lambs, on which the duty is $7.50. Now, Sir, I hold that Canada at the present time is the very best spot in America for breeding animals of all descriptions for export to the United States. As Mr. Wells, the great authority on these subjects, said: "Canada is the home of the long-wooled sheep; it is there that our short-horned and thoroughbred cattle are brought to the greatest perfection, and to Canada the Americans turn their attention when they want to improve their own flocks." Therefore, a closer intercourse between the two countries would be most beneficial and profitable to Canada in the matter of raising stock. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about beef, but they know nothing about it. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) told us that the animals exported from Canada had an advantage of $12 and $15 per head in the English market over those exported from Boston and New York. I was down in Montreal on Tuesday last. I have a son who had been in the old country with cattle, and I instructed him before he left England to go and see the American cattle sold, and to pay strict attention and to give me a correct statement of the difference in price between the American and Canadian cattle on the English market. He did so, and he told me that ten shillings was the very highest he had ever seen any of our Canadian animals sell for over the American cattle, and that in a great many instances there was not more than five shillings a head difference. Now, Sir, to such an extent has this been the case that people who have paid any attention to the public press will remember that last spring a syndicate of American buyers came over here, and within a few days bought 7,000 or 8,000 fat cattle, mostly in Ontario. What have been the facts with respect to these cattle? A great many of them have been taken from Ontario to Boston, and shipped from Boston to Liverpool, London and Glasgow, for the reason that the exporters find that the cheaper freight they get for the cattle from Boston more than pays them for the disadvantage of their cattle having to be slaughtered within ten days of arrival at the port of debarkation. I hope hon. gentlemen will pay attention to such statements as this, and remember them in the future. The hon. gentleman who preceded me stated that our beef trade would be injured if we had unrestricted reciprocity. I speak advisedly when I say that no greater blessing could befall the farmers of Ontario than unrestricted reciprocity. The Americans with their cheap corn can raise beef 1 cent per pound cheaper than we can, and pork at from 1 cent to 1¼ cents per pound cheaper than we can; and if any hon. gentleman doubts my statement I would refer him to the statement made by Professor Robertson before the Committee on Agriculture the other day, in regard to his experiments in fattening hogs. I found that the pork he spoke about was produced by the Americans at a cost of 1 cent per pound cheaper than we could produce it with either pease or barley. And I hold that we could compete with the Americans successfully in raising either pork or beef provided we got their cheap corn. I have a statement from Mr. John White, of Mitchell, a large farmer, who fattens both cattle and hogs and converts them into beef and pork. He states that he fed three or four thousand hogs during the past year, and that to do so he paid a duty on corn to the tune of $1,000. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that that $1,000 would not have gone into his pocket if he had not been obliged to pay it in duty on corn? And will anyone tell me that he would not be able to compete at much greater advantage with the Americans in the sale of pork if he had not that duty to pay? If hon. gentlemen would answer such questions as these among the farmers of Ontario they would do a great deal to satisfy them; but I would not envy their feelings if they attended two or three meetings of the farmers in western Ontario and attempted to teach them some of the doctrines they set forth in this House. Now, every farmer would send on the average to the United States ten lambs, on which he would pay a duty of $7.50. He would sell on the average 150 bushels of barley, on which he would pay a duty of $45. He would send 100 bushels of wheat, on which he would pay $25 of duty. Now, I believe that a very large quantity of our wheat would go to the United States if we had unrestricted reciprocity. In 1888, 777,698 bushels of our wheat, most of it from the Province of Ontario, went to the United States, although 20 cents a bushel was paid on it. Hon. gentlemen opposite may ask me how that was. I will tell them how; and I have a statement in my possession from a correspondent in the North-West, which shows that even Manitoba would be benefited in a few years to the extent of millions of dollars if we had a free market for wheat in the United States. I believe that every bushel of the surplus wheat of Ontario would go to the United States for seed, and I believe that large quantities of our oats would go there for the same purpose. We know that our oats are stronger, and at least two pounds to the bushel heavier than theirs. The United States would be greatly benefited by having our wheat free, and we would be greatly benefited by having their corn free; and yet we are told that the United States is not our proper market. Every farmer would sell to the United States an average of 50 bushels of oats, on which he would pay a duty of $7.50. He would send 50 bushels of pease on which he would pay a duty of $10. A very important industry in Canada has been ruined by the McKinley Bill—that is, the export of split pease to the United States. We have been told that if American corn came into Canada free it would destroy our market for pease. Mr. Thompson, an oatmeal miller in Mitchell, states that if corn came in free it would not injure the pea market of Canada, because England would take all our surplus peaes, provided we produced a better quality. Let every farmer sell 5 tons of hay, and he will have to pay a duty of $20. Let him sell 60 pounds of wool, and he will have to pay a duty of $6.60. Let him sell 300 dozen of eggs, and he will have to pay a duty of $15. Let him sell 30

pounds of poultry, and he will have to pay a duty of $1.50. Let each farmer sell 60 bushels of potatoes, and the duty will be $15. There is $158 which each farmer would pay in duty on these articles going into the United States under the present tariff. And when we consider the increased prices which he has to pay for the goods he buys as well as the reduced prices he gets for what he sells, there is a difference to him, according to that calculation, of $260; but let us put it at one-half of that—$130. That much kept in the pockets of the farmers of the Province of Ontario would enable them to turn the tide of adversity, and once more place themselves upon a solid foundation. But I have not yet told all the evils which the tariff inflicts upon the farmers. Let a farmer go to build a common house and it will cost him $81 for hardware, upon which he will pay $16 of duty. Let him build anything like a bank barn and it will cost him $52 for hardware, on which he will have to pay $10 of duty. If he wishes to put up a comfortable house, with a wash-room, bath-room and all modern improvements, such as our dwellings of late years have, he will have to pay a much larger amount of duty. Then a kit of tools will cost at least $20, on which he will have to pay $5 of duty; so that he will have to pay from $30 to $50 duty on a house, a barn and a kit of tools. There are many other articles I could enumerate in regard to which the tariff bears heavily upon the farmers. The farmers of Ontario begin to feel the effect of the National Policy to such an extent that they are enquiring on all hands how they are to improve their condition. Now, I want to make a short statement in regard to the exports of Canada. Every hon. gentleman in discussing our exports to England and the United States should bear in mind that there is a duty of something like 18 or 19 per cent. on all goods going to the United States, while the goods we send to Britain go there free of duty. I was told by a large cheese dealer that if it were not for the duty of 4 cents a pound which Canadians had to pay in order to send cheese to the United States large quantities of our cheese would be sold there, because they admit that it is superior to theirs. One of our butter dealers who was running three creameries went to New York two years ago and sold butter there at 1 cent a pound less than he could get for it in Canada, after paying a duty of 4 cents a pound on that article. A great deal of our butter would go there also if it were not for the duty. Now, our total exports in 1890 was $82,335,514. To Great Britain we sent $41,499,149, and to the United States $32,291,207. In animals and their produce, the export was $25,106,995. To Britain we sent $18,578,722, and to the United States $5,996,474. But remember, Sir, that upon all our animals there was a duty of 20 per cent., and that the United States, in days gone by, have taken a very large number of animals from Canada. Of agricultural produce we exported to the value of $11,908,000, of which Great Britain took $3,666,826 and the United States $7,519,253, just nearly double the amount that England took, although the Americans themselves raised products of the same decription to an enormous extent. In fact, of our agricultural produce two-thirds were taken by the Americans, although they had to pay a duty of 17 or 18 per cent. But let me state that of our entire export of animals and their produce, the West Indies, of which we have heard so much, took $23,132 worth, and other countries took $531,000 worth, out of the total $25,000,000, showing that Great Britain and the United States are the only markets to which we can pay much attention after all. In agricultural produce the West Indies took $229,822 worth, and all other countries $727,921 worth, of a total of $11,000,000 worth. Now, when we come to Ontario we find that Province exported to the extent of $25,128,494, of which Great Britain took $4,621,689 and the United States $20,007,423. In animals and their produce, Ontario exported $6,780,137, of which Great Britain took $3,033,594 and the United States $3,745,025. In agricultural produce she exported $7,098,324, of which Great Britain took $915,818 worth and the United States $6,158,389 worth. The West Indies took of animals and their produce $442 worth, and of agricultural products $684 worth. Now, let me just examine a statement I have here, by which I find that from the Province of Ontario the West Indies took $522 worth of agricultural produce and $242 worth of animals and their produce, and Japan and China took $27 of agricultural products from that Province and not one cent's worth of animals and their produce. Now, when we take these facts into consideration, what nonsense it is for the hon. Minister of Justice, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to talk about their finding markets in these countries for our exports. When they went down to Halifax they said that the policy of the Government was to build railways and canals and other public works and to find markets. And where were these markets to be found? They were to be found in Australia, which does not take one cent's worth of agricultural produce from us, and in China and Japan, which only take $27 worth, and not one cent's worth of animals and their produce. These are the markets these hon. gentlemen direct our farmers to in lieu of the United States, and then tell us that the markets of the United States are not our natural markets. Why, the facts I have just shown, that we send from Ontario $6,159,389 worth of agricultural products and only $915,000 into the free markets of Great Britain, are stronger than any argument any hon. gentleman opposite can bring to show that the United States are not our natural market. Sir, if the duties were removed the Americans would take all the produce we have. What does it matter to us what they do with our products, so long as they come in and buy, and are willing to give us better prices than we can get anywhere else. I have a few arguments yet remaining. One of them is with respect to salt. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. McDonald) made the statement that we manufactured 800,000 barrels of salt. I cannot think my hon. friend could have made such a statement, because that is the whole consumption of salt in the Dominion. My hon. friend stated, on the contrary, that that was the total amount consumed in Canada, but that the amount produced was in the neighbourhood of 250,000 barrels. Our hon. friends have stated that one man controls the whole salt industry of this Dominion. That shows again that they were talking of something they knew nothing about. There was a company formed, composed of Dr. Coleman & Sons., of Seaforth, Ransford Bros., of Clinton, and R. Wrightmeyer, of Kincardine, who formed themselve into an association and made an arrangement with the other companies to take the salt at the

selling price. It was stated also by the hon. member for West York that it paid well to manufacture salt at 55 cents par barrel. I have not lived in the County of Huron for forty-eight years without knowing something about the condition of that industry. I have seen the first well started there, and have witnessed the development of that interest since; and I state here, from my own knowledge, that the salt industry, at the time this combination was formed, was tottering and going to the wall, and they had to form a combination in order to preserve their own property, because it did not pay to make salt at that price. One reason why it did not pay was the duty on the coal they used, and besides they had to pay double the freight the Americans do. If our Government wish to do justice to the salt industry, as I hope they do, if they want to see the salt industry flourish and placed upon a solid basis, so as to compete with the salt imported from other countries, they should give free coal and a rebate upon the plates used for the pans, and the rivets and bolts used in putting the pans together, and the tubing used to convey the brine to the tanks and from the tanks to the boiling pans. Our salt manufacturers would then be willing to compete with any country in the world, and could afford to sell their salt at 60 cents per barrel and have a better living profit than they have to-day. I hold that, in the present readjustment of the tariff, the salt industry has not received the consideration it ought to receive. The Government ought to have swept away the duty altogether upon the raw material, so as to place that industry upon a solid basis. I hold that the salt industry requires fair-play for more than one reason. There are some 550,000 barrels of salt that come into Canada free of duty—so much from England, so much from France, and even so much from the United States. Our salt manufacturers have their field confined within very narrow limits. They have not the whole market of Canada because of this salt that comes in free. I was opposed to their raising the price to $1.25 a barrel, and I told one of them that if they had kept the price at $1 a barrel no one would have said anything against it; but they did too much. There is no doubt that during the time the duty was in existence, they made money. They made $60,000 or $70,000 a year, which they put into their pockets, out of the hard earnings of the farmers of Canada, while the combine was in existence, and the Government did right to put an end to the combine; but they should do the same with all the combines. Why do they single out one combine and allow all the rest to go on and prey upon the farmers, as well as the other members of the community? Then we have heard a great deal in regard to eggs. I have in my pocket invoices from New York and from London, England. Eggs were shipped to the old country in the month of May last year, before the McKinley tariff came into operation, and others were shipped to New York. Perhaps those that were shipped to New York were a little cleaner, but they were large and small. Those that were sent to London were all picked. There were 11,610 dozen eggs sent to New York. The total cost of sending them there was $101.35, not quite 1 cent per dozen. The shippers had their returns from New York twenty-three days earlier than they had on the eggs shipped to London. The latter amounted to 10,550 dozen, and the cost upon them was £64 12s. 1d., or a little under 3 cents a dozen, so that the eggs that went to London cost 2 cents a dozen more to put upon the market there than the eggs that went to New York, and the return from the eggs that went to London was 10·28 cents per dozen, while on those that went to New York it was 14·26 cents, just a fraction under 4 cents a dozen difference. The same gentleman, Mr. Wilson, told me of two shipments that he knew of to the old country this spring, and the one netted a little over 9 cents, and the other a little over 11 cents a dozen. He has another shipment there now, and I sent to ask him about the result. He telegraphed me in reply that he could not tell the exact result, but he did not expect to make as well as to New York. He sent two shipments to New York. These were placed on board at Seaforth, and $1,200 of duty paid, and he netted upon one shipment 12 cents and on the other 12½ cents. This gentleman has attempted to place eggs on the English market many times in the last few years, and he has never found the English market profitable. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there is a market for our eggs in England, and Mr. Wilson will agree with them that there is a market; but it is not a paying market, it is not a market where our eggs will pay as well as they do in New York. Is it to be supposed that eggs going to London or any other port in England will be in the same condition as they are when they are put on board in Montreal, and yet it takes as long to get them to Montreal as to New York or Boston. Further, Mr. Wilson had to place refrigerators on the vessel at his own cost. They had not that accommodation, though; if they found it a paying trade they might find it worth their while to provide that accommodation. Then, as to coal oil. A gentleman who is well acquainted with that trade says:

"This American oil is sold wholesale to the retailers at 23 cents and by them to the consumer at 30 cents, and I find that Canadian Peerless is sold at 19 cents, another quality at 15 cents, and the cheapest of all at 12 cts. per gallon by the wholesale, and to the consumer at 25 cents, 19 cents and 15 cents per gallon. The plain fact remains that the best water-white American oil could be sold here for 12½ cents wholesale and, say, 15 cents retail; but by the enhanced cost caused by the tariff it is sold wholesale for 23 cents and retail for 30 cents per gallon."

I say that also in the article of coal oil we suffer a large amount of injury. There is over a million dollars paid on coal oil, and $600,000 of that goes to the manufacturers. There is a duty paid upon our implements, and if it were not for the increased duty placed on iron and on implements we would be able to get them at something like the cost price at which they are sent out by the American manufacturers, because it is certain that they will not send to Canada these articles at less than the cost of production. As a Canadian farmer, I have no doubt that we can compete with the Americans or with any other country on the face of the earth, and when the hon. gentleman who spoke before me gave a statement in reference to the condition of the English farmer he described the condition of the Canadian farmer as plainly as language could describe it. Any one who says the Canadian farmer is not at the present time in straitened circumstances talks of what he knows nothing about. I say that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was within the

mark when he said that Canadian farm lands had depreciated 27 or 28 per cent. The decrease in value is more than that. I know of a farm which was sold not long ago, with a brick house on it and good outbuildings, for $4,150, and it was bought a few years ago with nothing but a log shanty and a frame barn on it for $5,000, and the improvements cost at least $1,500. I know another farm that was bought for $10,000 ten years ago, and was sold two years ago for $7,500. I could enumerate a great many more, but let that suffice. I think I have proven that the Canadian farmer has not received the same price for his products in the markets of the world, when compared with the prices received by the American farmer, that he did before the National Policy was imposed. I think, also, that I have proven that he has lost in what he has to sell to a greater degree. I hold that unrestricted reciprocity is the only way that the farmers of Ontario can be benefited. With the other provinces I cannot say that I am acquainted; but I do know this, that nature has placed us in a position that we can supply the Eastern States with all the agricultural produce they require much more cheaply and much more easily than even the Western States. We are people belonging to the same race, we are people of the same language, our laws are founded upon the same basis, and I hold that it is to our interest, while retaining our nationality, to have the closest trade relations and the most friendly relations with that country we possibly can. I believe all the talk of our friends opposite about going to Washington, and about disloyalty, is complete humbug, and nothing else. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it was at the instance of Secretary Blaine that negotiations were opened at Washington last year, but we have heard Mr. Blaine declare emphatically that it was the British Minister who first introduced to him the subject of a conference at Washington; and if this Government has only put this before the people as a red herring they will find they have gone too far, and the people will find that they have been humbugged long enough. They tell us that when the National Policy was imposed it was for the purpose of giving us a market for all our coarse grains, all our beef, all our mutton and other produce; yet we find the Government are telling us now they will have to seek out markets in foreign countries at the very antipodes of Canada, when we have a market close at hand. I believe the statement is correct that the home market is the best market we can get, and when we cannot get a home market the next best market we can find is to step across the imaginary line. A gentleman who spoke last night gave away the whole argument when he said that certain border constituencies along the frontier had changed their political complexion in the last election because they were well acquainted with the benefits of the market of the United States, and that shows that the people no longer believe in the tales told them by the Government and their supporters. Now, I want to give another statement that I have taken from the *Empire* newspaper, and one taken from the Port Hope *Guide*, respecting the price of grain at certain periods. I find, according to the *Empire*, that on the 5th of last December—and that was one of the days that my hon. friend from North York has mentioned as being a good day—that in Toronto wheat was selling at 87 cents a bushel, whereas in Buffalo, on the same day, wheat was selling for 97 cents a bushel. We will take a 10-acre field of wheat. Last year an acre yielded, on an average, 19 bushels: that would be 190 bushels that the farmer would be able to take to the Toronto market, and he would sell that for $165. But the Buffalo farmer, taking the same quantity of wheat to market, would get for it 97 cents, or $190—he would have $19 more than the Canadian farmer for his 10-acre field of fall wheat. Now, take barley. I find that barley in Toronto on the same day was 53 cents a bushel, and in Buffalo it was 90 cents. Now, let the Toronto farmer sell the produce of a 10-acre field, 22 bushels per acre: that would give him 220 bushels, which would yield him $116; but the Buffalo farmer, selling the same number of bushels, would get $198, or $82 more than the Canadian farmer. Let me take oats, and I find that in Toronto on that day oats were selling for 39 cents and in Buffalo they were selling for 49 cents. The average crop of oats was 28 bushels per acre; this would give each farmer 280 bushels of oats. The Canadian farmer would get for his oats $109.20, while the Buffalo farmer would get $137.20, or $28 more than the Canadian farmer. On these three crops of wheat, barley and oats the Buffalo farmer would carry home in his pocket $128.40 more than the Toronto farmer, both having cropped the same number of acres. That was the effect of the McKinley tariff last fall on the farmers of Ontario, and I hold that every farmer who sold barley last fall lost 15 cents a bushel on account of that Bill. Mr. Speaker, you can remember, and so can every hon. gentlemen in this House, that there was a time when it was uncertain at what date the McKinley tariff would come into force, and if it had come into force while the grain-buyers had a large amount of barley on their hands they would have lost 20 cents a bushel. Now, let me take another statement from a Port Hope paper, giving the relative prices, on 30th April, for grain at Rochester and Toronto:

	Rochester.	Toronto.
Fall wheat	$1 20 to $1 22	$1 12 to $1 13
Spring wheat	1 15 to 1 16	1 04 to 1 05
Barley (York State)	0 83 to 0 90	0 55 to 0 58
Oats	0 68 to 0 70	0 58 to 0 60
Potatoes	1 25 to 1 30	0 95 to 1 05
Butter, per lb	0 23 to 0 25	0 25 to 0 28
Eggs, per doz	0 15 to 0 15	0 12½ to 0 13
Wool	0 28 to 0 30	0 22 to 0 22½

Now, a farmer selling the produce of 10 acres of wheat in Toronto would get $205; selling 10 acres of barley he would get $124, because barley was 83 cents a bushel; and selling 10 acres of oats he would get $134. The Canadian farmer, selling the produce of 30 acres would take home $464; while the American farmer, selling the produce of 30 acres, would take home $571, or $107 more for his grain than the Canadian farmer. And so with regard to wool: we find that the price of wool in the United States was 28 to 30 cents, whereas it was only 22½ in Toronto. Take potatoes. The Rochester farmer would take home $15 more than the Toronto farmer upon a lot of 59 bushels. That is the way the tariff works against the farmers of Canada as compared with the farmers of the United States. Let me say that it does no good to the farmers of Ontario to be told that the farmers of the United States are in a worse condition. If it can be proved that we can get a better price in their markets that is all we want. We do not enter into

partnership with the Americans, but we go into their markets to compete with them, and they in return can come here and compete with us. One reason why we can always compete successfully with them is that we have a more fertile country and produce larger crops, and what we desire is to obtain a better price. Taking all these matters into consideration, I contend that the hon. gentlemen opposite have not made out a good case, and that if we obtain unrestricted reciprocity one of the greatest possible blessings will be conferred on the Dominion of Canada in general, and on the farmers of this country in particular.

Mr. CORBY. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to make any remarks on this question, and I would not have done so had not the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) touched on the question of free corn. I must say I was surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is a farmer, advocated free corn, which must come into competition with the coarse grains of the farmers of the Dominion. I find, on looking over the imports for 1890, that although we had a protective tariff of 7½ cents per bushel on corn no less than $1,500,000 worth of cornmeal and corn were brought into this country. I repeat that when the hon. gentleman advocated free corn he must have known that corn would come into direct competition with our oats, barley, rye, and all our coarse grains. The total value of our imports entered for home consumption of farm produce, for 1890, was $12,659,720, as follows :—

TOTAL IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION AND IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES INTO CANADA OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE IN 1890.

ARTICLES.		IMPORTS ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.					
		Total.		From Great Britain.		From United States.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$		$
Horses	No.	1,922	85,192	56	1,752	1,866	83,440
Cattle	"	2,916	52,675	.....	.....	2,916	52,675
Sheep	"	48,844	107,674	.....	.....	48,844	107,674
Swine	.....	.....	82,984	.....	20	.....	82,964
Other animals	.....	.....	15,506	.....	793	.....	14,668
Mutton	Lbs.	246,363	17,798	.....	.....	246,363	17,798
Pork	"	17,470,108	847,154	23,702	2,320	17,445,726	844,816
Bacon and hams*	"	4,355,653	324,946	9,305	1,398	4,344,200	323,513
Beef	"	6,460,427	259,550	17,062	1,072	6,443,305	258,473
Meats, all other	"	1,548,506	144,891	27,866	4,067	1,505,529	139,161
Lard	"	4,855,5 6	301,286	2,675	258	4,882,831	301,028
Tallow	"	727,179	36,229	24,436	1,511	702,743	34,718
Hides	.....	.....	1,[illegible]93	.....	30,177	.....	1,660,553
Wool	Lbs.	8,905,261	1,729,056	3,177,752	678,897	3,824,114	691,599
Butter	"	381,329	62,212	4,287	1,139	376,890	61,027
Cheese	"	127,556	22,597	23,678	4,570	91,946	16,201
Poultry	.....	.....	16,286	.....	3,619	.....	11,836
Eggs	Doz.	659,051	91,773	326	69	625,168	89,444
Wheat	Bush.	188,934	150,128	16	111	188,908	149,994
Barley	"	12,550	4,963	333	367	12,217	4,596
Oats	"	352,786	98,535	821	565	351,965	97,970
Pease	"	5,910	7,842	972	1,472	4,875	6,312
Beans	"	9,801	15,525	69	156	9,098	14,891
Rye	"	526	277	3	6	523	271
Corn	"	3,242,391	1,170,022	.....	.....	3,242,391	1,170,022
Cornmeal	Brls.	188,308	381,532	5	21	188,303	381,511
Oatmeal	Lbs.	306,633	9,193	112,727	3,050	193,906	6,143
Flour (wheat)	Brls.	169,869	612,953	2,820	15,561	167,039	597,333
Bran, mill feed, &c	.....	.....	123,898	.....	.....	.....	123,898
Potatoes	Bush.	132,112	54,266	17	40	132,023	54,182
Hay	Tons.	5,093	28,186	.....	.....	5,093	28,186
Hops	Lbs.	1,092,781	198,675	190,594	34,915	595,016	105,295
Seeds, clover and grass	"	4,117,951	200,812	8,059	1,121	4,109,306	199,662
" other	.....	.....	277,675	.....	54,209	.....	186,406
Hemp, undressed	Cwt.	97,004	774,587	77,257	626,032	18,812	142,036
Trees and plants, all kinds	.....	.....	136,218	.....	3,538	.....	131,031
Tobacco, raw	Lbs.	11,376,263	1,344,780	.....	.....	11,226,944	1,316,718
Fruits, viz. :—							
Apples, dried	"	84,531	7,192	61	9	84,470	7,183
" green or ripe	Brls.	123,593	243,332	.....	.....	123,593	243,332
Currants	Qts.	8,952	492	.....	.....	8,952	492
Cherries	"	58,673	9,033	.....	.....	58,673	9,033
Grapes	Lbs.	1,135,266	79,008	418,041	31,339	714,685	47,503
Peaches	"	1,956,540	107,636	.....	.....	1,956,540	107,636
Plums	Bush.	10,755	24,581	.....	.....	10,755	24,581
Berries, all kinds	Lbs.	1,048,392	72,627	.....	.....	1,048,392	72,627
All other articles	...	.....	641,080	.....	52,082	.....	543,332
Total	.....	.....	12,659,720	.....	1,557,156	.....	10,548,534

* Shoulders and sides included.

In this statement of imports from the United States there is nothing on the list that cannot be raised in this Dominion; and if our American neighbours will not meet us on a fair basis, and if they are bound to go on increasing their tariff, as was done by the McKinley Bill, I, for one, although an importer of corn, would advocate a prohibitory duty against everything imported from the United States. As a distiller, I import 70,000 bushels of corn annually, to be used in the manufacture of spirits, on which I pay a duty of 7½ cents per bushel. I was accused by my opponent at the last general election with bringing in my corn free of duty. I want on the floor of this House to deny that statement. I want to deny that statement because it is not correct. I pay just the same duty as the farmer or any other man pays. I pay 7½ cents per bushel on all corn that I bring into this country for the purpose of manufacturing spirits. During the last general election campaign it was brought against me by the member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat to-night, that I stood up in this House and voted to allow the distillers a rebate on spirits exported from the manufactured grain. I deny that from my seat in this House to-night. It was reported that I voted when I did not vote, and I can leave it to a number of members who are present here to-night to say that I refused to vote on that question. I stated then that I was an interested party, and that I refused to vote, and I referred the Speaker to Rule 16 of the House of Commons. The vote was correctly recorded in the *Hansard*, and I wish to make this statement here, as it was brought against me by the member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett), who signed a letter to the effect that he saw me get up in this House and vote on that question last session.

An. hon. MEMBER. He is a liar.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. CORBY. I find when looking over the reports of the Inland Revenue for 1890 that the distillers of the Dominion of Canada used last year 66,790,421 lbs. of American corn, on which they paid a duty of 7½ cents per bushel. It has also been stated throughout the whole Dominion that the distillers have been receiving their corn free of duty when the farmers have to pay 7½ cents per bushel duty. I deny that statement, and I state here what is the fact, that the distillers paid the same duty as the farmers or anyone else. We not only pay a duty on corn, but we pay a duty on malt, and we pay an Inland Revenue tax of about $5 a bushel on every bushel of grain that we manufacture into whiskey. I do not know of any other class of the community which pays more into the Dominion treasury than the distillers of this Dominion do. Last session it was stated here from the Opposition benches that we could not raise hogs in this country fit for mess pork. I want to give the hon. gentlemen opposite to understand that we can raise hogs in this country fit to make any mess pork that the lumbermen may require. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that the reason the farmers of this country were driven out of the industry of raising heavy hogs was that the Americans flooded this country with mess pork, and I state here that our Government have not yet given us the protection they should give on pork. I claim that the Government should put the same duty on mess pork as they do on any other pork, and that would compel the Canadian lumbermen to buy our Canadian hogs. We can raise the hogs in this country if they give us sufficient protection, and the only reason we ever lost that pork trade has been that the duty was too low, and the cheap American pork flooded the market. I hardly think that the member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) or any of the Liberal party would advocate free trade in this country if they took into consideration the fact that we have a home market here in Canada for farmers' products to the extent of $500,000,000 a year. If the hon. gentleman wants me to give an explanation of how we have this market of $500,000,000 I am ready to give it.

An hon. MEMBER. Give them some light over there.

Mr. CORBY. I will give how I figured out this, and I think that the House will agree with me that I am correct in this calculation. Before we exchange this market of $500,000,000 a year for the products of the farmers, and allow the Americans to come in here and compete with our farmers, I think we should seriously take into consideration the extent of our home market. I stated before my election that I would advocate anything that is for the interest of this Dominion, and I am here prepared to do it. If the House will allow me, I will state how I make up this estimate. To make this estimate, I obtained the cost of feeding the steerage passengers and others on the steamship lines between Great Britain and Canada and United States. The managers of the continental lines estimate the cost of feeding the steerage passengers to be about 25 cents per diem per head; the White Star Line at about 50 cents; the Allan Line, 25 cents for steerage and 65 or 75 cents for intermediate and first-class passengers. I also got the statements of directors of penitentiaries, prisons, asylums, &c., and concluded that from 20 to 25 cents per head of our population would represent the consumption, and that our imports of farm products would about equal the amount required for seed, and thus, if our annual consumption is at 25 cents per diem per head, our total consumption of the products of the farm, and animals and their products, and agricultural products, would amount to about five hundred millions of dollars. The House may think 25 cents per diem per head too high, but it seems to me that these steamship lines, with their three classes of passengers, feed with economy their steerage passengers. I may state that an investigation was made by the Department of Agriculture in connection with assisted immigration a few years ago, which resulted in fixing the amount at 25 cents as the cost per head per diem, which corroborates my estimate as to the value of our home market. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer, nor did I intend to make any remarks on this question, had not the hon. gentleman who last spoke brought up the question of free corn, in which I am interested. Hon. gentlemen can all see that free corn means $5,000 a year direct profit in my own pocket, but I do not believe that it is to the interest of the farmers generally that we should have free corn; and although if the duty were removed on corn it would put money in my

own pocket, and be to my own personal advantage yet I will not stand up in this House and advocate what I think is against the interests of the country as a whole. I am not sent here to legislate to put money in my own pocket; I am sent here to legislate for what is to the interest of the whole Dominion, and so long as I hold my seat in this House as the member for West Hastings the policy which I will advocate is a policy which will benefit all the people of Canada. I beg to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the attention with which the House has listened to me.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on. Speak now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I may say that the whip informed me that there would be no more speeches to-night, and asked me if I would move the adjournment of the debate. Otherwise I would not have done it.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no desire to urge the hon. gentleman to speak at an unseasonable hour; but really, if we are to sit here until Christmas, we had better adjourn every night at ten o'clock, and take matters easily. I think we might spend another hour, and I do not suppose the hon. gentleman desires to speak any longer than that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not intend to address the House on this subject to-night; but as hon. gentlemen desire to continue the discussion for some time longer, perhaps I may as well say what little I have to say now as on any other occasion. The resolution which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for South Oxford may be divided into two parts. The first part proposes that the duties on goods which are the prime necessaries of the artizans, the miners, the lumbermen, the fishermen and the farmers of this Dominion, should be reduced to the lowest possible point; and the second part proposes that in the negotiations which are expected to take place at Washington in October next any treaty with the United States should be arranged on the widest possible basis. For my part, I believe that that resolution should receive the sanction of this House. If we want to build up this Dominion I think we must reduce to the lowest possible points the duties on those articles of prime necessity to the miners, the fishermen, the lumbermen, the artizans and the farmers, who are the bone and sinew of the country, and the classes from which we expect that the country will be built up. Now, our friends on the other side state that this has been the policy pursued by the Government of the day. I differ very much from that statement. I believe that a great many different articles which are of prime necessity to the working classes are very much higher than they should be, and that the duties are arranged in such a way, that while the Government receives a very small amount of revenue, the people pay the taxes all the same. One article I might mention is binding twine, which formed a subject of discussion here a few days ago. The duty on that article, which nearly every farmer requires, is quite a serious tax; and while we receive from it a revenue of only a little over $1,200, it was shown conclusively that it compelled the farmers of this country to pay from $250,000 to $300,000 a year to the manufacturers. If that amount of money went into the coffers of the Government the case would not be so bad, because it would then relieve the people's burdens in other directions; but while such a small amount goes into the treasury and such a large amount into the pockets of the manufacturers it is certainly a tax that should be removed altogether. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), in discussing this question, attempted to prove that binding twine was cheaper in Canada than in the United States. It struck me as strange, if that was the case, that he, as president of the combination manufacturing that article, was so anxious that the Government should retain the duty. Another article that I might mention is salt. I quite approve of the course the Government have taken in removing half the duty on salt, but I say that they should have gone further and removed it altogether. Salt is an article of prime necessity, which every family in this Dominion requires to use, and while a portion of the duty goes into the public treasury a large proportion of it goes to the manufacturers of salt in this Dominion. I believe there is no reason why salt cannot be manufactured as cheaply in Canada as in the United States. I know that within a short distance of the town in which I live is one of the largest salt wells in Canada; and on the other side of the river, in the State of Michigan, there is another salt well. We bought 400 barrels of salt from the American well at 60 cents a barrel, brought it to Canada and paid the duty, and it cost us less than we could buy salt for in Canada, where the price was $1.10. The manufacturers of the American salt told us that the net average price they received the year previous was 57 cents a barrel, and that out of that they defrayed all expenses, paid a fair dividend to their stockholders, and laid by a little for rest. Now, if they can manufacture salt on one side of the river for 57 or 60 cents a barrel I cannot, for the life of me, see why they cannot do it on the Canadian side as well. I believe they can; and, therefore, I think it was the duty of the Government to have removed the duty on salt altogether, and thus break down the combination which has been oppressing the farmers and the people of this country for some years past. Then there are other articles of prime necessity to the people of this country. For instance, there is coal oil, an article which has been frequently mentioned during the course of this debate. Now, that is an article of prime necessity to every family in this Dominion. There is none which does not require to use more or less coal oil, yet the duty to-day is over a hundred per cent., and the combine existing in Canada has forced the price of Canadian oil a great deal higher that it would be were it not for the duty. This is one article from which the Government should have removed the duty, and thus have reduced the price to every consumer. Besides, while the revenue from the duty on coal oil is considerable, it is not at all in proportion to what the people pay, and that is a most objectionable feature in this policy. If the duty all went to the State it would not be so bad, but when a large proportion goes, not to the State, but into the pockets of a few manufacturers, it is not in the interests of Canada that the duty should be maintained. I might go over many other articles, but I will not weary the House by doing so at present. The arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite

have been, to my mind, very conflicting. We find one gentleman will get up and talk against unrestricted reciprocity in any shape. We had the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) last night taking, to my mind, the most consistent course of any gentleman who has yet addressed the House from the other side during this debate. He took the same line as that which was taken last year by the Hon. Mr. Colby, then President of the Council, and opposed reciprocity in any shape. He did not believe even in reciprocity in natural products. He held it was not in the interests of this country that we should have any reciprocity at all with the United States, and argued that we should stand by the old policy, the old flag and the old humbug. Now, if that is really the opinion of the hon. gentleman from North Grey, his first duty should be to take the Government to task for having taken any steps to obtain reciprocity. Why did the Government dissolve the House last year? Their pretext was that they desired to go to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty and wanted to have the approval of the people before going there. That was the reason given by them to the people of this country for a dissolution at that time. But I fancy that no sooner was that intimation made by them than the manufacturers raised such a hue and cry that the Government felt it necessary to make a change. They brought such a pressure on the Government that the Government were compelled to change their programme altogether, and the result was that, a few days later, the then First Minister issued an address to the people, in which, from beginning to end, there was not one word said about reciprocity. Now, Sir, the only conclusion I can come to is this, that when the Government announced their intention of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States our manufacturers, as we know, all came to Ottawa and informed the Government that any such treaty with the people of the United States was out of the question. We have put up our money, they said; we have stood by you from year to year, and now, if you propose to negotiate a treaty with the people of the United States, you need not, in your appeal to the people, expect any support or assistance from us; and the consequence was, that when the First Minister issued his address not one word could be found in it about reciprocity at all. Now, the question has been often asked on the other side, and although it has been answered a great many times, in my opinion, from this side, yet I may mention the difference that exists between the two political parties. The Liberals come out boldly and squarely before the people and say that if they are returned to power their aim and object will be to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States upon the broadest possible terms, under which all the manufactured and raw products of both countries shall pass freely from the one to the other, but they do not propose for one moment to lose control of their own tariff. On the contrary, we propose to retain control of our own tariff, so that we can admit goods from England, Ireland, France, Germany or any country free, if we like, or tax them if we choose; but so far as the trade and commerce of this country and the United States is concerned, there shall be the greatest freedom of intercourse between the two countries, and trade will flow between them as freely as the waters between the two great lakes. That is the policy advocated by the Reform party, and on which they went to the country, and which they propose to carry out when returned to power. But what is the policy of the Government? They talk about reciprocity. One gentleman gets up and says he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products or anything else. Another says it would be foolish for us to negotiate a treaty with the United States, as it would ruin our farmers and manufacturers, and then turns round and says the Government propose to negotiate a treaty if they can obtain a fair, reasonable and equitable treaty. It is for the Government to tell us what they consider a reasonable, fair and equitable treaty. If they propose to negotiate a treaty on the lines of the treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866, all the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite would be futile and fall to the ground. The great argument advanced by them is that such a treaty would reduce the price of coal; that it would ruin our farmers, by the admission of free corn to compete with their coarse grain. But if we should negotiate a treaty on the lines of the treaty of 1854 we would admit all the raw products of the United States freely, and thus the same injury would be inflicted on our farmers, so far as the products are concerned. While we are willing to admit—while I, for my part, am quite free to say that, so far as corn and pork, and some of these things are concerned, it is possible that our farmers might receive a little less if we had free trade with the United States, I contend that for every dollar they would lose on those things they would gain $10 on other things by having free trade with the United States. When we look at the position of these two great countries, extending for 4,000 miles alongside one another—people of the same nationality, speaking the same language, following the same pursuits, and trading to such a large extent as we have for the past two years—it seems to me foolish and almost absurd to say that the trade between these two peoples would not be a benefit to them both. In the Trade and Navigation Returns I find that the total value of our exports last year, to all countries, was $82,000,000, and of that amount we exported to the United States over $33,000,000, while we sent nearly $42,000,000 to Great Britain. There is a whole argument in itself. Why did we export $33,000,000 worth of goods to the United States? We could scarcely send a dollar's worth in there without paying a heavy duty. We could send all our goods to England free, but we did not, because it paid us better to send that quantity to the United States. We sent them there and paid the duty upon them, and then found that we realized more than we would if we had sent them to England. That being the case, it appears to me that if the duties were removed on those goods passing into the United States it would be far better for us, and we would get a much larger amount for our goods. Then again, if we take up the articles in detail we find that it is still more explicit. Of coal, we sent to the United States last year 574,000 tons. We sent that coal there and paid 75 cents a ton duty on it, and yet it paid us to send it there and to pay the duty. If that duty were removed, and we could send that coal into the United States free, I argue that we would realize just that much more for our coal. Let me remind the House that, while we are sending a large quantity of coal into

the United States, we are at the same time importing from the United States a large quantity of coal. From Nova Scotia we sent nearly 80,000 tons of coal to the United States, and from British Columbia we sent 495,000 tons. It was cheaper for the people of San Francisco and California to get their coal from British Columbia, and the people of New England took their coal from the mines of Nova Scotia. If it were not for the duty which exists, I say that trade would largely increase, and the miners of Canada would receive more for the article they have to export. Then there is the article of horses, which has been mentioned very frequently. Last year we sent more than 16,000 horses to the United States. To Great Britain we only sent 125. Remember this, that we could have sent all our horses to England free, but we sent 16,000 to the United States, and paid 20 per cent. duty upon them, rather than send them to England free of duty. Why did we do that? It was because the people of Canada knew where the best market was, and so they sent their horses to the United States though they had to pay the duty. It may be that next year's Trade and Navigation Returns may show that a larger proportion of horses have gone to England, because, under the McKinley tariff the duty has been raised so enormously that possibly the horses may be sent to England; but it simply shows that, as far as horses are concerned, the United States is our best market, and has been for years, and that if both countries were free from the duty upon horses, if we could send our horses into the United States free as we can send them to England, the great majority of our horses would go to the United States and not to England. Unrestricted reciprocity would therefore largely benefit the people of this country in regard to horses, because there is no country in the world where such good horses can be raised as in Canada, and there is no question about the development of that trade. It is a most profitable trade for our farmers. I question if there is an animal on a farm that gives so much profit to the farmer as the horse. If we had the markets of the United States open to us we could double and treble the industry of raising horses. Of horned cattle, we last year exported 7,840 to the United States, and we sent about 67,000 to Great Britain. So far as our cattle are concerned, we have two strings to our bow. Our fat cattle all go to the English market. That market is and always will be open to us upon the same terms as it is to the whole world. We do not have any special favours in the English markets, and if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity there would be no change in that respect. But we also have a market for a poorer class of cattle that it does not pay to send to the old country, and animals of that description have found a market in the United States, in Buffalo and in New York, with its three millions of people that have to be fed every day. If we had free trade with the United States our trade in that respect would largely increase, and our farmers would still have the market for fat cattle and the best grades in the old country, while they would have a market for the other class at home. Last year we sent 250,000 sheep to the United States. Why did we send them there? Because it paid us better to pay the duty and send our sheep there than to send them to the old country, where they would be admitted free of duty. Yet we only sent 57,000 sheep to England. There is no single article which shows this point so well as the article of eggs. Eggs have been going from Canada to England free and to the United States free, and what has been the result? Last year we sent to the United States 13,000,000 dozen of eggs and to England only 3,600 dozen. Now, that shows that while the markets both of the United States and of England were open to us, we sent the greater proportion of our eggs to the United States; the McKinley Bill has put such a heavy tax upon our eggs that, possibly, next year we will be forced to find a market for a large portion of our eggs in the old country. Now, if we had free trade, I venture to say there would be scarcely any eggs sent to the old country at all. The facts show that while the two markets have been open the people know where their best market is, and has been, and consequently they have sent their eggs to the best market, and that has been the market of the United States. Now, take the article of cheese, and the very contrary result is shown. The facts show that we have been exporting our cheese to the old country much more than to the United States. Why? Because there is the best market for cheese. We have sent our cheese there, we have sent our eggs to the United States, and consequently I say that the markets of the United States are our natural markets for eggs, and England is our natural market for cheese. One gentleman said to-night that we would imperil our cheese trade if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity. Nothing of the kind. The English market is open to all the world, and we would still have the English market for our cheese and our butter, and everything we would like to send there, as freely and as readily as we do now. Then, take the articles of game and poultry. Last year we sent to the United States $154,000 worth, while England only took $1,600 worth. The United States market would be open to us if we had free trade with that country, and I can assure this House that in the county from which I come the little article of poultry and game is of very great importance to the people. We are within reasonable distance of the city of Detroit, and our farmers have been in the habit of raising poultry and game and bringing it to the American market in an hour or so, where they can obtain a good price; consequently, to be shut out of the markets of the United States will be quite a loss to us. Then take wool. Our farmers export a large quantity of wool, and although that wool goes into the old country free we did not send any there at all last year. We sent over 1,000,000 pounds of wool into the United States and paid the heavy duty upon it. Now, that shows to my mind clearly that the United States for wool is our natural market, and with free trade between the two countries our wool would go there and our farmers would receive a much larger price than they do now. Then, we send a large quantity of apples, green and ripe, to the United States, and in respect of this article there is no question that free trade will benefit both countries. We require a good deal of fruit from the United States. It comes in earlier than our fruit does. There are a great many kinds of fruit that we cannot raise; we cannot raise in our colder climate bananas, oranges, lemons, &c., that we require for the good health of our people. We must go elsewhere for that fruit, and we cannot get it anywhere else than in the

United States, unless we go to the more southern countries. Now, if we had free trade in fruit it would benefit both Canada and the United States, because we have a large quantity of fall apples that come in early in the fall; and we cannot ship these apples to the old country, because they will not keep, but we can ship them to the United States. We have a great variety of fruit that ripens early in the fall—fall apples, for instance—but we cannot send them to the old country because they will not bear the voyage. Now, we have in Ontario ready access to the cities of Buffalo, New York and Boston, and all the large cities, within a few hours from any part of Ontario, from the great grain or fruit-growing districts of that province, and you can reach those cities within a few hours, where there is a very large consumption of these very articles, and if we had free trade we could obtain a good market for all the different varieties of fruit, and that would largely enhance the profit to our fruit-growers. Then another article that we export largely is barley, which has been mentioned frequently. Now our natural market for barley is in the United States; facts prove that. Notwithstanding that we can send that barley free into the old country, we do not send it there, because it has paid us better to pay the duty and send it into the United States. We paid 10 cents a bushel duty upon all the barley we exported last year, and we realized more for it than we would if we had sent it to the old country, where it went in free. Now, I fear that the duty has been raised so high upon barley that it will force us to send it to the old country or somewhere else, where we cannot get as much for it. I know that last year in the town of Chatham, in the neighbourhood of which a very large quantity of barley is raised, the very day the McKinley Bill came into effect the price of barley fell from $1.25 per 100 pounds to 90 cents. This shows clearly that the duty that it paid comes out of the pockets of the Ontario farmers. Hon. gentlemen contend that the farmers are getting as high a price now as they did last year. That does not prove anything at all. The argument is to show whether they would get any more if there was no duty at all, and that cannot be shown by comparing the prices of this year with the prices of last year. We know that prices fluctuate and change. Wheat, for instance, may be $1 this year, and next year it may be 80 cents, and the year afterwards it may rise to $1.25. We cannot prove anything by the prices from one year to another, but we must compare the prices in one country with the prices in the other country in the same day, and then you can institute a fair comparison. If you take the markets of Toronto and the markets of Buffalo you can make a very fair comparison, and you will find that the price in Buffalo is just about the amount of the duty higher than it is in Toronto. Now, the item of barley is a very large one in our export. We exported last year nearly 10,000,000 bushels, and it is a very serious thing for our farmers to be shut out of that market, and it is a serious question to know what they are going to do with their barley. If they have to pay 30 cents a bushel duty upon it, it will make a very great difference in their profits in the course of a year. Now, another article that we export very largely is the articles of beans. That article is, perhaps, of more importance to the people of the county I have the honour to represent than it is almost to any other part of the country. We raise, in the County of Kent, between four and five hundred thousand bushels of beans every year. The duty upon beans now is 40 cents a bushel. It has been 10 per cent., and, notwithstanding this 10 per cent. duty, nearly every bushel of our bean crop has been exported to the United States. There is no market for that in the old country. I may say that when the McKinley Bill came into force, last October, two of our bean buyers in the town of Chatham, finding they had a market for more beans than they could handle, opened an agency in the State of Michigan, and they actually paid, in the State of Michigan, 40 cents more for the beans that they bought there than for the beans they had bought in the town of Chatham. All those beans went to the markets of Philadelphia and St. Louis, and other points. We could send beans from Chatham to those cities, but we would have to pay 40 cents per bushel on them. Consequently, they could pay the farmers of the United States better than the farmers of the County of Kent. If we had free trade with the United States this duty would be removed, and we would realize so much more on that product. I could follow this matter through every page of the Trade and Navigation Returns and show that, in the large variety of articles, our best market is the United States. I desire to point out the fact that in only one respect are we enjoying unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and that is with regard to our railways. Our railways have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. They can load a car at Chicago or Detroit and carry it to New York free of duty. I observe the hon. member for East Elgin in his seat, and I should like to ask him how many trains would pass through the town of St. Thomas if the railways did not enjoy unrestricted reciprocity. The whole traffic over the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Michigan Central would cease and be annihilated, and there would simply be a local train passing backwards and forwards along the line. Our railways have to pay 60 cents a ton on all the coal they consume, a heavy duty on locomotives and cars, oils and other materials that are necessary for operating the roads, but notwithstanding all those difficulties they are able to hold their own and compete successfully with the railways in the United States. Year after year they are increasing their traffic and doing an increased volume of trade. Compare for a moment our railways with our shipping. Of all the millions of tons of shipping that come down the great lakes from the west to the east only about 5 per cent. is carried in Canadian bottoms. Why? Because our vessels do not enjoy unrestricted reciprocity. They are not placed in the same position as our railways. A vessel loading in Buffalo cannot unload at Detroit without first touching a Canadian port and unloading. The consequence is, as I have said, that our share of the shipping trade on the great lakes only amounts to about 5 per cent. Remove that obstruction, give us unrestricted reciprocity, and immediately our vessels will be placed in the same position as our railways. And what will be the consequence? Immediately a great demand will spring up for Canadian vessels. New vessels will be constructed; there will be a demand made on the ship-building yards of the Maritime Prov-

inces and Ontario, and vessels will be constructed because there will be business for them to do, and thus the trade and commerce of the country will be greatly increased. I want to notice some of the arguments advanced against this proposed measure of unrestricted reciprocity. Some of our friends say this would be a disloyal measure, that it would discriminate against Great Britain, that it would lead to annexation, that it would lead to direct taxation. I do not intend to dwell very long on these points, but merely to touch on them, first, as to its being disloyal. There is no need to discuss that point. I consider myself as loyal as any man in this House or the country; but I do not think it is necessary for a man to be constantly preaching his loyalty. Whenever you find a man continually saying he is an honest man and very trustworthy it is desirable to look after your pocket, for if he can he will have his hand in it. So it is in respect to loyalty. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are always talking about their loyalty and saying we are disloyal, are, I think, loyal for revenue purposes. As to the point that this measure would lead to annexation, I do not think there is anything in that objection. With unrestricted reciprocity we would obtain all the advantages we possibly could obtain by annexation, without any of its disavantages. I believe our institutions are better that those of the United States, that our laws are better in many respects, and are better administered, and I like the position we occupy. But we want enlarged trade relations with the United States, we want the privilege of buying articles we can obtain cheaper there, and we also want the privilege of selling them our products which we can dispose of to advantage; and consequently we do not want their laws and their institutions, but their trade and their money. If we had unrestricted reciprocity by which we would have the privilege of buying and selling in those markets as it might suit us, that is all we want. So there is no danger of unrestricted reciprocity leading to annexation. When we had a reciprocity treaty in force from 1854 to 1866 it did not lead to annexation. In fact the feeling and desire for annexation which prevailed to a considerable extent in Canada immediately on the negotiation of that treaty died away, and when the treaty was abrogated, in 1866, every one will admit there was very little feeling in favour of annexation. I am sorry to say I believe that feeling is growing in Canada, that there are a great many people who are looking with a good deal of favour on closer associations with the people of the United States, and the reason of it is that they want freer trade with that people, and immediately we open the United States markets I believe that feeling will pass away altogether. Canada is one of the richest countries in the world in minerals. We have in Nova Scotia, what I believe is not elsewhere to be found, an abundant supply of the richest coal and iron at the same time. These minerals are close together on the lines of railway, close to the border and close to the seaboard, and if we had the privilege of sending the iron into the United States, I believe an immense development of the iron industry would take place. I see no reason why this should not occur; we have these minerals and the very best facilities for shipping them, and all we want is a market in which to sell our products. At the present time these producers have only the markets of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and part of the Province of Quebec. They cannot send iron to British Columbia or Ontario because the freight would eat up the profits, and we can even get iron from England cheaper than we can get it from there if it were obtained for nothing. So that they are limited, and the reason that they do not develop their mines is that they have not a market for their goods. It is the same way along the shores of Lake Superior. Every one knows that we have the richest mines on the north shore of Lake Superior that are to be found in any country in the world; they are far richer than those on the southern shore, and yet, strange to say, on the south shore there is bustle and activity and towns and cities are growing up, and factories and mines and rolling mills are established, and the immense product of that country is coming down the lakes every year; while on the Canadian side there is all desolation, and no towns or cities are growing there at all. The reason for that is that it would not pay a man, if he had the money, to develop these mines, and erect rolling mills, and put in the necessary capital, because he has not a market for the products of these mines; but the moment you open up a trade with the United States, the moment you remove the barriers between those two countries, you have almost an unlimited market, and a great development would take place so far as our minerals and mines are concerned. Now, with regard to our manufactures. I look upon our manufacturers with a good deal of faith, I am glad we have the enterprising manufacturers that we have in Canada, I believe they are helping to build up this country, and to make it great and prosperous, and, I believe, that once you remove the duties, a great proportion of them at least, will be benefited thereby. I know the great milling industry, which, perhaps, is one of the greatest industries in this Dominion to-day, and as a miller I have no hesitation in saying, that if we have free trade with the people of the United States, it would be one of the best things that could happen to the millers of this country. We have, as was stated here to-day, a very large amount of capital invested in our mills and mill plants, but we have not a market to sell our flour in. If you open up the Eastern States to us, and give us the markets in Buffalo, New York, Boston, and the New England States, where they do not raise one-tenth part of the quantity of flour they consume, the millers of this country would immediately find that a great impetus would be given to that industry; a larger number of men would be employed, and a great development would take place. A short time ago I was speaking to one of our largest carriage makers in the town of Chatham, Mr. Grey, of William Grey & Sons, a firm known all over the Dominion as one of the largest and best manufacturers of carriages that are to be found in any country, and Mr. Grey told me himself that if he had free trade with the United States he would be immediately able to employ 74 more hands, because, he said, we could manufacture buggies and waggons just as good and as cheap in Canada as in any other country in the world, if we were placed on the same terms as the other manufacturers. He says to-day that he cannot do this, for the reason that he has to pay $4 per ton duty on pig iron which he uses, $13 a ton on

round iron, 35 per cent. duty on oils and paints, and 60 cents per ton on coal, and consequently he cannot manufacture a buggy as cheap as he would under other circumstances. He said that if we were to take off the duty on these goods and give free trade we would be able to get our iron and coal and paints and oils upon the same terms as the American manufacturers, and we would be able to make as cheap a buggy as they did. Consequently, he said, that immediately the restrictions on this trade were removed he would be able to employ 75 more men. I have no doubt that the other manufacturers would be in the same position. We have also another large carriage factory there, belonging to Mr. Robert Milner, who also manufactures carriages and buggies on a very large scale, and they would be enabled to enlarge their plant and increase their output, and give employment to many more men if these duties were taken off. I do not wish at this late hour to detain the House too long, and I will only refer to one or two more items. I wish to say a few words on the question which has often been raised as to how we are to get our revenue under unrestricted reciprocity. It seems to me that our friends on the other side should not ask us how we are going to raise a revenue, and I do not think it is necessary to tell them. I do not think that the doctor is obliged to tell the prescription which he is giving to the patient. We say we can raise all the revenue we require, and we can do it without direct taxation. We have no fear but what we can raise the revenue and carry on the affairs of the country just as well with unrestricted reciprocity as the Government is doing to-day, and we can do so without direct taxation at all. Now, after all it is only a question of which shoulder you put the burthen on. It seems to me that it does not make very much difference to the people of Canada whether they take it out of one pocket or out of the other; as long as the money comes out of their pockets it does not make any particular difference which pocket it comes out of. I do not think anybody will contend that the amount of duties paid on goods coming in from the United States does not come out of the pockets of the people of Canada. I believe that every dollar of it does come out of our pockets. I believe that in the first place it is not necessary to spend as much money as the present Government is spending in carrying on the affairs of this country. When we find that the Mackenzie Administration carried on the affairs of this country at an expense of $23,500,000, and that we are to-day expending nearly $37,000,000, it seems to me that there is a great waste of money in some way. I will refer to just a few of the items in which a very unwarrantable increase of the expenditure has taken place. For instance, the interest on our public debt in 1878 was only $7,000,000, and to-day it is $9,656,000. In 1878 the administration of justice cost us $564,000, and this year it has increased to $709,000; Civil Government in 1878 cost $823,000, while last year it amounted to $1,300,000 in round numbers; the protection of our fisheries in 1878 was only $82,000, and last year it increased to $328,000; in 1878 our Indians cost $489,000, while last year the cost had increased to $1,107,000. We also had a very large increase last year in the cost of our North-West Mounted Police. For militia and defence we spent in 1878-9, $779,000, and last year that expenditure had crept up to $1,287,000. Right here I might say that in my opinion a very large saving might be made under that head. I do not believe that it is necessary to spend so much money as we do on that service, and I call to mind the speech addressed to this House by the late member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), in which he stated that out of the million and a quarter that was spent on the force, about $250,000 went to the men and about $1,000,000 to the officers. I think that was wrong, and a great saving should be made under that head. Then, the Royal Military College at Kingston is costing us about $100,000 a year, and I would like to ask what good that is to the people of this country? Then the revision of the voters' lists cost about $300,000 a year; this year I venture to say it will not be done for less than $300,000 or $400,000 besides; I think I may safely say that it will cost the two political parties at least $400,000. Now, I believe that is an utter waste of money, and it should be done away with altogether. I believe that the time has come in this country when we should give every man who is 21 years of age the right to vote. The old principle of compelling a man to own $200 or $300 before he is given a right to vote is wrong. Every young man in this country, no matter what his colour or his creed, or his nationality is as long as he is a British subject, should have a right to vote, because it must be remembered that these young men are contributing to the support of the country as well as anybody else. When the news was flashed across the wire a few years ago that a rebellion had broken out in the North-West it was the young men who left their farms, their workshops and their counting houses and went to suppress it; and many of them dyed the snows of the North-West with their blood; and if to-morrow a war should break out the Government would say to the young men: take your musket and go to the front, and do not dare to let the enemy cross that line except over your dead body. I ask if any man upon whom such a responsibility is placed, should be debarred from saying how or by whom this country should be governed. Many other ways might be pointed out in which the expenses of this country could be largely reduced; but seeing that the hour is so late I will not weary the House by dwelling upon the subject. I have only to say in conclusion that I believe that the very best thing that could happen to the people of this country would be to get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. It is possible that we may not be able to obtain a fair and equitable treaty. All we can do is to try. If we try and fail we cannot blame ourselves; but I believe, from the statements made by the leading men in the United States, that we can obtain such a treaty. At all events it is the bounden duty of the Government of this country to try to obtain such a treaty. If we can sell our raw products in the United States to advantage it would certainly, in my opinion, be much better for us if we could also buy what manufactured goods we could to advantage. Therefore, I believe it is the bounden duty of the Government to try in every possible way to secure large trade relations with the United States, and in that way promote the general welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. McLENNAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—CONTRACTS.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that a Message be sent to the Senate to request their Honours to grant leave to the Hon. Theodore Robitaille, one of their members, to attend and give evidence in the investigation now proceeding before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that a Message be sent to the Senate requesting their Honours to grant permission for the temporary occupation of one of their Committee rooms, by the officials employed in connection with the investigation now proceeding before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

G. A. BOURGEOIS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that leave be given to the Committee on Public Accounts to enquire about the payment of $600, made to G. A. Bourgeois, late post office inspector of the Three Rivers division, as such payment appears in the Auditor General's Report for 1889.

Motion agreed to.

DREDGING AT ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to enquire from the hon. Minister of Public Works when the report and documents concerning the dredging of the beach at St. Jean Deschaillons will be brought down? I have been told that these documents were ready.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I think that I shall be able to put them before the House on Monday next. I have enquired and I have been told that they were being prepared.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. LAURIER. I enquired yesterday about the absence of the superintendent of the Printing Bureau, and I was told by a member of the Government that the superintendent referred to has gone away on leave of absence. I would like to enquire whether the leave of absence is still running, and when it is to expire?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Leave of absence was asked upon a special order of the physican of Mr. Senecal, Dr. Clarence Church, of Ottawa. The leave of absence has not expired. I have communicated with the deputy superintendent of printing, who advises me that there is no absolute need of the presence at the office of the superintendent at the present time. The work of the office is going on very well and smoothly. I expect the superintendent back in a day or two, according to the last letter that he wrote himself to Mr. McMahon.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the services of the superintendent are not necessary at the present time when the House is in session, I would enquire whether it would not be quite easy to do without the services of a superintendent altogether? It seems to me that it is more necessary to have him here at the present than at any other time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that no discussion is allowed on a question like this, under the circumstances.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I desire, however, to say that the leave of absence was given on an order of the physician.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, 23rd ultimo, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. McLENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of this House for a short time while I make a few remarks on the subject before the Chair. This is my first attempt at speaking in this House, and I shall need the kind consideration of hon. members. I would begin by saying that the ways and means of raising a revenue for the requirements of the country, and the manner in which it is expended, are matters of very great importance. We must also bear in mind that the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which is also under discussion at the present time, involves the political and national existence of our country. At the last general election, in my county, and I suppose it was the same in all other sections of the Dominion, the great issue before the people was that of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, and, I suppose, political union, as a great many people believed that that would be the ultimate result of unrestricted reciprocity. On every occasion when I met my opponents on the platform, I asked them to explain how they were going to carry on the Government of the country in case unrestricted reciprocity was adopted, and our revenue from the present tariff was wiped away. On every occasion they refused to give me an explanation as to how this policy was to be carried out if they succeeded. We claim that it would create a deficiency in the revenue amounting to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000, and we asked our opponents to explain how this money was going to be raised if their policy were successful. They refused to do so. Now, Sir, I claim it is most unfair to the electors to ask them to vote on any question upon which a thorough explanation has not been given. It is most unfair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to place a policy before the country that

they are unwilling, in fairness to the electors, to explain how they propose to carry out, if they should succeed in obtaining power. In 1878, when the Conservative party was in Opposition, they placed a policy before the country and explained it, and they gave the electors an opportunity of voting on it intelligently, knowing what they might expect if the Conservatives carried the country. I have asked throughout my county how the policy of the Opposition was to be worked out? I have asked, on behalf of the electors, not only the Conservative electors but the Reform electors, this question, and I ask that same question here, Sir, and it is quite right that every Canadian should ask hon. gentlemen opposite to explain to the country how they propose to make up the deficiency in the revenue? An hon. gentleman, in this debate, stated the other day that they would explain their policy when they crossed over to the Government side of the House. If the honest electors have to wait till hon. gentlemen get on the Treasury benches, they will have to wait a long time, and it is necessary that they should know how the Opposition propose to carry out their policy before then. During the early part of my canvass I found there was a feeling in favour of unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada, because that policy was either insufficiently explained or improperly explained by it advocates. An hon. gentleman on this side of the House said the other day the electors seem to have been loaded on one side for some years. But when we met the electors of my county, and I suppose it was the same in other counties, when the matter was properly explained to them, and when the Opposition leaders refused to explain what they meant by unrestricted reciprocity, the people began to see that there was something wrong, that hon. gentlemen opposite were wearing a mask and were treating the electors most uncandidly. It is unfair to place a policy or an issue before a constituency without giving the people an opportunity of knowing how that policy or issue is proposed to be carried out. An hon. member said last night, I think the hon. member for Kent, that we were not in favour of any kind of reciprocity with the United States. I say this: I have nothing against the United States. I do not think there is any hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has anything personally against the United States. We want to do business with them. We want to deal fairly with them, and we ask them to deal fairly with us; but we do not propose to give away everything we have and to get nothing in return. In regard to what the hon. gentleman said the other night, that we were not in favour of any kind of treaty with the United States, I remind the House that the hon. gentleman quoted all the natural products of the country, and I ask permission of the House to read from the statute which was passed in 1879 by this Government, the following section:—

"Any or all of the following articles; that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bean seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, pease and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

It is clear from this that we are willing to enter into any reasonable treaty with the United States. I do not want this to be forgotten, that I insist on hon. gentlemen opposite explaining how their policy will work if they succeeded in carrying the country, and especially how they propose to make up the deficiency in the revenue. If it means direct taxation on the people, and if hon. gentlemen are afraid to tell the people what it really means, I, with every honest elector, must say that it is dishonest for any party to place a policy before the country of which they are afraid to show the true meaning. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has moved an amendment, in which he states:

"That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers."

Everything that comes into the country is an article of prime necessity, and everything imported is because the people require it. We find there is a treaty likely to be made in October next. Would it not be a sensible and businesslike proceeding to wait and see what that treaty will amount to before we forthwith give everything we have and take the duty off everything in this country, and afterwards be compelled to ask Uncle Sam to do something for us? That is not a business-like way of doing business. If hon. gentlemen opposite want us to enter into reciprocal trade relations with the United States, why should not one side of the House advise the other as to the best course to adopt in the interest of the country, instead of placing the subject in such a position that it will be impossible to make any treaty with the United States. Would it not appear that the Government should be allowed to have matters in their own hands until the negotiations at Washington have been concluded, and we ascertain that a treaty might have been entered into. At least it would be desirable to discuss the question here as the clauses of a Bill are discussed one by one by both sides of the House, and thus endeavour to secure the best interests of Canada in any negotiations entered into with the United States. I think that would be a fair thing to do. Now, I wish to condemn the speeches which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they stated that we in Canada are altogether helpless, and cannot live without the assistance of the United States. That is not a very patriotic argument, and such statements as that only tend to humiliate us as a nation, and may place in an awkward position the representatives of Canada when they go to Washington to negotiate a treaty. There was quite a discussion in the House the other night with regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) in amendment to the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will refer to a few points in that amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), and I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they were afraid of in it. That amendment asks the House—

"To approve of the policy of the Liberal-Conservativ Government in permitting the free importation of raw materials into Canada."

Do the hon. gentlemen opposite object to that? Have they an objection to the free importation of raw material, in order that labour may be employed in the manufacture of articles required in this country? Surely they should have no fault to find with that. The amendment then asks the approval of hon. gentlemen—

"To the liberal aid which has been granted to important and necessary public works, notably railways, canals and steamship lines, which have proved such important factors in developing our resources and facilitating our commerce."

Are the hon. gentlemen opposite opposed to developing the resources of the country, and to the wise and prudent management of our finances?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As in the Quebec Harbour Works.

Mr. McLENNAN. I hardly think they can have any objection to the prudent management of the finances of the country in an economical way. This amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet then asked the concurrence of the House in approving—

"Of the wise and prudent management of the finances which, adequately providing for the public service, has maintained and advanced the credit of the country, and while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure, has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years."

Do the hon. gentlemen opposite object, because there has been scarcely any increase in the debt of the country for the last two years? Would they like that the Conservative Government should pile up a debt upon the country as the Liberal Government did when it was in power? Do they approve of the action of the Government in taking the duty off tea and coffee? Hon. gentlemen opposite may object to this, but I am quite sure that the people of the country will not object to it. After the wise and generous policy of this Government in taking a duty to the extent of $3,500,000 off raw sugar, we have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say that this left the matter in a worse position than it was before. If that is the case, I would like to know how it is possible for any Government to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. The amendment to which I refer then says:

"That this House, while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and with the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenue which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with the continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians."

Do hon. gentlemen opposite object to that; do they object to our carrying on our negotiations as any self-respecting people should do; if they do not object, and I do not see how they can object, I cannot see why there should be a row kicked up by them on that matter. Now, in 1873, when the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power, they had a duty on tea and coffee, and some of the hon. gentlemen opposite told us the other day that tea and coffee were the proper articles on which to place a duty. That may be so, from their standpoint, but they must remember that tea and coffee are articles which are used by the poor people of this country more largely than by the wealthy class, and it is well that the people throughout this country should know that the placing of duties on tea and coffee is part and parcel of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gave us the other night some of his experience during the administration of the Reform party, and he said that during that period there were Singer sewing machines coming into this country, and that on enquiry he found that a sewing machine was manufactured at a cost of $9 and that it was sold in Canada for $48. That was during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not think it would be possible for any man to give a stronger argument in favour of the National Policy and of protection than that. It shows that when we were not manufacturing that machine in this country that they charged us 433⅓ per cent., I think, on the manufacturing cost of that article. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not such a free trader as you would suppose, if you take his past record during the administration of the Liberal Government. I have here a campaign sheet that was used in the elections of 1878 by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and it contains all their picnic speeches throughout Ontario. The hon. gentlemen had picnics in Canada in 1878, and they did not succeed in returning to power. Their picnics at that time were not a success, and previous to the last general election in 1891 they tried picnicking in the United States instead of in Canada. I believe that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite went down to New York, and the very first meeting they had there they talked a man to death. Not only that, but the annexationist, Mr. Longley of Nova Scotia, made a speech there as was reported in some of the New Brunswick papers.

Mr. FOSTER. The Nova Scotia papers.

Mr. McLENNAN. No; the New Brunswick papers. Moncton is in New Brunswick. There is a report here of the speech that Mr. Longley made on that occasion, interlarded with applause, and showing how his speech was appreciated by the audience; but the fact is that Mr. Longley never made that speech at all, for the gentleman who was to introduce the great orator from New Brunswick died suddenly at the meeting before he could make his speech. Now I will quote to the House what Mr. Mills of Bothwell said in 1878. He says:

"It is said the Americans have been injuring us by sending into Canada wheat, flour and Indian corn, and I wish to call your attention to this question. Before doing so, perhaps I had better give you some evidence of the fact that the duties imposed by the American Government upon the various products of the agriculturists of Canada have in nowise affected the prices of the various articles which have been sent into the American market from Canada."

There are a number of figures given here which I will not tire the House by reading, and if there be no objection, Mr. Speaker, I will hand them in. He says further:

"I have here the prices of the various farm products for the twenty-two years from 1854 to 1876, during eleven of which years reciprocity prevailed, and during the other eleven our produce was subject to high duties. In 1854, the Canadians received on the average for the horses they sold $65.27 per head; in 1855, $74.26; 1856, $77.08; 1857, $76.09; 1858, $79.07; 1859, $84.77; 1860, $81.97; 1861, $81.40; 1862, $77.13; 1863, $75.79; 1864, $78.46; 1865, $79.61. These were the years during which reciprocity was in force. In 1866 we received for horses, on an average, per head the sum of $92.79; 1867, $78.68; 1868, $82.14; 1869, $82.97; 1870, $87.97; 1871, $93.96; 1872, $101.38; 1873, $105.01; 1874, $107.44; 1875, $104.62; 1876, $102.89. Now, if the 20 per

cent. duty on horses had been said by the Canadian farmer, he would have received smaller prices during the years protection was in force than he did receive in the eleven years of reciprocity. But the fact was, he received higher prices. In regard to the prices of horned cattle, we received in 1854 an average per head of $23.83; 1855, $23.28; 1856, $24.29; 1857, $26.11; 1858, $22.24; 1859, $26.56; 1860, $27.70; 1861, $24.50; 1862, $20.31; 1863, $23.63; 1864, $30.70. These were during the years of reciprocity. Since then, under protection, we received for horned cattle, in 1865, $29.91; 1866, $22.85; 1867, $24.86; 1868, $24.77; 1869, $21.88; 1870, $27.91; 1871, $22.62; 1872, $28.12; 1873, $25.57; 1874, $24; 1875, $21.13; 1876, $23.70; the average in these latter years being quite as high as when they were admitted free from duty. Who, then, pays this tax of 20 per cent. on cattle imported into the United States? The average price per head that we received for sheep in 1854 was $1.75; 1855, $2.16; 1856, $2.83; 1857, $2.88; 1858, $2.20; 1859, $2.29; 1860, $2.76; 1861, $2.72; 1862, $2.47; 1863, $2.75; 1864, $4.58; 1865, $3.61; 1866, $3.40; 1867, 2.33; 1868, $2.28; 1869, $2.32; 1870, $2.63; 1871, $2.64; 1872, $2.87; 1873, $3.03; 1874, $2.74; 1875, $2.63; 1876, $3.59; the average being just as high during the eleven years when duties were imposed as when the sheep were admitted free. Next, take the prices of some of the cereals. In 1854—and mind, this was the period of the Russian war—we received for wheat an average price per bushel of $1.45; in 1855, $1.86; 1856, $1.39; 1857, $1.09; 1858, $0.96; 1859, $1.06; 1860, $1.10; 1861, $1.08; 1862, $0.96; 1863, $0.85; 1864, $0.93; 1865, $0.94; 1866, $1.32; 1867, $1.62; 1868, $1.15; 1869, $1.13; 1870, $1.04; 1871, $1.13; 1872, $1.30; 1873, $1.37; 1874, $1.34; 1875, $1.13; 1876, $1.11. I will now give you the price got for our wool during the same period: 1854, 24c.; 1855, 25c.; 1856, 26c.; 1857, 21c.; 858, 22c.; 1859, 30c.; 1860, 28c.; 1861, 28c.; 1862, 24c.; 1863, 35c,; 1864, 45c.; 1865, 43c.; 1866, 42c.; 1867, 34c.; 1868, 27c.; 1869, 28c.; 1870, 31c.; 1871, 29c.; 1872, 42c.; 1873, 46c.; 1874, 35c.; 1875, 34c.; 1876, 32c. I might go over the prices of barley, rye and other cereals with much the same result, thus establishing the incontrovertible fact, that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the products of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

Now, for a number of years there was a protective duty on horses in the United States of 20 per cent., and if that duty had been paid by the American farmer, he would have received smaller prices during the years protection was in force than he did receive in the eleven years of reciprocity; but the fact was, he received higher prices. The average price of a horse paid during the time of the Treaty of 1854, by the figures of the hon. member for Bothwell, was $77.57. The average price during the subsequent eleven years was $94.71. Horses brought, according to these figures, 22 per cent. more during the years of 20 per cent. protection, than during the eleven years of reciprocity. Horned cattle were about the same during the eleven years of reciprocity, and during the eleven years following. The prices of sheep were about the same. The average price of wheat during reciprocity was $1.14, and the average price during the eleven years after reciprocity was $1.24, being an increase of 9 per cent. during the eleven years following reciprocity. Wool during reciprocity was 30 cents a pound, and during the eleven years following it was 34½ cents a pound, being 15 per cent. higher during protection than during reciprocity. These are the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell made at a picnic held at Fergus, Ontario, on Saturday, July 7, 1878, at which speeches were delivered by Hon. Messrs Mackenzie, Cartwright and Mills. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will see from this that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they did not believe in this free trade principle that they advocate so strongly now. They had a large majority in this House between 1873 and 1878; but in 1878 we placed a policy before the country, and explained to the people what we proposed to do. We appealed to the people, and they elected us by a very large majority. Hon.

gentlemen opposite were not satisfied with that, and there was another appeal to the electors with regard to the conduct and legislation and management of the public affairs of this country by the Conservative party; and the electors again decided in our favour. Four times they decided in our favour, and nothing can show a justification of our policy more clearly than that; and as long as hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to tell the electors of the country what they mean by the policy they lay before them, they will continue to remain in the cold shades of Opposition. Now, a good deal has been said in this House about the High Commissioner coming to this country to take part in the elections. The High Commissioner is not an ordinary man. He is the representative of the Government and of this country, and he is supposed to protect its interests; as a Privy Councillor he is sworn to be true and loyal to its institutions, and that being the case, if he thought there was an attempt made by hon. gentlemen opposite to do anything that was against the interests of this country, he was perfectly justified to come to this country and take part in our elections. Now, as hon. gentlemen are so particular about matters of that kind, I would like to say to them that if they want to do away with all interference of officials in elections, they should commence at home. In my county we have a large number of officials of the Provincial Government, who are the most active election agents for the Grit party. I will give you a list of the number of officials we have in Ontario, and every man of them is an active man in elections. There are 321 division court clerks, 347 division court bailiffs, 297 license commissioners, 52 jailers, 45 sheriffs, 43 deputy sheriffs, 52 turnkeys, 41 clerks of the peace, 61 registrars, 61 deputy registrars, 100 license inspectors, 90 police magistrates, 50 wood rangers, foremen on colonization roads, and employees whom they engage at election times, and many more too numerous to mention, paid at the expense of the province, all making up several thousand men; and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, from my experience there is not one of these men who is not most active in the fray when there is an election. The very moment an election is announced, they are up in arms, and when there is a close and tight election, they are not satisfied with the officials in a constituency, but they send the provincial officials all over the country. In my election, a man of the name of Mr. Patullo, from Woodstock, who was the organizer of the party opposite in 1878, and who was then, and is now, county registrar of Oxford, came to my county. I think he also visited the Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Huntingdon. He travelled through the whole of my county taking part in the election, although he was a paid official, as I have said, of the Mowat Government. He is only one of thousands, and you can put them all on a par; there is no difference between them in regard to interfering in elections. Now, there are very many of such in my constituency, but I will simply give the names of certain parties so that their actions may be enquired into. There is one McNab, the license inspector in my constituency, who is the most active man we have in the county. He was a member of this House at one time, and he makes special visits to hotels at election times and intimidates hotel-keepers, telling them that complaints have been made against them and that if they do not look out they will be in danger of losing their

licenses. More than that. I tell you, Sir, that neither I nor any other Conservative can afford to even loan money in my constituency upon hotel property, because if I did, and if the property should fall into my hands, I could do nothing with it, as anyone to whom I would lease or rent it could not get a license. When there is an election or an election protest, this commissioner goes around with his hat collecting money; and it is not left to these men to give what they are willing to subscribe, but they must give what the commissioner says they must subscribe, so that a hotel in that county is not worth anything unless it is owned by a Reformer, no Conservative being able to get a license. There is but one exception, and that exception was due solely to the strong fight which was made through the press for the last three years. A widow who has the best hotel in the County of Glengarry, the best hotel, I may say, in the eastern counties, could not get a license, and her only sin was that her husband, who died a few years ago, was a Conservative. But public feeling became so strong that they had at last to give her a license. That is the way the Mowat Government officials are dealing with the hotel-keepers and the people of this country; and I tell you, Sir, the hotel-keepers and everybody under the power of that Government, are not men but slaves, in this province. Now, there is in the County of Glengarry a man named John Macdougal, who was disqualified for seven years on account of his corrupt acts, who was deprived of his franchise during that time, but he was made division court clerk by Mr. Mowat, and in that capacity is most active in promoting the interests of his friends during the elections. He was the chief organizer of the party in the county: he was a stumper and a buttonholer, and he buttonholed every man who came into the county, and the officials of Mr. Mowat buttonhole every man who comes into the county, from one end of it to the other. When a farmer comes in, this man will ask him: How are the crops? Well, they are not very good, will be the reply. Oh, that miserable Conservative Government, we must get rid of it, they are ruining the country, he will tell the farmer; and the price of grain is so low, we cannot get a good price for anything, and you will never have any luck while the Conservative party are in power. That sort of thing has been going on for years. This man has been the chief organizer and one of the chief stumpers of the Grit party, and, owing to his good conduct in supporting the party and making himself so officious in the elections, he was promoted by Mr. Mowat to the position of County Court clerk, in which position he enjoys, not a salary, but an income of about $3,000 —all owing to his being a good boy and getting himself disqualified on account of his corrupt acts during elections. Again, these hon. gentlemen talk about interference in elections. The *Electeur*, one of the organs of the leader of the Opposition, during the last elections, said:

"Two trains of the Grand Trunk Railway, one with twenty-three and another with twenty-seven cars, drawn by three locomotives, arrived at Lévis conveying two thousand Canadian voters, who had come to exercise their right of franchise. All these voters were unanimous in their support of Mr. Laurier and reciprocity, and at all the stations along the road they cheered for Mr. Laurier and commended him to their friends."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLENNAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear;" that pleases them, but if it was on the other side, would it please them as well? It was all right for the Grand Trunk Railway to do this and bring in voters under their influence, but hon. gentlemen opposite think differently with regard to Sir Charles Tupper and the Canadian Pacific Railway; there is no doubt of that. I have a letter here from a man in my constituency, who writes as follows:—

"The following is a true and unexaggerated statement of the influence brought to bear on me by the Grand Trunk Railway at the last general elections. About the 1st of February I was engaged under C. Durocher, as station hand on the Lancaster section, and about two weeks before the election, the road master, J. McGovern, came to me and asked me which way I was going to vote. I said I was going to vote right, to which he replied: See that you do. His manner and tone implied a threat, and Durocher, the foreman, told us the next day, that he was told to discharge every man who voted for the Conservative candidate. I voted on March 5th, and marked my ballot for the Government candidate. I made no secret of it. The next day, the road master, hearing of this, discharged me, giving no reason for doing so. I am perfectly satisfied the only reason McGovern had was that I had not voted for the Reform party.

(Signed) "R. D. McCORMICK."

Now, I listened the other night to hon. gentlemen speaking on the opposite side, trying, of course, to justify the action of the Reform party during their term of office, and making a comparison with regard to the expenditure and increase of debt, and so forth. I did not expect, when coming to this House as a new member, that I would find any hon. gentleman opposite who would dare to make any comparison between the Government which held office from 1873 to 1878 and the present Government. I think they had better let that matter rest. However, an hon. gentleman took upon himself to make a comparison—an unfair comparison, I consider. Now, let us see how this debt has come about, and what we have to show for it. Well, at the time of Confederation in 1867, the Federal Government assumed the debts of the provinces. They assumed the debts of Upper and Lower Canada to the extent of $62,500,000, the debts of Nova Scotia to the extent of about $8,000,000, and of New Brunswick to the extent of about $7,000,000. The Dominion Government started in then with a net indebtedness of $75,728,000. We find now that we have a net debt in 1890 of $237,500,000. Since 1867 we have assumed other debts, making in all assumed for them $109,000,000, and we have paid subsidies to the provinces of something over $80,000,000. This will leave a net indebtedness of $47,500,000—taking out the debts assumed by the Federal Government and the subsidies paid to the provinces, and there can be no objection to charging the subsidies paid to the provinces, because the leader of the Opposition has stated that he is in favour of carrying out the terms of the Quebec conference, let us see what the debt amounts to outside of these items. As I have stated, the debt was $75,728,000 in 1867, and it was $237,500,000 in 1890, an increase of $161,000,000 since Confederation. During the Reform administration of five years, the increase was $40,500,000. I want the party opposite, and the country to distinctly understand that they must be held responsible for the time that they were in office, and we are willing on this side of the House to be responsible for any increase of debt during the time that the Conservative party have been in power. Between 1873

and 1878, they added to the debt $40,500,000. We will add to that the Fishery Award which was paid to those hon. gentlemen during the last year of their administration, amounting to $4,500,000, which makes a total increase of $45,000,000 during their five years of office, or an average increase in the debt of $9,000,000 a year. The increase in the debt during the Conservative Government, for eighteen years, was $121,000,000, less the provincial debts assumed since 1867—and, as there is no such charge against hon. gentlemen opposite and it is not an ordinary transaction, we have a right to credit ourselves with that amount—and that leaves a total increase in the debt, in the eighteen years, of $90,000,000, or a Conservative annual increase of $5,000,000, or $4,000,000 less than the average increase during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Between 1873 and 1878, the increase in interest was 27 cents, or an average increase of 5⅖ cents *per capita* a year. From 1878 to 1890, the increase has been 7¼ cents a year against 5⅖ cents a year during their term of office. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a statement in 1884, which is reported in *Hansard*, vol. I, page 597, in which he said it would be better for this country to borrow three or four hundred million dollars and throw it into the ocean or blaze it away in fireworks than to have this Government in power and to have the money spent in that way. I am surprised that any hon. gentleman holding the position socially and politically that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford holds, and the chief critic of the Reform party, should make such reckless statements. Even supposing our railways and canals, and the Parliament buildings where we are now standing, were of no use at all, as stated by the hon. gentleman, still the money which had been expended in the country on those works is a benefit to the people. That was a reckless statement, and an hon. gentleman holding such a position as he does in this country and in this House, whether his position is to be envied or not, at all events holding the position he does in his party, ought not to make such a reckless statement; and when he does make such a statement, what faith can you have in any statements he makes afterwards upon other subjects? The expenditure of the money of this country has not been recklessly carried on. In the United Kingdom the railways cost $216,000 a mile, in Belgium $177,000, in France $143,000 a mile, in Germany $103,000, in Russia $97,000 a mile, in Austria $97,000 a mile, in Victoria $66,000 a mile, in India over $64,000 a mile, in New South Wales $64,000 a mile, and in Canada only $56,900 a mile. So you can see that our railways have not cost any way as much as those in other countries, and the rates charged for our carrying trade are much cheaper than in any other country in the world. In England it is 2 cents per ton per mile, in Germany 1·70 cents, in Belgium 1·57 cents, in France 2·14 cents, in Italy 2·40 cents, in Holland 1·50 cents, in Russia 2·32 cents, in the United States 1·04 cents, and in Canada only ·93 cents per ton per mile. We have more miles of railway in proportion to our population than any other country. In Great Britain and in Europe, the population per mile of railway averages 3,224, and in Canada it averages 491, while our carrying trade is cheaper than in any country in the world. Now, as the hon. gentleman said he thought it would be better that money should be thrown away in the ocean or blown away in fireworks than spent as it has been by this Government, let us see what we have done with that money. Our canals and river improvements have cost us about $36,000,000. We have the finest lakes and rivers in the known world; we have a chain of navigation from Port Arthur and Duluth to the Straits of Belle Isle and through to Liverpool, a distance of 4,500 miles. Nature has done a great deal for this country in the way of lakes, rivers and harbours, and she also placed difficulties in the way which had to be overcome, and that could only be overcome by the use of large sums of money. Unconnected these lakes and rivers would not make an open chain of navigation, and we have connected them by the expenditure of a large sum of money in building artificial waterways in the way of canals. We have the Intercolonial Railway, which has cost us somewhere in the neighbourhood of $46,000,000; and I think every hon. member in this House will admit that it was necessary in the interest of this country to build that road. Again, the debts of the provinces have been assumed, since 1867, to the extent of $31,000,000, and we have expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway about $62,000,000, and these four items make a total expenditure of $175,500,000. In these four items alone we have $13,500,000 more than the total increase of the debt, and if we include the amounts paid in subsidies to the provinces since 1867, $80,000,000, we will have $93,000,000 more than the whole increase of the debt, to say nothing about all the other public works, Parliament buildings, post offices, Custom-houses, railway subsidies to other railways, light-houses, docks, wharves, and a thousand other improvements of an expensive and useful character, necessary for the improvement and development of the country. So far as the expenditure of our money is concerned, I think any reasonable man in this House or in the country will admit that it has been properly and wisely expended. Now we will come to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have done considerable work on railways myself as a contractor, not only upon that railway but others as well. Between 1873 and 1878 hon. gentlemen opposite tried to introduce a scheme to build that road. They wanted to build it by water, to utilize the water stretches. Well, you can understand a man going up to the North-West Territories with his family, and furniture, and various effects of all descriptions; you can understand what a time he would have getting to that country through this route the hon. gentlemen proposed to build. Go by rail, then a piece by water, then cross a bridge by tramway, then take a scow, then another tug or a Red river cart, and he might get there, but he would have a pretty lively time of it before he got to his journey's end. A few years ago there was a great cry throughout the country that we did not have cars enough to bring down here all the wheat they had in the North-West. Well, now I would ask how would you get down 15,000,000 bushels of wheat by this line that the hon. gentlemen proposed to build? It is only for a few months during the summer that their line could be used; and how would you be able to get that wheat down here? Is there any man in this House or in the country who will justify the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite at that time in regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway? I say it is a most

fortunate thing for this country that they did not get anybody with confidence enough in the scheme to enter into a contract with them and to put their money into it. It would be just throwing so much money away if they had succeeded in getting anybody to build that road. Well, when they started out, they could not get anybody to take the contract, and they started out to build it themselves, and at the rate they were going on it would take them about 100 years to complete the road, and we would never see it completed. However, the elections came round and the people saw the fallacy of their scheme and the mismanagement of their administration during the time they were in power. They were turned out, and Sir John and his Government came into power in 1878. Confidence was restored to the country, and Sir John's Government entered into a contract to build and equip the road from ocean to ocean. During the letting of the contract hon. gentlemen opposite placed every obstacle they could in the way, and they brought forward a company which was said to be a bogus company at the time. I do not know why the gentlemen composing that company should lend themselves to anything of that kind. You will understand the dishonour of a thing of that kind if you were to let a contract and then allow another man to follow and say, I will do it cheaper than this man, and then you took it away from the first man and give it to the second one. I tell you that a man, or a railway company, or any other corporation that would do that sort of thing are not deserving of any trust or confidence in any way whatever. The moment the contract was let, hon. gentlemen opposite at once commenced crying down the country, and injuring its credit and preventing this Government, if possible, building the road. They said the North-West was a barren wilderness and that Dakota and Texas were more suitable States in which our people should settle. Unfortunately very many people in this country took this advice and went, but they are returning as rapidly as they can and are settling in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. They said the construction of the road would plunge us into bankruptcy, that it would not pay the axle grease, and that it would cost $8,000,000 a year to run it, that it was impossible to build it within ten years, that British Columbia was "a sea of mountains." They further said the whole credit of the country could not build the road; and if we loaned $30,000,000 to assist in constructing the road we would never get it returned to the treasury. In fact, they painted everything as black as possible. Let me now present the other side of the case. What would have happened to this country if this $30,000,000 loan had not been granted? But it was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and we have got it back. The contract was let as stated, and completed in five years, not in ten years as hon. gentlemen said it was impossible to complete it in, and not in 100 years, the time it would have taken hon. gentlemen opposite to build it if the task had been left in their hands, and if they had proceeded with the work as they were doing it when they were routed from office. And it has paid the axle grease for the wheels and it has not cost the country $8,000,000 a year to run it, and it has been found that our North-West lands are better than Texas or Dakota. The road is paying well, the stock is advancing, the $30,000,000 loan has been paid back, and many millions of dollars have been circulated through the country. Let me ask what would have happened the country if this $30,000,000 loan had not been granted. The Canadian Pacific Railway would have been bankrupt, the financial institutions of the country would have been bankrupt, the wholesale men would have been bankrupt, as would have been the manufacturers, and, in fact, the position of the country would have been such that fifty years would have been required to recover. Let me now show the amount of money expended on the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. From Montreal to Vancouver the distance is 2,906 miles. The average cost of our railways is about $57,000 per mile. This would make on the main line a cost of $165,642,000, and taking $62,000,000, which the country has paid for the building of the road, it would leave on the main line an outlay of outside capital of $103,642,000, which was expended in this country. Again, there are about 4,000 miles more of branch lines built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which, taking the average cost of railways in Canada at $57,000 per mile, would necessitate a capital expenditure of $228,000,000. After deducting the $62,000,000 paid the Canadian Pacific Railway in cash, there was actually expended an outside capital of $103,000,000 and $228,000,000, making in all $331,000,000 spent in the country by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have the railway, and they cannot take it away from us, and it is as useful to us as if it had been built by the Government. The land we gave is open for settlement and cannot be taken out of the country, and every dollar received for land is invested in the railway. The Opposition desired that the Government should build this road and increase the debt of the country by over $100,000,000 on the main line. Again, they said the Government should operate the road, because it would not pay the axle grease and would cost $8,000,000 a year to run it. This alone would be 4 per cent. on $200,000,000. This would be verily a profitable investment for the country, first increasing the debt by $100,000,000, then operating it at a cost of $8,000,000 a year. Thus we are saving 4 per cent. on $200,000,000 by allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to run the road. Such were the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with this great enterprise, and these, as well as their predictions regarding the developments of this country, have proved erroneous. This is their past record, and this is the only means we have of judging of their ability. They have opposed everything and they have accomplished nothing themselves. They say that Mr. Abbott should not be Premier of this Government, because at one time he was chief adviser of this great enterprise, which they could not carry out successfully. This is, I consider, the greatest certificate of ability that could be given to Mr. Abbott. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the United States and want us to join hands with them, from a farming standpoint, but they forget to make comparisons between this and any other country. Let me say that the land in the United States is not better cultivated than is the land in Canada, and does not give as large a yield; and from the

statistics that have been presented to the House, it does not appear that the American farmers are to be envied even although they have a market of 60,000,000 people at their doors. They are hopelessly in debt and they have chattel mortgages, land mortgages, bills of sale, and mortgages on their crops growing in the fields before they are harvested. I have a statement here showing the mortgages on the farms in some States of the United States which I will read to the House. In ten States of the American Union an examination was had as to the amount of farm mortgages, with the following result as reported by the New York *Times*:

Ohio	$761,000,000	at 6 p. c.	$45,660,000	per annum.
Indiana	398,000,000	"	23,880,000	"
Illinois	620,000,000	"	37,200,000	"
Wisconsin	250,000,000	"	15,000,000	"
Michigan	350,000,000	"	21,000,000	"
Minnesota	175,000,000	"	10,500,000	"
Iowa	351,000,000	"	21,060,000	"
Nebraska	140,000,000	"	8,400,000	"
Kansas	200,000,000	"	12,000,000	"
Missouri	237,000,000	"	14,220,000	"
			$208,920,000	
Average interest per State			20,892,000	

It is estimated that there are mortgages in the United States to the extent of $9,000,000,000, or at the rate of $144 per head for every man, woman and child in the United States. That is the state of things in that country. Now, if we take the States bordering on Canada, we find that they are not increasing in population, according to the last census, at the same rate as the population of Canada is increasing. According to the last census, the acreage of land cultivated in the United States increased by only 11 per cent., whereas the acreage of land under cultivation in Canada increased by 43 per cent. If you compare the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, with the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts, you will find that the population of these Canadian provinces has increased a great deal faster than the population of the States I have mentioned. During the last twenty years the decrease in crops in these States has been 3,500,000 bushels, whereas the increase in the Canadian provinces I have mentioned has been 16,000,000 bushels. Therefore, our provinces are going ahead, while those States are drying up and becoming deserted by the farming community. The Department of Agriculture at Washington gives the yield of the same four States since 1880, and it shows a falling off in their crops to the extent of 1,300,000 bushels in eight years, while our provinces have improved. Dakota, that land of milk and honey to which hon. gentlemen opposite advised our farmers and young men to go, is in a terrible state of destitution. Their lands, teams, implements, horses, cattle, growing crops and everything they possess are mortgaged. They are paying 2 and 3 per cent. per month on their mortgages, and the farmers in that State are now leaving their lands in the hands of the capitalists, and returning to be prosperous in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The following report is furnished by the *Bankers' Monthly*, a United States publication of excellent reputation, entirely free from party or faction, and it presents a sad spectacle. The mortgage indebtedness of:

Kansas is	$ 235,000,000,	with an interest	debt of	$14,100,000
Indiana	645,000,000	" "	"	38,700,000
Iowa	567,000,00	" "	"	34,020,000
Wisconsin	500,000,000	" "	"	30,000,000
Illinois	367,000,000	" "	"	22,020,000
Ohio	1,127,000,000	" "	"	67,620,000

Summing it all up shows us that the farms of these States alone are mortgaged to the tune of $3,441,000,000 and of which the interest alone, computed at 6 per cent., which is much below the usual rate paid there, would amount to $206,406 per annum—and yet the farmers of these States have enjoyed all the advantages of the 60 million market at their very doors. This is the point I wish to bring out. It will be seen that with all these advantages, their future is one of abject poverty "if not slavery." The six States mortgaged for $3,441,000,000, and the average mortgage per State is $573,500,000. Now let us see about England. In England the average yield in grain is 29 bushels per acre, but owing to the amount of grain raised in other countries and the reduction in price, this became unprofitable and the area of wheat acreage has decreased about 27 per cent. during the last ten years. Before the Depression Committee in England, Sir James Cairn and others, the highest authorities in England on agricultural matters, have estimated that the tenants' capital in ten years (1875 to 1885) has been reduced by £81,000,000 sterling. That the tenant farmer had actually lost in ten years a sum equal to over $400,000,000. That since 1885 there has been no improvement whatever in the condition of the farmers of Great Britain but they are still on the down grade. According to the annual returns of the Loan Companies and Building Societies in Canada, the amount overdue in 1880 was $4,130,557, and in 1890 only $2,055,427. This shows over $20,000 less than half overdue principal on the mortgages in favour of 1890. This will show the condition of the farmer and his ability to pay now as compared with some years ago. The amount of foreclosures was, in 1880, $2,096,956, and in 1890, $2,062,033. Here are less foreclosures in 1890 than in 1880 by over $34,000. By looking carefully into statistics of both countries I find that the mortgage indebtedness in the United States is at least over 125 per cent. higher than in Canada. We have settlements in Canada, Sir, with not a dollar of mortgage. The people have comfortable brick houses, substantial outbuildings and good furniture, with pianos and organs; they have covered carriages, and our young men can smoke their Havana cigars and drive their girls to the picnics. We have prosperity in our country, and we have no depression and misery such as they have in the States of the American Union. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that there has been a great depreciation in the value of land in Canada of late years. But we must remember that we have opened up a great deal of new land in the North-West and many of our young men are going to the North-West and taking up farms, and that would naturally throw a good deal more land upon the market in this section of the country. But take the North-West, and take the Dominion of Canada from one end of it to the other, and you will find that the value of our property has largely increased if we consider the value of the land, the implements, the stock, and the improvements. Now, a great deal has been said about the manufacturers, and hon. gentlemen opposite try to make

the farmers believe that they should be driven clean out of the country. Well, the farmers do not believe that. I know myself, of my own personal knowledge, that in my constituency there is not a town or village or cross-roads but would be glad to have a manufacturing industry started there; and although hon. gentlemen opposite call them legalized robbers, we would be glad to get some of these legalized robbers to start business among us. I hope they will, because the existence of these factories increases the value of lands in the neighbourhood, creates labour and circulates money, and this is exactly what we want. Now, in regard to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, though the comparison made by the hon. member for Bothwell was not favourable to that treaty, there were circumstances at that time that should be taken into consideration. The Russian war was going on, and there was also fighting in the United States. The people were not producers at that time, either in the United States, in Russia, or in Great Britain; so that we had an open market for everything we wished to sell; and I believe that if the same condition of things existed now, it would be a great benefit to this country, whether we had reciprocity or not. Now, when hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the depression in Canada—and they certainly take a great deal of trouble to show that there is a depression in our own country—I think it would look reasonable and fair if they made a comparison with some other country. Their whole aim seems to be to belittle their own country; they seem as if they would like the outside world to believe that we are paupers, and cannot live without the assistance of our American friends across the border. Now, with regard to reciprocity in natural products, I have no doubt we should derive some advantage from it in the case of many articles, and I am in favour of it if it can be got upon fair and honourable terms. I am in favour of reciprocal trade relations with the United States in a fair way; but I am not in favour of giving away everything we have and receiving nothing in return. I am bound to stand by my nationality and my country, and our connection with the British Empire. We will always uphold that and stand by it. At the same time, anything we can do that is in reason, and consistent with the best interests of the country and with maintaining our rights, I am in favour of. I think it is quite proper that we should enter, as early as possible, into a fair treaty, such as the Government are anxious to get with the United States. But I am opposed to the United States having the management of our revenue and taxation; I am opposed to adopting their Customs duties, which are twice as high as ours, and direct taxation along with them; and under the principle which hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating, we would not have the management of our Customs duties. Now, something has been said about the price of wheat, and one hon gentleman opposite, I think from Huron, tried to make out that when grain was cheap the policy of this Government was to blame for that. Now, I have a statement of the prices of wheat from 1873 to 1889, showing the highest price and the lowest price for every year; and I would just say that this report was taken from the books of Ogilvie & Co., Montreal, the largest grain dealers in Canada. I got it some time ago, and they did not know what I wanted it for; I was not in Parliament at the time. That report shows that in April, 1880, the price of wheat was 71½ cents, while in September of the same year the price was $2. Therefore, according to the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, in April we would have a very poor Government, because the price of wheat was so low, and in September, when the price was high, we would have the most magnificent Government you ever saw. You see that kind of argument goes for nothing; I do not think it worth while paying any attention to it. We know that the home market rules prices in this country; and the production of grain in other countries has been so great of late years that it is perhaps the cause of the falling off in price here. Although you hear hon. gentlemen opposite saying a great deal about our young men going across to the United States, you find that very few of them are doing business there in a farming way. I find that the average of our wheat growth per acre in Canada is about 8 bushels more than it is in the United States. Now, with regard to this issue of unrestricted reciprocity which has been before the country, I shall have to say a few words concerning that. The Hon. Edward Blake said that unrestricted reciprocity would be discrimination against England and would lead to political union with the United States. Now, there are many hon. gentlemen opposite who should not refuse to accept the opinion of Mr. Blake. Mr. Blake was a very honest man in their estimation; he has been the leader of that party for many years, and that is what he says of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Blaine says that you cannot remain under the British flag and deal with the United States; that if you want the advantages of the market of the United States, you must become Americans. There is no uncertain sound about that, so far as Blaine and the Republicans of the United States are concerned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the reason of the two visits to Washington.

Mr. KENNY. By whom?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance and Sir Charles Tupper, if you want to know.

Mr. McLENNAN. But the Minister of Finance and Sir Charles Tupper went in the day-time. The hon. gentleman opposite from South Oxford went between two days. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not like to hear this. The Hon. Mr. Hitt had reported a resolution from the Committee of Foreign Affairs to the House of Representatives, proposing commercial union with Canada. He described that union in these terms:

"What is commercial union with Canada. It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties or taxes to be levied on goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of Custom-houses on the north, by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada; abolishing their Custom-houses along the same line by which they collect duties on goods we send into Canada, and leaving intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada as it is between the States. The line of Custom-houses will follow the sea and include both countries. The internal revenue system of taxes on liquors and tobacco in the two countries would also have to be made uniform in both."

They will not even allow you to have anything to say about your tobacco and whiskey. Mr. Wiman, in the United States, pointed out the means to cap-

ture Canada; and I am sorry to have to say it, but the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been agitating, in and out of Parliament, the doctrine which will bring utter ruin to Canada and dependence upon the United States, and his party are agitating in that line as well. In the Boston *Herald* of the 22nd January, it was reported that Mr. Murray, the celebrated American author, found fault with unrestricted reciprocity, as introduced by Mr. Wiman, on the ground that it did not ensure the annexation of Canada to the United States. Mr. Wiman, who was the originator of the scheme, who is the real leader of the party opposite, briefly replied to the arguments used by Mr. Murray. He pointed out that if it was desired to lessen the power of England, that end could not be accomplished better than by Canada trading with the United States and ceasing to trade with Great Britain. "The very thing Mr. Murray wants to accomplish," said Mr. Wiman, "will be better accomplished by the plan I propose than by the plan he proposes." Now, there is no uncertain sound about that to anybody who understands the meaning of the language used by these gentlemen. What does Mr. Farrer say in a letter dated Toronto, 22nd April, 1889, to Mr. Wiman? Mr. Farrer says:

"Secondly, the general belief is that the Republicans would not listen to any such scheme. Thirdly, a very large number of persons are inclined to think we had better make for annexation at once instead of wasting two bites on the cherry. Lastly, the old parties here are rapidly breaking up, and when Sir John goes, we shall be adrift without a port in sight, save annexation. Moreover, although the Liberals have taken up commercial union they are not pushing it with any vigour."

"When Sir John is dead, there will be no port in sight save annexation," is the opinion expressed by the leading editor of the leading organ of the Reform party, who was engaged by one of the leaders of the Reform party, who now sits in this House. Sir, newspaper men are supposed to be the educators of public opinion; and this is the direction in which this gentleman, the mouthpiece of the Liberal party, is educating the people of Canada. If hon. gentlemen opposite are not in sympathy with the opinions of their editor, who is managing their leading journal, it is their duty at once to get rid of him; and so long as they keep him in their employment as leading writer on their chief organ, they endorse the policy he advocates through that paper. A little further on, in the same letter, Mr. Farrer says:

"The littleness and half-heartedness of the Liberals is also very disheartening. Then, again, the truth is, that every man who preaches commercial union would prefer annexation, so that the party is virtually wearing a mask."

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite began preaching commercial union and then changed to unrestricted reciprocity. The editor of their chief organ says that every man who advocated commercial union would prefer annexation, and that they were wearing a mask. They were wearing a mask in mine and other constituencies, when they would not explain what they meant by this policy of unrestricted reciprocity. And he adds:

"Can't you come around this way and have a talk?

"Yours very truly,

(Signed) "E. FARRER."

Mr. Hitt says:

"There is some logic in what Farrer says of not making two bites of a cherry, but going for annexation at once."

Mr. McLENNAN.

Now, Sir, you will see the conspiracy that is being worked against the people of this country, and you will see, from the very facts I have given and the letters that changed hands between these parties, that there was a conspiracy working, and that these gentlemen were wearing a mask; and they said that if they could only get Sir John—our late lamented leader, whom we are all sorry to lose, and who was so good, and true, and loyal to the interests of this country—out of the way, there would be no port in sight but annexation. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have been to the United States very often previous to the last election. We never noticed that disposition on their part before. We never before saw our Canadian politicians parading the United States to such an extent as the hon. gentlemen opposite did. They indulged in banquets there, and were going to hand over our country to the United States, and some of them were going to be elected senators and all that sort of thing, and they were having a grand time generally. And, as I said before, they made speeches and had speeches of theirs reported which they did not make. Why were they over there? They ask what authority has this Government to send representatives to Washington? This Government has authority to negotiate with the United States and enter into a treaty with regard to trade relations with the United States, if it thinks such a treaty advisable. But the Opposition had no authority to pledge this country to anything; and if they did pledge this country, it must have been on the understanding that they would receive some assistance from the Americans in return for the sacrifice they were going to make to the United States of this country. Here are Mr. Longley of Nova Scotia, and Mr. Wiman, and Mr. Farrer, and the Ontario and Quebec representatives, down in Boston, New York and Washington. Here are these letters which I have read. It is right and proper, and I have always understood it so, to judge men generally by the company they keep. Now, the company that the hon. gentleman has kept was hostile to the interests of this country. I have here an extract from a Buffalo paper. We find that the press of the United States, and the press of Great Britain, and of all other countries have pronounced upon this subject, and they say this would lead to political union, that it would lead to annexation. Here are disinterested opinions, and disinterested opinions on matters of this kind are certainly of some value. The Buffalo *News* says:

"There are many Canadians now in the Liberal party who favour free trade relations, but are not prepared to go so far as to support unrestricted reciprocity because they regard it as the first step towards annexation, for which they are not prepared. Their opinion on this matter cannot be successfully combatted. Commercial union would compel Canada to adopt our tariff policy, and the loss of fiscal independence would pave the way for the loss of political independence. Besides, under such conditions there would be a discrimination against England in favour of the United States, and that would about snap the loose tie that now binds Canada to the mother country. Every vote cast for the Liberal candidate in most of the constituencies at least will be, in effect, a vote for annexation, since commercial union must lead to that. We have never been able to form any idea over here just how much feeling for annexation there is in Canada, but this contest will give something of a notion. Should the Liberals triumph all doubts will be set at rest as to what is Canada's destiny. It will not be so many years before she will be knocking at the door of Uncle Sam."

Now, as I have stated, unrestricted reciprocity would cause a considerable falling off of revenue, say $12,000,000, and the goods which now come from Great Britain would be manufactured in the United States, and we would lose the benefit of that revenue or at least two-thirds of he Customs duty on the goods that now come from England. We would practically surrender nearly all our Customs revenues. Worse than that, our import trade would be destroyed and transferred from the St. Lawrence and ports in Canada to ports in the United States, such as Portland, Boston and New York. Now let me make a comparison between the Governments of this country and the United States. The Federal Government at Washington collect all Customs and Excise duty. They assume no State debts. They grant no subsidies to States. Upon the State Governments fall the charges of administration of justice, civil and criminal; they maintain the militia, the quarantine and public health; they provide the penitentiaries. If they want public works, they must provide them at their own expense. Take, for illustration, the canals in a few of the States. The State of New York has paid about $65,000,000, Pennsylvania about $44,000,000, Virginia about $8,500,000, Ohio $20,000,000, Delaware over $3,500,000, Maryland about $11,500,000, Illinois about $6,500,000, Indiana $7,000,000, New Jersey $7,000,000, and the same thing throughout the remainder of the United States. The Federal Government of Canada collect all Customs and Excise duty, they have assumed the debts of the provinces to the extent of $109,000,000, they pay $4,000,000 to the provinces every year, they build railways and canals, they provide for the administration of justice, the militia and penitentiaries and other matters of that kind. Thus you will see that, under the system of government in the United States, if adopted here, the Provincial Governments would have to raise this by direct taxation, were we put under the same system of government as that of the United States, by directly taxing the people in the same way as municipal taxes are levied. In the next place, the farmers and property holders would have to pay an indirect tax in proportion to the taxes levied upon the people of the United States, which are much higher than those levied upon the people of Canada. I think this would be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. There would be a deficiency in revenue amounting to $16,000,000 which would have to be collected by direct taxation; there would be the interest on $109,000,000 of provincial debts, amounting to $4,500,000 a year; there would be the subsidies to provinces of $4,000,000; and as the leader of the Opposition says he endorses the Quebec conference, the result of that would add about $2,000,000. Then for canals and public works we would have to pay $5,000,000, for the administration of justice, militia, &c., $2,000,000. Then there would be the expense in collecting this revenue, the cost of collectors and bailiffs to make seizures in collecting this money from the poor farmers, which would amount to, say, $1,000,000 more. This would make a total of $34,500,000, or a payment of $7 per head upon the whole population of Canada. At that rate, a county with a population of 22,000 would have to pay $154,000 a year, or in twenty-three years $3,500,000. My experience is that the property holders do not believe in this enormous taxation, and I doubt very much if they will ever endorse the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite while it leads in that direction. And this you will see accounts for the indebtedness of the United States, because they have to pay a high duty and an indirect tax. They have to pay a direct tax to support the State Government, and they have to collect their municipal tax besides, and this accounts for their great mortgage indebtedness, and they will never get out of it unless things are very much changed. Now, as I stated before, the Provincial Governments will have to make their own improvements and build their own railways and canals. And I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), to the condition his province would be in, and he had better consider this before going into an agreement of this kind if he wants the Prince Edward Island tunnel built. We know that the State of Massachusetts had to build its own tunnel, and under this new system the Province of Prince Edward Island would be allowed to build its own tunnel, and that would have to be done by an assessment on property. Now, they talk about free trade. A gentleman here last night talked a good deal about free trade. Well, it is a very fine thing to preach free trade to the people throughout the country if it meant free trade and nothing more; if they could run this Government without any money, and build their railways and canals for nothing, then certainly a free trade Government would be a very fine Government. But I cannot see for the life of me how the Government of this country can be carried on with much less money than it is now. I cannot see how the position can be any better. Hon. gentlemen opposite certainly did not do very well when they were in power before, and we can only judge them from their past record. Free trade, of course, sounds very fine, but money must be had to carry on the affairs of the country. Now, England is a free trade country, but it is not such a cheap country to live in after all, and it is not such a free trade country as people generally suppose. In the first place, they collect over $100,000,000 revenue on what they call luxuries, and one of the luxuries is tea. They collect over $25,000,000 on tea alone, which we consider a necessity. Every poor man in that country uses tea, and every poor man in this country uses tea. Then on excise, the license system, carriage tax, they collect $130,000,000. There is a charge against every carriage a man uses in that country. I think it is 2 guineas for every four-wheel carriage with two horses, and 1 guinea for a four-wheel carriage with one horse. The farmers in this country generally have plenty of carriages, and they would find it expensive if they had to pay 2 guineas on every two-horse carriage, and 1 guinea on every single-horse carriage. England raises on stamps alone $69,000,000. Now, that is nearly double the whole amount of money that we spend in this country. They pay for every note of hand, every agreement, every insurance, every arbitration, and everything that represents money or in which money is mentioned, they have to put on stamps in proportion to the amount, that means a tax of about $2 per head. Then there is the income tax, a house and land tax which amount to $381,000,000, or $10 per head. That is free trade. But I do not think

that the people of this country would care about such free trade as that. Remember that with a direct tax you cannot catch the masses of the people, you cannot catch the floating population. A man might be able to live grandly, he might entertain his friends in a club or in some fine hotel with the best champagne, but you cannot reach him by direct taxation; so the property holder would not only have to pay his own proportion of taxes by a direct tax, as hon. gentlemen opposite propose to levy upon him, but he would have to pay a proportion of every other man's taxes, and it would come pretty hard upon him. As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many public works going on in the country, and it is necessary to know who we should entrust with the responsibility of building and administering them. Now I want to draw your attention to a statement that was made by an hon. gentleman opposite a few days ago, that reflects upon the honour and credit of the nationalities of this country. I have it here, it is not necessary for me to read it, but I take this opportunity of saying a few words about the utterances of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman that I allude to is the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). In this House on the 24th of June, he spoke of the untrustworthiness of Scotchmen, Englishmen and Irishmen in consequence of their excessive use of intoxicating liquors. The hon. gentleman said that Scandinavians, Bavarians, Italians, and even Chinamen, were superior, or were considered so by contractors and by captains of steamers, who preferred them to Scotchmen, Irishmen, Englishmen, Americans, Frenchmen or any other people of this country, When I say Americans, these are the people I have referred to. Scotchmen will regard with just indignation and resent the words which have been spoken by a man of their own nationality. Scotchmen in their early days, were pure and honest. Scotchmen do not deserve any such treatment, particularly from a man of their own nationality. We can go back to the days of Prince Charlie when there were £30,000 offered for his head. There were hundreds of people in that neighbourhood who knew well of his hiding-place. The people at that time were so poor that many families had to live on the milk of one cow, but not one of them was so dishonourable as to betray their trust. I say, then, that no man can make any insinuations or truthful charge against Scotchmen, and he is making a mistake if he does it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe I was the gentleman who made the statement, and what I stated was that Scotchmen, Englishmen and Irishmen, when they were working on a bridge across the Firth of Forth, went from work into a hotel and put themselves into such a state of intoxication that they could not be trusted when they came back to their work, and the contractor who was building the bridge had to employ foreigners who would come back sober to their work; and I stated that they were superior to Scotchmen, Englishmen and Irishmen only when men of these nationalities indulged in the national evil of intoxication.

Mr. McLENNAN. If I am allowed the privilege, I would be very glad to read what the hon. gentleman said:

"I heard the other day of a condition of things in my native land for which I was ashamed. I read a statement from the contractor for the construction of the bridge over the Firth of Forth, in which it was stated that in building the bridge, it was found that the workmen of Brechin had fallen into such a condition that when men were required who were prepared at all times to do their duty, the contractor had to employ Italians and Bavarians. After the Scotchmen had worked two or three hours, which was the time they were able to work on the foundations of the bridge, the moment they left work they went to the hotels, and when they again returned to take their places they were not capable of performing their duties. Hence foreigners were put in their places, and the long-boasted British workmen had to give place to men who were not, I believe, superior, but interior, except for this drinking evil. I also saw recently the statement of a sea captain sailing between the old country and Australia. When asked what kind of sailors he preferred, he said he would not have Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen or Americans. When asked his reasons, he said they went ashore when the vessel reached port and got drunk and fell into the hands of the police, and there was no satisfaction in employing them. Then he was asked as to the nationalities of the men he employed. He replied Italians, Danes and Norwegians, with whom he said he had no trouble: and for cooks he chose Chinese. These nationalities are superseding British sailors in sailing British vessels."

The pages of history are full of the records of Scotchmen, and there never was a battle fought by the British that was creditable to them but Scotsmen took a foremost part in it. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) the other day acted in even a worse manner in regard to the Scotch nationality. He appeared to be insulted because he was called a Scotchman and said to speak broad Scotch. I am a Scotchman, and I am proud of my nationality, and if a man refers to me as a Scotchman and says I talk Gaelic, it is the greatest compliment he can confer on me. I have been a contractor for many years, and my knowledge of Scotchmen does not bear out the statement of the hon. member for South Huron. I have talked to other contractors and they agree with me. It may be that the hon. member for South Huron is not the originator of the statement he made in this House, but he is the man who dragged it into the Parliament of Canada to be placed in *Hansard*, to be spread broadcast from one end of the Dominion to the other, and to be placed on our records for generations to come. I would say this, that a Scotchman or a Canadian Scotchman going to the United States cannot carry with him a better certificate of character than the fact that he is a Scotchman or the son of a Scotchman. Although the hon. member for Huron may not have originated the statement he made, he is legally and morally responsible for the words he used. Another hon. gentleman, I refer to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), insulted the Highlanders of this country a few years ago. They resented that insult, and the result, and the consequence has been that the hon. gentleman has gone through the country like a wandering Jew, trying to find a constituency that would take him in. It is not necessary to say anything respecting the qualities of Scotchmen, or as to what they have done. Speaking of Scotchmen, I may say, that the progress and development of this country is largely due to Scotchmen. They have filled the most responsible and important positions in this country and the world. Even the greatest financial institution, the Bank of England, was founded and run by Scotchmen. Scotchmen have been the most prominent men in the Parliament of Great Britain and in this country. They have been the most prominent men financially, commercially and in every position of life. It is an

ill bird that fouls its own nest. Hon. gentlemen opposite have for years spoken disparagingly of this country and its people. It is time there should be an end to it, and the electors of South Huron, and the country generally, will resent with just indignation the words which have been spoken by the hon. member. Let me read to the House a few words from the introductory remarks taken from the history of the 42nd Highlanders. Speaking of the character of the Highland soldier, the writer says :

"He was taught to consider courage as the most honourable virtue, cowardice as the most disgraceful failing; to venerate and obey his chief, and to devote himself to his native country and clan and thus prepared to be a soldier, he was ready to follow wherever honour and duty called him. With such principles and regarding any disgrace he might bring on his clan and district as the cruelest misfortune, he appreciates the value of a good name. His aim is fixed and must terminate in victory or death. He goes on the field resolved not to disgrace his name, be victorious or die on the ground he maintains. The striking characteristic of the Highlander is that all his actions seems to flow from sentiment. By kind treatment you can lead him to mouth of cannon if properly directed. Will rather die than be unfaithful to his trust."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have gone into the subject more fully than I expected. I thank you and the House for your patience and kindness in listening to me so long. I have dealt with the tactics of the Opposition at the last election, the increase in the debt, and the improvement and development of the country ; the building of our public works, notably the Canadian Pacific Railway ; the depression and misery among agriculturists in the United States ; the decrease in acreage and value of property in England ; the agricultural condition of Canada ; unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against Great Britain. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that taking everything into consideration and making a fair comparison between all countries, that we are better off than any other country in the world. Our forests are worth many millions a year. Our minerals are worth many millions. Our fish are worth many millions. Our agricultural and animal products are worth many millions. Our North-West Territory wheat lands are the best in the world and they produce more to the acre than any other country in America. They produce the best class of wheat which commands the best price and makes the best flour. Our insurance companies and all financial institutions have increased during the last few years. We have a good country. If we stand true to our country our country will stand true to us, and we will build in Canada a country second to none in the world. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the attention you have given to my remarks.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, I purpose making some observations on this very important subject. It is no doubt quite true, Sir, that very much has been said, and very much well said, on both sides of the House on this question. It is natural, it appears, that matters of a political character should strike our minds in different directions, and we are prepared to expect a certain latitude in discussing questions of great import to this country. In the speeches that have been delivered on this subject by members on the other side of the House ; taking them collectively, we find that they all agree to this fact : that the condition of the farmers in the United States is most deplorable. I may, perhaps, make an exception of the Minister of Finance, but, with that exception, all the other speakers on the Government side of the House have led the House and country to believe that the condition of the farmers in the United States is most deplorable. I have thought it a strange thing for the Government of this country to dissolve the House for the avowed purpose of making a treaty with a people so deplorably poor as the people of the United States are said to be by hon. gentlemen opposite. It strikes me as a very peculiar thing that the gentlemen who decry everything in the United States, dissolved Parliament and placed in the mouth of His Excellency the story that they did so for the purpose of asking a reciprocity treaty with the United States. One and all of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who have spoken in this debate have complained that we, on this side, have not given them a full, and clear, and definite idea of our policy, and yet we have listened, and you, Mr. Speaker, have listened in vain to find out what the Government and their supporters mean by their proposed treaty, or to find out how they expect to get a better treaty by all the time throwing deprecatory observations in the face of the people of the United States. It does look to me a most singular thing that the Government of this country should ask the Governor General to dissolve Parliament for the purpose of making a treaty with the United States, when nearly all of the followers of the Government in this House say that they will not submit to a treaty in natural products at all. It is a singular thing that gentlemen on that side of the House, who claim to possess a great deal of loyalty, and who are loud in proclaiming their loyalty, not only in this House but out of this House, should make the conduct of affairs in this country contingent upon the action of the United States. Why, Mr. Speaker, we find that even in a matter of a general election, they asked His Excellency to dissolve the House so that they might be able to have a new Parliament to deal with this question. During the first two or three days of the late campaign the Government told the people that they wanted a treaty with the United States on the lines of the old Reciprocity Treaty ; but the sugar men and some others of that ilk met in Montreal, and they said that they were opposed to reciprocity in any form. The first days of the campaign the Conservative cry was the old flag, the old treaty, the old policy and the old leader ; but after three or four days, when the sugar men had met in Montreal, the old policy was continued, but not a single word about the object for which they stated that His Excellency dissolved the House. They had dropped the question of reciprocity with the United States. Then the First Minister issued a manifesto to the people of this country, and from one end of that manifesto to the other, he made no reference, or no allusion whatever to the supposed object for which Parliament had been prematurely dissolved. It appears his friends in the Red Parlour, and his friends in the sugar combine, had intimidated the Government, and not a single word was afterwards said in reference to reciprocity. Then they had an alternative policy ; they were to have the old policy in one place where they thought it was popular with the people, and they were to have the advantage of a treaty where they thought a treaty might be popular. They thought to head

off any expression of opinion that was growing in this country in favour of more extended trade relations. Now, Sir, we find they went to the polls and they elected a new House of Commons, upon the old electoral lists. It appears to me, Sir, that the Government were afraid to have the lists revised because many of those who had favoured the Government had left Canada, and had settled in the United States. Although we heard hon. gentlemen on that side of the House tell us we have no exodus before the election, yet since the election they tell us that a great many people came back to Canada to record their votes on that occasion. They practically admit what they heretofore denied. Now, Sir, I listened to the Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, and I have listened to the Budget speeches of several other Ministers of Finance, and I have found that whenever they have raised the duty on any article, they have invariably claimed that that would make the article cheap; and their followers have always echoed that sentiment. But this session, after we had been agitating for a reduction of the duty on sugar year after year, the hon. Finance Minister comes down and proposes a reduction of the duty. Why does he do that? Not because the country wanted it. Not because the Opposition asked for it, but he does it because the United States did it. It was the dictation from Washington that compelled him to do it; and this is not the first time that this Government has bent and yielded to the dictation of the Government at Washington. They may talk of their loyalty; they may say that this Government exists only for Canada; but there has never been a Government in this country which has yielded so abjectly to the dictation of the United States as this Government. But on this occasion they have done it neither well nor gracefully. The hon. Minister of Finance boasts that he is saving to the people by this act $3,500,000 a year. In other words, he tells the people of this country that for the past twelve years the Government have extorted from them on the item of sugar alone $42,000,000 more than they should have taken from them. Then, again, we find that the American Congress in the McKinley Bill provided that any nation which had an export duty on logs should not have the benefit of the reduction of duty on lumber which they were making by that Bill; and the Government of Canada, that Government who boast of their British connection, of being under British rule and subject to Queen Victoria, dropped down humbly on their knees at the dictation of the Government at Washington, and took off the export duty on logs. Then, this Government of ours placed in their Customs Act of 1879, the National Policy measure, a statutory offer in which they pledged the Crown and Canada to the United States that, with regard to all the articles enumerated in the schedule of that offer, as soon as the United States would remove the duty from any of them, Canada would do likewise. The Government of the United States took the duties off several of those articles mentioned in the schedule, and our Government, claiming to be loyal, disregarded their own statutory offer, and allowed the duties to remain on those articles after the Government of the United States had taken them off. We brought up the question in this House, and showed the Government that as British subjects they were bound to maintain the honour and good faith of the Crown of England; but it was not until pressure was brought upon them by the Imperial Government that they took the duty off those articles. In several other matters we find this Government going humbly down on their knees to the United States. Why, Sir, they get very amusing when they talk about any of our friends who have large business connections chancing to visit Washington or any other city in the United States. Then they are sure that a conspiracy must be brewing. These gentlemen, who appear so loyal on the outside, have an idea that it is very disloyal for any of our friends to visit the United States. After they dissolved the House on the pretence of making a treaty not later than the 4th of March last, when the commissioners were to go to Washington, what did they do? The High Commissioner came over at the invitation of the Government to aid them in the elections, and what did he do? He made a tirade against some of the best institutions we have in this country, and decried the credit of the country in every way. He represented that overtures had been made by the Washington Government to Canada for a treaty. Then he went to Washington, came back again, and a few days afterwards returned to Washington, taking with him the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Justice, as a deputation to meet the Government of the United States to negotiate the reciprocity treaty which they had promised to the people. The Government of the United States had never had any official notice of the subject at all; and when it was known by telegraph that this deputation had started from Ottawa, the Government of the United States sent word back for them not to come. However, they persevered. They went down there like a cavalcade, prepared to stay all summer. The High Commissioner, with all the pomp and glory attaching to him from his achievements as a Minister at the Court of England, took with him the two Ministers. It was a matter of some comment at the time that the only men he took with him were from the Maritime Provinces. Those provinces had not responded so strongly for reciprocity at the election as had the other provinces; and when these two Ministers were sent, was it an admission that neither in the great and glorious Province of Quebec, nor in the greater Province of Ontario, had they a Minister fit to go on an embassy of that kind, and they had to take two from the Marytime Provinces?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To say nothing of the North-West.

Mr. LANDERKIN. To say nothing of the North West. It was announced and heralded in the press that they were coming. They had to make a show of carrying out what they had promised and what they had dissolved the House for. They did not want their dissolution to appear to be a false or a lying dissolution. So they made a show of carrying out what they had promised, and this is the way they carried it out. They went there; the Minister showed them in, and the Minister showed them out, and the time occupied was only three minutes. It was a three minute treaty. It beats the record in the diplomatic history of the world. There is a humorous, but there is also a serious aspect to this case. To those who are born in Canada and who love Canada it is a disgrace to the

Canadian people—we can hold no other view—for men to trifle as they were doing for political purposes, and to try to bring the Government in the United States into the scheme with them. But the Government of the United States were quite as wary as they were, and were not going to be entrapped by our Government into becoming parties to any frauds which they might wish to perpetrate upon the Canadian people. We have changes in the tariff nearly ever year, to such an extent that it is getting to be the normal state of things to have changes. I notice that hon. gentlemen on the other side are continually charging some hon. members on this side with changing their views, and seem anxious to make it appear that if hon. gentlemen on this side have, within the las forty years, held at any time different views on any political subject, that it is an indication that their views now are neither right nor sincere. Suppose we applied that rule to the other side. We find, by the changes made in the Budget this year, that the hon. Finance Minister has decidedly altered his views. Why, when he first came into the House he would not touch whiskey with a ten-foot pole; he would not hear of any trifling with the tariff at all, and would have nothing but immediate and absolute prohibition. We have his resolution in *Hansard*, in which he placed himself squarely before the people as a prohibitionist, but to-day we find him, in his tariff, making a slight increase in the articles of whiskey and rum, and other strong spirits, and doubling the tariff on beer. He has so changed his views that he wishes to put it out of the power of the people to use beer, and to drive them into the use of strong drink. That must be the result of his temperance legislation. He is injuring the barley industry by greatly increasing the Excise duty on malt, and thus restricting the manufacture of beer, while he deals very gingerly with brandy and whiskey, and other strong liquors. He is going to improve the condition of the country, and further the cause of temperance, by giving the people dearer beer and cheaper whiskey. That certainly is a most decided change from the prohibitory legislation which he, at the outset of his career in this House, brought before Parliament.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before you left the Chair, Sir, I had referred to that wonderful pilgrimage made by the triumvirate to Washington. They did not inform the country, neither have the Government informed the House, what they went for. The Government have not taken the House into their confidence. They have not told us on what lines they were going to make a treaty, concerning what articles they were going to negotiate, how far they were going to extend trade, what tariff they were going to substitute for the present one, and in what respect they expected an increased trade. There were many people in the country who thought that if the Government were sincere in asking His Excellency to dissolve the House before its time, in order that the Government might negotiate a reciprocity treaty, they should have taken the country into their confidence, and let the country know what sort of a treaty they intended endeavouring to obtain. There are many people who believe that had the Government gone to Washingston and arranged with the authorities there a treaty on the lines on which they intended arranging one, and then appealed to the country, that would have been a higher form of statesmanship than the course they did pursue. This deputation, or delegation, or embassy, or whatever you choose to term it in diplomatic circles went to Washington and stayed there three minutes. They completed no treaty. They came back. They came together as far as New York. There they parted. Was the High Commissioner ashamed of his allies, or were his allies ashamed of the High Commissioner? Why was it that the High Commissioner dared not come back to Canada? Was it that, being an old politican, and able to some extent to discern the feelings of the people of Canada he did not dare to come back here and meet the frowns of the people, so that he went direct to England *via* New York? I will not adopt the language of our Tory friends and call these gentlemen arch-conspirators, because I think our friends opposite sometimes get out of order when they are speaking of their political opponents. However, they came back together as far as New York, and there they parted. I believe they had some difficulty in sorting their trunks in New York. Some of the High Commissioner's trunks got mixed up with those of the Minister of Justice, and some of those belonging to the Minister of Justice got mixed up with those of the Minister of Finance. But at all events we learn that from Coteau they had a special car, and that their trunks were so numerous that they had to be brought in by a freight train, No. 16. I do not know how many trunks they had, but I know it is said they had to attach this special car to a freight train, and the locomotive must have been a very strong one to bring those of them who came back to Canada. They came back in the night, and got here about five o'clock in the morning, and I believe they were here for three or four days before they dared to come out of the house, and that is to their credit, because, if they had any shame when they had done wrong, they should be unwilling to meet the people face to face. It seems to me a little peculiar for the Government to advise His Excellency to dissolve Parliament for a purpose without making known that purpose to the House or the country, and that they should not only have trifled with His Excellency but with the whole people of this country, that they should have dissolved Parliament, if I may say so parliamentarily, with a lie in their mouths, and should have put a falsehood into the mouth of His Excellency and led him to dissolve the House for a purpose they never intended to carry out. In such a case, the House should be re-dissolved. I think, if His Excellency looks into the matter and sees that he and the country have been deceived, as a constitutional Governor he will consider it his duty to again dissolve Parliament and let the matter be fought out again before the people.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We do not want another election.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not very fond of elections. I have had enough elections myself, but I would like to see the case properly presented to the people, and, if hon. gentlemen opposite appeal upon a false issue and deceive the people on the grounds on which they asked His Excellency to dissolve, if they are loyal and true to Canada and to the Empire to which we belong, His Excellency should at once dissolve the House and let us go to the country on this issue again. Imagine such a thing taking place in the Imperial Parliament, imagine such a fiasco as that to which we are witnesses, imagine the British people being humiliated as this Government has humiliated the Canadian people. Why, it would not be tolerated in England. The people would rise in their might and would hurl from power any Government, no matter of what party, that trifled with their followers and trifled with the country as these hon. gentlemen have done. The Minister of Finance has been at times somewhat severe on those who have held in years gone by opinions different from those they now hold. In regard to some members he goes back twenty years, and he thinks a change of views on their part lessens their power and influence in the House and in the country. To show the way in which the tariff has been tinkered with, and changes have been made, I wish to show the position of the Minister of Finance and his views on that subject a short time ago. I have in my hand a book which was published under the title of "The Canadian Temperance Manual and Prohibitionists' Handbook," by Professor George E. Foster, and I will read some of his views contained in that book. This was published in 1881, and I will show the House and the country how that gentleman's views have materially changed on this vital issue which has been before the country for a number of years. If the changes in his views and principles are against the interests of the country, I think it is due to the House and the country to state them. In speaking about prohibition in the State of Maine, the Minister of Finance at that time used these words:

"It seems really strange that people should be found who will reiterate the statement that prohibition has not succeeded in Maine. In almost every instance they will be found to be persons who either are determined to believe all prohibitory laws a failure, or are entirely unread as to the history and results of the Maine law, or who set up the preposterous plea that the law fails if in a single instance or a number of instances it can be proven that its provisions are violated. First, then, it becomes necessary to fix a standard of success. What shall it be? Are we to believe that every law is a failure which does not entirely suppress and eradicate the evil against which it it directed? Suppose we judge other laws by that standard, what one of them should we find a success? People steal and our gaols contain burglars, breakers, robbers and petty thieves—is, therefore, the law against theft a failure? People gamble, engage in lotteries, run places of vice, sell diseased meat, violate health ordinances, &c., but no one thinks of declaring that therefore we are to conclude that the laws which prohibit these things are failures and ought to be repealed."

Now, in reference to the revenue, it will be remembered that a short time ago a deputation waited on the hon. Minister and he stated that prohibition at this time was impossible owing to the loss of revenue which would be entailed. What did he say on that subject a few years ago?

"You will lose the revenue and increase the taxes.

"Who pays the license revenue? The liquor sellers, says our objector. Where do the liquor sellers get it? Out of the pockets of the people. And if the people refused to patronize their bars, the liquor sellers would starve or else have to do honest work for a living as do other people. So the people have to pay into the liquor sellers till the amount he gives to the treasury, plus the amount necessary for the keep and enriching of the liquor seller and his family. What do the people get for it? Shoes, blankets, flour, meat, clothing? No, they get whiskey, beer, rum and the like, which not only gives them no strength, no warmth and no food, but makes many of them foolish, dissipated, idle and drunken, and adds in every way to their general burdens. Suppose that in a certain city there are thirty liquor sellers, and they pay $100 each for a license, a sum equal to $3,000. This goes into the city treasury. But it comes out of the pockets of the people. Suppose each of these liquor sellers takes in over his bar, $2,000 per year. This is a total of $60,000. Where does this come from? Out of the pockets of the people. So that the people actually pay, not only the $3,000 which the sellers hand over to the treasury, but $57,000 in addition, which the sellers put in their own pockets. How infinitely better it would have been if the people had paid the $3,000 tax directly, and kept the $57,000 in their own pockets. The rum-sellers were simply tax-gatherers, who took $60,000 from the tax-payers, gave over one-twentieth of the amount to the people's treasury, and keep nineteen-twentieths to themselves."

Now, you see he fears that if we were to enact a law which he said in this article was essential, and which he believed could be carried out, we would lose a revenue, but according to his views, as enunciated a few years ago in the book which he published over his own signature, he says that would be no objection at all. Now, speaking to the objection of some people that prohibition would ruin the country, he says:

"Let us ask this objector to give us a 'Bill of Particulars' as to just what will be ruined if the Act passes, and the dram-shops are closed up.

"(*a*.) Will the labourer be ruined? Nay, the dram-shop gives no tools for better work, no strength to the arm, no steadiness to the purpose, no noble ambition. If the dram-shop gets a hold on the labourer it steals his earnings, breaks down his energy, palsies his strong arm, unsettles his brain, makes his home miserable, and ends, if possible, in ruining him. * * *

"Will the home be injured? The question answers itself. If the saloons could be shut, what a flood of light and joy would sweep into the homes in Canada, chasing out the evil spirits of neglect, discord and revel, which the saloon has introduced into many of them, lighting up the wan face of Despair with the warm rays of Hope, bidding plenty enter across the threshold where poverty has long crouched, and touching anew the chords of Love's harp, so long covered with the dust of sensuality and hate. Ah, no; the homes would not weep if the saloons were closed."

The question came up in the House to close these saloons and the Minister of Finance told us that he voted for that, but he did it in a moment of weakness. He further says:

"Will society, the school or the church be injured? Nay. But all these would rejoice if this, their persistent plague, could be swept away. Not one element of social purity, not one impulse to intellectual endeavour, not one aspiration towards heaven and God come from the rum shop. But as its doors shut and open, open and shut, disorder, crime, filth, apathy of intellect, tendencies to idleness, germs of immorality and temptations to sin, do constantly pour forth upon society, school and church. These help to lift men upward; the saloon continually pulls down and degrades."

These were the views of the Minister of Finance on this question but a few short years ago. Now he has changed. What accounts for the change? He will be willing to judge my friends on this side if they change. Was it office that changed him with its allurements and caused him to go back on the principles which he advocated in this House and which he has written in this book over his own signature? Is it office that lures him away from what he conceived to be the path of duty before he entered the House and entered the Government? He made use of other expressions which show that

the change in his views has been very material. He said:

"As the eye of citizen, philanthropist or Christian, sweeps the present or gazes out into the future, what curse looms up so darkly? What enemy of man works so incessantly or with such fatal results? To measure all the waste of wealth, the destruction of labour power, and the burdens caused by that poverty, crime and disease which are its constant outgrowths, would overtask the strongest powers of the most gifted political economist. To estimate the pain, the shame, the suffering and death of soul and body whichever follow in its wake, would simply call for more than human capacity. For a vice which mocks the hopes of humanity, withstands the beneficence of Deity, this has no equal. What fatal inactivity is it which allows any good man to be for one moment idle or unconcerned in the face of so monstrous an evil, and one which stands full across the pathway of our country's progress?"

These were the views that the Minister of Finance held a year or two before he entered this House and before he became a member of this Government. Then he speaks of all the influences that tend to lead him to this conclusion, and speaking of the home, the school and the church, he says:

"This blessed trinity of influences joins hands with our humanity, and leads it upwards towards the rest.

"But over and against all these the drink traffic pollutes its hostile camp, and gives them perpetual battle.

"It robs the homes of its tenderness, fouls its purity, vitiates its teachings, blasts its hopes, and turns its memories into a burden of bitterness.

"It antagonizes the school by locking up intellects in apathetic idleness, by barring the path of knowledge to thousands of little children, by lulling all ambition in the dull lap of sensuality, and filling the same with images of evil and degrading desires.

"It undermines the church by its subtle attractions, which leads the child from the Sabbath school, the worshippers from the sanctuary and the preacher from the pulpit; by its unhallowed appetites and passions, which eat into the better moral nature, deaden the conscience and drown in their mad contentions every whisper of the better and heavenly."

These were the views of the Minister of Finance a few short years ago. He wound up with this appeal:

"Reader, think, ponder, resolve and act.

"This greatest of preventable evils can be prevented, this worst of slavery can be abolished, this most crying of all national disgrace can be forever done away with.

"And if we will but recognize in this the great work of our age, and undertake it cheerfully, courageously and hopefully, this century may behold in Canada a victory which shall immeasurably add to the sum of human good, and remain for all time the fairest gem in all the coronal of our country's history."

These were the views of the Minister of Finance a few years ago. The Minister of Finance did not tell us, in the speech he delivered, of the grounds upon which he changed those views or why he neglected to attain the object he seemed to think so desirable after he entered the Government. It is a singular thing indeed, it is a startling thing indeed, to find a gentleman who held those views, who put his pen to paper to record those views in a volume—it is a singular thing indeed to find that as soon as he gets into office, then he pleads that the revenue requirements of the country will not allow him to proceed. How much more honourable it would be in the Minister of Finance, when he found that the Government held different views from his, how much more honour it would reflect upon that gentleman, had he resigned his portfolio and gone into the ranks to fight for what he advocated in his book, and what he has advocated in this House. Now, Sir, I will, for a few moments, review some of the speeches that have been made in support of the policy of protection in this country; I will review them shortly, because I hold that it is my object, and my aim, and my determination, and my line of conduct in public life, to do all I possibly can do to help the party I belong to in order to get for the people of this country better markets. The policy that I approve of, and that I uphold, is the policy that will enable the people of this country to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. That is the end to which we are tending, that is the end for which I am fighting, and for which I intend to fight as long as I remain in public life. I believe in liberty and I believe in freedom. I believe not only in liberty of speech, and freedom to do and to act in accordance with our conscience, but I believe in liberty and freedom of trade. I believe that while we have fought in the past for freedom and liberty of speech, it is just as essential now to the welfare and to the development of this country that we should fight for freedom of trade and to take away the shackles. They tell us on the other side of the House that the National Policy, that is the high protective policy, the policy that taxes us $16,000,000 more than we were taxed before it was introduced, is a cure for hard times, that when the industries of the country are suffering it makes good times. How? The Government put up the tariff and add to the burdens, and take $16,000,000 more out of the pockets of the people during one year than before the introduction of that policy. We say that any such policy is calculated to stifle the industries of this country, that it is calculated to do incalculable injury all round, because this country with its population of 5,000,000 cannot tolerate burdens of $39,000,000 annually for the government of the country. That sum is what was calculated as the public expenditure for either last year or the previous year. When this country was governed from 1876 to 1878 for $23,000,000 annually, we had as good a service as we have had since. It has been stated by a member of this House that of that grant for a certain public work and a certain contract amounting to $5,000,000 there is very little to show, and the revelations we have day after day indicate that the hon. gentleman's opinion is likely to be verified, and people who come from that section bear out the contention that very little is to be seen for the $5,000,000. The hon. member for Albert had one speech and one wail. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) acted on him as a kind of nightmare. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) followed in his wake, and they united to condemn that hon. member. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) joined in that song, and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) took up the refrain. They all pointed to the hon. member for South Oxford, and every time they spoke of him their warmth seemed to increase and their indignation to rise. Why all this indignation against the hon. member for South Oxford? Simply because he is trying to get better markets for the people of this country, simply because if his policy should prevail we would have fewer cross-walls or wet basins in this country. That is why these hon. gentlemen do not like him. Probably they will have to put their hands in their own pockets and pay their own election expenses, instead of having sums granted out of the pockets of the people. If we get that policy of the hon. member for South Oxford we will get better times. The money used, as is shown daily by the revelations,

before the committees, will be taken away from hon. gentlemen. Thus they do not like the policy of that hon. gentleman. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of blue ruin. That is something of which I like to hear them complain. I like them to be consistent, even in their blue ruin. Whenever they speak of the period when this country was governed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), they speak of starvation, of ruin and of blue ruin, in its various forms. You would not imagine that there was anything in this country at that time; you would think that everyone had gone away to the United States, that there was no industry or business going on here. Let me show the House the result of the National Policy, as depicted by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in the county he now represents. Here is what the hon. gentleman said of his old home:

"Those of us who saw it remember very well when in each village there were the blacksmiths making ploughs, and harrows, and horse shoes, and horse nails. As my hon. friend reminds me, we saw the people shearing their own sheep, and carding and spinning and weaving the wool. Well, some of us left our homes in our boyhood and took no particular note of the strange industrial changes that the country was undergoing, but when we went back twenty years later we found that artizan class had gone from the village; we found that where there were three or four shoemakers making boots and shoes for the people of the village there was now but one cobbler left repairing boots; we found that where there were three or four tanneries, tanning skins, taken from the cattle of the country round about, there was now but one or none."

He depicts the state of affairs that results under a high tariff throughout the rural parts of the country. He thus shows conclusively, and hon. gentlemen say he endeavours to be honest politically and is fond of making statements which appear to be true. If he will travel through many other rural districts he will find that the same state of things exists as he has described, and he will find that the policy he endorses is calculated to bring about that state of ruin he has depicted. The hon. gentleman speaks of ruin. Does any member on this side of the House know a locality where such ruin stalks about as is depicted by the hon. member for Albert? That hon. gentleman is very much down upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) because he made a speech in Boston. It seemed to me, after hearing what the hon. member for Albert said, he could not have read that speech. It does appear to me that if he had read that speech he would not have used the language he did in regard to it. I have here a report of the speech which the hon. member for South Oxford delivered in Boston, and I say it was a very creditable speech and did honour, not only to the hon. gentleman, but to Canada as well. The hon. member said that in any treaty we would make with the Americans—and he was speaking to an American audience—for every dollar the Americans got under a treaty, we proposed to obtain a dollar in return. What objection can the hon. member for Albert have to that speech?

An hon. MEMBER. He wants a dollar and a quarter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I dare say; but it is no use talking about making a treaty on those terms. You must make a treaty equally advantageous to both parties, or not make a treaty at all. What position does the hon. member for Albert occupy now? Does he uphold this system that gives the province from which he comes dollar for dollar with the Americans? The hon. gentleman was not a member of the House at the time, but the contention of the Conservatives was that in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway we were to have an all-rail Canadian road running through our own territory. They were too loyal to think of having any connections with the United States; they wanted nothing but an all-rail Canadian line. The people of Canada built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was a noble work. The Government take great credit for the work, but the people paid for it. After we built it we gave it to the company, and the company have shown a good deal of energy in operating it. What did the company do? They did not go round by the Intercolonial Railway for patriotic reasons, but they ran a line across the State of Maine. Was this to make a winter port at Halifax or St. John? No. It was to make a winter port at Boston, and lately they have made another arrangement whereby they get access to New York. The very gentlemen who contended and stated over and over again that this road was to be an all-Canadian one, that it was not to pass through any territory except Canadian territory, have found that the wisdom of the managers of that company was greater than their wisdom, that it was necessary, if the company was to keep pace with other companies, that it should reach the seaboard, and the inland waters as well. The company had the shrewdness, sense and judgment to see that point. What did they do at the other terminal end? They now go by the "Soo" branch to the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. Now, what do the produce dealers in Halifax or in St. John say?

An hon. MEMBER. They say they are all right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They do not say anything of the kind. They say that the produce from Boston is taken cheaper to western Canada than it is from the city of Halifax or St. John; and they say again, that the produce from St. Paul and Minneapolis and from Dakota is taken cheaper to the Eastern market than it is from Manitoba and the North-West. That is the true position, and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) sustains that position, and supports a Government which allows a company which we have built a road for, to adopt this system towards our people. We are not finding any fault with the Canadian Pacific Railway for doing this, but when the hon. gentleman opposite will take upon himself to make charges against the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on a matter of this kind, he ought to study the position in which that railway places his people in relation to trade, and in relation to other matters. Is St. John a winter port now; is Halifax a winter port now? What will these cities get? They will get at best, under this system, the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. Then, again, we have sunk $60,000,000 in the Intercolonial Railway, and the Government built a road across the State of Main with Canadian money, to cut the throat of the Intercolonial Railway as well as to cut the throats of the cities of St. John and Halifax. Is there any intelligent man who cannot understand that? Why, there were complaints about this made only a short time ago, which I read in the press, about a Mr. Chipman, of Halifax, who is a supporter of the Government, but who is not a supporter of this system of

things. So much for the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). The member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) spoke about the unity that existed between the party that is behind the Government, and among the members of the Government. He said there never was a time in which the Government and their supporters were so firmly and solidly united as at present. There never was in the history of Canada a time when "Uncle Thomas" had such influence as now; there never was a time in which he had as much influence, or as much power as he has now. It is delightful to witness the unity and the concord of interest over there. Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite refer to difference of opinion on this side of the House, but they have had an opportunity of seeing that the difference is only in a very slight degree, and that the members on this side of the House are united on this policy, which is to give better and more extended trade than we have now to the farmers, the artizans, and every other class in this country. They have their fads on the other side of the House. They have their Imperial federationists, and I think the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said he was an humble member of that body. I think the member for Haldimand also spoke several times about going down the halls of memory to find things against hon. gentlemen over here. I would not wonder if before I am done I will go through the halls of memory, in order to satisfy that gentleman that he was doing a very dangerous thing when he took that subject up. Now, let us see the harmony that exists on the other side of the House. Take the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State; two lovely berries moulded on a single stem, you might say. No discord there: harmony, unity, concord there, both united; their policy is office, but not love or friendship, I am afraid. Then we see the harmony that exists between the Minister of the Interior and his subject from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who sits behind me. Both of them are from Assiniboia, and you see the harmony and love that exists between them. The member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) did not look over the whole ground, I think. I do not think he surveyed the trade question either. I do not think he had ever given his sanction or consent to neglected, exploded theories which he is trying to uphold in this House. He has not looked over the political aspects of the case when he tries to make everybody believe that everybody over there is happy and contented, and that all the members of the Government are united, and all their followers are satisfied. Is the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) satisfied himself? Do you suppose he would like to see this Government stay in forever, unless he can be in there himself? I wonder how long the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) will be loyal to the Government, if he does not get into the Cabinet? That is a question I would like to see solved. Then we find there was a little difference of opinions between the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). The member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) made some allusion of a very friendly character to the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the other night, which indicates the unity and friendship in the party. Now, I will just show the House the unity and harmony which exists between the Department of the Interior and the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Here is an article from a paper called the Regina *Leader*. It is headed "A Peddling Minister," and it says:

"Dewdney's management of the Interior Department has always had two very patent features. The first is gross incompetency, and the second, a conspicuous disregard of the interest of the settler."

Did you ever see a party so firmly united as that?

"The first fact is one that strikes every observer of the hon. gentleman's course in the House of Commons. His appearance when answering the questions of members, or trying to reply to attacks, is pitiable in the extreme, and if he had possessed even an ordinary amount of common sense, he would long ago have withdrawn himself from an arena for which he is utterly unfit, and where he is at once discredited and commiserated. He adds no strength to the Ministry."

Now, I would not go so far as that; not by any means. I am only bringing these matters up to see if I cannot heal these divisions in the ranks of the party over there. Then the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaks of himself. He says:

"We succeeded in smashing the regulations withdrawing cancelled pre-emptions from homestead entry, and we venture to say that these obnoxious orders will not long be suffered to make other laws a laughing-stock, or proclaim a brainless, oppressive, incompetent, and altogether ridiculous departmental figure-head."

I could go on reading for a good while just to show how united that party is behind the Government. I will not do it. There are enough other matters to attend to without attending to that. The member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) did say one good thing. He said, it was necessary to have sentiment; that it is necessary for us to be loyal. Now, the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has good reasons for being loyal. I do not know there has ever been any member in this House who has been so signally marked by Her gracious Majesty the Queen as the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). Why, Her Majesty has even gone so far as to issue an address to assist the member for Haldimand in one of his elections. Here is a copy of his address. At the head of it is the British coat-of-arms, and it reads thus:

"FOR INDIANS ONLY.

"To the Indians:—The Queen has always loved her dear, loyal subjects, the Indians. She wants them to be good men and women, and she wants them to live on the land that they have, and she expects in a little while, if her Great Chief, John A., gets into Government again, to be very kind to the Indians, and to make them very happy. She wants them to go and vote and to all vote for Doctor Montague, who is the Queen's agent. He is their friend, and by voting for him every one of the Indians will please

"QUEEN VICTORIA."

There are to be found some people with old-fashioned ideas of morality, who would call this use of Her Majesty's name a forgery. I will not so designate it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I do not object at all——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think I am in order. It is a personal explanation. I do not object to the hon. gentleman having his joke; I am sure we all enjoy his pleasant banter across this chamber——

Mr. MULOCK. What is the point of order?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I had nothing to do with that circular, as the records of the courts show.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will leave that with the hon. gentleman and those who know more about it than I do. I will not say that he did or did not issue that circular: but I know that a great many people say that he not only issued, but penned it himself. Scarcely any one else on the other side of the House would have enough genius to do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a point of order. I have already stated that I did not pen that circular. I have stated that it is a matter of record before the courts that I had nothing to do with it. After I made that statement, the hon. gentleman said that I did draw it up. I must ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. member for South Grey to say that the hon. member for Haldimand drew it. He said there were people who said he did.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then the hon. gentleman denies that he is the agent of Her Majesty. I thought he claimed that virtue. But no; when the matter is brought up, he declares that he is not Her Majesty's agent, and we all know that he is not, nor is any other man or party who advocates protection. They are not the Queen's agents; they are the Queen's enemies. Now, the hon. member for Haldimand said that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had done nothing for this country, and he further said that they had piled up deficits year by year. Is it not extraordinary that he would get up and talk in that way when he knows that all the taxes raised from every source in the last year Mr. Mackenzie was in power were $23,000,000 odd, whereas last year, or in 1889, the taxes from all sources amounted to $39,000,000, or $16,000,000 more than they were in Mr. Mackenzie's last year. But the hon. gentleman said that Mr. Mackenzie's Government had never done anything for the country. I will tell you what Mr. Mackenzie did. He gave to this country honest government, and that is what we want again. He went into power at a time when the corruption and mismanagement that had been festering in the government of this country for years had come to be realized, and he had scarcely time to clear the decks and get things organized when the people in a moment of frenzy left him at home. But I tell you that to-day the people regret the act, as they feel the blush of shame at the rascalities which are being brought to the surface every day in the committees of investigation now going on. I am astonished to hear hon. gentlemen who should know better getting up and making these statements about the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. That Government, in addition to what had been left to them by their predecessors, had to govern British Columbia and the North-West; yet, notwithstanding that, as well as all the heavy engagements and burdens which had come to them through the mismanagement of the previous Government, they managed the affairs of the country so economically and well that they kept the taxation and expenditure down to what they were when they took office. But in the first year after they left office, the expenditure sprang up $5,000,000, and last year it was $16,000,000 more than in the last year of Mr. Mackenzie's Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about surpluses and deficits. It would be very easy indeed to prevent deficits. I do not think a deficit is a sign of bad government nor a surplus a sign of good or prudent government. It is very much safer for the people to have the money in their own pockets than to have it in the pocket of the Finance Minister, because he might in a moment of weakness spend a good deal more than is necessary. I do not think a surplus is a sign of strength or statesmanship or good government. Let me quote what the deficits in Mr. Mackenzie's time were. In 1875-76 there was a deficit of $1,900,000, ; in 1876-77, $1,400,000; in 1877-78, $1,128,000; making in all $4,488,959.90. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that that Government should also be charged with the deficit of 1878-79. They were not in office in that year; but even if we added that, their total deficits would be $6,424,959.50, whereas the present Government had deficits amounting to $12,365,889.20 in five years. If you are going to condemn one Government because it had deficits, you certainly have to condemn the other much more on the same ground. Now, the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), speaking on this subject, referred to the hom. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and here is the modest estimate he made of that hon. gentleman:

"Now, the hon. member for Brant had a good deal to say upon the question of sugar. He knows a good deal about it. I remember that in a previous year I had the pleasure of discussing this subject in the House. I am only sorry the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is not in his seat to-night, because the statements he made were so absurd, and the conclusions at which he arrived so monstrous, that I am confident when he gets the real facts of the case, and he will do it if he takes the trouble to read what I say, he will freely admit that in discussing this question he came to the House without any knowledge of the subject he was going to discuss."

This is a pretty modest paragraph from the junior member. It would hardly be modest in the senior member to use such language towards the hon. member for South Brant. He goes on:

"The next statement made by the hon. member for Brant to which I wish to refer is one that proved most clearly that he had no knowledge whatever of the subject on which he spoke. He not only did not know the facts, but he did not know where to go for his knowledge, which I dare say is just as bad."

It is rather amusing to hear the kindly way in which our hon. friends across the House speak of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). He did not know anything about the sugar business, he did not know where to go. He really did not know the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) was in the House, or he would have gone to him and got his opinion. The hon. junior member for Halifax also said that sugar was cheaper in Montreal than in New York. If it is, why does the Finance Minister keep the duty on it? If we can make sugar cheaper here, why do our manufacturers want protection? Why does the Finance Minister not take the duty off sugar if our refiners can make it cheaper than can the refiner in New York, and why not give our people the opportunity of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest? I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) the other night, who spoke at a reasonable length. I was out one day, shortly afterwards, on the cliff overhanging the river here, and saw a tug making her way up stream with a scow in tow, and somehow or other I could not help being reminded of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). The tug was towing a scow up against the current and was struggling to make headway. In like manner the

hon. member for L'Islet was struggling with his subject and pulling all he could to make way against the current. The tug was driven back by the waves and the current, just as the hon. gentleman was drifted back in his attempt to make headway with his cumbersome subject; but the current of reciprocity in this country was such that he could not succeed, and the hon. gentleman will find that that current will drive the Government out of power just as the tug the other day was driven down the current. I have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side say that because they tax the people of this country $16,000,000 a year more than is necessary to govern the country, or more than perhaps we would require to govern it with, they have made better times, and that in keeping up the burden of taxation they have necessarily increased the value of real estate. They say that increased taxation has increased the price of real estate throughout the country. Why, Sir, everybody knows that is not the case. The other day, in the county I have the honour to represent, a farm was sold. I saw the gentleman who bought it, and asked him what price he paid. He said he gave $2,800, and he added that ten years ago the farmer who made the sale was offered $5,000 for that farm and declined the offer. Instances like these are common and are daily becoming more common, because if you increase the prices of the commodities that the farmers use, if you do not give them the advantage of lower prices in the things they buy, of course you will depreciate the value of their property. The hon. Minister of Finance and his supporters tell us that when they increase the taxes, they lower the prices of articles used by the people. Then, when they take the duty off sugar, they turn around and say that they have lessened the taxes by $3,500,000. I do not see how they can reconcile these statements, or prove such a paradoxical proposition. I believe it is the duty of the Liberal party to stand true to the traditions of free trade. Gentlemen on the other side lose themselves altogether in a maze and a labyrinth when they discuss our policy; but our policy is so clear and easily defined, that there is not the slightest difficulty in understanding it on the part of those who approach it with a view of understanding it. They say they can make a treaty whereby they can exchange horses with the United States, and that is perfectly loyal; but then they say, that if you put a manufactured article, if you put a saddle on that horse, and take him across, that is disloyal and that the party who propose that are in favour of annexation. They speak of Messrs. Wiman and Farrer. I believe Mr. Farrer was trained in the same political school as the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny); and if he is an annexationist I would like my hon. friends opposite to understand that it is only a question of a very little time when he will be in the Government.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has stated, that Mr. Farrer attended the same college in England that I did.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The same political school.

Mr. KENNY. No, I know what he meant, because it was mentioned in the English papers, and I may say, for the information of my hon. friend, that the rector of that college, when it was brought to his notice, considered that the reflection thus thrown on his college was so injurious that he made a public statement that Mr. Farrer was never in that school.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That may be true, as the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds.) Courtesy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is speaking truly, and I do not know why the hon. member for Leeds should doubt him; but there is this to be said, that if Mr. Farrer is an annexationist or has signed any document to that effect, he will be a Tory premier before ten years. Of that, hon. gentlemen can be as certain as they can be of anything. The fact is our Tory friends have the greatest respect for anybody who holds peculiar views on that question. Why, they would not make the hon. Minister of Justice Premier, although he has great claims, but he has not as strong claims as Mr. Abbott, who signed the annexationist manifesto—a fact which commended him to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Justice had been a solicitor for the United States Government, and that also was a great recommendation in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite. As a general rule, hon. gentlemen opposite like statesmen who are trained in the Liberal school. Mr. Abbott was trained in that school and so was the hon. Minister of Justice, and these are the only two men of prominence they have on that side. They have the idea that others are not fit to rule this country.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was also trained in that school.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I thought there was something good about him. Now, I will just say, in conclusion, that we quite understand the policy we are advocating. We believe it is a practical policy. We believe it is a policy which will go a long way towards relieving the distress that prevails in this country. We believe it will restore values to land. We believe it will bring better wages to the workingman, and that it will supply what is wanting in the fiscal policy of this Government, namely, a better market for our people. We have now the British market free, and if we would get the American market, we will have two strings to our bow. We are, in every way, much better able to meet the requirements of the people, if we adopt the policy of the Liberal party, than we otherwise can be. The Liberal party are not afraid of discriminating against the mother country because the National Policy and high taxes does that now, as everybody, who examines the question at all, must know full well. We can ship our products to the mother country, and they go in free, but when we ship them to the United States they are charged a high duty; and by our tariff we charge just as high against England as against the United States. Will any hon. gentleman tell me, that under those circumstances, our tariff does not discriminate against the mother country? Will anybody tell me that it has not lessened our trade with the mother country which we enjoyed before? We have no fear in meeting the objections of hon. gentlemen opposite to our policy, led, as we are, by practical statesmen, led by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier), our devoted and cherished leader, and by his colleague the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We have every confi-

dence and we believe that this country has every confidence in that hon. gentleman and his colleagues. We are proud of them. In all the years they have been in public life, have their opponents fastened a single charge on their political or personal characters? They stand up as proud ornaments in this House, as an honour to this House and to this country. And, if the people had got their way, as they would if it had not been for gerrymanders, for a bogus Franchise Act, for cross-walls and wet basins, they would have been ruling the destinies of this country to-day.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The remarks I have to address to the House will be exceedingly few. I wish to take this opportunity, as perhaps the best opportunity that will offer, of calling the attention of the Government and the House to a matter which is of very serious importance in view of the negotiations which may take place in October next, or whenever they may take place, with the American Government. I refer to the condition of our timber trade. It is not perhaps exactly germane to the subject now under discussion, but I think it is certainly more germane to that subject than many matters which have been referred to in the very long and discursive addresses to which we have listened in this debate. It will be in the recollection of the House that, shortly after the passage of the McKinley Bill, when the American import duty on lumber was reduced, the Government, evidently after a good deal of hesitation, decided to abolish the export duty on saw-logs. I want to call the attention of the House to the very unsatisfactory condition in which our lumber trade is placed under the present conditions, and I do that in the hope that, when the Government consider this matter with the United States Government, they may be able to place this on a more satisfactory footing. I refer to this as a matter which affects a very important element in our future national interests. The Government of this country, as I have said, after a good deal of hesitation, decided, in deference to the wishes of the lumber trade, to abolish the export duty on saw-logs. That has brought us into this condition, that at the present moment there is going on from a large part of the timber country of the Dominion, and especially in the Province of Ontario, and especially from that portion of the province which I represent and in which I feel the most interest, a two-fold diminution of our timber property. In the first, place we have a very large quantity of the raw material being exported to the other side, there to be manufactured into lumber. This has already grown to such proportions that I am assured upon excellent authority that during the next season the export of saw-logs will amount to a quantity variously estimated at from 80,000,000 to 140,000,000 feet. That means a very large diminution in the employment of labour and capital upon our side of the line, and it means a corresponding benefit to the saw-mill owners upon Lake Michigan and elsewhere on the American coast. Further, it means a much more rapid diminution in the production of our forests, and besides that we have the stimulus given to the trade on our side by the reduction of the duty to $1 a thousand. There is, therefore, as I have said, a two-fold stimulus given to this trade, which, however beneficial it may be at present to the pockets of some individuals engaged in that trade, must result disastrously to the best interests of the country. I admit that the subject is a very difficult one. It would be exceedingly injurious to the present owners of saw-mills to at once reimpose the export duty, because that would subject them to a duty of $3 a thousand feet upon their produce going to the other side, whereas at present I am told by lumbermen who are largely engaged in the trade that the reduction of the duty has enabled them to dispose of a large quantity of inferior lumber which was previously unsaleable in the American market. If we continue the system of allowing the export of our raw material to go on, it will cause the depletion of our forests more than it has taken place in the past, a depletion which no Government, provincial or otherwise, has yet seriously tried to remedy; and it appears very extraordinary that, with all the experience we have before us of the action of European and other governments, with all the evidence that we have to guide us, that those forests whence there has been a continued export have still suffered no diminution, yet we have not taken the first step towards replacing that vast and important production which we are so rapidly losing, and which now will go from us faster than it ever did before. The Ontario Government have, I think, done wisely in providing that, in certain limits which may be sold hereafter, the lumber must be manufactured in this country. That, however, applies to but a very limited portion, and does not affect the very large limits which are rapidly passing into the hands of American speculators and manufacturers, and the result is being very seriously felt. There is the small town of Midland, in the riding represented by my hon. friend from East Simcoe, and the trade there is paralysed. Three or four saw-mills are shut up in consequence of this export. In Parry Sound, one of the principal saw-mills has been shut up because an American firm has purchased the mill and all the limits, and, undoubtedly, if any of the lumber is cut at all, it will be cut of the qualities not worth exporting, but the chief production of those limits, hundreds of millions of feet, will be sent across the line and will be lost to us. The same thing is true in regard to various portions of the Georgian Bay, and will apply to all the waters running into the Georgian Bay and extending to the headwaters of the Ottawa, so that the result will be more serious even than I have mentioned. I hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration. Everyone will admit that the difficulties are great, but it is the business of the Government to meet difficulties. That is what they are there for, and I trust they will find some means of meeting this difficulty in such a way that if we are compelled to dispose of our lumber, it will be disposed of to the best interests of the people of this country, and that we will not be reduced to the condition of mere exporters of the raw material when we should use it ourselves to the best advantage. I have very little more to say. I have only to say a word to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) whose speech last night I listened to with very great interest, and I do not think that any hon. gentleman on that side has stated his facts and marshalled his figures with greater effect than he did. I think it was very gratifying to gentlemen in this House who are professional farmers to observe that one of their class was able to present his case so ably, both in regard

to the breadth of his views and the force and ability with which it was presented, which I consider was a credit to the class to which he belongs. But I think the hon. gentleman made a mistake. I think he did protest too much. There was one remark to which I desire to refer, where he proved from his figures, proved to his own satisfaction if not to the satisfaction of the House, that every farmer has, for the past eight or ten years, been losing $500 a year upon 100 acres of land, so that in that case every farmer must have lost in that time about $5,000. That is the necessary conclusion from the words of the hon. gentleman. He, put the loss to a farmer at $500 a year, calculating on 70 or 80 acres of land. That is how I understood him, and if I am wrong I am open to correction. He, therefore, has evidently proved too much, for I do not think he can convince the people of this country, or any farmer in this country, that he has been losing at the rate the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The thing is absolutely impossible, we should all be paupers and we should neither have clothes to wear nor food to eat were his contention correct. But the hon. gentleman could see no good thing at all in the National Policy. If prices were high, the National Policy was to be blamed for it; if prices were low, the National Policy was equally at fault. Every misfortune, whether it was midge, or rust, or blight, or failure of crops, or general lowness of prices—all was attributable to the evil effects of the National Policy. As I say, the hon. gentleman said a little too much, and he weakened his case most decidedly by what I am quite sure was an unintentional exaggeration, or at any rate by a use of figures of speech which he could not justify or warrant. Now, I would like to say in this House what I said to my constituents when I was arguing these questions at the last general election—I said what I say now, that I do not understand how a system of protection is, in principle, compatible with reciprocity. With the best reason I can bring to bear upon the subject, they seem to me a contradiction in terms. Now, the National Policy, I say as a supporter of it, is a highly artificial system, there can be no question about that; and if you once interfere with the National Policy it will be exceedingly difficult to avoid bringing about a general disruption of the whole system. Now, I am not in favour of reciprocity upon any terms that seem to me at all likely to be adopted, either by this Government or by the Opposition, because you cannot have reciprocity, even in natural productions, without sacrificing somebody. And who are you going to sacrifice? Are you going to sacrifice the farmer for the sake of the coal owner, or the coal owner for the sake of the lumberman? How are you going to overcome these difficulties? I can quite understand that there are many things which naturally form a subject of reciprocity. Now, coal seems to me to be one of these, because we both buy coal and sell coal, and, therefore, we can have reciprocity in coal; but in almost every other article that you can mention you cannot have reciprocity, because we sell it and do not buy it. Now, if any of our manufacturers feel that they have so strengthened themselves, under the operation of the National Policy, that they can extend their trade to other countries without any necessity of the aid of protection, by all means give them an opportunity of doing so. It is very desirable that they should do it. If our agricultural implement makers can sell their wares in the United States, supposing the duty was taken off and reciprocity in those articles was established, by all means let them have an opportunity of doing so, and if our woollen manufacturers can do the same, by all means let them do so. But I say that reciprocity is not a true basis upon which to place our trade with the United States. Reciprocity can never be a true basis of trade where people are both trading in the same market, where they are competitors, where they produce and export the same articles. I say the term does not apply, and we are misleading ourselves and misleading the country in thus talking about trade under the term of reciprocity when that term does not, in any logical sense, apply. I have only one further remark to make. I was told by a gentleman who, I think, was very familiar with the commercial position of the country, that when the lamented death of the late leader of the Government took place it produced a complete paralysis in the general business of the country, because the merchants and the manufacturers and the business men generally were uneasy at the possibility of hon. gentlemen opposite taking their places upon this side of the House, and bringing about a general change in our commercial relations. It was felt that such a change would be disastrous, and so unquestionably it would have been, and so unquestionably it will be, if ever those hon. gentlemen have an opportunity, and at the same time have the will, to carry out the principles which in Opposition they have advocated. Now, some of my hon. friends on this side of the House are exceedingly afraid of the possibility of these gentlemen succeeding in their very laudable political ambition. Now, Sir, I, for one, have a very strong objection to their taking that place, for a number of reasons. But I think the dread need not be so great as is generally supposed. I believe that the responsibility of office, the effect of public opinion, and public opinion in their own party, would prevent those gentlemen from doing at least one-half of what they profess their desire to do.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Dishonest.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not know that we need justly charge them with dishonesty, even supposing they failed to carry out their programme. Of one thing I am sure, that they never would carry out their programme, because I am sure they never could make a treaty with the United States, if we may judge of the opinions prevalent in that country, upon the terms which they themselves say they are willing to carry out. I say that it is just as impossible for them to make a treaty with the United States, after the declarations the leader of the Opposition made in this House a few nights ago, as it is for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to make a treaty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like, with the consent of the hon. gentleman, to ask him what he thinks, then, are the chances of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, that is a subject I am quite prepared to leave to those gentlemen themselves. I have sufficient confidence in those gentlemen to believe that they will try to do what they have said they are going to try to do, and I believe they will try to do it, and I hope that they

may succeed, because if they succeed, according to their professions, they will succeed in procuring a benefit without causing any injury, and I say if they can accomplish that——

Mr. MULOCK. I thought you were entirely opposed to reciprocity.

Mr. O'BRIEN. So I am in any sense of the term in which it is generally used, but I say if those gentlemen can bring about a greater measure of free trade without interfering with any interests which are protected by the National Policy—if they can do that, by all means I for one shall be exceedingly pleased. Hon. gentlemen opposite, with the responsibilities of office upon them, and influenced by the force of public opinion by which they must in office be guided far more strongly than in Opposition, would be very different gentlemen to what they are now sitting upon that side of the House. I think that that terrible curse of pessimism which is upon them would very much disappear; I think that clothed with the responsibilities of office we should find the then Minister of Finance occupying a different position to what he does to-day; I think that under such circumstances "Richard would be himself again," and we should find him using the same manly and independent language towards the people of the United States, and in defence of the interests of Canada, which he did upon a former occasion under somewhat similar circumstances—I believe that instead of finding him the cringing, craven pessimist that he is to-day, with not a word to say for this country, with no confidence in the present and no hope in the future, we should find him a very different character. Now, Sir, I think that the probabilities are altogether in the direction which I have indicated, but I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition, in all that he has said, and that his followers have said, has at any rate allowed us to arrive at the conclusion that, taking them at their own words, they are in the position of gamesters who have staked everything upon one single cast of the dice. They say the country is in a miserable, depressed, wretched condition; that is the basis upon which they start, and no remedy is to be found for it, they have suggested none, they have hinted at none, but this unrestricted reciprocity. Well, now, suppose they cannot get this unrestricted reciprocity, where are they?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Honesty and retrenchment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. They are completely stranded, they are lost, according to their own showing they would have to give up the attempt to govern this country, just as before they had to give up the attempt to govern, because the people would not submit to be governed by men who could suggest no remedy for the existing evils. They would be compelled at once to resign their office, because if they fail to do that which was the only salvation of the country, according to themselves, they would have to go back into Opposition. But we are not dependent at all upon the tender mercies of the framers of the McKinley tariff. In the first place, I deny the extravagant propositions that have been laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the general depression which exists in this country. Why, the whole appearance of the country is against it. Instead of a farmer losing $500 a year, all the farmers with whom I am acquainted, if they are not making money, are certainly not going into debt. When you travel through the country you see great improvements, new barns, new dwellings, new school-houses, better roads and farm buildings, newer agricultural implements and every sign of improvement go where you will. When they talk about depreciation in value of farm property, hon. gentlemen opposite certainly should know better than use language that is not justified by the facts. Everyone knows that before the opening of lands in the North-West, farm lands, especially in Ontario, had reached at least double their value. Land is only worth what it will produce per acre. A field that produces twenty bushels of wheat is worth a sum according to the value of those twenty bushels of wheat; but at that time when a farm of 100 acres was put on the market it was generally sold at a preposterous and fancy price. That was the condition of affairs in Ontario owing to the scarcity of land and to the fact that our people had no outlet for the increasing population. The high prices of produce prevailing during the Crimean war had, moreover, given the people an extravagant idea of the profits to be obtained from farming, and to this was added the inflation consequent on the American war. A change has taken place, and property has come down to its real value. I believe that to-day any farm in Ontario for sale will find a purchaser at its real value, that is, a value based on the crop the farm will produce, and that is its real value. Of course, the opening of the North-West changed the position of affairs. It put millions of acres of land on the market, and hon. gentlemen must recollect, and no one knows it better than the hon. member for South Oxford, that farmers in Ontario will not be content with less than a hundred acres for each of their sons, and if they cannot get it at home they will go elsewhere to obtain it. That led to the settlement of the free grant district. Although the region was unfavourable in many respects, yet 30,000 people found their way into it during a few years. Our people will not be content with small farms, and they will go where they can obtain all the land they require. If you have an emigration from a limited area like the best part of Ontario, where the land has been held at its enormous value, and if one farmer out of eight or ten goes and seeks farms elsewhere, farm property must decrease in value; at all events, it must come down to its real value, and I contend that is exactly the value to which it has come down. Under these circumstances, first to lay a foundation, which is as utterly baseless as that of assuming that the depreciation exists, and then to build on that foundation an argument, for which only one remedy is to be found, is to adopt a view which certainly is not statesmanlike and does not commend itself, and will not commend itself, to the common sense of the people of the country, as it has not done on past occasions when public opinion has been tested. With regard to the lumber question, I have for years looked upon it as a very serious one. I think it is very little to our credit as statesmen that neither in any of the provinces nor in the Dominion has any practical attempt been made to bring about a better condition of things. We have been in the position of the old woman who killed the goose that laid the golden egg. No one knows better than I do, as I have closely watched the

consumption during ten years, how our forests have been depleted, and how we are now dependent on inferior grades of lumber which some years ago we would not have looked at, and it is very little to our credit that we have not been able to overcome this condition. It is a matter that the Dominion Government should take into its serious consideration, and if they cannot do it themselves, let them try and induce the Provincial Governments to unite with them to bring about a more satisfactory condition of affairs. This is most important, not only as regards our supply of timber, but also as regards our farming interests, because we all know how very strongly the climatic conditions are affected by the permanence of our forests. In modern scientific research nothing is more clearly established than that the climate and the rainfall and the quantity of the rainfall are affected by the forests. We have seen in the Western States, especially in the treeless regions, how storms and cyclones have devastated towns and cities, destroying property and life. That is what we will come to when our forests are destroyed, and, therefore, this question deserves serious consideration, not only from the economic point of view as regards the value of our timber, but as regards the general production of the soil.

Mr. DAWSON. In rising for the first time to address this House I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I am not repeating an idle form in craving the indulgence of hon. members. If I listened only to the nervous tremor of my heart I would have kept my seat and taken no part in this debate; but the trade question is so pre-eminently important a one that a man would be a coward indeed who refrained from discussing it. I take it that the duty of the House is to so legislate as to develop the resources of this country, to stimulate the trade of the country and to render the people so prosperous that each resident will become a voluntary immigration agent, and in his correspondence with those across the seas induce others to come here and share in the prosperity which he finds on this side of the water. Parliament can do much to bring this about, but it can do nothing to bring it about as freely and as surely as by securing for this country the priceless boon of unrestricted reciprocity with the country to the south of us. I am sure that all of us must heartily agree with the sentiment which was uttered by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) in the early part of the session, when he said:

"The relations and the interests of the people of the two countries which compose the northern part of this continent, are, in the commercial way, in a social way and in a friendly way, closely interwoven in many respects, and I believe that if a fair reciprocity treaty can be effected along the lines of the old treaty of 1854, it will be of considerable benefit to both countries, and that it will meet with favour from all parties in the Dominion of Canada."

We will also, I am sure, agree with the hon. member for New Westminster when he stated:

"I am aware that Canada was very prosperous under the treaty of 1854."

These hon. gentlemen both advocated a renewal of that treaty. But at this day, what has been the cause I know not, a change has come over the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) distinctly declared that he does not believe in reciprocity in natural products. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) argued strongly against reciprocity in either minerals or farm products. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), drew piteous pictures of the farm population of the United States; in fact, he would lead us to believe that that nation is a nation of beggars and paupers. He turned from this piteous and gloomy picture to the prosperity of the farmers in his section of the Dominion. He assured us that in his youth he was reared or lived in a rural section, and that he was accustomed to visit that section and note the wonderful progress it had made. As a result of twelve years of unremitting toil during 365 days of each year, because the farmer's toil is daily, he discovered that the farmer was able to purchase an organ, and the hon. gentleman endeavoured to prove that the farmer is prosperous because during those twelve years he has been able to place in his home a musical instrument. It will, perhaps, be well to hear what some farmers have to say, and I will quote from statements made by some of the farmers with whom I am myself most familiar. Mr. Joslin, of Wolfe Island, says:

"Farms are not worth near as much now as they were ten years ago. The land on Wolfe Island is far better than the land on the American side from Cape Vincent to Clayton, but it won't bring nearly as much acre for acre. I can remember the time—and it is not far back to remember—only fifteen years or so—when the farms on Wolfe Island were worth far more than the farms between Cape Vincent and Clayton, but ours have gone down in price. The manager of a western loan company recently wrote their agent to realize, if possible, the amount of their loan upon a certain Wolfe Island farm, but if this could not be got, to sell at any price and send on the money. The farm was valued for loan at $5,500—and the loan was only $3,200. To-day I believe that our whole Township of Wolfe Island would not sell for the mortgages on it. We are simply struggling on and hoping for better times to come. And the way to bring the good times is to give us reciprocal trade with the United States. We are tired of being bled for the benefit of other people. We want to be loyal to this country, but if we are to remain so this country's got to give us a chance to live and provide decently for the people that depend on us."

There is another farmer in the same neighbourhood and he stigmatizes protection in no unmeasured terms.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. What is the Christian name of this Mr. Joslin?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Joslin is his name, I will give the hon. gentleman his Christian name later. I have a statement from another farmer named Robert Bullis, also of Wolfe Island. He says:

"Protection is to Canada what landlordism is to Ireland: the beggary of the many for the benefit of the few."

He also says:

"On the produce of my farm I paid into the revenue of the United States last year about $300 to be permitted to sell in the only market seeking my products. This year I presume, my contribution will be nearly double. The politician who adapts his policy to the exigencies of the hour tells us that much good may come of this great loss, and points to markets that will doubtless be opened up in future ages in a land beyond the sun. This is about as consoling to the struggling farmer as a life-preserver floating at an unreachable distance is to the drowning man going down for the last time."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I presume it will be admitted there is a North-West in the United States, as well as a North-West in Canada. When the fact of the depreciation in the value of farm lands in Ontario was mentioned here, it was met by the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the North-West had been opened up, and that the immigration to the North-West has drawn so many of our farmers

from the Province of Ontario, as to cause a great depreciation in the value of lands in that province. But there has been as large an immigration from the eastern parts of the United States to their North-West, and yet, while our lands on Wolfe Island, in the County of Frontenac, have been steadily depreciating in value, the lands just across the little silver stream that separates us from the State of New York, have been steadily increasing in value. The argument of the hon. gentleman opposite breaks down here. The cause of the shrinkage in land values in the Province of Ontario is not wholly, or in any considerable measure, due to the immigration westward, but it is because farming can no longer pay, under the disadvantages with which the farmer has to contend in this country. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, the ideas of the farmers themselves as to their condition, and yet the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) assured us in speaking of the National Policy the other night that, "we have during the past twelve years under that policy, enjoyed a prosperity which has been almost a marvel to ourselves"; and all hon. gentlemen opposite unite in saying, that we cannot be more prosperous, that we are just about right as we are, that we do not in fact desire reciprocity or any other measure that would disturb the existing state of things. If we are so prosperous in this country of ours, I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me why it is, or how it comes, that during the first half of the year 1891 there were 996 failures in this country, against 869 for the corresponding period of the year 1890; that the liabilities involved were $8,702,781 in 1891, against $7,224,502 in 1891, and that the assets in 1890 amounted to $3,618,227 against $3,614,172 in 1891, or in other words, that in the first half of the year 1890 the assets amounted to 50 per cent. of the liabilities, whereas in the first half of the year 1891, the assets amounted to only 42 per cent. of the liabilities? I do not think that this shows that the country is in quite as prosperous a condition as hon. gentlemen opposite would fain have us believe. If the United States is such a wretchedly poor place as has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen opposite, it has struck me as rather marvellous that we should be subsidizing tunnels under the River St. Clair, subsidizing railways to bridge the St. Lawrence, and that the great and ever patriotic Canadian Pacific Railway should be so anxious to make American connections. I am sure that the hon. gentlemen opposite will fail to convince the public of the truth of the assertions they make with reference to that country. They cannot get us to believe that the United States is a nation of bankrupts. Now, I am prepared to admit that reciprocity in natural products would be a considerable benefit; that is, if we cannot get the larger, and, as I believe, more beneficial measure of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But there is one thing that must surely strike all fair-minded men, and that is, that a reciprocity treaty like that of 1854 is simply impossible between these two countries. If frequent refusals to renew that treaty will teach men anything, it ought to teach us that the United States have determined never again to grant us the advantages we had under the reciprocity treaty of 1854; a treaty which they very properly, from their point of view, stigmatized as a jug-handled treaty. But hon. gentlemen may say that we have no assurance that we can secure for this country the boon of unrestricted reciprocity. My reply to them is, that we have not yet tried, and until we have tried and failed it is too soon to say that it is impossible for us to secure such a treaty. I can hardly imagine that it would be in the power of any man to over-estimate the benefit of unrestricted reciprocity to this country. Under the item of lumbering, at present it costs us 20 per cent. on the value of all cedar railway ties and cedar telegraph poles, to enter that United States market; a tax of 35 cents on every 1,000 shingles, equivalent to $1.40 per cord on every cord of shingle bolts cut in our country. That is the duty which is levied under the McKinley Bill, and here I would remark, that it is the shipper into the United States who pays this duty; as a certain shipper discovered last spring. When it was known that this clause in the McKinley Act would come into operation on the 1st March, great efforts were made to get into that country all the cut of the past year, that was destined for the United States. A friend of mine had 3,000 telegraph poles which he found it impossible to get across the line before the McKinley Bill came into operation, and upon these 3,000 telegraph poles he paid a sum of $600 before he could enter them into that country. He paid the money, and was perfectly satisfied who it was who paid the duty. Now, if the Americans would imitate the Canadian laws, it would be worse still for those of us who desire to ship cedar into the United States. I understand that it is the duty of the Minister of Customs to collect a duty for 11 cents value on 8 cents worth of binder twine, and also we are told that a reaper shipped to this country and bought for $70 had to pay duty on a value of $110, when crossing the line. If the Americans adopted this principle, their tariff would be prohibitive indeed. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) assumes that the National Policy assists lumbering. How the National Policy, which puts a duty on the blankets, the axes, the saws, the pork and the iron which the lumbermen use, and on oats too—because the hon. gentleman said that under the operation of the National Policy oats were 8 cents a bushel higher on this side than they were on the other side of the line—can assist the lumbermen, I fail to see; and yet the hon. member for West York said that the National Policy assisted the lumbering industry. Perhaps he wanted to assume all the responsibility of the McKinley Bill, because since the McKinley Bill came into operation our lumbermen have been able to buy hay at a very much lower price than before. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) objects to selling raw materials to the Americans. He says, adopt the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and the Americans would come over and buy up our mines, and thus furnish our raw materials for the manufacturers of other countries; to this the hon. gentleman strongly objects; and yet he supports an Administration which was responsible for the removal of the export duty on saw-logs. A saw-log is certainly a raw material; and when hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of putting this raw material into the hands of the Americans, surely they should not object to the shipment into the United States of sawn boards. I agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland, however, in what he says about the vast mineral wealth of this

country, and as I do not pretend to be in any degree as able a speaker as he is, I will read his remarks on that subject, which I think are well worthy of being put on record a second time:

"It is impossible to over-estimate our mineral resources. It is impossible to estimate the great wealth that lies buried beneath our soil in every portion of this Dominion. Our mineral resources should be one of the greatest sources of our wealth, if not the greatest source of our wealth in the future. It is of the utmost importance that our mineral resources should be developed in such a manner as to contribute to the wealth of the country, and that wealth does not consist only in the value of the ores which lie beneath the soil, or the labour of those who dig the ores from the bowels of the earth, but the chief value of this mineral wealth lies in the labour required to convert that raw material into articles of use and articles of commerce. How is that to be accomplished? It is desirable that manufactories should be established in this country for the purpose of converting the raw material into manufactured goods, and that can only be done by maintaining the absolute control of our tariff legislation. Adopt the policy which the hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, and you at once place it in the power of American capitalists to come here, to purchase our valuable mines, to obtain control of the means of transportation, to dig our valuable ores from the bowels of the earth and carry them away as fast as sail or steam can carry them, and furnish our raw materials for the manufactures of other countries."

In defending the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, I could not do better than repeat these words, which contain a very strong argument in favour of that policy. If the effect of that policy would be to introduce American capital into this country for the development of our mines and for the purchase of our minerals, of which we have such an abundance that it is impossible for this country to require anything like a tithe of the mineral wealth we possess, the advantage to the country would be inestimable. Now, I have always been led to believe that in developing our mineral resources the first thing we require is a market, and next, facilities for reaching that market. Vast sums of money have been spent by the Dominion Government, by the Ontario Government, and by the various municipalities in providing railway facilities in our mining regions. The city of Kingston and the County of Frontenac between them gave nearly $500,000 towards the construction of a railway running back into that county—the Kingston and Pembroke Railway. Shortly after that railway was built, the iron mines were opened. At once several hundred men were employed in and about those mines. Some years ago, however, a duty of 75 cents a ton was placed on the ore being shipped to the United States, and the immediate effect of that tax was to close every mine in that county, because the men carrying on the work were obliged to pay a direct tax of 75 cents a ton, not into the treasury of the Dominion, but into the treasury of the United States. They found the payment of this tax greater than the industry could bear, so that the mines were shut down, the men discharged and the capital withdrawn, and since that time the mining industry in that county has been paralysed. Just before every election, however, we hear about smelting works that are to be erected in different cities along the frontiers of the counties where iron ore is found; but these smelting works are never erected. I understand that in Nova Scotia where both iron and coal are found, the smelting industry has not attained such proportions as we might have expected it would in view of the fostering care which has been given to it for many years. No smelting furnaces have yet been established in the Province of Ontario, and where have the men gone who have left the mines? During the late campaign, in looking over the voters' list in the different polling sub-divisions in my constituency, I found that my friends had marked the lists with many black marks, crossing out name after name. On enquiring where those people were, the answer invariably was: Gone to the United States. I found that scores of men had left the riding and had all gone to the United States. Now, the object which we aim at, and which is not satisfactory to the hon. member for Westmoreland, is the opening up of these mines to the capital of the Americans and the sale of the ore, if we can find a market for it, in the United States, and there is a market there for all the ore we can produce. In the section of the country in which I am interested, we have marble in the township of Barrie, plumbago in Denbigh, mica in Miller and Loughborough, iron in Palmerston and Clarendon. Every township is rich in mineral resources, and the policy I am advocating is one that will develop these resources and open a market for the product in the United States or anywhere else where we can find purchasers for it. Now, I would like to place on record the opinion on this subject of Mr. C. H. Waterous, of Brantford, one of our largest manufacturers. He says:

"Last summer I was up in Northern Michigan and was told that they expected to ship three millions of tons of iron ore from Escanaba alone this year. From St. Ignace it was believed 1,500,000 tons would be sent out, besides many tons of charcoal pig iron. Other places were shipping great quantities. Escanaba, St. Ignace, Sheboygan, &c., are thriving towns, and that country is almost peopled with Canadians. From that iron district so prosperous and rich, go to Belleville and through the Hastings iron districts or up to the Irondale mines. At Belleville there is timber for charcoal as plentiful as at Escanaba, and shipment is easy from the Bay of Quinté, but practically nothing is being done. The same story applies to Irondale. The iron ore is remaining in the ground and the Michigan ore is being hauled to Ohio and the Eastern States yet those markets are closer to Belleville and Irondale. To my mind the most deplorable thing at present is the exodus of Canadians. Last week three boys went from our shop, and they are going continually as fast as we make men of them. We are keeping our raw material in the ground, but we are driving our young men out of the country. I have heard it said that we must not ship our ore out of the country, but must keep it until we can manufacture it ourselves. Why not say the same of our lumber, barley, oats and other natural products? Why not keep our lumber until we can manufacture it into furniture? Why not keep our barley and malt it ourselves? Why not feed our grain to cattle and stock in our own country and then kill them here? Why not carry this protest against the shipment of ore, because it is a raw product, to its logical conclusion? When I see our great resources lying idle and our young men going over to the Americans to find employment in opening up their country, I am convinced there is something wrong that can and should be righted. Would reciprocity help the matter? It would result in the development of our resources. There is no doubt in my mind of the splendid results."

And yet hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that we are hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans. Our sons, who are every day finding their place among the Americans, are, indeed, hewers of wood and drawers of water over there, because there are very few of them, under the present condition of Canada, able to leave this side with money in their pockets, and they have to begin at the lowest rung of the ladder and to work themselves up to the top. Surely we all agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) when he said that agriculture was the mainstay of

the population, and that the quality of the harvest is the guarantee of the wealth of the people, and with his advocacy of a reciprocity treaty in the interest of agriculturists. My hon. friend seems to differ from an hon. gentleman, who at one time had a seat in this House. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Colby. That great man, whom a greater people punished for his heresy on this trade question, and he also differs from the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who placed himself on record as follows :—

"Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we want free trade with the United States, that we want our most valuable markets thrown open to the American farmer as well as our own. I do not believe in that. I think we should keep our own markets for ourselves, as far as possible. Of course, there are two or three articles that we could send to the United States with advantage to ourselves, but any Government should be exceedingly careful before making any bargain which will throw open our markets to the American farmer and drive the Canadian farmer away from his home and from his most profitable market."

My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) also differs from the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for St. John, when he says :

"If I may be allowed to express my individual opinion, I believe the balance of advantage, if there were any, would be very small indeed in favour of the farmers of this country; and I believe that, if this policy is ever adopted, no class of the people in this country will be so bitterly disappointed with the result than those who expected that greater advantages and greater prosperity would result from its adoption. The United States can no more be said to be our natural market for the agricultural products of this country than Canada can be said to be the natural market for the agricultural products of the United States."

Yet we are told hon. gentlemen opposite are a perfect unit in opinion with reference to the policy they wish to adopt. Now, as to whether it would benefit the farmers or not, it seems to me idle, after all that has been said and proven on this side, to go over the arguments again. It cannot be alleged that the receipt of from $30 to $40 or $60 apiece more on horses than they are now getting would not benefit the farmers of this country, or that the receipt of 30 cents a bushel on their barley or 5 cents a dozen on their eggs more than they are now getting, would not benefit them. But there is a way out of this difficulty. The McKinley Bill has placed a prohibitory duty on hay, but the hon. Minister of Finance tells our farmers that they can escape this evil by shipping their hay to England. I commend the hon. gentleman's project to our farmers, but I am sure that, if he asked them frankly their opinion concerning the advice he gives, they would say the remedy was a very questionable one indeed. It would also be useful to our farmers to receive those things which they require to use in their calling at a lower rate than they have to pay for them at present. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laboured very severely indeed to prove that such articles were not any dearer on this side than they were in the United States. Well, I will not argue that question with them, but my experience is this, that in the cases where American manufactures are sold in competition with Canadian manufactures, our farmers give the preference to the American goods, and the merchants who sell them say that they derive better profits from the American article, and the farmers say that the American article is superior to the Canadian. Now, it seems almost silly to waste the time of Parliament in arguing who pays the duty for the entry of agricultural products into the United States. Until hon. gentlemen opposite can tell us how it is that the addition of comparatively speaking, a very small amount of Canadian products controls the American markets, it will be impossible for us to see the truth of their contention that our farmers do not pay the duty. If any farmer or any hon. gentleman desires to try the experiment for himself, I would advise him to wait until next winter, and then let him cross to the other side with a horse, and he will soon find out who pays the duty. Let him try to enter that horse on the market there before the duty is paid, and he will find that it will be confiscated. He will have to pay the duty before he can enter the horse into the American market; and when he gets it there, he will receive no more for that horse than an American would for an animal of similar value. Let him bring a load of barley across the ice, and after he has paid the 30 cents a bushel duty, he will find that he will receive exactly the same price as the American farmer does for his barley. I would commend this little experiment to any hon. gentleman who doubts the truth of our assertion that the Canadian farmer pays the duty on the products he sends to the United States. Mr. Speaker, divest this question of all side issues, extinguish the false, misleading sidelights that were flashed upon it during the last campaign; let the orators who shout treason and mislead the people with false and foundationless cries, place the question of reciprocity *versus* protection on their pure merits, before the people, and I am certain and I believe hon. gentlemen opposite are certain, that their monstrous, deformed, abortive and hideous offspring, the National Policy, will be buried deep beneath the votes of an indignant people. It would then be in order for these hon. gentlemen to go on their knees, and, after repudiating their unhappy child, confess that it was conceived and brought forth in a moment of weakness. They will find that the farmers will vote for unrestricted reciprocity, that the villagers will vote for unrestricted reciprocity, that the townspeople and the people in the cities too, if wise, but it is not always in the cities that you find the most wisdom, will vote for it. Why, Sir, when the *Empire* announced the dissolution of the House last winter, and said that the object of dissolution was to ask the judgment of the Canadian people on certain proposals, the chief of which was the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, certain friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, living in the village of Tamworth, a village in my riding, went wild with joy, and rushed through the streets expressing their delight at learning that the Government at Ottawa had announced the fall of the National Policy. I have never been in the Red Parlour, and do not know what the weight of influence of that august chamber may be; but, after the late leader of the Government had visited that chamber we find, on reading his manifesto, that there was not one word in it regarding the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. On the contrary, that hon. gentleman determined to run that election, as the preceding elections had been run, on the National Policy. His words were as follows :—

"As in 1878, in 1882 and again in 1887, so in 1891 do questions relating to the trade and commerce of the country occupy a foremost place in the public mind. Our policy, in respect thereof, is to-day what it has been for the past thirteen years."

Not a word of reciprocity in the manifesto. Why, Sir, this was a dreadful blow to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the village of Tamworth, and it required very persistent efforts to whip them into line; and despite the cries of treason, discrimination and disloyalty, we succeeded in reducing the protectionist majority there from 52 to 40. Now, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), put himself on record with reference to protection. He said:

"Protection, as administered in the United States, has, in many cases, tended to make thinks dear. Let the hon. gentlemen note my words exactly; protection as administered in the United States, if you can call the tariff of the United States a protective tariff, has had a tendency to make things dear. The tariff of the United States never was a protective tariff in the true sense of the word. It started as a high tariff for the purpose of raising extraordinary revenue, and it has been continued, irrespective of whether it was required for the protection of native industries or not."

Now, that is exactly what we have to say with reference to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. These hon. gentlemen are noted for their magnificent expenditure. It was necessary that they should gather together a magnificent revenue so that they might have the pleasure of a magnificent expenditure, and it was necessary to bleed the country in order to keep this up, and so they framed this policy and misnamed it the National Policy. The effect of that policy is summed up in the concluding words of my friend opposite. We will apply them to the National Policy, and I think the majority of the people of this country will agree with me that the application is right in regard to our National Policy:

"It started as a high tariff for the purpose of raising an extraordinary revenue, and it has been continued, irrespective of whether it was required for the protection of native industries or not."

Now, this protection fails to protect. It does not protect many of the industries which it is said to protect. The manufacturers of stoves know this to their cost. The duty on pig iron is $4 a ton. There is a factory in the west where 1,000 tons of pig iron are used in a year, and they contribute $4,000 a year to the revenue in addition to the duty which they pay on the coal and coke which they consume. These men say, remove the duty on pig iron and on coal and coke, and they are ready at once to compete, and to compete successfully, with the manufacturers of stoves in the United States. Believing that they were to receive a measure of protection, the stoves manufacturers of this country have so increased their facilities that their foundries are equal to supplying twenty millions of people. They have only five millions to supply, and the result is a depression in that trade which we all deplore. The manufacturers of boilers, engines, agricultural machinery and agricultural implements are also depressed. These are cases in which the so-called protection fails to protect. There is a duty of $13 per ton on boiler plates, 15 per cent. on tubing, 12½ per cent. on thin sheet iron and $13 per ton on thicker sheet iron, $13 per ton, which is equal to 30 per cent. on bar iron, 1½ cent a pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem* on rivets, 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem* on bolts, and the manufacturers find this duty on the raw material so excessive that they are manufacturing at a great disadvantage, and, while their output must be sold at a considerable price above that of the manufacturers in the United States, they are not deriving such a profit from their manufactures as we all would like to see them receive. They also say that, if the raw material, which they put into their works, were allowed to come in free—and that raw material is in many cases the finished product of some one else—they would be ready to compete with the manufacturers of similar lines of goods in the United States. I was greatly amused and somewhat pained during the late campaign when I saw some of the caricatures that were posted in every bar-room and on nearly every wall in Canada. There was one caricature which was called "The Inundation," which represented Canada as being in a deep valley surrounded by high walls which were being pierced by the industries of the United States, which were to sweep out the industries of Canada. When I have lost all faith in the thrift, integrity, courage and noble manhood of Canadians, I will be prepared to endorse a caricature of that kind. The painter of that caricature, and the protectionist party who endorsed it, must believe that Canadians are inferior to Americans, that we are deficient in brain, in muscle, and in energy, that we are lacking in self-respect and are distrustful of ourselves. I cannot agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in that view of the Canadian people. The Minister of Finance exhorted us to cultivate faith in Canadians. It is hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have faith in Canadians, and we have reason to have faith in Canadians, because they have been tried and not found wanting. The Canadians who have gone to the United States have not been swamped there. Our boys who have gone across the line have made their mark, and we have no reason to be ashamed of them. We have no reason to be ashamed of Munro, the publisher, or Hill, the St. Paul railway king, neither need any Canadian be ashamed of Wiman, the Toronto newsboy, who is now New York's millionaire. We believe that Canadians, if they had access to a larger market, could greatly increase the value of the industries of this country. We believe that it would be easier to get cheap English capital if we had a larger market. Americans have no difficulties in obtaining English capital. Day after day we have seen vast sums of British capital invested in American enterprises. What the British capitalist desires above all things is to invest his money safely where it will yield a sure revenue, though it may be a small one. Take the stove manufacture for instance. With a facility for supplying a market of twenty million people, and with only five million to supply, is it reasonable to suppose that English capitalists would desire to back that industry up, but if we had access to the market on the other side it would largely increase the chances of the manufacturers of this article, as it would enlarge the market for the manufacturers in this country as well as for other classes. We could manufacture for the increasing population there as well as for the population we have here, and I believe that the English capitalists have a higher faith in the Canadian people, knowing them to be remarkably skilful, sober and industrious, than hon. gentlemen opposite showed they had in the late campaign, and I believe they would back them up as readily as they now do the Americans in their manufacturing enterprises. Now, I would like to know—I am here to be taught—what is the meaning of this term "discrimination;" I want to know whether it is my

duty to teach my sons that they are disloyal to Great Britain and untrue to the Crown if they decline to regard their destiny in this country as consisting solely in furnishing a market for goods sent here by the merchant princes of Manchester, the manufacturers of Birmingham and the cutlers of Sheffield. Am I to tell them that the only reason for their existence on this continent is to provide a market for the merchants I have named? If, perchance, the Angel of Death should hover over the home of one of our people and call away an inmate, is the mourning parent to be branded as a traitor, as disloyal to his Queen and untrue to his country, if he should bury his dead in an iron coffin of American manufacture instead of in one of honest English oak? There seems to be a great deal of nonsense in this talk about discrimination, and in saying that, if we should discriminate against British trade, we are therefore disloyal to Great Britain. I take it that Canada has done much for Great Britain, and Great Britain knows and acknowledges the debt which she owes to Canada. We have provided Great Britain with a western entrance to her possessions in the east. We have constructed a great highway which may any day prove to be of vast advantage to the Imperial Government, and they know it. Another benefit which we have given to Great Britain is to provide homes for her surplus millions. With our great territory in the west, we can furnish homes for the millions who are annually crowded out from that country, and I believe that the highest act of loyalty that we can do is to make this country so prosperous as to provide good homes for their people when they come to our soil. It is the old cry of annexation. Every step that we take in advance is branded as a step in the direction of annexation. Why, Sir, when the question was under discussion of changing the currency of this country from the old clumsy method of pounds, shillings and pence to the decimal system, timid souls cried out that it was a step in the direction of annexation; and when it was determined to change the gauge of the Grand Trunk Railway, from the broad to the narrow, so as to assimilate our own to the gauge prevailing in the United States, we were again told—I heard it was even stated in the Legislature—that it was a step in the direction of annexation. These timid souls supposed that the yellow freight cars of American roads traversing the Grand Trunk Railway would so debauch our people that they would cry out for annexation. The Liberals can afford to sit still when they are branded as traitors. The whole history of the Liberal party gives the lie to any such charge as that. Conscious of our loyalty, and knowing the debt that this country owes to the noble stand which in the past has been taken by the Liberal party, we can afford to remain silent and treat with contempt the stigmas sought to be fastened upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite and their followers throughout the country. Now, it is well for us to see what is thought in England of this National Policy that hon. gentlemen say is so loyal. Let me read to you the opinion of the *Railway News* upon that subject:

"It is something startling to hear of the Premier holding up his hands in pious horror at the iniquity of the States in passing the McKinley tariff, while altogether ignoring the existence of a similar fiscal policy inaugurated by himself in Canada. There is a touch of the 'Pecksniff'

in his denunciation of 'the ignorance and vice' which in the United States have passed the new tariff, and the pleasant dream of the Dominion sitting 'calmly and quietly under the British flag, and looking out with philosophy upon the struggles of a fierce democracy.' Who could suppose that this unctuous Premier, congratulating himself and his hearers that they were not like other men across the frontier, was himself the advocate and founder of a system of prohibition and protection which was directed against the mother country, under whose flag it is his delight to sit in tranquil security and philosophic ease?'"

Now, Sir, I think we can dispose of that question. It is mockery and hypocrisy for those hon. gentlemen to talk about discrimination against Great Britain. If it is necessary in working out the destiny of this country, that we should discriminate against Great Britain, we need not cry out until we hear some sound from across the sea, and I am sure that we shall wait a long time before Great Britain will ever attempt to interfere in the least degree with the free working out of our destiny. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite detest any allusion to '49, but the Liberals are justified in alluding to that little incident of '49. Men whose sentiments of loyalty were so shallow, that in a fit of spleen they were ready to sign an annexation manifesto, may be excused for being very anxious about the loyalty of their fellow-citizens. We must allude to this little incident of '49, it is necessary as an apology for the attitude which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) quoted in very lusty tones, a sentiment which is contained in the manifesto of the late Premier, in which he said: "A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die." Now, Sir, one end and aim of our policy is to bring back our sons and our relatives who have been driven into exile in the United States by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; our policy is aimed at bringing them back, so that, upon their natal soil, they may be in a position to re-echo the sentiment of the late Premier, and say "British subjects we were born and British subjects we will die." Now, Sir, it may be somewhat daring in me to allude to the revenue question, as I am a new member, but perhaps the House will indulge me while I do so. The attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite has puzzled me. They tell us their policy is to admit into this country all raw materials free and to tax manufactured goods; their object is to keep out of this country all manufactured goods and admit all raw materials free. Where, then, is their revenue to come from, if they are not to admit any manufactured goods upon which to raise a revenue? If they are successful in realizing the professed aim of the National Policy, I would ask them to tell us how they will replace the millions that would be lost to the revenue if the National Policy were successful in keeping out all manufactured goods? Now, I do not know whether hon. gentlemen contemplate the adoption of a policy of direct taxation in the working out of the policy which is advocated by the Liberals. It is alleged that it must lead necessarily to direct taxation. Whether that is the case or not, I will not argue to-night, but I will say that in one of my meetings an opponent of mine pressed this view very strongly indeed. A farmer got up in the meeting and said: "I think nothing of the contention of the gentleman who has last spoken. I have a horse to sell, and under the policy that is being advocated by Mr. Dawson and the Liberals,

the value of that animal will be increased by $30. It is alleged by his opponent that an annual tax equivalent to $15 each family must be levied to replace the revenue that would be lost under the operation of unrestricted reciprocity, therefore when I sell my horse I will have two years' taxes in my pocket, and I will have in addition all the tax that I am paying upon imports from that country." These were the views of an intelligent farmer, he was not afraid of direct taxation, and he thought we had better adopt it rather than allow matters to go on as they are at present. Whether it is necessary to adopt direct taxtation, I will not discuss to-night ; abler men have answered that question for us, and have shown that in the great increase of population and wealth which would take place in this country under a better fiscal system, it would not be necessary to resort to direct taxation. I believe those hon. gentlemen, I have faith in the future of Canada, and I think that under a proper management of our affairs the population of this country would so increase that the revenue would be amply sufficient to carry on the government, even with the loss of the millions which certainly would be sacrificed under the operation of this measure. I would say to those hon. gentlemen who are crying out about loyalty, that in England it is not considered that we are very loyal to the mother country in refusing, practically, to provide homes for her people who are constantly leaving that country. She sees thousands of them passing along our Canadian Pacific Railway, by way of Sault Ste. Marie, into the United States, instead of going to our own North-West, and she is dissatisfied with the condition of things under which that movement takes place. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment which has been proposed to this House ; I support it because I believe that it will help the farmers of this country, that it will stimulate the lumbering industry, that it will revive our mining industries, that it will increase our manufacturing industries and extend our trade, and that the result will be to surround our homes with that degree of prosperity which ought to obtain in a country so rich, and of natural resources so great as those we possess in this beloved Canada of ours.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I have listened with attention to the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me, and I am sure that in the first speech he has delivered as a new member he has indicated, whether his principle and contentions be right or wrong, that, at all events, he is a very fluent speaker. The hon. gentleman, although fresh indeed from the electors, seems to have entirely forgotten the result of the elections. The hon. gentleman told us that he is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, and that if it was left for the people to say whether we should have unrestricted reciprocity or protection, he pledged his faith to the House that the voice of the people would be in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the people have already spoken on the subject to which he referred ? Does he forget that the people have just returned a House with a large majority of members pledged to support a policy diametrically opposed to that which the hon. gentleman is advocating ? Does he forget also that in 1887 the people pronounced most forcibly in opposition to the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite ? Does he forget that in 1878 and in 1882 the people pronounced as they did last April ? Sir, it is only a vaunted boast of hon. gentlemen opposite to ask again for an appeal to the people, prognosticating a verdict different from that of which they have already had five lessons. The hon. member for East Grey, when he addressed the House, also craved for another dissolution, and he announced what the result of an election would be if Parliament were dissolved. We never can please hon. gentlemen opposite. If we dissolve Parliament, they declare from the first day after dissolution until the day after the elections are over, that it is an unfair proceeding, and if we do not dissolve Parliament we are treated to the like rebuke. I do not know how we can please hon. gentlemen opposite unless we sacrifice the country's interests and allow them to come over here. But I do not think we will ever be found guilty of betraying our trust, and so long as the people are of the opinion they hold to-day, hon. gentlemen will remain on your left hand, Mr. Speaker. I have also the privilege of congratulating the Minister of Finance upon the record he exhibited in the Budget speech he delivered a few days ago. That hon. gentleman has proved himself to be a thorough political financier, a man in whom to-day the country has unlimited confidence, a man who by his character and ability has fastened himself on the people of this country as strongly as any other Finance Minister that I remember of in my short political experience. I have to congratulate him especially on what he undertook to do, and which he says was a bold stroke for a Minister of Finance to make, to sweep from the revenue some $3,500,000. I congratulate the hon. gentleman not only on the step he took, but also that the position of the country enabled him to do so. I have to congratulate the people of the country on the fact that they have in the hon. gentleman and in the Cabinet a body of men who were willing to deal with the subject of sugar when it arose in the way those hon. gentlemen have done. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said he could see no advantage that had been gained by the reduction of the sugar duty, that no benefit would accrue to the people, that the Minister of Finance had claimed $3,500,000 of benefit, but he could not see any. If he can see no benefit I do not see who is to blame for it. He must be very oblivious if he cannot, without looking at figures, know that the people are benefited directly by the removal of this duty. I need not go into the question of the sugar duties, into the statements made by the Minister of Finance, but I will state this, that while a purchaser in any store at Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto a few weeks ago would obtain 12 or 13 lbs. of granulated sugar for $1, he now obtains 20 lbs., which, at 7 cents a lb., means 49 cents more for the dollar than formerly The hon. member for South Grey says he cannot see how the people are benefited by the reduction in the sugar duties. I received a letter from a lady the other day, who wrote that shortly after the removal of the sugar duty she took advantage of that act and purchased double the usual quantity of sugar and had made double the quantity of preserves she had ever made before. So it is all over the country. I guarantee that every housekeeper has made a greater quantity of preserve this year than ever before. This ques-

tion impresses me much more in another aspect, not only in the financial view affecting our individual pockets but as to how the National Policy has increased the industry of manufacturing sugar in this country. It gave me pleasure when the Minister of Finance was able to present a tabulated statement from which it appeared that in 1878 we imported 6 per cent. of raw sugar for refining and 94 per cent. of the refined article, while to-day the position is absolutely reversed, and now we import only 6 per cent. of the refined article and 94 per cent. of the raw material. I am also glad to be able to state for the information of this House, that at the present moment we are in the proud position of being able to say that, we are not paying a fraction more to-day in Canada for sugar than is a person who buys sugar in the city of New York or in any other place where the American sugar refineries are located. If you take the New York papers to-day, you will find that the price of granulated sugar is 4½ cents per pound, and if you look at the Montreal papers you will find that the price there is just about the same. There is not an eighth of a cent difference between the Montreal and New York quotations. I am also told, although I do not know it myself, that there is 2 per cent. discount for cash in dealing with the Montreal merchants, while there is only 1 per cent. discount in dealing with the New York merchants. I am also told another fact, that granulated sugar made in this country has more saccharine matter in it than that made on the other side of the line. In addition to making this tremendous reduction in the revenue of the country, the Minister of Finance tells us that the interest *per capita* does not to-day exceed six cents more than in 1879. Sir, that is a wonderful state of things, and if the Government are not to have credit for that, amongst one of their small benefactions—I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will call it a small benefaction to this country—then, I am very much mistaken in my opinion of the people of Canada. A little while ago, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was reviewing the unity of the Conservative party, and said that he thought it would be interesting to look across here, and describe the unity that exists amongst the ranks of the Conservatives. Before I refer to the harmony which exists on his own side of the House, I will tell the hon. gentleman that there is unity amongst our ranks here to-day; there is a unity that any leader ought to be proud of, there is a unity as strong to-day as there was when our late leader was with us; we are keeping up his memory in this country in following his footsteps, and in holding loyal allegiance to the Premier whom we have undertaken to support. But, Sir, although the hon. gentleman from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) chose to make a little ridicule in his own mild way, as to some little personal difficulties between the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the Minister of the Interior, there is no question of national importance involved. If the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has some misgivings, or some little differences, with the Minister of the Interior, what has that to do with any national issue? Can you call that a division in the ranks? Certainly not. I will tell you where there is a division in the ranks of a political party. I can see division on the other side of this House; I can see two great parties amongst you; I can see a party lead to-night by your present leader, a gentleman for whom I have the very greatest respect, a gentleman who I believe is conscientious in advocating what he believes to be for the interests of this country. I can see him supported in that policy by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). These two gentlemen have a large following on the other side of the House, but let me ask: Are they followed by all the Liberal party? I tell them they are not. You have the shadow of Edward Blake hanging over you, and I tell you to-night, gentlemen, that there are members in your ranks who will not support the policy of your leader, and if the Hon. Edward Blake were amongst you now, you would show that you were divided into two parties. More than that, if the Hon. Edward Blake had only spoken to this country a week before he did, there are many of you on that side of the House to-night who would not be occupying a seat in this Parliament. If he had spoken earlier, if he had announced the views of many of you, because your views are his views to-day, you would have been elected upon a different policy, and upon a different platform than that on which you secured your election. Let me refer to the division in your ranks. Your hon. leader heads the party composed of members of the same class as the gentleman who spoke last to-night—a party wedded to unrestricted reciprocity pure and simple, for the hon. the leader of the Opposition has pledged himself to unrestricted reciprocity. He says there are to be no Customs walls between here and the United States, and that there is to be discrimination between the United States and Great Britain. Above all you have the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), your coming Finance Minister when your time comes to occupy the Treasury benches, proclaiming that he will raise the revenue by direct taxation. I tell you, gentlemen, there is not a solid body of you on that side of the House who are supporters of that policy. Let me read a few remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford, because I do not like to take up the time of the House with many quotations. I have, however, one or two extracts from the speeches of that hon. gentleman which will probably establish thoroughly the position I take. As the hon. gentleman for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said, I will try to show the unity that exists between gentlemen on the other side of the House. I will quote briefly from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) delivered at Chatham last winter, and when I am referring to his Chatham speech, let me tell you that that speech was first published in the *Globe*, and that it appeared again in the *Globe* of the following Saturday. It had been revised in the meantime, and it was kept as a standing advertisement in the *Globe*, with his corrections made in it. It must, therefore, be an authentic document, which we have a right to quote from. The hon. gentleman speaking to the farmers of Chatham, said:

"We propose to obtain for you the power to trade freely with the rest of this continent; to have leave to make the best use you can of your great natural advantages, which can only be done by full, free and unrestricted reciprocity with our kinsmen in the United States. This is what the Liberal party offers you, and they can get it, too."

Where did the hon. gentleman make the agreement whereby he could come back to the electors of

this country and tell them, that that was the policy of the Liberal party and that "they could get it for them, too?" Sir, that is an assumption which, surely the hon. gentleman would not use, unless he had been in negotiations with someone who had, on the other side of the line, the power or the authority to give him such an assurance. The hon. leader of the Opposition adopts the very same policy. His platform has been laid down in his own speeches as full, free and unrestricted reciprocity, and it is also to have the effect of removing the Custom-houses. The hon. gentleman, the other evening, in anwer to the hon. member for Haldimand, said, that in substance that statement was correct. So that these two hon. gentlemen, one in Quebec and the other in Ontario, laid that policy down as the fast policy of the Reform party, which they would carry out when they came into power. Another hon. gentleman on that side of the House, to whom, I suppose, they like to hear reference made, and whose speeches they like to hear quoted, I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who also took his lesson from the hon. leader of the Opposition. Although sometimes there seems to be a little difference between them, at the same time when the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Charlton) has an opportunity of lauding his leader he lays it on so thick that I suppose that the hon. leader of the Opposition would wish he was out of the room at the time. That hon. gentleman, when addressing the Young Liberals of the city of Toronto, made this remark:

"With commercial union between the two countries we could dispense with a standing army——."

I tell you the volunteers and the militia are going as well as the Custom-house officers—

"for, under the new relations that would be established between ourselves and our neighbours, there would be no necessity for one, for we could do away with our Custom-house officers, who would have to seek other fields of usefulness."

So that the hon. leader of the Opposition has the company of the hon. member for North Norfolk in this proclamation of their policy. This hon. gentleman declares it as strongly as does the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I do not suppose that hon. gentleman now wishes for a moment to retract. I suppose he holds his position on the floor of this House, and contends to-day that that is the only policy that will relieve the suffering people of this country. I mentioned a moment ago that a part of that policy was the direct taxation hobby of the hon. member for South Oxford. That hon. gentleman has been wedded to that hobby for a very long while. Away back in 1878 he said:

"Well, Sir, I would say at once that if we possessed in Canada any tax equivalent to the income tax now in use in England, I would not hesitate to advise the House to have recourse to that means of increasing the revenue."

Dare that hon. gentleman go to the country now upon the question whether we should have direct taxation instead of indirect taxation such as we have at present? If he did, he would come back with fewer men behind him, I can assure you, than he has at present. In the *Globe* newspaper, we find his speech at Chatham reported thus:

"Sir, we hear a great deal from time to time of the difficulty of raising a revenue by direct taxation, and, looking at the incomprehensible stupidity of certain of our taxpayers, I am bound to admit that the objection to direct taxation has weight."

To-day the hon. gentleman is as thoroughly wedded to that hobby as he was when he told his audience in Chatham that if it were not for their incomprehensible stupidity they would adopt it. What does the hon. gentleman have to say when he thinks of the remark made by his respected friend, the Hon. Mr. Blake, when he said that the question of direct taxation in this country was a thing removed altogether from the domain of practical politics? Sir, they are a united body indeed. Now, in reference to the fourth branch of the policy of the hon. gentleman, which is discrimination against British goods, we know perfectly well that the adoption of their policy must necessarily result in that; it cannot be anything else. The hon. gentleman has been asked on several occasions whether it would have that effect. I do not want to accuse him of not knowing the effect of the English language. I certainly could not do that, for I have too much respect for his intelligence. But I do know this, that he knows it would discriminate against British goods; and judging from what he says here, he intends to carry out his policy irrespective of what it may do in the way of discriminating against Great Britain. The hon. gentleman, who last addressed this House, in speaking about his children, if I recollect right, said he would not like to teach them to assist in making trade for the merchants of England. Well, Sir, I can say this much that to so instruct his children, to say the very least of it, is unneighbourly towards the mother country. I hope for myself that I shall never teach my children such a doctrine. I hope that I am able to teach my children to encourage trade between this country and the mother country. I trust, Sir, that I shall never teach my children to favour a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, by which the Custom-house walls are to be taken down, and discrimination to be made against the mother country; I trust I shall never teach them to say: We will not deal with you at all; we will only deal with the United States; and we will put a tariff wall so high around our country that not one of us can trade with you if we want to. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen who lead the Opposition, or that portion of the Opposition which I have taken the liberty of calling the right wing, are supported by gentlemen whose names have often been mentioned in this House. They are supported unquestionably by Mr. Wiman. His policy and theirs are in accord. He has been, for aught I know, the very one who laid the reciprocity egg which I saw one time in a newspaper called *Grip*. I know that they are in harmony with Mr. Goldwin Smith; I know that their opinions and his are alike; I know that commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade are all one and the same; and I know that Mr. Goldwin Smith has said that the manifest destiny of the two countries, Canada and the United States, is to come together, and that commercial union is but a step, though a large step, towards that end. We also know that some of these hon. gentlemen largely share the opinions expressed by a man called Farrer. Now, it has been said that we have charged hon. gentlemen opposite with disloyalty. I wish for my part to say that I do not charge them with disloyalty, because I have no right, standing on the floor of this House, to think that I can look into the innermost recesses of any person's heart, but I can say

this, without fear of contradiction, that the policy they advocate is not a patriotic policy. I can say this, that the policy they advocate is one that tends directly to a union with the United States. I need not refer to the language used by any hon. gentleman in the House to-night, but I can refer to that used by a gentleman in whom hon. gentlemen on that side certainly have confidence, the Hon. Edward Blake; and it will perhaps do no harm if I take the liberty of quoting his words and putting them again on record in *Hansard*. In his manifesto, he said:

"The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the United States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union, and the more successful the plan, the stronger the tendency, both by reason of community of interests, the intermingling of the population, the more intimate business and social connections amounting to dependency which it would create with the United States, and the greater isolation and divergency from Great Britain which it would produce, and also and especially through inconveniences experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty. Assuming that absolute free trade with the United States, best described as commercial union, may and ought to come, I believe that it can and should come only as an incident, or at any rate as a well-understood precursor of political union, for which indeed we should be able to make better terms before than after the surrender of our commercial independence."

I simply give you his expressions, and I tell you, Sir, that in this respect he and I agree. Now, I will also give two or three lines from the utterances of a gentleman, whose opinion carries weight on this side, and whose opinion is highly valued on the other side, though that gentleman has passed away. In his manifesto, the last one he issued, in speaking of commercial union and this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, he said:

"It would, in my opinion, inevitably result in the annexation of this Dominion to the United States."

Sir, the opinion of that gentleman is the opinion we on this side all hold. Who was it that discovered this policy? Hon. gentlemen opposite have been in search of a policy for a number of years. They found three or four policies, to my recollection, and when they discovered their last policy they found three or four names for it. Who was it that discovered the policy, who was it that laid the egg, I do not know, but he certainly is to be found amongst the men I have named; but of one thing I am certain, that whichever of them did lay the egg, they all sat on the nest and kept it warm and hatched the egg, and they are, in that respect, political incubators. Sir, I will now deal with the left wing of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have found the right wing, and we will now find out where the left wing is. To begin with, I find in the left wing such men as the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). We will content ourselves with taking up these three leaders and prospective Cabinet ministers who advocate another side of the question We find that the hon. member for West Ontario, on the hustings, delivered an address to his constituents at his nomination, which was published in the *Globe* and circulated all through his county. And I feel satisfied that if his address had been couched in different language, he would not have the honour of occupying his seat in this House to-night. Let me give you, Sir, a small quotation from his address, I am now referring to that section of hon. gentlemen opposite who do not adopt unrestricted reciprocity, who stated to their electors that they would not support such a policy, and who also declared that unrestricted reciprocity, as described by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), was really not the policy of the Reform party in this country. The hon. member for West Ontario stated:

"I do not understand unrestricted reciprocity to mean an abolition of the Custom-houses on the border, but an enlargement of the free list to as great an extent as commissioners appointed by the two countries should decide to be in the interest of those they represented. This was clearly to the advantage of the farmers both in buying and in selling, and the manufacturers who were truly of value to the country desired it also."

By these expressions, the hon. gentleman repudiates the policy laid down by the leader of the Opposition, and he tells the farmers of his riding that unrestricted reciprocity does not mean what it has been stated to mean by the hon. leader of the Opposition, but that there are to be commissioners appointed who shall put upon the free list such articles as shall be deemed in the interests of the two contracting parties. Why, Sir, that is pretty nearly the policy of the Conservative party. Neither the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver) nor the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) could have been returned to this House, if they had advocated for one moment discrimination against Great Britain. It is a fact, with which every person is thoroughly conversant, that they never adopted the unrestricted reciprocity plank of the platform of the gentlemen who lead the right wing of the Opposition. Then we had the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and I am sure that the hon. leader of the Opposition must be very thankful to him for having laid down so clearly and positively the platform of the Reform party the other evening. What did that gentleman say? He said:

"But, passing from the consideration of the National Policy, we are frequently asked, what policy has the Liberal party to present to the country?"

Why, he is speaking for the leader of the Opposition, and he added:

"Well, Sir, we have that policy which is known as an enlargement of the trade relations between this country and the United States. That is our policy; we do not define it down to the very articles that will be permitted to come into this country and to go into the other, but we, as a Liberal party, have always proclaimed on the public platform and in the legislatures of this country that we are in favour of free trade in natural products with the United States; but if the United States refuse to grant us that——"

That is trade alone in natural products.—

"we are willing to go further. We are willing to allow a large proportion of manufactured articles in the United States to come into this country free, provided we are given the same privilege of sending the manufactured articles of this country into their markets free."

Now, there is the position taken by the hon. member for East Huron. If they cannot obtain free trade in natural products alone, then they are willing to go a step further and make an exchange of a large proportion—not all by any means—of manufactured articles, provided the Americans will deal similarly with us. When the hon. leader of the Opposition heard those remarks made by that hon. gentleman who is no doubt aspiring to a seat upon the Treasury benches at some time, did he not smile? It is said that—though this is now almost a matter of ancient history—when Disraeli said as a young man that he wanted one day to be

Premier of England, his friends about him smiled, and I think it must have been the same smile which spread over the face of the leader of the Opposition when he heard the policy laid down by my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). Mr. Disraeli's aspirations came to be fulfilled. You must take care of your laurels, or the hon. gentleman behind you may come forward and replace you. I was courted by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to enter upon this enquiry. He says they are a united people and a united party. If you are, then discord and not harmony should be the definition of the word "unity." There is another branch of this question of a united party which I may touch upon for a moment. To recall a few remarks made in the debate by hon. gentlemen opposite, I may point out that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) advocated the other evening a protective tariff on salt, but he was very particular to condemn the tariff upon coal oil. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) was determined to have the tax put back again upon salt, and said that industry would be destroyed and that the salt combination had been formed for the purpose of saving the industry and not to rob the people, and he practically asked that the salt duty should be reimposed, and in the next breath he condemned the Government for keeping the duty on oil. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) argues strongly for protection on pork and bacon, but he is in favour of free corn and meal. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) advocated the duty upon flour and Indian corn, and after that I do not think he cared much what came in free. The former member for Essex (Mr. Brien) also was a protectionist on Indian corn, but he was free trade in regard to all classes of agricultural implements. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) carefully expressed his policy. He said that, as long as a protective policy existed, he wanted protection on oil, but he is satisfied to let wheat and oats come in free. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) advocated protection in wrecking, but I suppose he was willing to have free trade in everything else. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) likes his protection sweetened just as well as anybody. There is a list indicative of a little more unity. It is a very strange list and could be continued a little further if we had time. I am curious myself to know, and I think the country has a right to know, which section of the party on the other side of the House, when they come to change places, which, I suppose, they expect to do some day, intends to take the Treasury benches. The two wings cannot take the place at the same time with the two policies.

Mr. BAIN. We will be there.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. It would be absurd to suppose that the Conservative party can remain in power forever; but, as long as the Conservative party keeps on in the even tenor of its way, as it now does, I believe it will remain there. Looking at the resolution we are discussing to-night, what is it? I hardly know what it is. The speech the hon. member made in introducing it was one thing. It was in favour of free and absolutely unrestricted reciprocity. The resolution he introduced was another thing. Does the hon. gentleman, as an ex-Finance Minister, as a man of ability, undertake to tell the House that the way to carry out his policy is to give away what we have to trade with before we commence to make our bargain? If that is the way to make a treaty, I have yet to learn how to make treaties. If I want to get reciprocity with another country, am I first of all to put on the free list the articles I want to get that reciprocity in? The resolution practically says that we are at once to put on the free list all such articles as may be classed under the head of the necessities of life. By this resolution we are asked to allow American cattle to come into this country free, while our cattle have to pay an enormous duty when they cross the line. We are asked to allow American swine, pork and bacon and other articles of that class to come in free, while we cannot take a pound over there without paying a large duty upon it. We are asked to do the same thing in regard to butter and cheese, which are prime necessities, and also in regard to wheat. Does the hon. gentleman who spoke a short time ago think it would be proper to take down the tariff wall on wheat and allow American wheat to come in here free while our farmers have to pay 15 cents a bushel upon all they send to the United States? That is what you are asking us to vote for, and I have no doubt you will vote for it. Does the hon. gentleman want to let American oats in here free while we have to pay 15 cents a bushel on the oats we send in there? I remember, in Port Sarnia, before the National Policy was inaugurated, to have seen American oats coming in by the ship load, and dumped on the wharf at Sarnia at 16 cents a bushel, and our farmers taking their oats back to the bins rather than sell at such a price. Then, as to potatoes, we are asked to allow American potatoes to come in here free.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; read the resolution.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. You do not put it in distinct terms, you say "largely reduced," but it is practically free. You have been advocating free trade all along, and you have couched this resolution not in such a way as to back up the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but in order to catch all your votes. It seems to me that I have occupied a good deal of your time. A good example has been lately set us of making short speeches. We have had three speeches lately of reasonable length, and I would not like to transgress the excellent rule that has been recently initiated by several speakers. But I cannot sit down without making a few remarks upon an interest of great importance to my section of the country. Hon. gentlemen will know in a moment what I refer to, and in speaking as I do now of the petroleum interest of Lambton, I do not want to consider it as the individual interest of that locality, but I want to speak of it as belonging to the whole Dominion. Let me preface my remarks by directing attention to a statement that was made by an hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate, yes, by three or four hon. gentlemen, who have made an attack upon the oil industry and the protection which has been afforded it in this country. I do not think I should have spoken to-night as long as I have, had not that industry been so unjustly and

unfairly attacked. Not only has it been attacked in this House, but it has been the subject of still greater assaults outside. It was used during the last election by hon. gentlemen opposite for, I may say, all it was worth to catch a vote. The protection that we have has been misstated, the price of American oil has been misstated, the price of Canadian oil has been misstated, and no person was more guilty in that respect than the hon. member for South Oxford. Sir, I wish now to state that the oil we make in Canada is as good a burning oil, as good in every quality that is essential to a petroleum oil, as any oil made to-day in the United States. It is true that some years ago we did not make as good an oil, because we laboured under difficulties which the Americans had not to contend with. The Americans have a lighter quality of crude oil, which yields a larger percentage of illuminating oil than does the Canadian crude. Our Canadian oil is charged with a greater proportion of sulphur than is the American crude, and consequently we had difficulties to overcome that the Americans never had at all. Sir, when I make the assertion here that our oil is as good as that made in the United States, I do so without fear of contradiction. I do so the more freely because the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) only a session or two ago, in speaking upon the subject in the same debate in which he made the remarks that I referred to a little while ago, said "that the oil manufactured here is equal to any petroleum oil manufactured anywhere else in the world. I frankly admit that in the past our oil was inferior, but the difficulties which the refiners encountered have been overcome, and we are manufacturing to-day as fine a burning oil as can be produced anywhere else in the world." If my testimony does not carry that weight with the hon. gentlemen opposite, which every speaker likes to obtain for his remarks, I am sure those hon. gentlemen will accept the testimony of the hon. member for West Lambton as to the quality of our burning oil. Now, when you take up an American paper you will probably see oil quoted at 7½ cents, as has been mentioned by a previous speaker. I do not say every newspaper may quote it at that price, but if you take up a trade newspaper you will find that 7½ cents is the ordinary line of American oil, but it is an oil that will not stand the test that we require for safety purposes in this country. The oil that we admit into this country to-day from the United States is not of that class that was referred to by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) when he said that American oil was sold at 7½ cents a gallon, because he had seen it in the newspapers. Now, other gentlemen have referred to the price of oil as well as the hon. member for East Huron. The hon. member for East Huron stated that in the United States, allowing what he considered a fair profit, a better oil could be sold for 13½ cents than an article for which we would have to pay 20 cents in this country. Now, if the price is 13½ cents in the United States, retail, I presume he meant, I would like to know how that statement is to be reconciled with statements that have been made by other hon. gentlemen concerning oil. I wish the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had remained in his seat, because I was particularly desirous that he should know something about the oil business, for I do not think that he does know much about it; I wished to give him a little light upon the subject, and to throw a little oil upon his troubled waters, but the hon. gentleman would not permit me to do so, for he left the Chamber when I commenced to speak on this subject. Now, that hon. gentleman, in addressing an audience in the town of Chatham, speaking to the farmers said:

"Does he want a gallon of coal oil? He will have to pay 150 or 200 per cent. more than he could buy it for if we had free trade with the United States."

Now, Sir, my education teaches me that 200 per cent. upon the price of an article is equivalent to multiplying the price by three. If the hon. member for East Huron was right in stating that the retail price of oil in the United States was 13½ cents, then the hon. member for South Oxford told the farmers of Chatham that they are paying now for their oil three times higher than Americans are paying, and that under free trade they would receive oil one-third less than they were paying for it now, either way you like to take it. Sir, if the farmers are now paying three times more for their oil than they would pay under free trade with the United States, they must be paying for it 40 cents per gallon; while the fact is that the Canadian farmer at Chatham can get his oil for 15 cents a gallon. I am not responsible for the price at which the retail merchant sells it in towns or villages, where he may put upon it any price he chooses; but I can say this, that the oil that is used all through that district—and I have a sample of it here—is as nice an article as any one would wish to look at, and it is sold at 12 and 12½ cents at the place of manufacture. It does not cost over 1 cent a gallon to deliver it at Chatham, and there is a discount of 2 per cent. off for cash; this would bring oil wholesale not over 13 cents or 13½ cents in Chatham, while the hon. gentleman tells the farmers that if we had free trade with the United States they would get their oil for one-third of the price. That, I think, is not a fair statement for anyone to make. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had a very nice business on hand during the last election. He went through the County of Oxford setting the farmers against the oil trade. He did there what he did in Chatham, but in Oxford I am told he carried around two sample bottles of oil. He had a bottle of American oil, the finest sample he could get, and I do not know but that after all it was Canadian oil, as I am told that American and Canadian oil can be taken out of the same cask according to the price the purchaser wishes to pay; and he had also a sample of Canadian oil, yellow, dirty, inferior oil. The hon. gentleman exhibited these samples and told the farmers, referring to the American oil, that if we had free trade that was the oil they would get. Let me now follow the prices a little further. The hon. member for South Huron stated the other day, and his statement was almost correct, that Canadian oil was sold for 12 cents per gallon, that there was another quality for 15 cents—wholesale at the point of manufacture he meant—because in the oil industry, like the coal industry, the question of freight has very much to do with the question of price, but I will deal with that matter before I get through. The hon. gentleman was about right in giving 12 cents—it was 12½ cents. Then 15 cents he gave as the price of a better quality; at the present day it is about 16 or

16½ cents. But the hon. gentleman also told the House that American oil was quoted wholesale at 23 cents in this country, and it was asserted that if we had free trade with the United States, the best water white oil could be sold here in this country for 12½ cents per gallon. The quotations he gave of the prices at which oil was sold in this country, 12, 15 and 23 cents are about correct; but I dispute the other statement, and I will prove its fallacy by a calculation which will satisfy every hon. gentleman that the fine superior quality of American oil would not be sold here for 12½ cents. The hon. gentleman well knows that in the United States a gallon of oil is a wine gallon, in Canada it is an imperial gallon, and there is one-fifth difference between one and the other. When we read in the newspapers that a certain quality of oil is quoted in Cleveland at 9 or 10 cents, that does not mean delivered in Canada. The oil has to be brought here and bear the freight here, just as much as our Canadian oil has to bear the freight from the place at which it is manufactured. The oil must be inspected and there is no hon. gentleman who will advocate doing away with the inspection of American oil. Again, hon. gentlemen must remember that there are the barrels to be provided and the duty charged on them. Unless we have free trade in barrels, there is a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* imposed, or 40 cents a barrel. The hon. member for Huron said the wholesale price of American oil to-day in Canada was 23 cents. I suppose the reason it is 23 cents is because of the duty added. If you were to buy it ex-duty, would it not be 7½ cents less than the 23 cents? That is a fair calculation. Freight, testing and barrelling must go on as at present, every expense connected with it applies whether there is a duty or not. So if the wholesale price is 23 cents in Canada—I do not know at what point of delivery he meant, but it does not matter for the sake of the illustration—and if we deduct 7½ cents, what will be left as the price of the oil? The net price will be 15½ cents in Canada. How can hon. gentlemen make the statement that we would have American oil sold here for from 7½ cents to 9 cents when I prove from their own calculations it would sell at about 15½ cents if there is no duty imposed? The hon. member for Huron—although I desire to give him credit for having given the prices very fairly—would find in the *Globe* any day this week the following prices in Canada:—Refined oil, Petrolia, 12½ to 13 cents f.o.b., 2 per cent. off for cash; American oil, 25 cents per gallon at Toronto, wholesale, water white, photogene the best quality of American oil, 27 cents. These quotations from the *Globe* are nearly correct. If you take 25 cents per gallon as the price in Toronto and deduct from it the whole duty, 7½ cents, it will be found that the merchants would charge 17½ cents ex-duty. Photogene, which is equal to our oil selling at about 16 or 16½ cents, would be sold at 19½ cents ex-duty. I hope this explanation will induce people when about to make statements in regard to the price of American oil as compared to Canadian, at least to make enquiries and ascertain whether the statements and calculations I have made are correct or not. I make the statement broadly that in the United States there are special classes of oil which are sold in Canada, including duty, at from 25 cents to 27 cents as per the quotations I have given. We have also a special brand of Canadian oil that the people of the class such as those who buy the photogene of the United States purchase. They certainly have to pay more for these high brands, and the reason is that there is a less percentage taken out of the crude, and probably double treating to make this extra oil, but there are people who can afford it and will pay a high price, many of whom have been accustomed to take American oil to the exclusion of the Canadian product, which was not formerly so good. But I will tell this House that you can buy the oil referred to by the hon. member for East Huron at Petrolia for 12½ cents, a first-class burning oil, fit to go into any lamp in the country; and when the people want a barrel of oil at that price all they have to do is to calculate what the freight is to the point of delivery. The freight of oil to Halifax is not more than 2¼ cents per gallon, 1⅝ cents to Ottawa and Montreal and 2 cents to Quebec. You know what the oil costs, what the freight is, and if you pay more than these prices, except a reasonable profit to the retailer, you have yourselves to blame. Now, Sir, I might also say that in the United States the oil trade is confined practically to one concern. The Standard Oil Company of the United States is to-day one of the most aggressive, one of the richest and one of the greatest monopolies that exists on the face of the American continent. If you refer to a small book called "Cook on Trusts," where there is an exposition given of the combines in the United States, you will find that two years ago the capital of that company was $150,000,000, and last year I am informed they divided in profits amongst themselves between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000. I see lately that they have got control of the Southern Pacific Railway, and that they control two or three of the railway lines in the United States besides. They are doing business in Canada to-day; all the gas produced from the gas wells in the County of Welland is taken by the Standard Oil Company and distributed in the city of Buffalo. They lay the gas pipes to the centre of the river, and they supply the city of Buffalo with Canadian gas. I am glad to see such enterprising people, but I want that they shall not get such a foothold in this country that, when they have once got it, they would be able to pinch us close, or fasten around our throats. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), speaking in that same debate, in reference to the Standard Oil Company and in reference to the necessity for a duty on oil if we want to protect our own industries, made these remarks:

"I do say, however, that if you take off the duty, the Standard Refining Company have but one object, and that is to secure the Canadian market, one way or the other, and if they succeed in doing that, the people of Canada would have to pay a much greater price for their oil than they are paying to-day."

Now, Sir, there is no person in this House of Commons who knows better than the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) what the effect would be, in taking off the duty on refined oil, and I have a matter here to tell you that I think will be rather interesting. In the year when the protection on oil was reduced from 10 cents to 6 cents in this House, that gentleman was previously asked, what action the Government intended to take on this question. The Government asked time for consideration, and when they had considered it, they came down to this House in their Budget speech, and they told the people of this country that they had concluded to reduce the

duty and protection on oil from 10 cents to 6 cents. There was 5 cents Inland Revenue, but I will not complicate matters by referring to that. It will be interesting, I think, to read the remarks of the hon. gentleman upon that occasion, for they will bear out what I have to say, that it would be the complete ruination of the industry if a fraction more of the protection the trade now enjoys were taken off. He said, in 1877, as reported in *Hansard*:

"The Government, therefore, have carefully considered this whole question with a desire to remove the burdens of the people as much as they could and yet not utterly to wipe out of existence a Canadian industry which had grown up under the protection of the law as enacted by hon. gentlemen opposite, the conclusion we arrive at is this: We propose to abolish the Excise duty altogether and to reduce the duty on imported petroleum from 15 cents per gallon as it is at present to 6 cents. It is necessary for us under existing circumstances to take back an equivalent for that amount."

Remember there was a little loss of revenue here, and he continues:

"We think that we may fairly ask the country to recompense us by paying an additional duty of one penny sterling or 2 cents a pound on tea imported into the country."

So that the hon. gentleman was prepared to make up the deficiency in the revenue out of the duty upon tea. Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) then told us, that he did this to reduce the burdens of the people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) anxious to relieve the people, indeed! Did he relieve the people? I will tell you what he did, Mr. Speaker, and then you can conclude for yourself. The whole reduction on the revenue by lowering the duty on oil, or if you like to call it, the whole gain to the people by that reduction was $72,000; there happened that year to come into the country 11,000,000 lbs. of tea, and the people lost by the additional duty, not only the $72,000, that they had gained in oil by the duty being lowered on the oil, but the difference between that sum and $220,000, the duties they had to pay upon tea. That is the way the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) relieved the people from the burden of taxation by taking off $72,000 on oil and putting on $220,000 on tea. I will quote to the House what a paper published in the County of Lambton, which I may tell you by no means supported the person who is now addressing the House, says upon this oil question. The Sarnia *Observer* of the 6th February, 1891, said:

"If there is an industry in the Dominion more entitled on its merits to such protection as a Government could reasonably give, than is the oil industry, we have no knowledge of it. Taking the amount of capital at stake; the peculiar disadvantages under which it is carried on, beginning with the extraction of the crude material from the bowels of the earth to its completion as a manufactured product, no other purely native industry can compare with it in extent and the difficulties it has to overcome. In a broad, sweeping measure of reciprocal free trade its sacrifice, under such circumstances, would be a matter of regret, and one that the most ardent free trader could find reason to deplore."

In passing on now, Sir, to the magnitude of this particular industry, let me call your attention to the trade in the United States. Why, Sir, the volume of trade in the United States in that one article alone is almost incomprehensible. They export to-day oil that they do not need for their own consumption, to the extent of $50,000,000 a year. That oil is carried from the United States to almost every part of the known world where it can find an entrance. I will take the liberty of referring you to the different tariffs that are existing in countries all over the known world against petroleum. But first, Sir, let me read you an extract from a lecture that was delivered by probably the greatest scientist on petroleum in the world. It is from a lecture delivered in 1888 by Mr. Charles Marvin, before the Royal Engineers in Chatham, England, in reference to the petroleum industry of the United States. Upon page 20 of this book, he says:

"From 1859 to 1879 it is estimated that the United States exported 6,231,102,923 gallons of refined oil, valued at £175,000,000."

The trade of Canada, imports and exports combined, amounts to about 15,000,000 gallons of refined oil a year, of which we manufacture in this country about 10,000,000 gallons and import about 5,000,000 gallons. Before our protection was lowered the importation of American oil was at a minimum compared with what it was when the tariff was reduced to 6 cents a gallon; then the imports from the United States immediately doubled and have since quadrupled. It is true that hon. gentlemen's policy would do a great deal more than affect simply the present development of the industry. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House must be aware that the favoured oil district in the County of Lambton is not the only place in Canada where petroleum is to be found. The hon. member for Gaspé has just shown me a sample of crude petroleum which we have just taken over to the Geological Department, and which I guarantee is as good if not better, than Pennsylvania oil; and he informs me that a company of Englishmen and Americans have in a short period spent $50,000 in trying to develop the oil-fields in that district. Then, as hon. gentlemen who have paid attention to the geological reports must know, we have in the Kootenay district, in British Columbia, and near the Crow's Nest Pass, very strong indications of oil; and I am informed that Professor Selwyn is at the present time on his way to the Crow's Nest Pass for the purpose of enquiring into the extent and value of the mineral deposits of that district. On top of that we have the great undeveloped oil-fields of the Athabasca region. It might be interesting here to read a few lines from a report on this subject made by a Committee of the Senate a few years ago, founded on information as to the marvellous extent of that district. It says:

"The evidence submitted to your Committee points to the existence in the Athabasca and Mackenzie Valleys of the most extensive petroleum field in America, if not in the world. The uses of petroleum, and consequently the demand for it, are increasing at such a rapid ratio, that it is probable that this great petroleum field will assume an enormous value in the near future, and will rank among the chief assets comprised in the crown domain of the Dominion. For this reason your Committee would suggest that a tract of about 40,000 miles (the area of the Russian deposits at Baku is only 1,600 square miles) be, for the present, reserved from sale, and that as soon as possible its value may be more accurately tested by exploration and practical tests; the said reserve to be bounded as follows: Easterly by a line drawn due north from the foot of the Cascade Rapids on Clearwater River to the south shore of the Athabasca Lake; northerly, by the said lake shore and the Quatre Fourches and Peace Rivers; westerly, by Peace River and a straight line from Peace River Landing to the western extremity of Lesser Slave Lake; and southerly, by said lake and the river discharging it, to Athabasca River and Clearwater River as far as the place of beginning."

Speaking of the present Canadian oil-fields, Mr. Marvin says:

"The general area is larger than that of all the petroleum districts of the present oil-producing countries put together, and the selection of the best southern section as a Crown domain is a measure that should be copied by the Indian Government without delay."

Now, you propose, by your unrestricted reciprocity, to crush out of existence in Canada, not only the existing industry and the capital invested in it, but forever to transfer from this country to the United States the work of supplying oil for the people of Canada. Sir, when the American fields run dry, which experience tells us will happen some day, we in this country, I am warranted by the highest geological authorities in the world in saying, will have an oil territory in the bosom of this Canada of ours larger than is to be found in any other part of this continent. Mr. Marvin has made a careful investigation of our Canadian petroleum resources, and I will take the liberty, for I could not put it in any shorter language than to quote his words. Speaking of the Ontario oil region, he says:

"The Ontario oil deposits cover an area of 50 by 100 miles, but the developed fields are confined to a belt 2 miles in width and 16 in length, situated about 16 miles east of Port Sarnia, and extending nearly parallel with the St. Clair River."

Here let me remark that this was written two or three years ago, and since that time you might say that it includes a territory five by twenty miles instead of two by sixteen.—

"The territory is divided into two districts, about 7 miles apart, called Petrolia and Oil Springs, in which collectively, 3,200 wells have been sunk. Petrolia produces the greater proportion of the 25,000,000 gallons obtained every year, and also owns nine out of the thirteen refineries at work in Canada. Although, when compared with the United States, where the average production of crude amounts to about 1,000 million gallons every year, the industry may seem insignificant, it yet gives employment to 3,000 men, and sustains a population of 8,000. * * * I venture to predict, therefore, that when the great oil-fields of Canada are opened up, the oil will be found to have an affinity with the Pennsylvanian, and will afford light not only for the future millions of the Dominion, but also for the present millions of the Pacific sea board, both on the American side and in China and Japan."

Now, Sir, to speak of our own industry at home, which I shall be pardoned, I suppose, for feeling a little pride in and making some remarks upon, it consists at the present moment of about 4,000 wells, not to speak of the abandoned wells. When I went there at first, hundreds of wells were put down at a cost of $1,500 to $2,000 apiece. At the present time it costs far less. You could put down five or six wells now at the cost of one in those days. But if you estimate the 4,000 wells in existence to-day at $500 each, that will amount to $2,000,000; the machinery at $500,000, the land—about 100,000 acres averaging in cost and value say $100 per acre—$10,000,000, and the abandoned wells at $2,500,000. That would make altogether about $15,000,000. Now, Sir, what revenue does this oil industry return to that district a year? The total proceeds from oil in the country are $7,500 a day; that is from the sale of refined and crude oils and the different products of the crude article. In the town of Petrolia large warehouse companies have established tanks to carry the surplus oil from time to time, which have a capacity for storing half a million barrels of oil. There are several refineries, representing a capital of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. Then, there are large cooper shops that make the barrels. There are chemical works in the city of London making acids for the purpose of refining the oil. There are two large manufactories at Petrolia, for manufacturing nitro-glycerine, which give employment to a number of hands. There are also boiler works established there, amongst the largest in the Dominion, and these works have been busy for years past, not only supplying Petrolia, but shipping car loads of boilers to Australia itself. They have shipped car loads of machinery to Australia, to Gallicia, to Italy, and foreign countries. There are large machine shops there. There are labourers employed in running the wells as well as in the manufacture of oil, and they are still at work commanding high wages, and I presume there are about 5,000 people to-day engaged, directly and indirectly, in the production and manufacture of oil and other articles in conjunction with it. A large population is also maintained, not only in the town, but throughout the country, where the trade has its connections and branches. I can also tell you this, Sir, and it will be of interest to the Finance Minister, as showing the advantages of protection, that within the last year a company from the United States came to Petrolia and bought out one of the largest refineries there, and within the last year have spent fully a quarter of a million dollars in developing the industry there. In this connection, I wish to refer to the policy of other countries with reference to this oil industry, and that is something which will interest the Minister of Finance. We are asked by those who are agitating for free trade, and who wish to close up our industries and stop the future development of the country, to allow American oil to come in free. Let us see what the policy of the United State has been. It is only a few years ago since the Americans took down the bars and allowed our oil to enter their country at a lower duty. Formerly they had a high tariff, which they have reduced to 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on refined, and 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on crude oil. When did they make that reduction? They did it, but not until their oil was as low as it is at present. They did not do it so long as they saw a single chance for a single gallon of Canadian petroleum going into their country. At that time what was the duty? We have been told that the duty we have upon American oil is about 100 per cent., and that it is an enormous taxation. Well, Sir, what will those hon. gentlemen think when I tell them that the United States formerly levied a specific duty of 20 cents a gallon upon crude oil, which, at the present prices of 40 or 60 cents a barrel, instead of being 100 per cent., would be about 2,000 per cent., and their duty on refined oil was, until, I think, 1884, 40 cents per gallon specific duty, which, taking the oil at 10 cents per gallon, would be 400 per cent. That is the lesson given to us by statesmen on the other side desirous of developing their country, and whom hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly asking us to imitate. Now, let me see them imitate them in this respect; but let me refer you, Sir, for a moment, to the high duties which prevail in other countries where oil is produced. I find that Russia, having one of the largest oil territories in the world, charges a specific duty of 18 cents per gallon. I would like to see how you could get our oil in there in face of that duty. France charges a duty of 17 cents per gallon specific duty, Portugal charges 25 cents per gallon, Spain, 22 cents per gallon, and Italy, 31 cents per gallon.

Austro-Hungary charges a specific duty of 17 cents, Greece 25 cents, and the United States' tariff I have given you. In referring to Austro-Hungary, I cannot help referring with feelings of pride to the great number of our young Canadians who are over there. I suppose that in the County of Lambton there will be found the most skilled lot of workingmen to be found on the American continent; and Austria and Gallicia and Italy and even Russia, have taken our young men from the town of Petrolia—at high wages, $4, $5, and $6 a day—with the tools and machinery used by them, and in Gallicia to-day there is a settlement of over 50 Canadians at least. We will be told that the National Policy has driven these men out of the country. But I say, that is not the case. The protective tariff, however, has this much to do with it, that, under its influence, the education of these young men was acquired by them in our own country and they have become the most skilful oil workmen and artesian well drillers in the world, and the skill they have acquired, owing to our protective tariff, has created a demand for them in all parts of the civilized world where artesian wells have to be drilled. I forgot to mention Australia, which is a country greatly in need of water, and where the sheep often die by thousands for want of that element; and I can tell you, Sir, that it was not until about six years ago that substantial relief was obtained in that country from the drougth, and that relief was obtained by means through the skill of Canadians from the town of Petrolia. American workmen and others had endeavoured to bore deep wells in Australia, but had practically failed. But one of our Canadians went over there with a gang of some eight men and machinery, and he put down a well, and succeeded in obtaining water, and the Australian sheep-fields to-day are teeming with artesian wells drilled by Canadians and by Canadian machinery. In reading a letter, which I received from one of those men, I felt very much pleased with a little incident he related. He said:

"The beautifully coloured birds of the Australian regions, when the wells are nearly done, and the instincts of these birds, strange to say, tell them when we are near water, and as we are about striking the water, thousands of those lovely plumaged birds hover round the derrick and cheer us in the centre of the wilderness of Australia with their songs. They wait until the great deluge breaks out, and pour down in myriads to drink."

I must not forget to say, in advocating this duty on oil, that I do not consider the oil industry for one moment, as a local interest in Canada. Like all other industries in Canada, it must go hand in hand with the others in the development of this country. It is in this respect like the coal industry and the iron industry, and the only drawback I know about it at present is the fact that it is centred in one locality. There are no combines, nor has there been one in existence in that industry for years. In fact, I believe oil to-day is made too cheap, and I do not believe there is half a cent profit per gallon in it to the manufacturer. I was saying that the freights are unquestionably against the trade. If fortune favours this country and develops the oil-fields of Gaspé, we will have oil produced in the east. We have oil in the west, and we have oil in the central part of the country. Then we will have the heavy rates of freight reduced which are now an obstacle in the way of this particular trade. But are we alone in that? Across the line, where do we find the oil-fields? Do we find them in Georgia, in Carolina, or in the State of Maine? No; we only find them in the favoured districts of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and I believe in a small part of the State of California. If they get oil in California, they will do what we are trying to do in British Columbia, and then this objection as to freight will be removed. This is, therefore, not a sectional question, but is one in which each province is alike interested. Protection has been placed and maintained on oil for the purpose of holding in its entirety the interest we now have and further developing the other sections of this country which have been found to be rich in oil. I have taken up a great deal of time in discussing this subject and I ask pardon of the House for having detained it so long. My only excuse is that, residing in that part of the country which is so rich in oil, I might be supposed to know more about it by experience than people who reside in other portions of the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Are we to understand from his figures that the difference we pay throughout the country in the retail price of Canadian oil, which I understand is about 25 cents a gallon, and the figures which he has quoted as the price in the coal oil district of Petrolia, is due entirely to the profit made by the retailer?

Mr. MONCRIEEF. The hon. gentleman from South Huron gave the correct prices the other evening. The price in Petrolia is 12½ cents. If you add the freight on that to where you live—I do not know where it is—it cannot be more than 2 cents, and then I can only say that all over and above that would be profit to somebody outside of those who manufacture it. It is a mere matter of calculation. The hon. member for South Huron says the price is 25 cents a gallon retail for that which costs only 12½ cents. If the freight is added, the difference between what is paid to the refiner and the amount charged by the retailer is profit, and the barrel is always left, and that is worth about $1.

Mr. HYMAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the Order of the House of the 25th June last, to the effect: "That it is desirable that any witnesses called before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be examined under oath or affirmation touching any matter coming before them," should be rescinded, as in the opinion of the Committee such an order should not be asked for from the House except upon the recommendation of the Committee.

He said: I am aware that this motion can only be moved by the unanimous consent of the House. I may say it is asked by the Committee unanimously.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion cannot be proceeded with out of its usual order. I understand it is objected to.

Mr. FOSTER. Does any hon. gentleman object?

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I object on principle to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I call attention to the fact that it was passed by the unanimous consent of the Committee, after discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. If objection is taken to the moving of a motion already on the Notice paper, it cannot be moved out of its regular order. I understand objection is taken.

Mr. WALLACE. But we are passing motions adopted unanimously by committees every day. If any hon. gentleman rises to object to this motion——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE Do I understand objection has been raised?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; objection has been raised to the motion which the hon. gentleman has just moved.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be empowered to investigate all accounts paid to or through J. E. Têtu, or in connection with any office or public service under his charge, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourth report of said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BARRON. With the consent of the House, I beg to move:

That all accounts for salaries and extra services or otherwise with the Post Office Department in regard to the following persons: namely, J. G. Poston, A. C. McDonald, M. P. Wright, E. A. LeSueur, Miss Kate E. Falconer, Miss J. Craig, Miss A. Graham, and A. E. Meighen, together with all cheques given in payment of such accounts, and any and all cheques, vouchers, receipts and other papers in any way relating to their respective services for the fiscal year 1888-89, and up to year ending 30th June, 1891, be produced before Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. Is objection taken?

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is not exactly in order. The accounts ought to be sent down to the House and then referred.

Mr. WALLACE. The motion is quite unnecessary, as the hon. member secured the passage of a similar resolution in the Public Accounts Committee to-day.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. The motion made before the Public Accounts Committee to-day referred merely to what was in the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1890. This motion refers to matters prior to that.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite clear that the only mode to obtain that is to move that they be laid before the House, and then they could be referred to the Committee. The hon. gentleman has not given any notice of the motion, and I take it that it is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I rule the motion out of order.

AMBER DEPOSITS IN NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BAIN asked, Has any person applied for or received from the Government the privilege of purchasing or working an amber mine or deposit in the North-West? If so, who has applied for or received such privilege or right? Where is the mine or deposit located? Was it granted to the first applicant therefor?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. Twenty-three applications have been made, but no privilege of purchasing or working an amber mine has been granted. Messrs. McFarlane & King, who claim to be the discoverers and were the first applicants, have been granted until the 1st of January next, the right to explore within the tract covered by their application. The following twenty applicants made twenty-three applications for amber locations at Cedar Lake:—McFarlane, King & Co.; P. H. Chabot; R. Brown, G. S. Robertson & Bradbury; R. S. & J. W. Tyrrell; W. A. Allen; G. M. Balderson; Jos. Kavanagh; J. E. Woods; W. B. Nesbitt; W. H. Hunter; F. Crompton; Mather, Sprague & Clarke; P. A. Pyne; J. Small; T. L. Brown; W. R. Bradbury; R. S. Tyrrell; A. E. Bradbury; J. W. Tyrrell; D. Sinclair. The deposits are said to be located along the shores and in the neighbourhood of Cedar Lake.

LEASE OF BUILDING ON SPARKS STREET.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the Government a lease of the building on Sparks Street formerly occupied by the Dominion Analyst? If so, from whom leased, how long, and what rent is paid per year? Is it at present occupied by any officer of the Government? If so, by whom, and for what purpose is it used?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government did lease the building referred to for $500 a year. It was so leased for the Assistant Dominion Analyst, and for the manufacture of methylated spirits, for five years. A portion of it is now occupied by a messenger of the Inland Revenue Department, who is there as caretaker, without salary. It is leased from Mr. Perkins.

POSTMASTER AT NELSON, B.C.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, What was the salary of the postmaster of Nelson, B.C., during the year 1890? Was there an increase made during the current year? If so, how much, and what reasons were given by the post office inspector recommending such increase?

Mr. HAGGART. During the year 1890 the salary of the postmaster of Nelson was $30. The salary has lately been increased to $200, the books of the department showing that the revenue of the office is more than sufficient to warrant such a salary according to the ordinary scale. The attention of the department was drawn by the post office inspector to the rapid increase of postal business at Nelson, justifying, as he believed, a considerable increase of salary.

TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. GERMAN asked, 1. Who are the contractors for the Toronto Harbour Works? 2. When was the contract let? 3. When was the

work to be completed? 4. What was the amount of the contract? 5. What progress has been made, to date, with the dredging and timber work? 6. What amount of work remains to be done? 7. What is the cause of the delay? 8. When will the work be completed? 9. What changes have been made, if any, since the contract was let? 10. If changes have been made, will they increase or decrease the cost of the work and to what extent, or have any changes been made in the contractors' price? If so, state what changes have been made in this respect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. Messrs. Murray & Cleveland, of St. Catharines, Ont. 2. On the 21st May, 1889. 3. Thirty months from date of contract, or on 21st November, 1891. 4. The contract was a schedule price one. Applying Messrs. Murray & Cleveland's prices to the quantities as per original plan, their tender would amount to $192,810. 5. The quantity of dredging done to date is 253,037 cubic yards. It should be stated, however, that the dredging done during the summers of 1889 and 1890, amounting to 199,914 cubic yards, was done for the purpose of keeping the eastern channel open during the time of navigation and not as part of the permanent 16-foot channel. With regard to the progress of the timber work, the following may be stated:—The work as originally designed consists in the construction of two entrance piers, respectively 2,280 feet and 2,420 feet in length, and a protection pier 1,500 feet in length, from the east pier to the end of Fisherman's Island. Up to date, 900 feet of the work is built up to one foot above zero, and 20 cribs 100 feet in length are framed 18 feet in height and ready to be placed in position. In addition a large quantity of materials are delivered in Toronto, such as: 61,733 lineal feet of timber 12 x 12; 46,144 lineal feet of timber 10 x 10; 18,000 lineal feet of poles for ballast floors, &c. 6. The quantity of dredging yet to be done to obtain the 16-foot channel, is estimated at 350,000 cubic yards, and from the above it would appear that 5,300 feet of crib work have yet to be placed in position, but it is expected that when the east pier and the protecting work are built, there will be no necessity to construct the west pier. 7. (1st.) The difficulty experienced by the contractors in procuring timber during the summer of 1889-90. (2nd.) The very rough state of the Lake Ontario during the summer of 1889-90 and the exposed position of the work. 8. It will depend on the state of the weather; it is expected, however, that the whole of the work will be completed in 1893. 9. In the original plan it was intended to place the crib work on the natural bed of the lake, and to open up a channel 12 feet in depth between the two lines of crib work. In June, 1890, it was decided to sink the crib work to a depth of 16 feet below zero, so that it might be permanent and permit of a channel 16 feet in depth being dredged, and to correspond with the lake and river entrance to the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals. Mr. Page, late Chief Engineer of Canals, was consulted, and recommended that the east pier be sunk to a depth of 16 feet, and an Order in Council authorizing this change was passed. The sinking of the cribs to the depth of 16 feet necessitated a change in their construction, their width being increased from 25 to 30 feet. 10. The change made by Order in Council authorizing the sinking of the eastern pier to a depth of 16 feet below zero, will increase the cost of the work by the value of extra materials required for the change, and that of the extra dredging, the estimated increase being $35,000. The change due to the increase in the width of the cribs will entail an extra expenditure of about $25,000. It is probable, however, that owing to these beneficial changes, and the fact that the eastern pier will be of a more substantial character than originally intended, it will not be necessary to construct the whole of the western pier, and that a saving of $75,000 will thereby be effected. None of the contractors' prices have been changed; they are paid at the schedule rates of their tender.

DEPARTMENTAL PAY-SHEETS.

Mr McMULLEN asked, Was it not the rule of some or all of the departments some years ago that pay-sheets had to be executed by each Civil Service officer, whether temporary or permanent, in payment of salary? When was the system abolished? On whose recommendation? And what were the reasons given for such abolition? Does the Government intend to reintroduce this system, in face of the developments which have taken place before the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I cannot get from his questions a clue to the kind of information he wants. I do not understand his question—my head is a little thick, I suppose—and if he will take the trouble to explain it to me and let the question stand, I will try to get an answer for him at a later day.

GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. FRASER asked, Has the collector of Customs for Guysborough been superannuated? If so, for what reason? Have charges been preferred against him by any person? If so, by whom? Why was he deprived of the office of overseer of fisheries? Who has been appointed to these two offices, and at what salary? Has any investigation taken place, by order of the Government, into any charges made against the said collector?

Mr. BOWELL. The collector of Customs for Guysborough has been superannuated, and Mr. William Cameron appointed sub-collector at that place, at a salary of $400 per annum. Mr. Cameron has also been appointed overseer of fisheries, at a salary of $150 per annum. It is almost impossible to answer the remaining portion of the question, certainly not satisfactorily, unless by the production of the correspondence, which will be brought down if the hon. gentleman will move for it. It is too voluminous to be read here.

ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES.

Mr. MULOCK (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, Have any seizures of goods been made since 1st January, 1879, by officers of the Customs, for violation of Customs laws, which have afterwards been decided by the Customs Department, or by the courts, to have been illegal? If so, what were the cases? What officers of the Customs profited by the distribution in the case of such seizures? What other parties, if any, profited in such distribution? Did the officers and parties who received a portion of the

proceeds of such seizures, or any of them, refund the money when such seizures were declared illegal? What were the names of the officers or parties who refunded the money comprising their share of such seizures upon declaration of the illegality of the same, and what was the date in each case of the payment of the same? What were the names of the officers or parties who did not refund the money comprising their share of such seizures after the declaration of the illegality of the same?

Mr. BOWELL. This question is one which should have been asked by a motion, and then I could have given the information. If the hon. gentleman would move for any particular case, I would be glad to give him full information upon it. In the meantime, I will give him what information I have. The only cases that can be brought to mind without a search through something over 8,000 seizures, in which seizures of goods have been made, and which come within the category of the questions mentioned, are the following, in which judgments were rendered against the Crown:—The Ayer Patent Medicine Company; Carter, Macy & Company, teas; The Bell Telephone Company, switchboards; and the Grinnell sprinklers; but as in none of these cases was any distribution ever made, there was nothing to refund. The case of the Vacuum Oil Company, in which judgment went against the Crown for a portion of the amount deposited, and which it was supposed was settled years ago, was brought into court on a *fiat*. As the matter still remains unsettled, awaiting the voting of funds to pay the amount of judgment, no call has been made for a refund of the proportionate amount covered by the judgment; but this will be done as soon as a final settlement is arrived at. I may say that this is the only case I can recollect at present in which the distribution has taken place and the decision of the courts was against the department. It may be added that in this case the portion of the award that went to the informer cannot be refunded, the party having died several years since. There have been two or three cases, as, for instance, the Fuller & Co. (dynamite), and the Noble's Explosive Company (dynamite), in which, on a revision and additional evidence being obtained from England and Germany to settle the actual value of the article, the department refunded the amount deposited, but in these cases, as in those above referred to as having been decided by the court, no distribution had ever been made of the proceeds.

PURCHASE OF CEMENT.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has the Government entered into any agreement or agreements for the purchase of cement? If so, what is the date of contract or contracts; the total quantity agreed to be purchased; the names and addresses of each person or corporation with whom any such contract has been entered into; the price to be paid, and when to be delivered?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I enquired about this in my department, and there is no arrangement or contract for the purpose mentioned.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BONDS.

Mr. FREMONT asked, When is it the intention of the Government to bring before the House the promised legislation regarding the bonds on that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway formerly known as the "North Shore Road?" Why has not the measure been brought before the House at an earlier period of the session?

Mr. BOWELL. The resolutions dealing with this question will be placed upon the Notice paper in a day or two. The reason this was not done before is because they were not ready.

THE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government: 1st. To dredge and deepen the Lièvre River between the town of Buckingham and the lock recently constructed at High Rapids, so as to permit steamers and boats drawing eight feet of water to circulate, and to render the depth of the river the same as that at the new lock? 2nd. To dredge and deepen the Ottawa River at and about the wharf of the town of Aylmer, so as to permit steamers to approach the same in low water?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I require more information than I have in my department about the first portion of the question, but attention will be given to the subject. With regard to the second portion, we have nothing in the department to show that more water is required at the Aylmer wharf.

CANADA STATUTES—DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to supply to municipal councils and justices of the peace, copies of the statutes of Canada?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The statutes are not given to justices of the peace. This matter was discussed a couple of years ago, and it was decided not to distribute them to justices of the peace. The criminal laws, however, and the amendments thereto are distributed, and a certain number of municipal officers receive the statutes.

MR. JENNINGS—CHIEF ENGINEER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before we proceed with the Notices of Motion, I would like to have information on a point which is of urgency. It is reported the Government have appointed, or are about to appoint, Mr. Jennings as Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works whether there is any foundation for that statement, because it would certainly affect his functions as an engineer employed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I saw that mentioned in the papers, but that is all the information we have about the matter.

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions and memorials relating to the construction of a line of railway by the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (Limited), in the County of Inverness, up to date.

He said: Before the motion is put, I desire to say a few words in explanation. Railway discussions in Inverness have been frequent for a number of years, and have been grossly misrepresented in the press

and on the platform. For thirty-five years the people of Cape Breton have been agitating for railway extension through that Island, but, for various reasons, not until January last has a line of railway been completed, and that was built by the present Dominion Government. Unfortunately for our Island, we were in former times divided among ourselves, and the Local Governments of Nova Scotia took advantage of that disagreement. In fact, whenever a railway project was contemplated in any part of the Island, we found that designing politicians always managed to defeat our hopes. I will not refer to what transpired previous to 1884, when, as many of the older members of this House may recollect, an agitation for assistance from this Parliament was commenced in this House. At that time we felt it would be possible to put an end to the rivalry existing among various sections of the Island, and I am happy to say that, to a large extent, we have succeeded in this Parliament; but unfortunately, or possibly fortunately for the Island, disagreement among the different sections of the country was very ingeniously brought about in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia. When railway matters in the Island were under consideration in this House in 1884, and an agitation continued for the purpose of constructing a main line through the Island by a Company, we found, to our great surprise, the announcement that a rival company had been chartered by the Local Legislature. When the charter was under consideration in the Local Legislature, Mr. Campbell, who then represented Inverness in that body, spoke as follows:—

"He was astonished at the course of the hon. Attorney General in introducing this Bill. That hon. gentleman must see the insincerity of this company in coming here and simply asking for a charter and a grant of Crown lands for the privilege of building a railway through the Island of Cape Breton, when companies in the past, with grants of moneys and Crown lands and mineral lands, had failed to build a mile of road in the Island. There was nothing in this Bill, it was simply to embarrass a company that was somewhat likely to build that road,—a company which contemplated the building of roads through several of the provinces of the Dominion,—a company backed up by the Dominion Government."

To this complaint and appeal on behalf of Inverness particularly, the Premier of Nova Scotia (Hon. Mr. Fielding) replied as follows:—

"He thought the suggestion of the hon. the Attorney General ought to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Bill was not being passed through a final stage. He did not agree with the hon. member for Inverness, as he thought it was no harm to have more companies than one chartered for railway purposes. He had seen a telegram in a Cape Breton paper suggesting that the granting of this charter was going to embarrass the Dominion Government; but though he, for one, was inclined to look to the Dominion Government to assist in railway building in the Island of Cape Breton, he did not see how the passage of this Bill, on the conditions suggested by the hon. the Attorney General, could have any such effect as had been spoken of."

Notwithstanding the remonstrances of Mr. Campbell, who then represented Inverness, the Bill passed all its stages through the Legislature and became law. The following year the railway affairs connected with Cape Breton generally, and Inverness particularly, were under discussion in the Nova Scotia Legislature, and Mr. Fielding, the Premier, on the 10th April, 1885, said:

"It has been the fact in times past that a skilful political leader could knock the heads of the two divisions of Cape Breton together, and prevent anything like the united action on the part of Cape Breton members by raising the question of the rival routes. In fact the question, of the rival routes in Cape Breton is a more serious question than the rivalry between the mainland and Cape Breton. I have my own opinions on the subject, but I would be quite willing to grant aid to either of those routes, if the company, on commercial principles, was ready to build on either of them. If we were forced to decide between the routes as we would be by this resolution, then I see great difficulty in the way. I am quite willing to admit the strong claims of Cape Breton. If this resolution had the approval of all the members from the Island, if it could be taken as a fair indication of the interests of Cape Breton, then it might be an indication of the line of policy which this Government would adopt. But I am afraid it does not; I am afraid it brings up the question of the rival routes, an exceedingly difficult question. On behalf of the Government I have to say that if any company be found to build a railway in Cape Breton, this Government will be ready to aid in that work to the extent of their power."

In this way it will be seen that the Premier of Nova Scotia was aware of the manner in which any railway enterprises could be defeated on the Island, as he admitted the manner in which that had been practised in the Local Legislature for some time. For some reason or other—I cannot well explain it myself—the Local Government of Nova Scotia has paid considerable attention to myself for some years past. In December, 1886, two members of the Local Government advertised a meeting in my county, in the village of Whycocomagh, in order to organize the Liberal party in that county against me, and the Local Government were represented by the Hon. J. W. Longley, Attorney General, and the Hon. D. McNeill. In 1887 it was proved that their efforts had failed to defeat me. In 1887 the Local Government granted two charters to rival companies in that county, and I have no hesitation in saying that was for the purpose of defeating the extension of a branch line of railway in the County of Inverness. Both charters were practically over the same ground. It is true they were differently worded, but the charter of one of the railway companies would enable the other, if they had the means, to build a railway over exactly the same ground from one end of the county to the other. The effect, however, was altogether to defeat the prospect of building a road at all. In 1891, the Premier of Nova Scotia paid some attention to the County of Inverness, as well as to other counties in the province. He addressed two public meetings in that county, and he did not fail to discuss Inverness railway matters at both those meetings, but he found that the people made it so hot for him that, though he had two or three other meetings advertised, he failed to put in an appearance. His action there obtained a large majority for me, and I have no doubt that, if he had appeared at the other meetings, my majority would have been 1,000. But as all these questions have been misrepresented, not only in the County of Inverness, but throughout the Province of Nova Scotia, and even in Ottawa, I deem it my duty to place on record, with such correspondence as I have called for, correct statements in regard to these railway matters. In the early part of the session there was a manifesto published in the *Citizen* of Ottawa in which, over the signature of Henry N. Paint, it was alleged that a report of a meeting which took place in the village of Whycocomagh, in February last was correct, but the gross misrepresentations which were made in that manifesto, and the garbled manner in which the report of that meeting was published in the *Citizen*, compel me, in justice to myself, to publish a correct report of that meeting as given by the

secretary of that meeting. I may say that, although Mr. Paint's report purported to be the correct report of the meeting held at that time, and was signed by the chairman and secretary of the meeting, only a very small portion of what took place was published. The preamble of one resolution was placed before another resolution, and what I stated was grossly exaggerated and misrepresented in his report. This is my excuse for reading to the House the correct report of that meeting, which I would rather place in the hands of the reporters if the Rules of the House did not prevent that being done, unless the report was read in the House, as published by the secretary in the North Sydney *Herald*:

"RAILWAY MEETING AT WHYCOCOMAGH.

"Pursuant to notice given by the warden of the county a meeting was held in Whycocomagh on the 3rd instant, for the purpose of considering the best method of obtaining railway extension from Orangedale Station on the C.B.R. to Cheticamp. Neil McAuley, warden, was elected chairman, and Andrew A. Munro, secretary.

"L. S. McKeen then moved the following resolution, which he supported in a few well-chosen sentences, relative to the great results which would arise from railway extension north:—

"'Whereas the C.B. Railway, recently opened for traffic, is located near the border of the county and does not traverse the leading districts; therefore, it affords but comparatively little accommodation to the people and trade of Inverness, unless a branch is built extending from, or near, Orangedale Station, on the C.B.R., to the northern part of the county; and

"Whereas such extension, passing at or through Whycocomagh, through or near the important districts of Mabou and Lake Ainslie, through Broad Cove and its immense coal-fields, through the thicky-peopled districts of Margaree, and terminating at the Eastern Harbour of Cheticamp, whould develop such large railway traffic as to pay not only the cost of such branch extension, but largely increase the earnings of the main line by being so important a feeder;

"Therefore, resolved: That the Dominion Government be respectfully requested to undertake the building of such branch as a Government work.'

"The resolution was seconded by J. S. Hart, and carried unanimously. The above resolution was ably discussed by Dr. Cameron, M.P., John McKinnon, M.P.P., Dr. McLellan, ex-M.P.P., Rev. J. Rose, J. S. Hart, James McPhail and others.

"Dr. Cameron, in addressing the meeting, laid particular stress upon the advisability of the branch referred to being built under the auspices of the Dominion Government, and proved conclusively, to the satisfaction of all present, that if the Government could be induced to carry on this work, it would be far preferable to having the line operated by any company whatsoever.

"Jos. McKinnon, M.P.P., in supporting the above resolution, gave a stirring speech, and dwelt particularly on the mineral and agricultural resources of the county, and the great need of further railway facilties.

"The next resolution, moved by Dr. McLellan, ex-M.P.P., seconded by Councillor J. P. McDonald, of Orangedale, read as follows:—

"'Resolved, that if the Dominion Government decline to build such a branch railway as a Dominion work, that it be requested to provide the necessary legislation for such liberal subsidy as will enable the road to be built by a chartered company able and willing to do so within a reasonable time, and that a petition be forwarded to the Government in accordance with the above resolutions.'

"In introducing the above resolution, Dr. McLellan urgently advocated the measures therein contained, and declared that he knew the people of the northern districts to be a complete unit in their desire for further railway communication north from Orangedale. He dwelt at length on the great advantage the proposed line would prove to the farmers of North Inverness in transporting their chief marketable commodity, namely, stall-fed cattle; and closed with a powerful appeal to all interested in the welfare of Cape Breton, to unite heartily in the endeavour to obtain this much-needed convenience.

"The warden then read a pithy communication from Alexander Campbell, ex-M.P.P., explaining his absence on the score of illness and expressing his full and hearty sympathy with the object of the meeting. He lamented the miserable management of former railway enterprises in Inverness and the manner in which the county had been mulct by those whose chief aim seemed to be to plunge it into a sea of debt and difficulties.

"After reading the above communication, Mr. McAulay asked if there were any further resolutions to lay before the meeting, whereupon H. N. Paint, ex-M.P. for Richmond, moved the following resolution:—

"'Whereas the electors of the County of Inverness residing at Orangedale, Broad Cove, Margaree and Cheticamp, are most anxious to have railway connection with the present Cape Breton Railway at Orangedale, which would place Port Hood, the county town, within eighteen miles and Mabou within eight miles of railway communication;

"'Therefore resolved, that this public meeting called by the warden of the county, ask the Dominion Government, should it decline to build such branch as a Government work, to grant a charter to the Inverness Railway Company who made application for a charter at the last session of the Dominion Parliament, and whose corporators are: H. N. Paint, James H. Longhead, Duncan McMillan, William A. Allen, J. G. Butterworth, James Isbester, P. K. Hyndman, Hiram Duncan, J. S. Hart, John McKeen, G. C. Lawrence, and J. K. McDonald; providing they satisfy the Government of their ability to build, equip and operate such line, and to commence active operations within one year.'

"The above resolution was seconded by Dr. Cameron, M.P., and almost unanimously carried.

"John McKeen, of Mabou, in speaking to the above resolution, expressed the opinion that in deference to justice H. N Paint and his associates should be preferred to any other company who might apply for aid to carry on the work, on account of time, trouble and money already expended in making surveys, preparing charts and bringing the matter before the public.

"The meeting being non-partizan undoubtedly contributed largely to its success. The greatest interest was manifested during the whole of the session. The most pleasing feature, however, appeared to be the perfect forbearance and unanimity which prevailed throughout.

"ANDREW A. MUNRO,
"*Secretary.*

"Whyco'h, Feb. 5th, 1891."

Those hon. gentlemen of this House who choose to compare that report as published in the North Sydney *Herald* of February 18th, 1891, with the garbled statement which was published in the *Citizen* of Ottawa in the early part of the session, will not fail to see the gross injustice which has been done to myself in that connection. On the very day of the meeting, and before it was known to us down by the sea that Parliament was dissolved, and also, I believe, before Parliament was dissolved, I addressed a letter to the late lamented Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, to which I received a reply, and I now desire to place it on record for fear it might not be in the correspondence which will be presented to this House in answer to the motion which I have just made:

"EARNSCLIFFE, OTTAWA, 10th February, 1891.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 3rd instant, on the subject of the construction of a line of railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove in Inverness. From your description of the line it is evidently one having great merits, and the moment the general election is over I shall bring the matter before my colleagues with every desire to meet your views. At present my colleagues are all scattered looking after their elections. I sincerely trust that you will be elected, and thus have an opportunity of pressing the construction of this line with your usual energy and perseverance upon the Government.

"Yours sincerely,
"JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"H. CAMERON, Esq., M.D.,
"Mabou, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia."

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

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). February 10. It was in answer to a letter written by me on the 3rd of February, the day on which that meeting was held in Whycocomagh, at the request of the meeting, which was presided over by the warden of the County of Inverness, called by him and addressed

by myself, so that the letter and the answer were simply owing to that meeting which had been called, not by my friends, by any means, but by the most bitter opponents I had in the county. Having written that letter and received the answer, I felt that I had discharged my duty in that connection. But the Local Government did not discontinue to pursue me; they followed me till 1891, and I hold in my hand a circular which was issued by a member of the Local Government, the Hon. Daniel McNeil, I believe, in answer to a circular which I issued relative to railway matters in Inverness. I will quote the following passages:—

"After admitting, for the first time, I believe, 'that in 1887 the Local Government of Nova Scotia promised a subsidy of $3,200 a mile to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company,' he proceeds to say that he gave this company 'all the assistance in my [his] power.' I deny that he gave such or any assistance; I feel confident that all of you who have perused his series of correspondence published in the Halifax *Chronicle*, during the early months of 1888, or who have privately or publicly heard him discourse on the subject, will agree with me in characterizing this statement as a bold, unblushing falsehood. Apart from his letter to the *Chronicle*, he wrote other letters which are conclusive evidence that he was inimical to the Inverness and Richmond Railway enterprise at its inception. These were written to the Hon. W. Ross from Ottawa in reply to an application made by him on behalf of that railway company for the usual Dominion subsidy, after their Act of incorporation had received the assent of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. The first of Dr. Cameron's replies is dated 21st May, 1887, in which he imposes the following extraordinary and unreasonable condition upon the company, after acknowledging the receipt of a telegram, letter and copy of their Act of incorporation: 'As there is no provision for a subsidy from the Local Government embodied in that Act it is simply a delusion and a snare.' The Hon. Mr. Ross very properly pointed out to him that no such provision had been embodied in the charters granted the previous year by the same Legislature to the Lansdowne and Stewiacke, the Joggins, the Cornwallis Valley and other railway companies, to each of which the Dominion Parliament had granted the usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile, the same year the charters were granted, before even they had organized; that each of those companies not only had that subsidy granted, but had a contract entered into with them by the Dominion Government before they applied to the Government of Nova Scotia for a contract: and he further pointed out that inasmuch as the General Railway Act of 1886 granted a subsidy of $3,200 to such railway companies as the Inverness and Richmond, it was superfluous to have the same embodied in the Act. Mr. Ross then quoted the section of that Railway Act which empowers the Government of Nova Scotia to subsidize such railways. It is as follows:

"'The Governor in Council may grant to any company offering to construct any line of railway in the Province of Nova Scotia, not already subsidized by the province, a cash subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and a land subsidy not exceeding 2,000 acres per mile. Provided that such subsidy shall not in any case be granted until the company offering to construct the railway shall have furnished to the Governor in Council satisfactory evidence that it has at its disposal, either from grants provided by the Parliament of Canada, or from private capital, or from both, funds sufficient, with the subsidies authorized by this part of this Act, to complete such railway, and shall have given ample security for such completion.'

"Dr. Cameron's reply to this is dated 30th May, 1887, in which he says: 'In answer to your favour of the 25th instant, I beg to say that at the outset I assured Mr. McKam that I could not deal with any company that would not have a reasonable subsidy granted to it by the Local Government in the Act of incorporation.' This same statement is repeated in another letter from Dr. Cameron to Hon. W. Ross, dated Ottawa, 7th June, 1887. The quotations in both extracts are mine except the word 'guaranteed,' which the doctor himself quoted. I have the original letters in my possession, which can be seen on application to me."

The very fact that Mr. Ross of Halifax, who was at one time Minister of Militia in the Government of Canada, placed the correspondence relative to this matter in the hands of my political opponents in this country, makes it due to myself and due to the constituency which I represent that this correspondence should be published, in order to show the gross injustice which has been done me by these misrepresentations. The first correspondence I received from Mr. Ross was dated 18th May, 1887, as follows:—

"HALIFAX, N.S., 18th May.

"McKam here. Full power from New York. Incorporated company to complete arrangements with you and the Local Government. Only municipal concession asked is right of way and tax exemption. Council meeting, Port Hood, Friday. Other company requiring municipal bonds for four per cent. interest on $100,000 for twenty years. Will you wire to Council to present this writing?

"W. ROSS."

At a glance, on reading that telegram, there is not an intelligent elector on the Island of Cape Breton but would realize from his past experience that the object of creating those two companies and sending them to the municipal council of Inverness, and to this Parliament also, for aid, was for the purpose of destroying, if possible, any prospect of railway extension in the County of Inverness. Smarting under that feeling, I replied to Mr. Ross, as set out in the circular from which I have quoted. On 18th May, 1887, I received a letter to which this telegram relates. It was dated Halifax, 18th May, 1887, as follows:—

"HALIFAX, 18th May, 1887.

"H. CAMERON, Esq., M.P.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have not troubled you with any letters of mine this session, but have watched that so far you have been silent on Cape Breton interests. Mr. McKam is here from New York with full powers to negotiate and enter into contract for the building of the branch lines of railway in your county. I understand that Mr. McNeil, a member of the Local Government, took some care to have the enclosed incorporation Act passed, and views with much favour the lines of railway to be opened up, so that through him the co-operation of the Local Government, to the extent of $3,200 per mile and some other concessions, will be assumed. The company, comprised of wealthy capitalists, require no municipal concessions or guarantees further than the right of way and exemptions from taxation, while I notice that some other incorporated company requires municipal guarantees which, at the outset, shall create doubt and distrust of their being able to successfully complete any great undertaking of this kind. My object in writing you is that you had some correspondence with Mr. McKam, and also with A. McKay, Esq., a member of the Legislative Council. We saw the Provincial Secretary here and explained to him the object of commencing soon in order to have the line completed in the time mentioned in the Act. He stated that the first move should be by the Dominion Government, in procuring the subsidy either in the Estimates or by resolution, and once the contract would be entered into then that his Government would be prepared to do their part. In the absence of his council he was not prepared to give any written guarantees until further progress was made at Ottawa, but that he would view with favour these important lines, and once the company would show that they had made proper arrangements with the Dominion Government and prove to their satisfaction their ability to build this road within a reasonable time, then that the $3,200 per mile would be provided by them, making payments whenever ten miles was finished. The Local Government would be deeply interested in having a road to the Inverness coalfields, shipping during winter at Cariboo Cove, and probably at Cheticamp during the opening of navigation. The object now will be to see that the Dominion subsidy would be provided for in the Estimates or by resolution in your House. I understand that another company is incorporated, but the very fact of their seeking municipal guarantee for the interest of $100,000 as being made a consideration proves that they are mere adventurers, who simply desire to sell their charter. You can readily understand that Mr. McNeil would not view favourably any line that would not include Port Hood and the shore, which the other company would not do. Mr. McKam is here now, and he is waiting for further instructions from Mr. Bell; then he may have to proceed to Ottawa. The incorporation Act will speak for itself, and I have no doubt you will be able to see that money matters will be arranged

there so that the contract may be entered into soon. The engineer and staff are ready now to come to locate the line as soon as matters are pressed forward a step or two. You may understand that I have no direct interest in this matter only as far as it tends to the general development and prosperity of our common country.

"In haste,

"Yours very sincerely,

"W. ROSS."

About the same time I had an application of a very similar character from the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and I felt it was not only an insult to myself, but it was an insult to the intelligent people of the County of Inverness, to have two railway companies sending here representatives, each with a promise from the Local Government of a subsidy of $3,200 per mile. I answered the letter as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 21st May, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I received your telegram and your favour of the 18th instant, enclosing copy of 'An Act to incorporate the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (Limited).' As there is no provision for a subsidy from the Local Government embodied in that Act, it is simply a delusion and a snare. It is evident that the object of chartering two rival railway companies to build a railway through Inverness is to play the one against the other. This game may deceive a few, but there is intelligence enough in Inverness to comprehend the deception.

"Yours truly,

"H. CAMERON.

"Hon. W. Ross."

The next letter which I received, under the guidance and direction of the Hon. Wm. Ross and the members of the Local Government to whom he referred in the first letter, was from L. G. McKam, and was as follows:—

"HALIFAX, 25th May, 1887.

"HUGH CAMERON, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I understand that our mutual friend Mr. Ross, has written you, sending you a copy of the charter of Mr. Bell's company. At first, I was afraid that there would be some trouble with the municipal council of Inverness, but from the information received and the explanation that will be made at their next meeting in June, I have every reason to believe that everything will be right. We only want from the council exemption from taxation and the free right of way. There are no guarantees of interest wanted. As far as matters stand at present, much, if not all, will depend upon your personal exertion and influence at Ottawa, so the success of this enterprise is largely in your hands. The first thing to know, will the Dominion subsidy be provided for, and if not, all our efforts will for a time fall to the ground. If the money will be voted by your Parliament, and it will if the Government say so, then, with this assurance, that contract will be secured, then the survey would be proceeded with and the work commenced as early as the proper arrangements will be perfected. Mr. Bell, and those associated with him, will send such explanations to the Inverness council as will satisfy them that they are prepared to begin at once as soon as contract business is settled. I will be pleased to hear from you stating how far you can be successful in securing success in Ottawa. If there is anything that you would suggest or desire me to do while here, please mention it. There will be no trouble with Local Government as there is a general Act which empowers the Local Government to subsidize any railway in any part of the province. Mr. Bell & Co. are quite capable with their own means to build this railway and are prepared to subscribe the stock and commence operations just as soon as the Dominion contract is secured. They have their office secured in the city of New York, the engineer engaged for the whole time, they have no interest in no other company, and all they require is the Dominion subsidy and the contract. There will be no trouble with the Local Government; of that I am assured, as the general Act covers the whole ground for all railways in this province.

"Yours truly,

"L. G. McKAM."

Here, again, I may say that about the same time the other company was pressing me, on similar grounds, to secure a subsidy for that company, and to that letter I replied as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 28th May, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have carefully examined your charter for the 'Richmond and Inverness Railway Company,' in connection with the Local Railway Act of 1886. My opinion of 'Lobster' section 5 of that Act was published in answer to Mr. W. J. McCurdy last year in the North Sydney *Herald*. There is not one dollar guaranteed for your company in that Act. It it permissive, and therefore delusive in the hands of dishonourable and dishonest political tricksters. At the outset I assured you that I could not deal with your company nor with any other company that would not have a reasonable subsidy guaranteed to it by the Local Government in its Act of incorporation. Do not rely on promises of Local Government.

"Yours truly,

"H. CAMERON.

"L. G. McKAM, Esq."

On the 27th May, I received the following letter from my friend Mr. Ross:—

"HALIFAX, 27th May, 1887.

"H. CAMERON, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 21st instant, I have to state that when your letter was written, stating that the charter granted to Messrs. Bell & Co. was 'a delusion and a snare,' as it did not provide any subsidy from the Local Government, that you are all astray in your hasty conclusions, forgetting that there is a general Act, passed in 1888, which gives full power to deal with such charters. You will find the Acts of 1888 in your library there, but section 5 of chapter 1st reads as follows:—'The Governor in Council to grant a cash subsidy, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and a land subsidy not exceeding 2,000 acres per mile. Provided, that such subsidy shall not in any case be granted until the company offering to construct the railway shall have furnished to the Governor in Council satisfactory evidence that it has at its disposal, either from grants provided by the Parliament of Canada, or from private capital, or from both, funds sufficient, with the subsidy authorized by this Act, to complete such railways, &c.' Surely there is nothing delusive or dishonest in the reading of this Act; and to include in a charter what is already provided for, is entirely unnecessary.

"You will see, therefore, the Government here can do nothing however willing to aid the Inverness Railway enterprise until either a Dominion subsidy has been obtained or the company is able to satisfy the Government that it has funds at its command ample to finish the undertaking.

"Take the two railways now under contract, viz., Joggins and Stewiacke Valley, there was no provision for a subsidy from the Local Government in the charter, and, in fact, they never demanded the subsidy until they brought their contract from the Dominion Government, it was then that they received the assurance of the Local Government that the subsidy being secured under the general Act to which I now direct your attention. From what Mr. McKam informed me, I concluded that you were, heart and soul, favourable to this road, and that you could at any time secure the Dominion subsidy, but the tone of your letter has made a different impression on my mind. It is needless to say that the Local Government must do certain things; I am aware that they are ready to do all that the general Act requires of them. If you and the Dominion Government will not move, that at once settles the extension of railways in Inverness for some time to come. I have no doubt but there is intelligence enough in the council of Inverness to understand the difference between a bogus company wanting a municipal guarantee of 5 per cent. interest for twenty years on $100,000, and one who requires nothing more than exemption from taxes and the free right of way. This company are moneyed men who will require no money grants being ever paid them until every 10 miles of the road is completed. The Bell Company is composed of men of high personal reputation who do not desire to play into the hands of any other company. With you, I fully believe that there is intelligence enough in Inverness to comprehend the wisdom of adopting the requirements of one company and rejecting the unreasonable demands of the other. Believe me, I have no personal interest in the building of railways in your county more than the general good of our common country. I used to consider you more than reasonably hopeful of having railways constructed in your part of the Island, but the tenor of your letter, which, in some of the expressions used, is strong

and unreasonable, compels me to conclude that the Inverness railways are yet in the dark future.

"Yours truly,
"W. ROSS."

To this I very curtly replied under the stimulation of such a political letter. There is no person who would read that letter but would infer at a glance, that it was not a letter from a person who desired railway extension through that county, and, on the 30th May, I replied as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 30th May, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—In answer to your favour of the 27th instant, I beg to say that, at the outset, I assured Mr. McKam that I could not deal with any company that would not have a reasonable subsidy 'guaranteed' to it by the Local Government in its Act of incorporation.

"I shall not accept either his or your dictum as to what the Local Government may do in any circumstance, as they repeatedly deceived me through similar agencies.

"Yours truly,
"H. CAMERON.

"Hon. W. Ross."

I received this letter in reply:

"HALIFAX, 3rd June, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have already stated that I had no personal interest in any railways in Inverness. Mr. McKam read me your letter, from which I concluded that you were favourable to the building of the proposed lines and it was merely to assist him that I attempted to explain the situation to you. I have now concluded that you are opposed to the proposed line and company, inasmuch as you ask the Local Government to have their guarantee in the Act of incorporation, when the law passed in 1886, to which I have already referred, provides for all such companies. No better proof of that need be mentioned than that two other companies are working under said Act and were satisfied that this incorporation Act, without subsidy being guaranteed, was all that was necessary. Neither of the two companies mentioned in my former letter approached the Local Government until the contract with the Dominion Government had been executed. For the Local Government to do more than what the general Act provides for would be illegal and unreasonable. Supposing that Mr. McKam, acting for W. H. Bell & Co., had the Dominion contract, then without the Local Government's subsidy the work would not go on and then there would be no money paid by the Dominion Government. In that case you could justly charge the Local Government with violation of their own Act, but there being no Dominion subsidy or contract, both which are necessary under the Provincial Act, then the blame can justly be attached to the want of action on your part. I would certainly say do not accept anything 'on my dictum,' but still I would suggest that the law in force and covering this case should be respected, because it binds the Local Government to certain action, but not until the Dominion Government do their part. I read your letter to Mr. McKam and I have concluded that you are unfavourable to this line and charter, as well as extremely prejudiced against the Local Government. This Act speaks for itself and they are bound by its provisions, but not until the first move is made there; but you refusing to act kills the whole project for an indefinite period.

"Yours truly,
"W. ROSS.

"H. CAMERON, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa."

To this letter I replied, on the 7th of June, as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 7th June, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—In answer to your favour of the 3rd instant, I beg to call your attention to the fact that the law passed by the Local Legislature in 1886 does not cover 'this case,' nor provide for 'all such companies,' only for such companies as the Local Government 'may' determine. I am in a position to prove that you and Mr. McKam have been deceived by the Local Government. In all my letters, telegrams, and private conversations I assured Mr. McKam and other promoters of railway charters through Inverness, that I would deal with no company that could not secure a reasonable subsidy from the Local Government in its Act of incoporation. What right, then, have you to say that I am opposed to this company? I have dealt fairly by him; and he should not allow the Local Government to deceive him, nor attempt to deceive me. If he failed to fulfil the only condition on which I would undertake to deal with his or any other company incorporated by the Local Legislature, he should have gone home and admitted his failure to secure $1, only on a verbal promise which I have reason to despise. Your assumed disinterestedness might subserve your dignity best by less intrusion.

"Yours truly,
"H. CAMERON.

"Hon. W. Ross,
"Collector of Customs."

This did not satisfy my learned friend, who was one of the late Ministers of Militia in this Dominion; so on June 10 he addressed me as follows:—

"HALIFAX, 10th June, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—At the risk of being again considered intrusive, permit me to say, in reply to your letter of the 7th inst., that I do not believe the statement that Mr. McKam and I have been deceived by the Local Government. The separate interviews we had with others before the Premier and Attorney General were of the most satisfactory character, and, notwithstanding your doubts, I have every reason to believe in the honour and truthfulness of the gentlemen. I refer you with much pleasure to the liberal intelligence and unanimous action of the council of Inverness, notwithstanding the influence at work to prevent them granting the concessions asked for. You ask by what right I have to say that you are opposed to this company? My answer is: You refused to take steps to secure the Dominion subsidy, and this done the Government would not be bound to enter into any contract until the proper guarantees are received from the Local Government. This would be, I hope, safe in the hands of the member of Government from your own county. Much more I might write, but our views and opinions are so far apart that I will not offend your dignity by placing them before you. I have again to repeat, on the honour of a man, that I have no direct or indirect interest in the proposed railway to the value of a cent.

"Yours truly,
"W. ROSS.

"H. CAMERON, M.P.,
"Ottawa."

To this I replied as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 13th June, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The Local Government promised the Richmond and Inverness Company a subsidy, but promised the Inverness and Victoria Company more than double that subsidy.

"The Inverness Municipal Council promises the Richmond and Inverness Company some concessions, but guarantees twice as much to the Inverness and Victoria Company.

"In view of these incontrovertible facts, professions of honour and honesty will fail to influence unbiassed judgment. Duplicity and insincerity are transmitted to me through childish hypocrisy.

"Yours truly,
"H. CAMERON.

"Hon. W. Ross,
"Collector of Customs."

Notwithstanding the repeated assurance of my friend Mr. Ross that he had no interest, direct or indirect, in this company, it was found when the company was organized that he had a direct interest, and the company was not long in existence when he turned up as its president. Shortly after, on receipt of my last letter, they sent me, jointly, the following telegram:—

"HALIFAX, 10th June, 1887.

"Provincial Council meet in ten days. Will have contract signed there. Will you have subsidy voted before Parliament closes? You are interested $5,000.

"L. G. McKAM, *Agent.*"

They thought that if they failed in one way, they would not fail by interesting me to the extent of $5,000. On the receipt of that telegram I immediately replied:

"OTTAWA, 11th June, 1887.

"L. G. McKAM, Esq., Halifax.

"Shall accept no interest in any company. If you secure necessary legislation or contract from Local

Government, am informed your company will have no difficulty securing usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile here.

"H. CAMERON."

This ended my correspondence with the Hon. William Ross, and if it had been published in the press or in a circular, instead of being placed in the hands of one of my most active opponents in the county, and used to grossly misrepresent me in that election campaign, I would not have been put to the trouble of reading it on this occasion. As various other misrepresentations have been circulated in the county in reference to my action on this question, I beg the indulgence of the House while I read from a circular on railway matters which I published in the county, and which explains my position fully in reference to Inverness railway matters, and railways of a similar character in all parts of this Dominion. It is dated 4th February, 1891, and in it I said:

"Before I left for Ottawa last winter, I addressed several public meetings, at which I pointed out that only one company should be encouraged to complete the Inverness railway system in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, which is a Government system. I pointed out that the main line to Cheticamp, and the branch to Orangedale, should be built by the same company; and if not, that the branch should be built by the Government, so that there would be only two systems at most to deal with. On this question I entertain very decided views, which I forced on the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, so successfully, that I received the following telegram from them in April last:—

"'HALIFAX, N.S., 1st April, 1890.

"'To Dr. H. CAMERON, M.P.,
"'House of Commons, Ottawa.

"'If the Local Government sign contract for our company, as promised, we are prepared to begin the branch from Orangedale to our main line, concurrently with that line as soon as the spring opens.

(Sgd.) "'OAKES, GREY & WHEATON.'

"This telegram was highly satisfactory to me, and I feel disappointed very much at their failure to proceed with their undertaking, as promised in that telegram.

"Occasionally companies operate railways even more satisfactorily than the Government. But my own opinion is, that the Parliament of Canada should undertake all branches in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I urged this view strongly when a company failed to build the main line through the Island. And the Government, in 1886, decided to make the Eastern Extension, so-called, and the Cape Breton Railway a part of the Intercolonial. I would be glad, indeed, if I could only prevail on the Government to make the whole of the Cape Breton system a part of the Intercolonial also. At present a majority in Parliament are opposed to that policy, including Hon. Edward Blake and other prominent leaders on both sides of politics in Ontario. When the subsidy for the Inverness and Richmond Railway was under consideration in the House of Commons, on the 13th of May last, Mr. Blake said:

"'I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice, because those who recollect the first stage through which a little scheme passed, will remember that it was urged that the Cape Breton Railway was to be a simple subsidized road, and that we were to provide the necessary railway communication at very small cost. We recollect that in the end the Dominion Parliament were called on to undertake the building of that railway, certainly not with any view that we should be called to give further aid to Cape Breton.'

"This is a positive censure on the Government giving any further aid to Cape Breton. On the same day Mr. Blake further said:

"'Take the lines to which I have referred in the Counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, and take the Cape Breton Railway, which is being constructed wholly at the expense of the Dominion; take the line in connection with the Gut of Canso, which has been acquired at the expense of the Dominion, and you will find this mileage of railways, some of them hardly producing any appreciable Dominion result at all, others producing some good results.'

"This was a decided appeal to the prejudices of all the rest of the Dominion against Cape Breton Railway particularly. Unfortunately for us, Mr. Blake has a majority in Parliament to his back on this question, but I hope that the prejudices which he and his followers in the House of Commons have aroused against further expenditures on this Island wholly at the expense of the Dominion, can be slowly but gradually removed until Parliament will adopt the policy of making all branches in connection with the Intercolonial Railway a charge on the Dominion treasury.

"Although the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company failed to fulfil their promise to me, to commence operations at Orangedale and Hastings 'as soon as spring opens,' I am satisfied it was the fault of their directors, the majority of whom are bitterly opposed to me in politics, and, with Mr. Blake, opposed to granting further aid to railway extension in Cape Breton. They stopped the railway. The company would not dare go on without their consent. The president of the company is Hon. W. Ross, who cares only for W. Ross. Alfred Smith, the vice-president, is only a tool in the hands of President Ross. The other directors are Willoughby Anderson, L. McKeen and S. McDonnell, Q.C. An impartial observer can perceive at a glance that all the directors but one, are violent, if not unscrupulous political opponents of myself and the Government I support. If they thought it would injure me, politically, they would advise and even compel the company to stop the railway. They did it. The directors have, therefore, placed the company in a very false position in the eyes of the public generally, and in the eyes of the tax-payers of Inverness particularly, who are doomed to pay dearly for their political gambling.

"Yours truly,
"H. CAMERON."

This, then, was the position I had taken with reference to these railways in the County of Inverness; this was the position I had taken several years previous on this question in the House, and this is the position I intend to maintain as long as I have the honour of a seat in this Parliament. I have now only to conclude, for the purpose of pressing for these documents and reports, by reading a letter which I received from the existing president of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company. I may previously state that the railway was a very unfortunate one, when it fell into the hands of tricksters, as I must call them who were deceiving the people. The company was first organized under the presidency of W. J. Bell, a gentleman of whose honesty and integrity I have a very high opinion, a gentleman who would not lend himself to trickery of that kind for the purpose of deceiving the people and fleecing the ratepayers of Inverness out of money to serve his own personal ends. Next we find that one F. B. Allan, and a member of the Local Government, ran away with the charter and all the papers in connection with the company, and left Mr. Bell out in the cold. They organized under the presidency of one Mr. Ward, a fictitious name, which they secured—a gentleman who, I do know, never had any stock in the company and never was qualified to be president. I had access to the books of the company and had the evidence of the transfer of that branch of the company to a third branch of the company, to prove that the said Ward, who was then said to be president of the company, never had any stock in it, and possibly never existed, except in the imagination of F. B. Allan and the member for the Local Government who ran away with the charter of the company for the purpose of making money out of it. Then, with reference to my friend the Hon. W. Ross, I may here state that if there is any person in this Dominion who should not use correspondence relative to railway matters or any other matters against me in the constituency of Inverness, that gentleman is Wm. Ross. On a future occasion I may justify myself by reading to this House and the country some correspondence which existed between that gentleman and myself; but whether

I do so or not, I here reiterate that he, of all others, should have been last to place this correspondence in the hands of my opponents for use during a campaign which was a bitter one, and when I could not contradict the very disgraceful manner in which it was used against me. I shall conclude by reading a letter from the existing president of the company, and you will observe that there was an annual president for this unfortunate railway company. The object of having an annual president, I assume, and I believe I have the right to assume, was for the purpose of annoying and embarrassing me in my capacity as representative of the county. I know nothing about this gentleman, I never heard of him before, but he addressed me this letter, dated Halifax, 12th June, 1891 :

"Dr. H. CAMERON, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We write to ask you to present our claim to the Government for the usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile for the Inverness and Richmond Railway, on the fifty miles to Broad Cove, and also for the Orangedale branch. We claim the latter is a part of our undertaking and would be ruinous to us if we did not get it. We were not aware of any rival company until we had expended about $45,000, when Mr. Paint put in an application to defeat us. We have not bothered the Government in this matter, and only want fair-play in getting the subsidy, and if you will have it arranged for us, we will guarantee to go on at once with the construction of the branch, as well as the main line. We have all the capital required to carry on the work as soon as the subsidy is granted, and we only claim it as being just and right, and the same that has been granted heretofore to other companies. If it is necessary we can show that we have the backing to carry on the work to completion. As you are aware, we have a large amount of work done, and it is very necessary that we are sure of the subsidy, and also want the branch. You will understand it would be difficult for the company to place bonds on the main line, without the branch being included.

"Mr. Paint has made some hard assertions, which are calculated to do our company harm. If he had shown his hand when we were going on with the work we might have acted differently, but we were not aware then of another company, and as the country was anxious for a railway, we pushed on with the work, expecting in good faith to receive the usual subsidy granted to other roads.

"We are, dear sir,
"Your obedient servants,
"B. M. DAVIDSON,
"President.
"JOHN R. MURRAY,
"Secretary.

"P. S.—When the subsidy is granted, our company will purchase the Inverness Coal Company's areas at Broad Cove, which the enclosed paper shows is not out of their hands, and for which they will not have anything to do with Mr. Paint.—J. R. M."

Since then, I find, I am sorry to say, the Local Legislature, of Nova Scotia, under the direction of Mr. Mc Kinnon, who is a member of the Local Legislature, rejected the amendment which was before the Legislature on the subject of the Inverness and Richmond Railway. I fear very much that the opposition then given to the road by a member of the Local Legislature, and by a large majority in the Local House, has been the cause of my not having had an answer from the president of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company since. Whether or not, any person with a reasonable head on his shoulders must frankly admit that the chartering of these two rival companies as has been stated by the president of the Inverness and Richmond road to be not only embarrassing this Government, but also to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, which expended a large amount on the branch line in that county. As I am not certain as to whether the local Act of incorporation enables the Inverness and Richmond Company to build the branch line, and as there are two other companies incorporated to build the branch line from Orangedale to Broad Cove, I would suggest that at this juncture, the only course to secure railway extension in this part of the Dominion is, first, as I have always urged in this House, that the Government should undertake to build these branches. If they failed to do that, let them grant a subsidy for that road, as I asked them to do in 1877, as the correspondence will show when it is brought down, as I also asked them to do in 1888, and 1889, and 1890, and in 1891. Notwithstanding that I have had no direct or indirect interest in the enterprise of either of these companies, and that I am determined never to have any direct or indirect interest in any such enterprises, I feel the enormous resources of the north-west coast of Cape Breton require the construction of a railway from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp, with a branch to Orangedale. When my hon. friends realize that there are fifty miles along the shore, from which it is impossible to ship coal, but where coal mines exist within three or four miles of each other, and within thirty or forty miles of the Government line of railway, I think they will realize that the building of the road by the Government would unquestionably be of advantage to the country, and, if the Government do not see their way clear to build it themselves, I think they should subsidize a company at $3,200 a mile from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp, with a branch to Orangedale. In that way, the freight traffic would increase in such a manner that as a surplus is shown on the Eastern Extension Railway where deficits have existed in the past, in the same manner the construction of this road would ensure the feeding of the Intercolonial Railway to a large extent, and I believe would, to some extent, make up for the large deficits which now exist on that road.

Mr. FRASER. Of course the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) must feel well in producing his yearly, or perhaps his biennial, budget in regard to the Inverness Railway. I would not address the House on this occasion but for one or two things which the hon. gentleman has said. He spoke of certain matters being embarrassing to the Local Government. I think he will find that the Inverness road in his county will be more embarrassing to himself than to any Government. He has spoken of the use of certain documents as being cowardly, but I think the House will agree with me that his attacks on people who are opposed to him and are not here to defend themselves are more cowardly, and that his reading of these private despatches and letters was not in the best possible taste. Leaving that aside, however, as far as the Local Government of Nova Scotia is concerned, he has the best evidence, even in his own county, of how they stand. For two elections their supporters have been returned in that county by large majorities, and at the last election, as I am informed, by a larger majority than the hon. gentleman himself. As to his statement in regard to a member of the Local Government running away with a charter, I can only say that I never heard of it, but, so far as the Local Government's action is concerned, while the hon. gentleman's great exertions in this House managed to obtain a subsidy of $1,000 a mile for this railway, the Local Government gave a subsidy of $3,200 a

mile. The question of the rival roads is for him to decide with his constituents. I do not know much about the merits of the case, but I submit that what he read in regard to that meeting would tend to show that he was in favour of both the roads. The policy of the Local Government in regard to that and every other *bonâ fide* railway enterprise in the province, though their ability is small as compared with that of this Government, has been to give $3,200 a mile to open up railways in the Province of Nova Scotia where the *bonâ fides* of the promoters was clear, and I submit that it ill-became the hon. gentleman representing Inverness (Mr. Cameron) to attack the Local Government of Nova Scotia on their railway policy. The Local Government need no one to defend them here. That Government, either in the province or in this House or elsewhere, are quite able to defend themselves.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). In reply to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), I may say that it will always give me much pleasure to discuss this matter with my learned friend, and we may have to exchange courtesies hereafter as I often have had to do with his predecessor, who, I may say, never spoke in the same tone that he has. If I attacked the Local Government of Nova Scotia, I was aware that I had to meet a member of that Local Government in this House. My hon. friend from Guysborough was a member of the Local Government, and I think, as I have reason to believe, he did as much to deceive the people of Inverness as the other members of that Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I do not refer to anything that was done in this Parliament. I am an older member of Parliament than my hon. friend from Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object to your age at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). He may not be old enough to see it, either. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that the Local Government, by a lobster clause in the law passed in 1886, is in a position to promise every company that has a charter by the Local Legislature, $3,200 per mile.

Mr. FRASER. No, I did not say any such thing; I said the Local Government gave a subsidy to companies that showed their *bonâ fides*.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Any company that shows its *bonâ fides* will be awarded a subsidy of $3,200 per mile. The Local Government of Nova Scotia passed an Act in 1886, I have no hesitation in saying, for the purpose of deceiving the people, and since that time, strange to say, no enterprise has been undertaken in the Province of Nova Scotia. It is true that the Joggins, the Cornwallis Valley, and the Stewiacke and Lansdowne were started on a basis which existed before the passage of that Act, but since the passage of the law of 1886, no railway enterprises have been undertaken in any part of the province. They deceived the east, they deceived the west, and they deceived the central counties, and they will continue to deceive them. The success which crowned their efforts in preventing the construction of railways on the Island of Cape Breton for 35 years, has enabled them to pursue a course which will strangle the construction of railways not only in Inverness, in Cape Breton, but in every section of the Province of Nova Scotia as well. That lobster clause 5 was passed for that purpose, and my hon. friend's party was responsible for it. It was a method by which they might possibly save money, and they did actually save it. The east suffers, the west also suffers, and no railway enterprise has been undertaken in the province since the passage of that Act, except such enterprises as were under way previous to the passage of that Act.

Mr. BORDEN. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman in regard to one railway, at any rate. I can assure him that had it not been for the Act of the Local Legislature which he is now condemning, the Cornwallis Valley Railway would not have been undertaken, and would not have been built. It was not undertaken until the year after the passage of the law to which he refers.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I quite agree with my hon. friend that that road would not have been undertaken unless they had secured aid from the Local Legislature.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to interrupt the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will have a right to reply afterwards.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I would like him to say now what he has to say. I wish to add that not a road has been undertaken since the passage of that Act, excepting the roads to which I have referred—I referred to the road which my hon. friend from King's has mentioned.

Mr. BORDEN. No, I beg your pardon.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Yes, I named distinctly the Cornwallis road, the Joggins road, and the Stewiacke and Lansdowne road. These roads were undertaken on subsidies granted in this Parliament in 1887, and on the strength of the Act of 1886, which passed the Local Legislature, they secured the local subsidies. That was such an Act as would enable the Local Government to build roads wherever they pleased; whenever a company showed its *bonâ fides*, then the Government granted the subsidy, and not until then. It placed power in their hands absolutely to burke the undertaking of any branch line in any part of the province, with the exception of those which I have named, even before my hon. friend had spoken; and they have so effectually succeeded that as a matter of fact they have refused to accept the *bonâ fides* of any other company in any part of the province up to the present time, and therefore no road has been undertaken.

Mr. FORBES. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for Inverness that no local road in Nova Scotia had been undertaken since the passage of that Act in 1886, I desire to make this correction: The Oxford and Spring Hill was built since that Act was passed, and money was paid over by the Local Government, $3,200 per mile.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Which one?

Mr. FORBES. The Oxford and Spring Hill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And Pugwash.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I named the whole of them.

Mr. FORBES. These roads have been undertaken and built by the companies on the strength of local subsidies granted to them by virtue of power given to the Local Government in 1886.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I admit all that.

Mr. FORBES. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman's statements; I failed to see the force of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and everybody else failed to see them, I think. The Local Government have granted subsidies in favour of local enterprises whenever they have been requested by the companies who desired to build the line, and the subsidies have been paid over by the Local Government the very moment the companies showed their *bonâ fides*. The Local Government, as a rule, look to the strength of the company and assure themselves of the honest intention of the company to build the line proposed before they pay over the money, and in this respect the Local Government's policy differs from the policy of the present Federal Government, who subsidize roads from point to point irrespective of the ability of the company to go on and complete the work. The Local Government have adopted the wise policy of ascertaining, first of all, whether the parties applying for the subsidies are fit and proper persons to receive these subsidies, and in every case where the application has been made and the Government have afterwards satisfied themselves by investigation, the subsidies have been paid over to the companies as they were in the case of Cornwallis Valley, Nova Scotia Central, Stewiacke Valley and Lansdowne, Springhill and Oxford, and the Pugwash, and also in the case of the Annapolis and Atlantic Line—there they have made a definite promise, and they intend to pay the money out the very moment the company shows its *bonâ fides*; I may also include in this statement the Hants Central. By virtue of the Act which has been mentioned, the Local Government have made a promise to pay over a subsidy, and upon the condition of the company showing their *bonâ fides*, they are able to receive the money. Consequently, I think the hon. gentleman is in error when he says that the Local Government is not ready to grant all the aid that the people of Inverness might require for their road.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I quite agree with my hon. friend, when he says that the Local Government grants $3,200 per mile to any company that satisfies the Government that they will build the road; but, unfortunately, all these companies that satisfy the Local Government happen to be in districts where they themselves are personally interested in the road.

Mr. FRASER. Hants.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Surely the hon. gentleman will not say that the Local Government were interested in the Pictou and Colchester.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I must take issue with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), when he says that the Local Government have made a promise with respect to the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway. I have no hesitation in saying that strenuous efforts have been made to induce the Local Government to make definite promises, but they have entered into no arrangement. They have refused to make a Minute of Council, and the only promise they have made, and it is the promise to which I presume the hon. gentleman refers, is a promise made by Mr. Fielding on a public platform during the election.

Mr. FORBES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—made on the floor of the Local Legislature.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The promise was also made in the County of Shelburne by that hon. gentleman, and, strange to say, all the electors of the County of Shelburne have one idea of that promise, and the constituents of the hon. member for Queen's have a totally different one. He says that Mr. Fielding has made the promise in the House of Assembly, but it is a very vague one, and does not bind the Government unless it is incorporated in a Minute of Council.

Motion agreed to.

ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE IN *LE CANADA*.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (translation) moved for:

Copies of correspondence between the proprietor or proprietors of the newspaper *Le Canada*, published at Ottawa, and any member of the Government; also, of any correspondence between any member of the Government and any other person in relation to the suspension of the publication in the said newspaper *Le Canada*, of the table showing the arrival and departure of mails at the Ottawa post office.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I desire to protest at the outset against the assertion published in certain newspapers, under the inspiration of I know not whom, that this motion is the result of a quarrel, or of an intention to make a general attack against one of the representatives of the City of Ottawa in this House. I must declare that such was never my intention, nor is it in my mind to-day. I have not now, nor have I ever had any but very agreeable relations with the members for the City of Ottawa. I would not demean myself by taking the time of the House for a moment for a personal quarrel. The aim of my motion is to find out the reason for which, in the month of April last, the French population in the city of Ottawa and its surroundings, which has no other organ than *Le Canada*, was deprived of the public information through its columns, which is to be found in three English newspapers of this city? I do not believe that this can have been prompted by a motive of economy. The hon. Minister has declared to the House that he only paid $50 to *Le Canada* while he was giving $100 to the *Citizen* and other papers which have no wider circulation nor more importance than *Le Canada*. The budget of forty millions which we vote every year has, until now, borne this $50 expenditure, and I do not see why in 1891 it should be less able to meet it than in 1890. Is the reason to be found in the fact that at the last provincial election *Le Canada* broke with the Conservative party of Ontario, and gave its support to the Hon. Mr. Mowat? Is it because in the presence of the policy of aggression and persecution inaugurated and advocated by Mr. Meredith in the Province of Ontario, *Le Canada*, a French Canadian and Catholic newspaper, refused to support this policy of proscription against its countrymen and its co-religionists? If such is the case the French Canadians would like to know it, and ascertain whether the Post Office Department is so bound up in

Mr. Meredith's policy that a newspaper cannot oppose the latter without incurring the wrath of the hon. Minister. Would the reason, perchance, be found in the course taken by this paper towards one of the present members for the City of Ottawa at the last federal election? The election took place in the month of March, the campaign was conducted in the month of February, and it is only at the end of April that the hon. Postmaster General withdrew his patronage from *Le Canada*. But, Mr. Speaker, the two hon. members for the City of Ottawa who were then running as Government candidates were elected, and it would be a meanness unworthy of gentlemen, it would be a great disappointment to their friends, if either of the hon. members for the City of Ottawa had used his political influence, I will not say in order to deprive *Le Canada* of a trifle of $50, but to deprive the French population of information relating to the arrival and departure of the mails in Ottawa, when the Government considers it to be of public interest to give the same information through the medium of three English newspapers. I hope that the Postmaster General, in furnishing the correspondence asked by the motion that I have the honour to make, will be in a position to satisfy the House and the French population of the Province of Ontario, that in withdrawing its patronage from *La Canada*, the Government has had no intention to show hostility to, or contempt for, this population, but that the thing was done for grave state reasons which the House and the French race will know how to appreciate at their proper value.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware of any correspondence between the proprietors of the newspaper *Le Canada* and any member of the Government. *Le Canada* was paid the amount of money usually allowed to papers of that class for publishing the arrival and departure of the mails, and the patronage was withdrawn from the paper and given to other papers, which was thought to be in the public interest. I have no knowledge of any correspondence at all except the notice sent to the paper to discontinue the publication of the advertisement.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDY TO A RAILWAY BETWEEN NAPIERVILLE AND ST. REMI.

Mr. MONET (translation) moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters or communications whatsoever received by the Government from any of the municipalities of the County of Napierville, or from any person in the said county, and of any answers made by the Government thereto, up to the 5th March last, in relation to the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of a railway between the village of Napierville and the village of St. Rémi.

He said: Mr. Speaker, here is the reason for which I ask the House to adopt the motion which I have just read. In the month of December last we had a by-election in the County of Napierville. It was much less the questions of politics that ruled the campaign than that of the construction of a railway between the two extremities of the County of Napierville, and of the granting by the Federal Government of a subsidy for the construction of that railway. If there had been any believing the Ministerial orators it would have been sufficient for the County of Napierville to elect my opponent, Mr. Paradis, in order to be entitled to this subsidy. Mr. Paradis was elected, several petitions were signed on behalf of the municipalities of the county, and sent to Ottawa. I would like to learn what answer the Government has given to these several petitions, in order that we may know if, when we were harangued about a railway in the County of Napierville, and a grant by the Federal Government for its construction, the purpose was to bluff the electors, or whether the promises made were sincere. For, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of promises, it can be said that the Government showed, on this occasion, a truly paternal bounty. The Quebec Government had already voted a subsidy of over $100,000 for the construction of this road, but the work had not been commenced, for in order to commence the work ready money—a thing that takes the shape of subsidies more easily in Ottawa than in Quebec—was needed. So the circumstances lent themselves admirably to the generosity of the Conservative party, which, desiring to carry this election, sent into the County of Napierville about the greatest men they had—those especially, on the word and promises of whom people had formed the habit of defending, even in election time. Of course, I mean the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. Deputy Speaker, and a great number of other Ministerial orators, who came to fight the battle of their party in the County of Napierville. All these orators, without binding themselves directly to cause a subsidy for this railway to be obtained from the Federal Government, were nevertheless ready to recognize the usefulness, the equity and even the necessity of such a subsidy. I remember very well that at a meeting held at St. Edouard the the hon. Deputy Speaker, Beauharnois' representative, made the remark to the electors that it was very ungraceful for him, in particular, to do his electioneering travels over December clods, and that the only means of remedying such a state of things would be to get a subsidy from the Federal Government for the construction of a railway. He added that he had obtained one for the County of Beauharnois, and that Mr. Paradis, once elected by the Conservative party, would certainly obtain one for the County of Napierville. The hon. Secretary of State, for his part, doubtless foreseeing that directly after the death of Sir John Macdonald the railway portfolio would be his, recognized also the importance, the utility, and even the indispensability of this railway. He recognized the equity for the Federal Government of granting a subsidy to the County of Napierville, which had never had any favours from this Government, even at the time the county was represented by the old chief of the Liberal party, Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion. I do not wish to lead this House into error; I do not mean to say that the hon. Secretary of State came and promised directly a subsidy to the electors of Napierville. Here are the words he used: "I cannot promise a subsidy for the construction of this railway, but what I have a right to do, and what I am doing, what I have a right to desire, and what I do desire, is to be a member of a syndicate which would be formed to work your railway." The question was therefore very serious, since the hon. Secretary of State spoke of the formation of a syndicate, and of being a member of the same. Now, Mr. Speaker, the electors of the County of Napierville are very anxious to-day for news of that syndicate. I never contended, neither did our friends, that it was not equitable for the Federal Government to grant a subsidy for a railway in the

County of Napierville. As I said a moment ago, the county has never had any favours from the Government, although it always furnished its share of the revenue; but I said to the electors to be somewhat wary of promises that we heard for the first time during a campaign. I was answered by a circular which was distributed to all the electors of the county, so that they might be all well convinced of the good disposition, the generous disposition of the Conservative party towards them. Here is that circular. I do not mean to insinuate that it was intended to serve as a means of corruption; this has never been in my mind, and the proof is that I did not contest the election of my opponent, which was due, I believe, to this circular, and to the promises made on the hustings. The circular reads as follows:—

"To the Electors of the County of Napierville.

"Gentlemen,—You are, on Tuesday, to decide which of the candidates for your suffrages you will choose to represent you in the House of Commons.

"This election, under the present circumstances, has a very important significance for the interests of your county. When, in June last, Mr. Ste. Marie left his seat in Ottawa to go and sit in the Legislature of Quebec, he declared that he wanted to endow your county with a railway, which is indispensable to three of the five parishes of the County of Napierville. So much importance did he attach to this enterprise that he persuaded the Government of Quebec to grant, through its Prime Minister, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, an important subsidy for the construction of this railway.

"You do not doubt that the action of Mr. Ste. Marie was sincere, and that he was working in the interest of your county. You know now that this road can hardly be built if additional help is not granted. You are now to judge whether you have a better chance to see this work accomplished, by electing as your representative in Ottawa Mr. Paradis or Mr. Monet.

"Mr. Paradis, while he declares that he means to keep in the House that independence of which the farmers are all so proud, says that he will support in a general way the policy of the Federal Government, and that he will especially devote his efforts to the success of your railway.

"Mr. Monet has not only contented himself with railing in the most violent way at the Federal Government and its measures, but he has insulted in an unqualified manner important men who lead the country, some of whom came to support Mr. Paradis in the county. You know that it is not by such conduct as his that enterprises which interest you so vitally can be achieved.

"This is not a matter of private interest, but of the public interests of the county. Prove, on Tuesday, by the vote you will give Mr. Paradis, that you understood these great interests, and that you intend to see them secured.

"Give your vote early, one and all, for the candidate of the people, Mr. F. X. Paradis."

Well, my opponent was elected. It is true that he never sat in this House, but it was not the fault of the electors, but rather of the Government who dissolved Parliament, and by that means refused Mr. Paradis an opportunity of taking his seat. The electors fulfilled their obligation, they voted for him and elected him. I, therefore, expect—although the County of Napierville has another representative now—that the Government also will to-day fulfil its promises, and I would not be surprised to find in the correspondence that will be brought before the House the promise of a subsidy for the construction of this railway. It would be nothing but the redeeming of the pledges given by important men who came into the County of Napierville. As to the accusation brought against me of having insulted these important men who came into the county, I do not believe that that should be a reason why this subsidy should be refused; for, if the same was just then, it is equally so now. On another hand, so many important men came into the county that I have not been able to trace the victim of these imprudent insults, and, notwithstanding all my good-will, I am still seeking whom to apologize to. In any case, even should this be counted against me, I hope that the punishment therefor will not be visited upon the electors of the County of Napierville, who still have the same rights to the granting of a subsidy, for the reasons given by others and by myself on the occasion above referred to.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bring down all the papers that are in the department in connection with this matter, consisting of petitions from the electors in the county which were forwarded by Mr. Paradis, and the petitioners were informed their application would receive the same consideration as was given to others. Beyond that, there is no other information that I have to give to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) The hon. member for Napierville has given himself the pleasure, quite legitimate, of re-editing for this House a little bit of an election speech, to memorize one of his elections, not the one, the remembrance of which is the pleasanter to him, but one of his elections. He did not miss the opportunity of saying that the Government, which had been represented during this campaign by many of its friends, and by one of its members, had responded to requests made in the county for a work of public interest, in such a manner as to satisfy the electors. There is no harm in this, and I must congratulate my young friend for not having said more, at least for not having put more than a certain colouring on what happened. It is true, that during this campaign in which I took a part—the one in which the hon. member was not the successful candidate—the question of a public improvement in which all the electors were interested, was discussed. I may, and I must, have said that the only way for the electors of Napierville to obtain a subsidy was to do in Ottawa what had been done in Quebec: to ask for it; that if the scheme was good—and I must have added that I had no reason to think that it was not an excellent scheme,—the Ottawa Government was surely no worse advised than that of Quebec, and that we would do for this railway and county what the Ottawa Government had done for other railways and counties, without any party or political consideration. I surely must have said that, as it was my duty to do. Promises were wanted, and I was asked for promises and my direct support with the Government and with my colleagues. This I could not give and did not give. What was done, was that petitions were sent to the Government, the reception of those petitions was acknowledged to those who had sent them, and they are now in the hands of the Minister of Railways. My hon. friend says that I went, perhaps, a little too far in saying that I had no objection to be a member of the syndicate or the company that was to build this road. My hon. friend knows what was the company, which, from information which I got from his own friends in the county was to construct this road. He must know that I could not, and that I should not belong to that company. The railway was to be built by a powerful company in existence in Canada. I have no right to say whether the Government of Canada will

be disposed to grant a subsidy now. I cannot say more to-day than I said at the time. Those who went with me into the county, the hon. Deputy-Speaker (Mr. Bergeron) and the Hon. Senator Tassé, said the same thing as I did, and will have no more cause to repent. My hon. friend has read an election circular. Well, we would have very funny things to bring before the House if we were to read all the circulars which come to light during election campaigns. My hon. friend is still young, and when he will have acquired a little more parliamentary experience, he will indulge no more in this practice of bringing before the House hustings squabbles and campaign disputes. He did not do wrong if he did it with the view of drawing the attention of the Government to an undertaking which interests his county. He did well; and let him be sure that I am to-day, as I was at the time, one of those who have much sympathy for the County of Napierville, which, it is true, has not had many favours from Governments, even at the time when the chief of a party in power was its representative here. I have much sympathy for his electors, and for the undertaking of which he has spoken.

Motion agreed to.

KINGSTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. GERMAN (for Mr. AMYOT) moved for:

Copies of the annual report of the postmaster of Kingston, including the year 1889, and containing a list in detail of the several lessees of the boxes in the Kingston Post Office; also copies of the list of said lessees for the said year 1889, containing the names of the said several lessees for the said year, beginning at the letter "B."

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman's motion I may state that there are no names of lessees of that year, 1889. The person who was to keep the list, a man by the name of Burns, I think, the deputy postmaster, neglected to keep it and there was no record kept. That answer I gave to the House before, but I promised the House when that question was put to me the other day, to send to the inspector in Kingston and ask him to find out by any possible means he could, who was the lessee of the particular box that the gentleman required to get the name of. The inspector went to the different letter carriers, and found out that there was evidence that the party who had leased the box, at the particular time mentioned by the hon. gentleman, was a man named Bancroft, and after his giving up the box after the lapse of two or three months, there were some letters came directed to Bancroft and Connolly, and Connolly & Co., and these letters were delivered to the clerk of Mr. Connolly on the works at the graving dock. That is all the information possible I can get on this subject.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Postmaster General state that Connolly succeeded as the lessee of the box?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think it.

Mr. MULOCK. That would be some information.

Mr. HAGGART. I can get the information for the next year, but there was no record of the lessees kept that year at all.

Mr. MULOCK. But inasmuch as the enquiry discloses the fact that Bancroft was the lessee, would not a similar enquiry disclose who succeeded Bancroft as the lessee of the box?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. I do not think there will be any trouble finding that out.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister be good enough to obtain that?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BARRON. I observe the Minister does not say that the inspector reported that any letters were received, addressed to Bancroft alone, but simply to "Bancroft & Connolly." It would appear that although Bancroft leased that box in that name, he himself has never received letters at all, and the only letters that were received were addressed "Bancroft & Connolly," and evidently written from the department here.

Mr. HAGGART. This is the effect of the letter and telegram I got from the inspector, that letters were addressed to Bancroft & Connolly, but there is indubitable evidence found from the letter carriers and from other parties, that a man named Bancroft had the box for three months during that year; that letters came; that he seemed to have given up the box, and that letters came to Bancroft & Connolly, and Connolly & Co., and that they were delivered by the letter carriers to the clerk of Connolly on the works of the graving dock.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand that no record is to be found in the post office as to who paid the rent of the box, as to when it was rented, and when the lease ended? Is there no record to be found containing that information.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no record at that particular time of the boxes which were let. The person in whose particular charge that was, was charged with misappropriating the moneys, and is at present in the penitentiary for the crime.

Motion agreed to.

THE CLAIM OF HUGH MUNROE.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

All papers in reference to the claim of Hugh Munroe, of River John, Pictou County, for damages for injuries caused to his farm by the building of the Short Line Railway.

He said: In moving for those papers I have simply to add, that at the time the Short Line Railway was built, a swamp was drained on Mr. Munroe's land. They failed to build a culvert to carry away the water that was put on his land from this swamp, and he suffered a good deal of damages. I would call the attention of the Government to the case of Mr. Munroe, who is a poor farmer, and I trust that the Government will at once send an engineer and see that justice is done him. It is a case in which I think damages ought to be given, as damage was caused to his land through no fault of his own, and he is a poor man and ought to be compensated. In moving for these papers I wish to call the attention of the Government to the matter, and I know that as soon as they make enquiries they will see that justice is done to Mr. Munroe.

Mr. BOWELL. I have caused enquiry to be made in the records of the Department of Railways and Canals, and I am sure there is no correspondence with regard to the claim of the character

referred to by the hon. gentleman. There is, however, a complaint that the farm-crossing on the railway is too steep to meet the views of Mr. Munroe. It is one in eight, and he desires to have it made one in ten. It was originally built one in ten, but since the track was laid and ballasting done, it has reduced to the extent I mention. Beyond that information we have nothing further, so far as I can learn, in the department. Whatever information there is on the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman will be laid before the House. If there has been any damage of the character the hon. gentleman referred to, it will be the duty of the department to investigate it, and to see that the man is compensated if he really has any claim.

Motion agreed to.

HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

All correspondence relating to application for increase of salary of Judge Johnson, County Court judge for Halifax County, N.S.

He said: In moving for these papers I wish to bring before the House a case which I think demands the attention of the Government. I beg to state that Judge Johnson is the judge for the City and County of Halifax. The judges, who have county court jurisdiction in Nova Scotia, or in the Lower Provinces, are paid the same salary; and that salary cannot increase beyond $2,400 a year. The salary begins at $2,000, and is raised I think to $2,400. Judge Johnson, as every man who practices at the bar in Nova Scotia knows, is a painstaking, hard-worked judge. I venture to say that no judge of the Supreme Court in the city of Halifax does more work than he does. He certainly does more than Judge Watters, County Court judge for St. John, N.B. I think that a judge in a large city should receive more than an ordinary County Court judge. Some time ago the salary of Judge Watters was increased by $600, to bring it up to $3,000; he is besides the judge of the Admiralty Court, in which position he receives $600 more; and the Government saw fit, while taking one county from his jurisdiction, to make him revising barrister, and thereby to give him $300 or $400 more; so that altogether he is getting from $3,600 to $4,000 a year. Judge Johnson was not appointed revising barrister, one of the reasons given being that he was too busy. I submit that if he was too busy to act as revising barrister, his salary ought to have been increased. The County Court judges in Ontario are also judges of probate, and their fees, I am informed, amount to about $600 a year each; so that the average salary of a County Court judge in Ontario is about $3,000, and that of the judge of the County of York, about $7,000. It is perfectly clear that a judge in a city like Halifax, who has so much work to do, ought to receive more than a judge who lives in the country; and while I know that I shall not have the approval of one hon. gentleman in this House in saying that the salaries of all judges are too low, I submit that Judge Johnson is entitled to as large a salary as other judges. He is a man of ability, and he devotes his whole time to his work; and when he does that and is not in a position to practice before the courts, or to engage in other business, the Government should enquire seriously whether he is fairly recompensed by a salary of $2,400. It is in no fault-finding spirit that I bring the matter to the notice of the Government, but because I believe that a man who gives satisfaction should receive fair-play in comparison with others; and I know that in doing so I shall have the sympathy and support of the hon. Minister of Justice, who understands the position of the matter. I think the Government ought not to hesitate for a moment to put Judge Johnson in such a position as to compensate him for the large amount of work he does. As it is near six o'clock, I will not prolong my remarks by going into matters, as I had intended, to show the amount of work he does. An examination of the calendar will show that he does more work than any other County Court judge in the Province, and I commend his case to the Government and trust that they will deal favourably with it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not a word to say against any of the statements of fact made by the hon. member for Guysborough with respect to the qualifications of Judge Johnson or the duties he discharges. I have no doubt that they are all that the hon. gentleman states them to be, and it may be that a good case exists for an increase of salary in his case. Nor do I intend to take up the broad question to which he very casually referred, of the salaries of the judges generally. That is a very large question, upon which, as we have already experienced, a good deal can be said on both sides. I rise more for the purpose of calling attention to the case of the County Court judge of Queen's County, P.E.I., who stands in the same relative position that Judge Johnson does. He receives the same amount of pay as the County Court judges of Prince and King's, although he does more work than both of them together—yes, more than they do when their work is doubled and doubled again. But it is necessary to have judges in those counties, and I do not say that they are overpaid; but in a comparatively large county like Queen's, which has a population of nearly 65,000, and with a very fair extent of jurisdiction for the County Court, a very large amount of litigation which took place in the Supreme Court a few years ago, now comes before the county judge. He is a man of good experience and legal attainments, and discharges his duties satisfactorily; and having no jury, but acting as a judge of law and fact, he himself attends to a large amount of business which was formerly done at a great expense in the Supreme Court. The system we have adopted of bringing near to the homes of the people the courts before which they can have justice, has operated in this case, as in many others, in giving that gentleman a large amount of work; and I would respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister of Justice that if he has the intention of increasing the salaries of any of the County Court judges of the Maritime Provinces, Judge Alley, of Queen's County has a very strong claim to be considered among the very first.

RETURN ORDERED.

Detailed statement of work done on the wharves at Vaudreuil and Boucherville, in the County of Chambly, since the commencement of the said works in 1886. 2. A detailed statement of the several sums expended by the Government in connection with the said works, showing the names of persons to whom such several sums were paid, and why and under what arrangement or contract such payments were made. 3. Copies of all reports of en-

gineers on the said wharves, and of the estimates, and also of all letters addressed to the Department of Public Works in relation to the said works.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

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

After Recess.

RELIEF OF ADAM RUSSWORM.

Bill (No. 131) for the relief of Adam Russworm (Mr. Wallace) was considered in Committee, on a division, and reported.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved third reading of the Bill.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Allison,	Mackintosh,
Armstrong,	McAllister,
Barron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Beith,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bowell,	McGregor,
Bowers,	McKay,
Bowman,	McKeen,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McLean,
Brown (Monck),	McLeod,
Campbell,	McMillan,
Casey,	McMullen,
Christie,	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Miller,
Corbould,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davidson,	Montague,
Davies,	Mulock,
Davin,	O'Brien,
Davis,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Prior,
Dewdney,	Reid,
Earle,	Rider,
Featherston,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Flint,	Ryckman,
Forbes,	Semple,
Foster,	Spohn,
Fraser,	Sproule,
Gillmor,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Sutherland,
Grieve,	Temple,
Haggart,	Trow,
Hargraft,	Truax,
Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Wallace,
Hutchins,	Watson,
Innes,	Weldon,
Jamieson,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kirkpatrick,	Wilmot,
Landerkin,	Wood (Brockville), and
Lister,	Yeo.—89.
Macdonald (Huron),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lippé,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bourassa,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cameron (Inverness),	Mignault,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Monet,
Desaulniers,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Savard,
Geoffrion,	Thompson (Sir John),
Guay,	Vaillancourt.—23.
Joncas,	

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF THOMAS BRISTOW.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 133) for the relief of Thomas Bristow. He said: I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice and the House generally to one or two circumstances connected with this Bill, and which affect very materially the whole subject of divorce, as now carried on in this country. I may premise my remarks by saying that the facts I am about to state in no way affect the standing of the petitioner in this case. On the contrary, if anything, they increase the right of the petitioner to relief. The facts are that the wife from whom the divorce is sought, without apparently just cause, left her husband and went away with another man. She remained away from her husband five or six years, and then went through a regular form of marriage with this other man. She is reported by one of the witnesses to have said that she considered that the fact of her having been separated from her husband five or six years was sufficient justification for marrying again; and she stated she was confirmed in this view by the advice of her lawyer. As I happen to know the solicitor in question very well and intimately, I venture to say that statement is absolutely false, so far as he is concerned; but what I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice, and, if possible, that of the Attorney General of Ontario, to, is this: that this woman has derived all possible benefit already which she could derive now from the action of the committee, as she has been subjected to no penalty, she has gained all the relief she desired, and she is now living, I suppose, with this man to whom she is married. I do not know whether this divorce has made that second marriage legal or not, but at any rate she is living with a man to whom either she has not been legally married or was not legally married when the second alleged marriage took place. I say it is a scandal upon the administration of our criminal justice if not upon our legislation, that this woman, or if the case were reversed, any man in such a position, should be allowed to contract the form of a second marriage, and should get the benefit of the form of a second marriage without any punishment being awarded. This is a blot on our criminal administration or upon the legislation which permits it. I know of a case almost precisely similar, which took place some years ago, where a man had notoriously abused and ill-treated his wife. After separation, he went through the form of a divorce in Chicago and coolly, after this divorce, which, of course, would not have any force in Canada, came back and married another woman in Canada, with whom he is living to-day. After this second outrage, the woman applied for a divorce and obtained it, but there was no punishment inflicted on the man, and no prosecution for bigamy ever took place. Of course, neither the wife nor the husband, in such a case, would like to enter a prosecution for bigamy, but there ought to be some machinery by which some person, as public prosecutor, should intervene and take proceedings, in a case like this, against the offending party. It is outrageous that the offending party should get the benefit which is desired from the proceedings of the Divorce Committee. I think the case is one which calls for close examination, either at the hands of the Min-

ister of Justice or of the Attorney General of Ontario, so that steps should be taken to prevent matters of this kind being any longer tolerated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, and I will call attention to the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) About two years ago attention was called in this House to the mode of dissolving these marriages, and it was thought that the language used in the Bill was broader than was necessary, that is, that if the conduct of one party was such as to justify the dissolution of the marriage tie, that was hardly sufficient to justify Parliament in allowing both parties to marry again. The provision that the marriage is "null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever" is certainly broad enough to enable the offending party to marry again, but I question that it was the intention of Parliament to do that. I remember it was stated that probably the draftsman in the other House had drafted these Bills under the old language, and that some change should be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to call attention to an important matter. Hon. gentlemen on the front benches when they address each other across the House do so in such a low tone of voice that we, sitting on the back benches, might just as well be in the corridor. When a Minister is speaking we cannot hear him, and I presume it is the same when members on the front benches of this side are speaking, that hon. members opposite cannot hear them. I wish hon. members on both sides would remember that the matters on which they speak are of interest to the whole House and should be heard. It is, I am aware, without any discourtesy intended to the members on the back benches, but, if members on each side would speak loud enough to allow members sitting on the rear benches on the other side to hear them, then they would be heard by the whole House.

Bill considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed, on a division.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) for the relief of Mahala Ellis, on a division.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Isabel Tapley, on a division.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 30) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.—(Mr. Reid.)

ANGLO-CANADIAN ELECTRIC STORAGE COMPANY.

Mr. MACKINTOSH moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company, be concurred in.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the amendment?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. A reduction of the capital from $500,000 to $300,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman what power this company has to expropriate, or to carry on its business on the highways, without the consent of the municipalities?

Mr. SPEAKER. Discussion can only take place in regard to the amendments that are under consideration.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite understand that we are discussing the amendment only, but the Bill does not become an Act until the amendment is concurred in. I observe that the original Bill proposed to confer very extensive powers upon the company, powers to erect poles and wires on the highways. I wish to know—it might affect my judgment about this amendment—whether those powers can now be used without the consent of the municipalities?

Mr. MACKINTOSH, I think the Bill provides that no expropriation can take place, no wires and no poles can be erected, except with the consent of the municipality.

Amendment concurred in.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you proceed with the Public Orders I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that Bill (No. 139), which I had the honour of introducing a week ago to-day, a very short Bill, is not yet printed in English. The Bill is only one page in length, and I hoped it would be printed, so that, if possible, I could have proceeded with it to-night. We have only one day in the week now for Public Bills and Orders, and I think it is too bad that these Bills should be neglected in this way—it means a week's delay. I think some explanation ought to be given of the delay.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Enquiry will be made, and the hon. gentleman will be informed of the result.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Mr. WALLACE moved second reading of Bill (No. 15) to amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. He said: This Bill is precisely of the same nature as the Bill of the session before last which was then rejected by the Senate. The object of the Bill as now brought in is the suppression of combinations in restraint of trade and is exactly the same as it was when passed through this House two years ago. We then accepted amendments made by the Senate because the last days of the session had arrived, and we either had to accept the Bill somewhat weakened by the amendments made by the Senate, or to reject it altogether. It was considered advisable to accept the measure, although mutilated by the Senate, rather than have no measure on the Statute-book relating to these combinations in restraint of trade. The two years that have elapsed since the Bill was passed have shown the necessity of the legislation that we are asking to-day from this House. Combinations have been broken up by the Act as it was passed, and warnings have been given to other combinations which have had the effect of compelling them to dissolve their organizations. There are, however, organizations still existing which are illegal, which are contrary to the best interests of the people of this country, and if the amendments that we ask for to-day are granted, they will effectually crush them out. I

think that we have some reason to find fault with the Attorneys General of the various provinces for not having seen fit to enforce the law as it stands against those who are breaking it. Public attention has been called, both in this House and out of it, to the fact of the existence of a combination by which salt was doubled in price at the salt wells. For many years salt has been sold at the wells, delivered on the cars, for 55 cents a barrel. Then a number of persons formed some kind of a combination; they went around to the salt manufacturers and said to them: Now, we will give you 70 cents a barrel for the salt you have been heretofore selling at 55 cents a barrel. That offer was, of course, accepted by the salt manufacturers, and these men immediately raised the price of salt to $1 per barrel, and a little later to $1.10. Every one will allow that the manufacturers of salt or any other article, or men engaged in any kind of commerce should have a fair and reasonable profit in their business. No business can subsist very long unless reasonable profit be made. The salt manufacturers made a profit of 15 cents additional, which I do not think the people would think was too much, because 70 cents per barrel for salt including the barrel, which cost 25 or 30 cents, is not an excessive price. But these men form a combination, do no work of any kind, have no capital invested in the enterprise. The salt manufacturers deliver the salt in cars to these men for 70 cents; they immediately send invoices to the purchasers, charging $1.10; they send 70 cents to the manufacturers, retaining 40 cents for themselves, although, I repeat, they have no capital invested, no men employed, no interests in the industry. That is an exorbitant and unreasonable price; the combination itself is illegal and should be broken up. It is quite true that within the last few days the dealers in salt reduced the price 15 cents and 7½ cents per 100 lbs., and these men have reduced the price of barrel salt to 85 cents. But their whole operations are wrong in principle; they are doing an injury to the people of the country, and if this Act is amended as proposed and the words "unduly and unreasonably" are struck out, they will find they will have to change their operations and work by more just and fair methods.

Mr. LISTER. When the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill last session or the session before, he was told in this House that the Bill if passed by this Parliament would not have the effect he desired it should have. The hon. gentleman, I notice, is always anxious to find fault with the Local Governments, and he intimates that the fact of his Act passed last session not having been enforced is attributable to the Attorneys General of the several provinces. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman that from the moment the Bill became law it was not worth the paper upon which it was printed, and the hon. gentleman knew it perfectly well. It was never intended to be operative. I desire to say further that so far as regards the Attorneys General of each province is concerned, that the hon. gentleman ought to know that it is not the duty of the Attorney General to enforce the criminal law. It must be put in motion by some individual in the state; and if the hon. gentleman is as keen and desirous as he would wish this House and the country to understand he is in suppressing combinations of this kind, why did he not take some steps for the purpose of having the law enforced? But the hon. gentleman knew that the Act could not be enforced, that no one could be convicted under it; and it is doubtful if the law were amended as he proposes to-day it could be enforced any more than the law passed last session. The only way to destroy these pernicious combinations is to repeal entirely the duties that protect them.

Mr. WALLACE. Do you propose to take the duties off coal oil?

Mr. LISTER. Never mind coal oil.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. LISTER. I will attend to coal oil in due time. I want this House to understand that the coal oil industry is nothing to me, and that I owe nothing to it, and I am here independent of it, and am as independent as any man to vote against the coal oil industry. If the hon. gentleman were as zealous, as he professes to be, to enforce the law as he is to make himself prominent in certain sections of the community, he himself would have gone before a magistrate and laid an information against this oppressive salt monopoly and other monopolies. Why does he not go and have the binder twine monopoly proceeded against?—a monopoly which is one of the most oppressive in this country. The industry here is closed up; it is under the control of an American firm, which is paying gentlemen, some of whom are sitting in this House, large sums of money; it has thrown hundreds of men out of employment, and is compelling every farmer to pay a great deal more than he otherwise would for the binding twine which of necessity he must use. If the hon. gentleman is so honest, if it is really desired by the Government and its followers to destroy the combinations which exist in this country in almost every branch of trade, why does not the Minister of Finance do as he said he would do the other day, whenever he found there were combinations he would take off the duty? I do not know whether the hon. Minister intends to carry out that promise or not. That is the method and the only successful method by which the trade combinations of this country can be wiped out. A word so far as oil is concerned. I said in this House several sessions ago that you have no right to single out the oil industry, that if you propose to reduce the duties, to abolish as it were the National Policy, I would hold up my hands for it, no matter whether it destroyed the oil industry or not. That is the position I take to-day. I say, again, that you have no right to single out one particular industry, and say that whatever protection you have given it shall be taken away and that particular industry closed. As regards the industry in coal oil, it is the only industry in Canada that can be protected by an Act of Parliament, and this must be apparent to anyone who gives it a moment's thought. We produce in Canada an inferior raw material, a material that produces less illuminating qualities and which costs more to refine than does the American. The result would be that as the American crude produces a greater percentage of illuminating qualities, costing less to refine, it would come into this country. Many men hold that instead of Canadians trying to make illuminating oil from petroleum it would be in the interests of the producer, and of all classes concerned, to manufacture lubricating oils. Whether

that be true or not I am not prepared to say, but I am sure I appeal to the common sense of every hon. gentleman when I say that for that particular reason, namely, its being an inferior raw material, is the only reason for the protection of that industry, the protection of it in a sense of protecting the manufactured article so far as its being an illuminating oil is concerned. I have no question that, for the reason that the Americans are able to manufacture illuminating oils cheaper, as their raw material is better, if you removed the duty the American oil would find a market here and would in all probability destroy our oil-refining industry. But there are many men who are familiar with the trade who hold that if we cease to refine for illuminating purposes, an ample market would be found for our oil in the United States as lubricating oils, if we could succeed in getting the Americans to remove the high duty standing against it in their markets. I repeat, Sir, that the only way to dissolve the combines is, as I have stated before, to abolish the high duty which protects the particular industries which are made the subject of combines.

Mr. SPROULE. I am a little surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), for if he had paid any attention to this subject, he would not have made the statement that the only way to dissolve combines is to take the duty off any article in respect to which a combination is formed. If the hon. gentleman had paid any attention to the subject, he would know that trusts and combines exist in countries where there is no protective tariff. Take, for instance, England: these combinations have existed in England, not only for the last fifteen years, but for the last one hundred years, and they are to be found in every other civilized country.

Mr. LISTER. They do not exist in England.

Mr. SPROULE. I tell the hon. gentleman that they do, and if he goes to the library he can find out for himself that they do exist. If the hon. gentleman does not know the facts, he might have qualified his statement by saying so far as his knowledge exists, but it is quite clear that his knowledge does not extend so far as it ought on this subject. Other countries have tried his method of doing away with the duty on articles to prevent combines, and, as they have failed, we are justified in supposing that his is not an effectual remedy. The United States have to deal with this same subject as we have, and they have endeavoured to do it in the same way. They are endeavouring to do as we are doing to-day, namely, making laws to attack the combines in another direction. Only two or three years ago, not less than 47 Bills were introduced into Congress in one year, with the object of doing away with these combinations. There were several members of Congress who held the same views that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) does, and they tried his remedy in reference to certain articles, but they found that this remedy was not effectual.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where?

Mr. SPROULE. In the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman say that free trade was tried in the United States?

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the duty was taken off some articles in the United States, for the purpose of trying if it would be effectual against combines, but this method was found not to be a remedy.

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

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman on the spur of the moment from memory, because it is two or three years since I studied the subject, but if he is anxious to know, I can get him the information later on and give it to him. If the hon. gentleman will wait until I am finished he can give his own version on the subject. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has asked: Why does not the member for York (Mr. Wallace) prosecute. It is not the duty of a private individual to prosecute under a criminal law in all cases where some injury is done to the public. It is the duty of the Attorney General of the province; it is the duty of the Provincial Government to prosecute, and I say, therefore, that we have just ground for complaint that when we have made a law and put it on the Statute-book, that the provincial authorities have not attempted to enforce that law for the purpose of doing away with these injurious combinations. It is the duty of the Provincial Government to enforce that law, just as it is their duty to enforce any other criminal law which we pass here. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Provincial Government at different times, and I say that they have never attempted to enforce this law. Therefore, we have the right to complain that they did not attempt to enforce this law, no matter how good or how bad it may be. The member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) further stated that the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) knew that this Bill was of no use, and that it never was intended to be of any use. If I understand the rules of debate in this House, no member has any right to attribute improper motives to another in reference to what he does or says in this House, and if the remarks of the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) do not attribute improper motives, then I do not understand the use of the English language. I am satisfied that the member for York (Mr. Wallace) was just as sincere in his endeavour to have his Bill made law, and just as honest in his conviction that if the Bill had passed as he introduced it, it would have been effectual for its object, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) ever was in reference to any Act which he has supported during his parliamentary term. I am satisfied that the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) was thoroughly sincere, and I believe that if the Bill had been passed in the form in which it was originally introduced, it would be effectual. The Bill was unfortunately amended in several ways, and it passed this House, not as the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) wished it should pass. It was allowed to pass that it might be got through the House, and leaving it to us the chance of amending it in the future so as to render it more effectual. The Bill was again changed in the Senate, and when it came back to this House at the last hour of the session, we were placed in the position, that if we did not accept the Senate amendment we would be unable to get the Bill through at all. The following session an effort was made to amend the law, but if I remember correctly, the contention both in this House and in the Senate was: "You have

passed a law, and you have that law on the Statutes which, in the judgment of the legal experts in this House, would be effectual to carry out its purpose if you would only prosecute under that law; but seeing that you have not prosecuted under the law, and that there has not been any failure of justice, you have no right to ask for this amendment." Upon these grounds we were defeated again in endeavouring to amend the Bill in the direction which we believe would best accomplish the object which was intended. Now, the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) again introduces the Bill, and he endeavours to secure this amendment which he believes is necessary in order to make the Bill as valuable and effective as it ought to be. When the hon. gentleman does so, there is no member in this House who has a right to impate improper motives to him, or to say that his aim is not to dissolve these combinations; or to insinuate in any way that he is here for the purpose of pastime in introducing a Bill that he believes to be no good. No member has a right to say that he is introducing this Bill for the purpose of making pastime for himself, or to gain a little cheap popularity out of it. That imputation is unjust and unfair. That is not the aim of the hon. member so far as my judgment goes, and certainly it is not the aim of other members in this House who have endeavoured to make this law as perfect as possible, because we believe it is very much needed.

Mr. McMILLAN. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in reference to the association which held the whole of the salt trade of Western Ontario in their hands, I trust that I may be permitted to correct the statements of that hon. gentleman. He said that this association had no money invested in the industry, and that they employed no hands. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that Dr. Coleman & Sons are the only manufacturers now at Seaforth, and they belonged to the association; Ramsford Bros. are the only manufacturers of salt in Clinton and they were members of the association; Mr. Wrightmeyer, of Kincardine, one of the largest exporters of salt in the west, was another member of the association, so that they all had money largely invested in it. Not only that, but a good many of the other salt wells have been unable to survive in the country at the low prices formerly obtained. In my own riding some years ago there were five salt wells in operation, but three of them went down and only two of them survive at the present time. The Merchants Salt Wells in Seaforth went down, Kidd, of Dublin, Ont., went down, and Roger, in Brussels, went down and the works were bought by Dr. Coleman & Sons, the time that salt was sold at 55 cents per barrel. While I am bitterly opposed to all monoplies, and to all associations to raise prices, I want everything placed on a fair level in this House. I say to-day that, considering the duties that have been removed from sugar, and the half duty removed from salt, that the salt interest has not received justice yet. They are charging 85 cents per barrel it is true, but all they desire is for you to give them free coal, give them free iron to make their pans, and the piping that goes into their wells and brings the brine to the tanks; give them a rebate on the duties on these articles, and the salt manufacturers tell me that they are perfectly sure that they can manufacture salt at 60 cents a barrel and make a fair living profit. The true remedy for the combiners, as will be found out in the end is, to remove the duties from the manufactured articles and from the raw materials. That is the only remedy that you can have for these combines.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did not the removal of the duty in the United States break up the sugar trust? That combine is in existence there still.

An hon. MEMBER. We will take all the duty off salt.

Mr. McMULLEN. When this question was before the House last session, the hon. member from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) introduced a Bill for the purpose of enabling the Excutive to remove the duty off any article, that they had just reason to believe was the subject of a combine. I believe that a Bill of that kind would be much better than the Bill which my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has introduced, although I intend to support that Bill because I am desirous to assist in every possible way I can to put an end to combines in this country. If the expunging of the word "unduly" will improve the Act now in force, I shall certainly support that action. I am exceedingly anxious that every effort should be put forth, I care not from what quarter it comes, to prevent combinations in trade; but I think the best way to suppress them would be to give the Executive power by Order in Council to place on the free list any commodity which they have just reason to believe is the subject of a combine. I regret that the Government did not consent to take the duty off binding twine, as the United States Government has done, for I am satisfied that the duty on that article this year will cause a very serious drain on the resources of our people, as it is at present the subject of a combine, as well as salt.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak a second time to this motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is, I think, mistaken in saying that the imposition of high duties has nothing to do with the production of combinations; and I think that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who has informed the House that combinations of this sort exist in England, will have a great deal of difficulty in presenting to the House an example. Combinations of this sort have existed in the United States, but wherever the duty has been removed on an article the combination has disappeared. I might refer to the well known instance of the manufacture of quinine. A few years ago the price of that article in the United States, as in this country, was $5 an ounce; but when the protection which was given to the manufacturers at Philadelphia was removed, the price was reduced to little more than one-tenth of what it had been before. What is true in that instance is true in every other instance where the experiment has been tried. Whenever a similar article may be imported from abroad, it will be brought into competition with the article which is the subject of combination. It is true, if an article is produced in this country which is to be found in no other part of the world, if some peculiar circumstance makes its production elsewhere impossible, then

there will be in the nature of things a monopoly in that article, which could not be reached by the removal of the duties. But that will not apply to salt. The salt men of Canada have before called the attention of public men to this fact, that the amount of capital invested and the number of wells sunk are capable of producing far more salt than will supply the Canadian market; and so combinations under a protective tariff were formed for the purpose of reducing the quantity put upon the market and keeping up the price. The same thing has happened in the United States. I might mention the salt wells in Kentucky which were rented at some $50,000 a year, and which were closed altogether by the Onondaga salt manufacturers. What has happend there has happened here, and exactly from the same cause, that is, because the Legislature of the United States, like the Parliament of Canada, has imposed a high protective duty which made a combination possible. Now, the hon. gentleman, instead of proposing to reduce the duty where combinations take place, undertakes to make the taking advantage of legislation which he himself has assisted in putting on the Statute-book, a criminal offence. The hon. gentleman helps to impose a very high duty, and makes it possible for the manufacturer to increase the price to the extent of that duty or very nearly so, and then he says: If you will do that, I will introduce a measure making your act criminal. Why, Sir, ought not the hon. gentleman's act to be regarded as criminal that makes such a state of things possible? Why should you make it possible by a protective tariff to impose an additional price of 50 or 60 cents on a barrel of salt, and then pass an act which says that if any party undertakes to avail himself of the advantage that has thus been created by the interference of the legislature, he shall be punished as guilty of a crime. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. Now, I say that this is a very clumsy and inefficient contrivance, and one that will be very far from being as satisfactory as the other that is open to the hon. gentleman, that is, to repeal the law imposing the protective duty, or to diminish the duty, and to that extent you will make a combination impossible; because whenever a party forming a combination here undertakes to ask more than the ordinary market price plus the duty, the foreign article will come in. By simply reducing the duty, the hon. gentleman can accomplish in an effective way, and without calling into operation a criminal law, what he proposes by this Bill. Then, I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the change which the hon. gentleman proposes. He says he proposes to repeal the word "unduly." Why, Sir, if he has made a combination illegal, the addition of the word "unduly" has not added anything to the character of the law. It simply introduces a word that is surplusage. If the hon. gentleman has not made the combination illegal, then the removal of this word "unduly" will simply make his Bill absolutely harmless, so far as regards the party against whom it is directed. Now, I have seen a telegram from a prominent salt manufacturer, who says that if you will give him free fuel, he is perfectly willing that you should remove the duty altogether, and by so doing, you would give to the community cheap salt. But the hon. gentleman does not propose to do that. He imposes high duties which make combinations and high prices possible; and when he sees parties taking advantage of his legislation to do what is the obvious result of that legislation, he comes here and proposes to make their act criminal. I say that the combinations in many cases may be wrong, but in many cases they are the necessary expression of self-preservation, and they may not be anything more than that; and the hon. gentleman, by proposing legislation of this sort, may satisfy his constituents, but he will never accomplish the results at which he aims.

Mr. BARRON. I am considerably surprised at the hon. member for East Grey saying that the Attorney General of one of the provinces has repeatedly refused to take proceedings under the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman misrepresents me. I never made such a statement.

Mr. BARRON. Of course, if I misunderstood the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPROULE. It had been brought to the attention of the Committee with the object of its reaching the Attorney General.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman certainly created the impression on my mind, though, of course, I must have misunderstood him, that the attention of the Attorney General was brought to the different breaches of the law. It does seem to me there is more of a desire to place the Governments of the respective provinces in a false position by this Act than a real desire to prevent combines. Take the Act the hon. gentleman proposes to amend. He proposes to strike out the word "unduly" in several sub-sections. Why, Sir, you might strike out this word, and yet the statute, as the hon. gentleman read it, will be entirely ineffective. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to this fact. What is the Act the hon. gentleman proposes to amend?

"Every person who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any person or any railway, steamer, steamship or transportation company, unlawfully——"

The hon. gentleman still leaves the word "unlawfully" in—

"to limit the facilities for transport——"

So that by striking out the word "unduly," he does not go far enough. He does not make the act of combining itself unlawful. He must declare in the Act itself, or by some means or other, what is an unlawful Act, because a judge or anybody else trying for a breach of this statute is brought face to face with the question: What is an unlawful Act? The statute does not say what is an unlawful Act; and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), evidently does not desire the passing of an Act to stop these combines, because when he amends the Act he does not go far enough. He does not strike out the word "unlawfully," as he should, in order to make the Act effective. If the word "unlawfully" was out, then every person who conspires or combines to limit the facilities for transport, &c. would be guilty of misdemeanour; but when he leaves in the word "unlawful," he leaves the law as it is, which he declares is not effective. We have a right, therefore, to declare on this side that there is no evidence of a *bonâ fide* desire on the part of the hon. gentleman to destroy combines but rather to make capital by professing such a desire; and, perhaps, as suggested by the hon.

member for West York himself or rather to be drawn from a suggestion of his, to place the Governments of the different provinces in rather a false position by trying to find fault with them for not prosecuting the different combines under the Act. My hon. friend beside me suggests that the provinces have no authority to prosecute under the Act. and that is so; but I am merely answering the point made by the hon. member for West York, when I say that the word "unlawfully" left in the Act leaves the Act entirely ineffective, so long as it does not declare what is an unlawful act.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is my impression that the hon. member for West York is quite sincere in his desire to prevent combines. I was on the committee with him, and I thought he was very anxious to ascertain all about these combines; and, therefore, I think he is sincere in his desire to prevent them. But when this Parliament undertakes to regulate the trade of this country and decide how much profit a man shall make, they undertake a very difficult and extensive task. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says they have combines where they have not protection. I have never heard of any combine in England since they did away with protection. It was all combines for a hundred years when they had protection. There were guilds and protected monopolies for everything; and those monopolies paid contributions to the Crown for the privilege of producing, and this was a source of great revenue to the Crown and the political party in power which absolutely sold these privileges. Now, when did we hear of any combines in Canada until protection was introduced? Did you, Sir, before Confederation, hear of any combines being formed in Canada to put up the price of an article and buy out certain industries? I never heard of it in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and I have been many years in Parliament. Neither did I ever hear of them in Quebec or Ontario. In fact, they were never heard of until after this pernicious system of protection was introduced, since which time they have grown up like mushrooms. When did you, Sir, first hear of combines in Canada? It was just two years after we introduced this protective system. This system is the prolific mother of combines, and this Parliament is undertaking a heavy work when it undertakes to regulate trade. In the Parliament of Great Britain, which is the greatest commercial nation in the world, there is no time lost in dealing with matters of trade, but they allow people to trade, without regulating by legislation what profit a man shall make and what this industry or the other shall be allowed to do. They legislate there on broad principles, and let the people do the trading. These matters should be managed by merchants and individuals. We are all traders: to trade is a natural right. To buy and sell where you can do so the best is a natural right, but we have undertaken to regulate these things, which are much better let alone. We ought not to interfere with trade at all in this Parliament, because trading is a natural right which belongs to everybody. Is there any moral wrong in buying or selling? There is a moral wrong in putting a law on the Statute-book which allows people to rob their neighbours, but there is no wrong, either in the law of God or the moral law, in buying and selling where you can and in making the most you can. But this Parliament has undertaken to regulate everybody's business. The hon. member for West York pretends there are combines in England. There may be, because it is possible for a combine to be formed among individuals, even where there is no protection.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no room for it.

Mr. GILLMOR. The whole world has to be in the combine where you have free trade, but when you come down to a locality and there put on a protective tariff, you afford facilities for combines. You appeal to men's selfishness, and they will tell you how generous they are going to be, but they combine in order to make money for themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he remembered the brewers' company who came over here to buy out the breweries in Canada and Chicago?

Mr. GILLMOR. Of course, they are coming here, but they are coming here to make money. What I wish to convey to the House is, that you are undertaking to do something that you cannot do. You pretend to say that, as soon as you see a combine, you will take off the duty. Is that the remedy you propose? There was a combine in salt, and, therefore, you took off the duty. If you took off the duty on every other article in regard to which combines are formed, perhaps there would be no combines at all.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) ventured to make a statement that there were no combines in Great Britain, and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), cheered him on in that assertion. Did he never hear of the arrangement which was made a year or more ago by the thread manufacturers of Scotland? Was not that a combine, and were not thread agencies in this country closed up in consequence of it? Was it not also a fact that the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was a party to bringing about a combination amongst the manufacturers of screws? However, what I desire is to cite that case of the thread manufacturers in Scotland. Take the case of the oil industry, of which the hon. gentleman said the duty should be taken off and then the combines would disappear. Suppose we took off the duty on oil, and allowed the American oil to come in here free. Would we in that way get rid of a monopoly? On the contrary, we would be at the mercy of the monopoly of the Standard Oil Company in the United States. While there may be some basis of truth in the contention of the hon. gentlemen opposite, from their point of view, that, if we swept away all the protective duties there would be fewer combines, still, apart from all that, there would be combinations formed, and this Bill, while working in harmony with the protective system, is intended to provide that no illicit and illegal combinations shall take place in restraint of trade. In conclusion, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has rather reflected upon me in regard to the remark that passed from my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) who said that in a free trade country there was very little opportunity for combines to be formed. I did not mean to say that there were no combines formed in Great Britain. What I meant to say was, that the con-

ditions for the formation of combines under a free trade policy are minimized while they are increased under a protective policy. I think that his reference to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's screws was rather unfortunate, as that is one arising simply from a question of patent rights. I am not aware of the circumstances in regard to thread combinations.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If you admit one case, you give away the whole argument.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was natural to suppose that this Bill would excite some debate, as it touches slightly on questions of free trade and protection, but to assert that combines owe their existence to protective tariffs is without any ground in philosophy or history.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says "oh," but I can appeal to either of those sciences, and he is a master in both. To refer to the first: a combination is only the result of active competition and an attempt to check competition. It may arise from a protective tariff or from many other reasons. It may arise from the protection which is given by the tariff or from the distance and difficulty of transportation from competing countries. In this country it might arise from a highly protective tariff, and in Great Britain it might arise from the distance from sources of production. The hon. gentleman must know from history that, ever since Great Britain has had a Parliament at all, she has made laws on this subject. From the commencement of the statute law you will find laws against forestalling, against regrating, combining, huckstering, and so on, everyone of these being intended to put down combinations, nearly all of them in articles which had no protection under the tariff, but were articles of abundant home production. The hon. gentleman will find that prosecutions were the result of these laws, but they had no relation to a protective tariff, and many of them occurred after free trade. These combinations arise occasionally from underproduction, from storms which impeded transportation, from war, and other circumstances. Nearly all these were in regard to articles on which there was no protection at all. To come to modern times, we all remember the debate which took place when this whole subject was investigated here, when instances were given, and repeated over and over again, of combinations which existed in Great Britain in regard to articles in which there was no competition, and in the United States in regard to articles for which there was no protection. As to the screw manufacture in Great Britain, the hon. gentleman opposite gives another instance of a combination which arose to check competition, not in consequence of a protective tariff, but from a very different cause. I wanted particularly to call attention to the fact that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has been accused of insincerity in pressing this Bill. The foundation of this charge was that he leaves the word "unlawfully" in the Bill, and they say he must be insincere, because it is impossible to tell what is the exact meaning of "unlawfully." My hon. friend goes the length of saying that those who administer the law do not know what the common law of the country is, because when we pass a statute and declare the penalty that shall follow the doing of an unlawful act we simply declare that those penalties shall follow the infraction of the common law, and nothing else. Therefore, when the hon. member for West York proposed to strike out the words of the Act, which he thinks ought not to be in the Act, and leaves the word "unlawfully," I venture to say that instead of making himself liable to the imputation of insincere motives in introducing his Bill he tries to put upon the Statute-book an Act which anybody who is fit to administer a law can administer and interpret without any difficulty. But if the Bill is not to be passed, if we are to have no law upon the subject of unlawful combinations, if we are to repeal the tariff, as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) insists we should do, then, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says, instead of declaring a remedy for the abuse which is declared to exist in this country we shall simply be folding our hands and leaving our people at the mercy of foreign combinesters without attempting any remedy at all, either as regards foreign or domestic combinations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the historical allusions of the Minister of Justice are rather against him. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the legislation of England with regard to forestalling is legislation that existed when almost every man in England held to the doctrine of protection, and the cases he mentions grew up at the same time; they were called into existence at the same time, and the propriety of legislation of this sort at the present day is more than questionable. The hon. gentleman knows very well that for years there has been no attempt to enforce the law with regard to these particular offences, and whether they ought now to be regarded as offences, even, has been seriously questioned. The hon. gentleman knows, too, that when these provisions were inserted in the statutes of the United Kingdom it was thought the proper thing to fix the price of every article that was put upon the market; the sheep had its price, and the prices of the ox, the cow and the horse were fixed by law, and so the parties who formed combinations for the purpose of increasing their value, were persons who acted contrary to the law. Then there was the further rule laid down that it was improper to purchase articles that were necessary to the maintenance of life, such as articles of food, and to hold them with a view of obtaining for them a higher price than they would ordinarily bring in the market. Now, I remember very well that the first work I ever read on political economy was directed against legislation of that sort, and I think, if I remember rightly, it was a work written by the late Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately, in which he undertook to show that it was one of the means by which starvation was prevented amongst the population, that food was not wasted when it was taken out of the market and that by being purchased and held for a higher price, it was held to be sold out to the population when it was most necessary; so that I think the historical allusion of the Minister of Justice is rather unfortunate for his argument, and not at all in support of the Bill proposed by the hon. gentleman who sits behind him. It has been pointed out by the Minister of Justice that there are other things than protection which may produce or may render com-

binations possible. No one has denied that. The copyright of a particular book or literary work may add largely to its price, and so long as the copyright is maintained a monopoly exists; in that case it is only a means devised to compensate the party for his right in literary property. Then, again, patent rights produce the same effect. But what is proposed to be legislated against here are not patent rights or copyrighted articles, but other articles that are ordinarily produced in the country, regardless of patent rights or copyrights, that enter into competition with articles that are purchased from abroad, and foreign competition is effectively excluded by the high duties that have been imposed, and we say to the hon. gentleman: If you will reduce those duties then you will accomplish the object that you have mainly in view by this measure. Besides that, a still more important matter is that the measure which the hon. gentleman put upon the Statute-book two years ago, and the amendment which he now proposes will not at all make the measure of the character which he intends it to be.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) called in question the correctness of a statement I made, I would like to quote from a work written by a Mr. Cook, of the New York Bar:

"In England the principle of 'trust' has existed for many years, but it has been confined to legitimate purposes. It has been in vogue in that country for forty years in carrying on mining operations."

Now the hon. gentleman said, in answer to the Minister of Justice, that combinations existed in England during the time of a protective tariff, but not in recent years, when England was under free trade. Now, the period of the last forty years has been a free trade period. The writer then goes on to say:

"And the modern trust seems to be but an outgrowth of their plan of organization. These old English trusts were called Cost-Book Mining Companies."

Then he goes on to cite a number of different kinds of trusts which led to litigation and caused frauds. He continues:

"In more recent times, in England, the genuine 'trust' has been used for legitimate investment purposes. The trustees are authorized to invest the funds of the 'trust' in the stocks and bonds of miscellaneous corporations."

Thus, these combinations to which the writer refers have had their existence since free trade was adopted in England, because the writer here expressly states "it has been in vogue in that country for forty years." Then the writer goes on to say that it had its origin in France, then was extended to England, and trusts were brought about by a number of people putting their money together in order to control operations on a large scale. He gives the history of a number of these combinations, not only in England, but, if I remember rightly, in Prussia, Russia and other countries. I point out this fact to show that because the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Lambton were not conversant with this author and with this statement it is no reason why they should get up and flatly contradict every member in the House who dares to differ with them in their opinion regarding the origin of these combines.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no doubt, as stated by the Minister of Justice, that combines, as they are called now, have had many other causes besides protection and tariffs. There is no doubt that distance may be a cause of combines. If an article is manufactured in one country and the same class of article is manufactured in another country, and if the distance is such as to increase greatly the cost of transportation, then a combination may develop naturally. But distance is not the act of man: distance is the act of nature, of God himself. On the other hand, protection is the hand of man. Protection is the very condition created by man in which combinations will flourish, and it is contended by this side of the House that the best method to take away combinations existing under protection is to remove the protection on those special articles. There is no answer to this argument; it is logic itself. That is exactly what is stated by my hon. friends. You, the Government, have created a monopoly, not by distance, not by nature, but simply as the effect of your legislation, and the best way to remove the evil which has been created by legislation is to remove the legislation which has made it possible. Moreover, with respect to the screw monopoly: I remember that in an address delivered by Mr. Chamberlain in New York, after the negotiations of the last Washington treaty, speaking of the absurdity, as he called it, of the protective tariff, he stated, as an instance, that the combinations in screws in the United States paid to his firm or to the monopoly in England a sum, if I remember rightly, of $100,000 a year, just to prevent the exportation of English screws to the American market.

Mr. BOWELL. £30,000 sterling.

Mr. LAURIER. That goes to justify the condition of things which the American tariff made possible. It therefore proves to me that, whatever may be the merit of this Bill, upon the question of free trade and protection, in this instance, the point is made that clearly the best way to remove this combination is to remove the protection itself.

Mr. BOWELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite have based all their arguments upon the suggestion and declaration that combines do not exist in a free trade country. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) said that in a country like England there was no reason or rather no foundation on which to base trade combinations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said the inducements were much fewer.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that. The hon. gentleman says that inducements are not so large there as in a protective country. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) gave a strong illustration of the incorrectness of that statement when he referred to the Coats spool-cotton combination. It is a very wealthy combination, and it is its wealth that enables it to buy up and control the whole of that industry in the kingdom. The hon. gentleman must not have forgotten there was a wealthy combination that controlled the copper of the whole world.

Mr. LISTER. It came to grief.

Mr. BOWELL. Never mind; the fact that it came to grief—most of these combinations come to grief in the end—does not remove the fact that wealth enables a number of people in any country, whether protective or free trade, to form combinations to control the market for at least a

certain portion of time. Another combination existed in respect to tin. I speak from a little practical knowledge, owing to the fact of having to do a good deal with the tariffs of the different countries in which these combinations existed. There was brought to the notice of the Department of Customs the fact that, when these combinations existed, prices in the home market were much higher than in the foreign markets to which they exported the products of their industries, whatever they might be. If hon. gentlemen wish to have a striking illustration they have it in the article of dynamite. Although Germany is a highly protected country, dynamite was taken from that country to the markets of England to such an enormous extent that it undersold the productions of Scotland and of England, and the result was a combination between the free trade manufacturers in England and the protected manufacturers in Germany in order to secure higher prices in the different mining districts of England for that particular article. It is an article used very extensively, as hon. gentlemen know, because in England the mining industry is very extensive and those connected with it are very wealthy. Now, there was a case in which the wealthy manufacturers in free trade England joined with the protected manufacturers of Germany and Belgium to keep the price at a higher rate in free trade England, Scotland and Wales, where they sold the dynamite, than they sold it to the mining people of Canada. Strange to say, this combination did not extend to either Germany or Belgium, protected countries, but was confined to free trade England. I speak of what I know, from the fact that we have had the best possible evidence that the price at which the manufacturers sold this article in the mining districts in England was higher than the rate at which they sold it in Canada. We found that the combination only extended to England, that the Germans and Belgians reserved to themselves the right to export the products of their countries to any foreign country other than England at lower prices than those at which it was sold in England. Consequently, we were obliged under our law to allow it to be entered at German prices, because it was exported from Germany. This example proves this fact, that in a free trade country like England, where wealth is sufficient, the manufacturers are able to form combinations. Wherever wealth is sufficiently great to control the raw material, just in proportion will they raise the price of the article into which it is manufactured in the country, and this principle extends especially to a country like England, where the manufacturers are so wealthy. So the position assumed by the Minister of Justice was practically correct, apart from history and philosophy. These instances to which I have called the attention of the House have occurred within two years; therefore, it was not necessary to go back forty years, or before free trade was established in England.

Mr. LISTER. They are not parallel cases.

Mr. BOWELL. If this is not a parallel case I do not know what constitutes one. I may be too stupid to draw the distinction, but I see difference between a combination to raise prices in dynamite and a combination to raise prices in salt. There may be a distinction which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) can draw, but I am forced to say I cannot. I do not wish to detain the House, but I could give several instances in the practical working of the Customs Act to show that combinations do exist, and that they prevail to nearly as great an extent in free trade England as in any part of the world.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no doubt whatever that the amending Bill of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) will be a great improvement on the law passed a year or so ago. In regard to the point taken by the Minister of Justice, I have to join issue with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Those customs that were legislated against in England were customs that came into existence wholly independent of any protection whatever. What occurred was this: Here was a market in the heart of England. A rich trader could go down there and buy up everything coming in; he could make a corner in it in a small way, and do what is done in Chicago in a large way in wheat. While there was not any particular law in existence in England at that time in regard to iron, a law might have been introduced to deal with that custom. It is, as the hon. Minister of Justice said very properly, to guard against an offence of that kind that this legislation of my hon. friend is intended, so that the illustration taken by my hon. and learned friend was strictly to that point, and the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell cannot be sustained. These customs are very interesting in their history. They show how under every condition, a man or a tradesman, or a body of tradesmen, will, if they possibly can, take an advantage. The broad principle laid down, that a combination can be formed whether you have free trade or whether you have protection, is irrefragable. The question of making a combination is merely a question of the power of wealth that you command. Take any trade you like, and if you can find a man with boundless wealth, and if he will go around to all the persons engaged in that trade, and make it worth their while to surrender their rights to him, he can make a "corner" in that special industry for all the world.

Mr. LAURIER. A "corner" is not a "combine."

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend makes a distinction without a difference; and I will show him that he does. What is a combine? A combine is a number of persons acting together to make a circle around a certain trade, within which circle they would control that trade so that they will put up the price. What in the name of goodness is the difference, whether one man can wield the money power that is wielded by a dozen men and make the same circle around a given industry? There is no difference whatever, so that my hon. friend makes a distinction without a difference.

Mr. BARRON. One man cannot be guilty of a conspiracy or combination.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah! a single man cannot be guilty of a conspiracy, but here again it is quibbling with words. What is a conspiracy but an offence against the law on the part of a number of persons; and the customs that were referred to by the Minister of Justice are making a "corner" by a single individual, where the law is against that. That is an offence on his part against the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And he would be a conspirator by joining with these other parties in making a combination.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly he would. I contend that the various positions taken by my hon. friends on the Opposition cannot be sustained, and I am surprised that two hon. gentlemen of such distinction in this House as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the distinguished leader of the Opposition should be deceived by phrases as they have been in this debate. I say they have been deceived by phrases, and my hon. friend (Mr. Barron), the budding hope of the party behind these hon. gentlemen, has also been deceived by phrases. However, I merely rose to say that, at a glance, the amending Bill of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a great improvement in the law; and for once, and only once—and I have no doubt it will never occur again as it has never occurred in the past—for once the vast historical knowledge of my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been at fault.

Mr. BARRON. I am sure it will be conceded by everyone in this House that the object of everyone is to put down combines; and, of course, with that object in view we are anxious to make that law as effective as possible. It is because we on this side of the House—I am speaking for myself—have thought that this Bill is not effective that we have raised the objections which have been raised. We have had perhaps some reason for concluding that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was not as desirous of reaching the root of the evil as he professed to be, because a session or two ago, when this matter was before us, we then pointed out objections to this Bill as it was then introduced. He did not choose to accept the suggestions that came from this side of the House, and the result has been that the amendment made in the Senate has rendered the Act wholly inefficacious. To-night we point out again that his Bill as proposed is an absolute nullity. Now, the Minister of Justice, for whom, of course, I have the greatest possible respect, finds fault with the remarks I made a few moments ago, when I stated that a judge or a magistrate, or any judicial officer trying a case of this kind, would have, first of all, to ask himself the question: What is an unlawful combination? The Minister says that he can easily ascertain that by looking at the common law, because there is and always has been a common law against unlawful combinations. Then, if there has always been a common law, why not leave it as before, because this Act, in effect, according to his own statement, is only crystallizing into a statute what has been the common law. I appeal to hon. members in this House to adopt a little common sense in looking at the matter before us. What does this Act say? It says:

"Every person who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, unlawfully, to do certain things——"

By leaving the word "unlawfully" in the Act it does not do any good at all. What you want to do is to leave that word out, and say:

"Every person who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, to unduly," &c.

When they combine to "unduly" do a thing, then these persons are so combined to unduly do it. Leave the word "unduly" in, but take out the word "unlawfully;" for, whosoever combines together to unduly do a thing, these people shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. A judicial officer, trying a case, would then have no difficulty, unless the difficulty in finding out what should be the construction of "unduly." He could find that they were "unduly" combined together, and, if they were so "unduly" combined, it would bring about the ends aimed at by the statutes. These persons doing these things "unduly" shall be guilty of a misdemeanour and are liable to penalties; but, when you leave in the word "unlawfully," the question at once arises in the mind of the judge: What is an "unlawful" doing under this Act? The Minister says that all the judge has got to do is to consult the common law of the land, and there he would find what was an unlawful combination. If the common law of the land is against unlawful combinations, why has any other law been introduced? It is said the common law has been proved to be inefficient for the purpose, and so you want to introduce a statute, and I am glad to have a statute introduced; but in introducing a statute why not introduce one that will have some effect. Do not introduce a statute which will clearly be ineffective, and be of no good whatever in aiming at the evils. If you leave this word "unlawfully" in it will be ineffectual. I say, strike out the word "unlawfully," and leave in the word "unduly," and then you will have an effective statute. Why not say "whoever combines together to unduly prevent or lessen competition, &c., shall be guilty of a misdemeanour." If you leave the word "unlawfully" in, and strike out "unduly," then I say, with all respect to the Minister of Justice, you leave the Act as it was before, and as it has been under the common law of the land, as the Minister of Justice intimated when he said "hear, hear" to my remarks a few moments ago. If you do not take out the word "unlawfully" and leave the word "unduly" in the Act it will be no good whatever. We therefore think, we have reason to say, that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) does not show that desire which would lead us to believe that he is sincere in aiming at the destruction of these combines. He can only have that desire if he adopts the suggestion made from some members on this side of the House, to take out the word "unlawfully" and leave the word "unduly" in the statute.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not intend to reply to the statements made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), as to the motive with which I introduced this Bill into Parliament; but, Sir, I do not think it would be very hard to distinguish the motives which actuated that hon. gentleman in his attack upon me when he was afraid to attack the Bill. You will always find some half-lawyer sort of argument introduced against a Bill by members of this House who dare not attack the Bill itself, and who want to attack the promoter of the Bill; and that is the case with the hon. member for West Lambton. He will pose as a promoter of this Bill when he goes back to his constituency, and will be able to boast that he only opposed the author of it. With reference to the statement that I knew it would be a dead letter, how could I know that? The Bill, as it stands on the Statute-book, is not the Bill which I introduced, or the Bill which

passed this House almost unanimously; but it is the Bill as it was changed by the Senate, and for which I assume no responsibility whatever. The Bill which was passed by this Parliament, and for which this Parliament assumed the full responsibility, has not yet had an opportunity to be tested. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell stated that there were no combinations in England. A good many have been mentioned already. Mr. Blaine, the Republican leader of the United States, when he came back from England in 1888, said that England was literally plastered with trusts and combines. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has mentioned the English combination on cotton thread. We all know that a couple of years ago, when this combination began operations in this country, competition ceased, the thread had to be bought from one man, and the price advanced in one day 33⅓ per cent. Another English combination was the copper combination, the most gigantic in the world, with the exception, perhaps, of the Standard Oil Company. It is true that it has broken down, as combinations will sometimes break down. It is said that of thirty-six articles sold in this country by the wholesale grocers there are more than twenty in which combinations exist; and these are in English goods only, and the English manufacturers set the prices at which their customers in this country must sell. Hon. gentlemen say: abolish or diminish the duties and then the combinations will cease. Well, Sir, what was the most prominent result of the investigations made by the Committee of the House of Commons? It was this: The Parliament of Canada abolished the duty on anthracite coal; and yet after that coal came free into Canada the most indefensible combination which was examined by that Committee was the combination in anthracite coal. The abolition of the duty had the opposite effect from what was intended. Therefore, the arguments of these hon. gentlemen fall to pieces. It may be that there are cases where the abolition of the duty will operate; but that is not a rule of universal application. The wholesale grocers are not manufacturers, and there is no duty which gives them a protection in their business; yet they have formed a combination in many articles in conjunction with the manufacturers in England and elsewhere, by which prices are raised to the consumers in this country. Therefore, the abolition of the duties in these cases would not effect one particle of reduction in the prices nor break down the combinations. Now, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) was defending the salt men the other night; but he admitted, if I heard him aright, that they took about $70,000 needlessly from the people of this country, and he justified their combination for this reason. He stated that the salt men of Huron say: If you will reduce the duty on fuel we will agree to have the salt duty abolished altogether, and have free trade in salt. Now, Sir, what is the duty on fuel to which the hon. gentleman refers? Cordwood was used in making salt the last time I was up there, and I am sure there is no duty on cordwood to interfere with the operations of the salt manufacturers. But suppose they use coal wholly, as I am told they do, the coal which they use is coal dust. Anthracite coal dust is altogether free of duty, and bituminous coal dust pays a duty of 20 per cent.; but as this sells as low as 10 cents per ton at the place of production the duty would amount to only 2 cents or 2½ cents per ton, so that it is pretty nearly free. I think the hon. Minister of Finance might easily remove that 2 cents per ton, and make it free altogether; but that is the only duty that the salt men can pay on their fuel; and yet the hon. member for South Huron says, that if you give them their fuel free of duty they will consent to the duty being taken off salt.

Mr. McMILLAN. What I stated was, that if the duty were taken off fuel, off the plates out of which they made their pans, and off nuts, bolts and pipes, then they would be perfectly willing to have the duty taken off salt, and they could sell it at 60 cents a barrel.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not hear the hon. gentleman to-night speak of pipes and plates, but he made that statement the other night. But then the pipes and plates are not renewed every year, or perhaps for half-a-dozen years; we know that they last a long time; and boilers and boiler plates are as cheap in Canada as in the United States; so that they have no grievance in this respect. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell doubted if it was wise to adopt this kind of legislation. I inferred from his remarks that he favoured no restrictions of any kind upon manufacturers, but was willing that they should form as many combinations as they please. The United States, to which hon. gentlemen opposite appear very anxious we should join our fortunes, are awakening to the enormity of these combinations, and none too soon, because there they have attained to greater strength and power than in Canada. But the authorities there having passed legislation to put down combinations, the proper authorities are taking active steps to enforce that legislation. Let me read an article to show what is being done on this subject:

"WASHINGTON, 14th July.—The Attorney General is bent on enforcing to the utmost the law against trusts enacted by the last Congress. Assistant Attorney General Maury is busily engaged in formulating instructions which will be forwarded to all officers of the department in every part of the country. These instructions are comprehensive in nature and direct a stringent execution of the law. United States officers will be requested to forward at once to the department information in regard to any form of trust or combination which can be suspected of falling under the provisions of the Sherman Act, and the Act covers all combinations of any kind organized to restrain trade among the several states or with other countries. In every case where civil process is found insufficient the criminal penalties of the law will be fully imposed."

The Attorney General of the United States does not require the urging that he requires in Ontario. I think we can fairly call upon the Attorney General of the various provinces to enforce this law. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) asked why did I not become an informer. My hon. friend beside me says it is because I am not a Grit. Well, I do not think it is necessary for a private individual to undertake the responsibility and trouble of prosecuting in a matter which concerns the interests of the whole people, because that would involve a large expense, which the state, and not the individual, should be called upon to undertake. I think we can fairly call upon the Attorney General of the various provinces to enforce the law, whether we get this amendment passed through the Senate or not, because I believe the law, as it stands now, would prove effective against evil-doers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How can the Attorney General do that, if no complaint or information be laid before him ?

Mr. WALLACE. I can point out many instances where the Attorney General has instructed officials to lay the information and prosecute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Without any complaints being made ?

Mr. WALLACE. We will make the complaint in a moment, if that is all that is required. We will take very good care to do that.

Mr. FRASER. I would not make any remarks on this subject, but the hon. gentleman who has just sat down spoke as if he had discovered some charge to fling against our Attorney General, when he mentioned that the Attorney General of the United States conducts the prosecution there. Does the hon. gentleman not know that it is the Attorney General of the United States, and not the Attorney General of any separate state, who takes action; and it is quite as easy for the Attorney General of the United States to carry out the laws of the central government as it would be for our Minister of Justice to carry out any law passed by this Parliament. The Attorney General of the United States carries out the laws passed by Congress himself, and sees that informations are laid, just as the Minister of Justice might do in the case of laws passed here. I wish to refer to this matter, to show that the Attorney General of a province is not called upon to lay the information; and I am sure the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), or some other gentleman on that side, would be the first to raise a hue and cry if an Attorney General of one of our provinces did anything to one of their darling children brought into existence by the National Policy. They would say: This miserable Grit of an Attorney General is trying to throttle the bantams we have brought into existence. That is not the duty of the Attorney General, but if the hon. member for West York or anybody else in Ontario or elsewhere will give such information as would satisfy the Attorney General that a combine exists he can very quickly have the law put into force. Surely it is not the duty of an Attorney General to go round the country in order to discover if there is a combine in existence. No man can expect that. I only mention this because there really appears to be a disposition on the part of the last speaker to lay the blame on the Attorneys General, and to make it appear, if the proposed amendment be passed, that, be the law perfect or imperfect, he has performed his duty, and the whole responsibility rests with the Attorney General. When a law is passed by this Parliament it is the duty of every good citizen, as well as the Attorney General, to see that it is executed, and I am sure every good citizen, were the law effectual and operative, would see that the combines are brought to their senses. With reference to combines under protection and free trade, there is this distinction: In a free trade country they cannot exist as they can in a protective country when there is an abundance of material in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. You have just come in, I guess.

Mr. FRASER. No; I understand what I am talking about. I say you could not, in a free trade country, have a combine in salt, for example, if there was plenty of salt in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. Why ?

Mr. FRASER. The argument may not be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is an argument all the same. I agree with what the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) said, that you must strike at the root of the evil. Is it not a pitiful spectacle to see Parliament called on to legislate combines into existence and then called upon to destroy them ? I thought there was a striking lesson in the remarks of the Minister of Finance the other day, when he said that, finding there was a combine in salt, he had to reduce the duty in order to free the people, and when he made the overt threat that if combines were attempted before the end of the year he would repeat the same thing. After giving protection which enabled the parties to form a combine, he has to take some means to get rid of the evil. I thought it much better to make it possible, by general legislation, to do away with these combines. I admit that the legislation introduced by the hon. gentleman is intended to be honest and strike at the evil, but in order to eradicate the evil we must do, as the hon. member for Charlotte has said, strike at its very source.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. MULOCK. I only wish to make one observation. I understood the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to reproach the Senate for the amendments to the Bill as passed by this House. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to whether protection is or is not the parent of combines or trusts. I think there is no doubt on this point. If we deal with individual articles we can point to many combines that exist in Canada to-day which could not exist if Canada were a free trade country. The hon. member referred to iron. I would like to know what would become of the combines in the manufacture of steel if the Canadians were free to purchase the foreign article ? What would become of the combine in pig iron, for example ? It would be impossible to have a combine in iron or steel, or the products of iron or steel, as long as they are manufactured in a free trade country, as they are to-day in England if they could be imported into Canada free. What would become of the combine in sugar which existed and still exists *pro tanto ?*

Mr. WALLACE. That was a combination made by the wholesale grocers.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is too astute and intelligent to think, for one moment, that there could have been a combine in sugar if it had been on the free list. He will not venture to say there could have been a combine for one week, had it been possible for sugar to come in free from Glasgow. He will not say the grocers could have controlled the combine.

Mr. WALLACE. How is it there are combines in other articles of groceries ?

Mr. MULOCK. It is true that combines and trusts exist in free trade countries, but they are not so possible in these countries. The protection that hedges in a country renders combines possible, which would not be possible under

other conditions. What, for instance, makes combines in rice possible? Rice is a necessary article of food and is used in large quantities in Canada. Does the hon. gentleman know that every poor man in this country who uses rice has to pay the combine price for his rice? Does he suppose that that would be possible if rice were admitted free? Rice is produced in various parts of the world, and if it could be imported into Canada free, as wheat is imported into England free, it would be as impossible to form a combine in rice in Canada as it is to form a combine in wheat in England. So the statement that combines exist because of the cussedness of the people themselves will not go down. The one reason which leaves combines possible is the policy of protection, which places the consumer at the mercy of a limited market. And now the Government, these combines and trusts being their own progeny, are endeavouring to commit infanticide. They have these children floating around, and they are trying to smother them. They are the legitimate offspring of illegitimate conditions.

Mr. BOWELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if there is a combine in rice?

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Customs must know that there are very few places in this country where rice can be cleaned, and that no one can import cleaned rice without paying a duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I thought you said there was a duty on cleaned rice.

Mr. MULOCK. The consumer has either to pay the combine price in Canada on cleaned rice or import the rice, and pay the Customs duty plus the import price.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the mining trusts in the old country?

Mr. MULOCK. Binding twine is one of the items which the Minister of Agriculture—I was about to say—I mean the prospective Minister of Agriculture, thinks he is conferring a blessing in disguise upon the farmers in supporting a duty upon. He is so much in favour of a duty on binding twine that he has become entangled in its meshes.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say binding twine; I said mining trusts.

Mr. MULOCK. What does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. SPROULE. I mean persons in the old country who have combined in regard to mining.

Mr. MULOCK. You can discuss that question yourself. I wish to refer to the good nature that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has shown in regard to the legislation which he proposes. As we all remember, he introduced a Bill in 1889 which was very materially altered in the Senate. It came back to the House in the last days of the session; and, as I wish to be fair to the hon. gentleman, I will say that he stated that he had to concur in the amendments that were made because it was so late when the Bill came back that it might not be passed if he did not. But he did not confine himself to accepting those amendments, under protest, as it were, but he went out of his way to a large extent and endorsed those amendments. He was warned at the time on the floor of the House that he was bringing the law into a worse state than it was before; that if his measure, with the amendments of the Senate, became law, it would greatly interfere with the condition of the workingmen which they possessed under the protection given to them under the Trades Unions Act. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the caution which was given to him then, he not only once but three times in committee, when we were dealing with that amendment, endorsed it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has not yet stated what the amendment was.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume the hon. gentleman knows what his amendment was, but I will read his remarks. He said:

"As we are within one day of the end of the session, and as this Bill, if it were returned to the Senate, would no doubt be thrown over to another year, I have consented to the amendments made by the Senate, because I consider that still, with these changes made, which weaken its effects somewhat, it is an effective Bill, that it will be a terror to evil-doers, and it will show that the Parliament of Canada have put on record their condemnation of the illegal practices we have been legislating against. I, therefore, consent to the Bill being passed as amended by the Senate, and if after the experience of a year it should be proved that further amendments are necessary, and that it is desirable to restore the Bill to its original shape, then that should be done."

Here he declared that it was an effective Bill, and yet he comes here to-day and says it is not an effective Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. You do not carry out your former contention at all.

Mr. MULOCK. Keep your head covered. When it was shown that he was promoting a law that would produce embarrassment, later on he goes on to say:

"I believe this bill will prove very effective——"

It was only "effective" a little while before, but now he is more confident, and says it is "very effective."—

"I believe this Bill will prove very effective, just as the Abbott Act proved effective last year, although in many cases not put into operation. Those men who are acting illegally were warned that they were breaking the law and warned to desist, and this Bill would exactly have the same effect on the combinations."

What are we doing here to-night? This Bill was to have the same effect as the Abbott Act. The combines were to desist, as the speculators in stocks had to desist. The bucket shops had to disappear under the Abbott Act and the combinations were to disappear under the Wallace Act.

Mr. WALLACE. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. He goes on to say:

"I have no doubt that the effect of the Bill will be to prevent combinations, and that it will prove beneficial throughout the country."

That was the position the hon. gentleman took, and now he is obliged to come and tell us that his Bill has proved ineffective, and he is endeavouring to assign other than the real reasons for that. You may beat about the bush as much as you like, but you must come back to the real cause, which is, that under the policy of the Government you cannot prevent the ingenuity of man enabling him to overreach his fellow man if you put the weapons into his hands.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Bill, as it was introduced by the hon. gentleman, did not create any new offence, but was simply declaratory of the common law of the land, which provides that any parties to a combination which increases the price of a commodity are guilty of a misdemeanour. The Senate intervened, and said: If you will declare the law of the land in this matter so that it may be applied to the conditions of modern life we think it fair and reasonable that you should modify that law, so that in its broadest and fullest sense it may place a limit to any improper exercise of that combination, and therefore they said: We will only punish a man when he combines unduly or unreasonably to raise the price. And now you want to strike out that, and say that you want to punish a man if he combines with another reasonably to raise the price. If that is the hon. gentleman's object he is doing a most unjust and unfair thing. The law now says, as amended by the Senate, that a combination unreasonably to raise the price shall be punishable; but he says: I am going to punish you if you combine to raise it reasonably. I say, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is not, in my humble opinion, taking a course calculated to further the real object he has in view. The real object he has in view, as declared here, was to punish combinations which had for their object the intent of withdrawing enormous and improper sums from the people's pockets, of forming corners and making the people pay double the price, to use his own expression, for an article which they ought to have for one-half the price. That is all right. The Senate Bill reached every case where the price was unreasonably increased; it reached every case where the price was unduly increased, and that reached what the hon. gentleman said his object was. But now he comes in and wants to strike this out, and to aim at honest and reasonable combinations, not having for their object the unreasonable raising of the price, but the reasonable raising of it. This law at first was framed to punish an unreasonable rise in the price, and the Senate struck that out, and have given notice to you that their object was to punish a combination having for its object an unreasonable increase of price. There seems to me to be a reasonable increase in the price if two men go into partnership and agree to raise the price so as to give them a fair profit on their trade; there is nothing wrong in that, morally or legally. If men combine with their neighbours to raise the price of sugar half a cent a pound, that may be a reasonable, a right and proper rise; but if they create a corner in the market, and raise the price four or five cents, or two cents, that law would enable you to get at them, because it would be an unreasonable rise. You are going to strike at the combinations of honest merchants having an honest and reasonable object in view. I consider the hon. gentleman is acting hastily and without reflection, but I believe this amendment to the Bill made in the Senate has been made with some reflection; it is calculated to do good, and I think the hon. gentleman will see himself, if he reasons this thing out, that if he wants only to punish an unreasonable or an undue rise in the price the Bill as it stands now achieves that object.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman's criticism of the Bill, every one of us must conclude, was perfectly sincere from the earnestness from which he delivered it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made the same last year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman would not, I think, make that criticism if he reflected a little upon another word of the Bill to which I must call his attention. The hon. gentleman's argument is this: that these words have been inserted by the Senate to prevent and punish that which is unlawful or which is immoral, and to exempt from the operations of this Bill lawful combinations, honest and fair combinations, which only reasonably enhance prices. Now, that is not the effect of the Senate amendment, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me when he reads the first paragraph of the first section, in which the word "unlawfully" appears as a condition, and that will still remain in the Act as a condition preliminary to the establisment of any offence whatever under the Act. So that if you strike out the word "unduly" and the word "unreasonbly," I say that under this Act a man who makes a lawful combination cannot be punished, a man who makes a reasonable combination cannot be punished, a man who makes a fair and an honest combination to get an honest price cannot be punished, because these things are not unlawful combinations. We all know that precedents on this subject are well established, some of them as late as two or three years ago, and that in every case, and especially in the most recent one of all, emanating from the House of Lords, the question whether the price was enhanced unduly and unreasonably entered into the consideration of the question as to whether it was an unlawful combination or not. And what class of cases is more familiar to lawyers than that class of cases in which it has been held that it is no violation of public policy when two partners dissolve business and one of them agrees with the other that he shall not carry on the same business in the same town.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Special exceptions to the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; it is in complete harmony with the principle on the subject. These two men have entered into an agreement, the result of which may be that the price of the article which they were producing, whether it was a manufactured article or not, was raised in that locality, but it was for an honest purpose. The business was previously carried on by the two in an honest combination, and it was agreed when they dissolved that one of them should go out of business in that particular place; but inasmuch as it was done with an honest motive, and not merely for the purpose of enhancing the price, that has been held to be not against the public policy which puts down these combinations in restraint of trade—it is not an unlawful combination. The hon. gentleman's view seemed to be a moment ago that it would be punishable under this Act, unless the words "unduly" and "unreasonably" were left in the Act; but it will not, because that will still not be an unlawful combination; so that the hon. gentleman will see, I think, and will admit on reflection, that the word "unlawfully" will still leave this Act decla-

ratory as a part of the common law. In that sense it is a very great question whether the insertion of the words "unduly" and "unreasonably" make any difference in that regard. Those who have undertaken to administer the law have told me, or those who desire its execution have declared from time to time, that the multiplication of these words upon the Statute-book has led to confusion in the interpretation of the Act; and I believe they have had legal opinions on the subject to the effect that it is not sufficient in a prosecution under the Act to establish that a combination was distinctly unlawful at common law, but that in addition the burden of proof lies upon the prosecutor to show that the price has been unduly and unreasonably enhanced thereby. Let us leave the offence as it is stated at common law. Let us only declare what penalties shall attach to the common law offence, and if we do that we omit these words in the Bill, which may amount to nothing, but which are only surplusage and will not weaken the Act by their removal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those hon. gentlemen who did me the honour to listen to my argument will remember that I prefaced it with the remark that this Bill was not intended to create any new offence whatever. It was alleged to be a Bill declaratory of the common law, and while it declared what the common law was, it did it using the words "whoever unlawfully." Therefore, the hon. gentleman gave away his whole argument when he admitted that while stating what the common law was it said "whoever unlawfully."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said the Bill declared what penalties should be attached to the common law offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remember that, in previous discussions, the hon. gentleman argued as a reason why the Bill should pass that it did not declare any new offence, that it was to be a legal bogey, that the law of conspiracy was not understood in modern days as other branches of the law were, and it was advisable, even while it did not declare any new offence, that there should be this formal declaration of the law. The hon. gentleman said it was necessary to use the word "unlawful," and, therefore, it was to be an unlawful combination respecting transportation that was to be a legal offence at common law. But, if there is a breach in the slightest particular the offence becomes that of a misdemeanour. The amendment of the Senate was that the mere limiting of transportation shall not be unlawful unless there is an unlawful conspiracy unduly to limit the facilities. There is no hon. gentleman but will believe in the common sense view taken by the Senate, and who would wish to punish a man for misdemeanour when the offence is of so small a degree as not to be worthy of notice. Parliament wants to get at the real offenders, and not at offenders in a small degree in matters which affect the pockets of people in the transportation of goods from one place to another; and I, therefore, submit, with every respect, after thinking the matter over, that the Senate limitation upon this declaration of the common law is a fair and just limitation, and it is only when men offend by combining unduly or unreasonably to commit the offence to which it refers, or hamper transportation, that they should be punished. I am with the Senate when they so define the law, and hon. gentlemen opposite are making a mistake when they take out these words and leave the bare, bald statement that the limitation of transportation or hampering it in any degree constitutes a misdemeanour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. BARRON. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the effect of the Bill is no more than the enacting of an Act stating what the common law is, except adding penalties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the Bill is not so elaborate as to define what the common law is; but it defines what penalties attach to common law offences.

Bill reported.

CANADA TEMPERANCE AMENDMENT ACT.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 34) to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1888, read.

Mr. FLINT. If the House is not going to adjourn, I will ask for the consideration of this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

IRON BOUNTIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to enquire of the Government whether a return of the persons to whom the iron bounty of last year was paid, together with the other information prescribed by the statute, has been laid on the Table of the House this session? To the best of my recollection, the statute requires that this should be done within fifteen days of the meeting of Parliament. I do not think it has been done this year, and I do not remember whether it was done last year or the year before. If it has not been done, and the statute has not been repealed, of course it ought to be complied with, and it ought to be complied with as well for the past years as this year. The statute passed in 1883 contained an express provision that within fifteen days after Parliament met, the names of persons to whom these iron bounties were paid, together with other information, should be laid on the Table of Parliament. I doubt very much whether it has been attended to regularly; I do not know whether it has been attended to at all.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman has called my attention to it, I will make enquiry and see. I do not recollect having taken charge of it any year. If the proper officer has not put it down I have no cognizance of it, and it may not have been done. I will see that it is done, if it has not been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the statute of 1883 the hon. Minister will see the fact set out—46 Victoria, chapter 14—and I think that is still in force. I am not aware that it was repealed. I would ask the Minister in the first place, then, to bring down in accordance with the law the returns for 1890, and if the returns for previous years have not been brought down—and I rather think they have not—I presume he will consider this sufficient information to see that the necessary returns are brought down for each of these years.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring them all down; I will bring all down that can be obtained.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I moved for a return in the earlier part of the session in reference to the late election. When will it be brought down?

Mr. FOSTER. Was that a general return of the late election?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Secretary of State will be in the Chamber in a moment and he will answer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I also moved for a return in reference to the expenditure of public money by the Public Works Department, in the different constituencies, since Confederation. When will that be brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I enquired about these returns about two or three days ago, and the deputy of my department stated they were being prepared. As soon as ready I will bring them down.

Mr. GERMAN. I would ask the acting Minister of Railways and Canals when the return will be brought down showing the number of extra men employed on the Welland Canal, which return was moved for early in the session.

Mr. BOWELL. When the hon. gentleman called the attention of the House to it a few days ago I wrote a note immediately to the department to ask whether the return was prepared, and I have not yet been informed. The chief engineer will be here very shortly on some other business, and I will make the enquiry. I will see that it is brought down at the earliest possible moment.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, the 23rd ultimo, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, that the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) is deserving of congratulations, not only from his own side of the House but from this side of the House as well, for the very clear and concise manner in which he brought his arguments before the House; and if at times he did impart the impression that he was pleading the case of a single client, rather than speaking from the broad platform of a member of this Parliament, I am sure that the particular industry which he so eloquently pleaded for has no reason to be ashamed of its champion. I am free to confess, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as I myself am personally concerned, I do feel that if there is an interest in Canada which is entitled to protection, so long as protection is continued in this country, I think the oil industry has a peculiar and special claim to a mite of protection. But, Sir, if we are to consider the broad question, and if we are to consider that industry simply as a component part of the whole, I do not hesitate for one moment to say that I would not permit it to stand in the way of an extension of trade. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) was very eloquent with regard to the advantages that protection has brought the oil industry, but he forgot to tell the House the cost to the country of that protection. I submit that in an argument of that kind it would have been better, first of all, to have told the House what the cost was, and afterwards to have told us what the benefits were. The hon. gentleman has supplied the argument in regard to the benefits, and if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to supply the argument in regard to the cost. In the first place, I find, Sir, that in the year 1890 we imported from the United States coal oil to the amount of 5,073,000 gallons, valued at $515,421, upon which this country paid $365,295 duty. The value of the oil barrels was $201,139, the duty upon which was $49,829, or a total in duty paid on oil imported from the United States of $415,124. Now, Sir, in addition to this we have to take into account the extra cost which the duty compelled the consumer to pay to the Canadian refiner for their oil. We find that the consumption of refined oil in Canada was, in round numbers, about 10,000,000 gallons, and let us see how much extra this cost on account of the duty. In the first place, I have made the calculation on the average cost per gallon of the American oil imported in 1890 in the market in which it was purchased. I find that out of the total of 5,073,000 gallons imported, and valued at $515,421, 521,925 gallons of that amount were imported into Manitoba, British Columbia and the North-West Territories. If we deduct this latter quantity from the total—and I submit, Sir, that it is only fair that this should be deducted, because I find that the cost of the oil imported into these provinces amounted to 17·70 cents per gallon, while the cost of the whole amount imported, deducting importations into those provinces, was only 9·30 cents per gallon in the market in which it was purchased—we find that the total amount of oil brought into the other provinces was 4,551,583 gallons, at a cost of $423,060, or 9·30 cents a gallon in the market in which that oil was purchased. Now, having found the value of the Canadian oil, and the value of the American oil in the market in which it was purchased, we have to take one common point where we are to compare the value of the two. I have chosen Montreal as a central point. We have the oil manufactured at Petrolia—and I have taken it at the hon. gentleman's own figure, 16½ cents a gallon in Petrolia; and I put the cost of the American oil, that imported in 1890, at 9·30 cents a gallon—plus, in both cases, the freight from the point where the oil was purchased. I have taken the city of Cleveland as being a fair relative shipping point for the American oil; and a glance at the map will show that the city of Cleveland is very little further from Montreal than are the oil regions of Canada; and, besides, it has extraordinary shipping facilities on account

of having water as well as rail communication. I have allowed on the cost of the American oil 2 cents a gallon for inspection, and barrel. This calculation makes a difference in the cost of 5·20 cents on every imperial gallon of oil consumed in Canada, plus the difference in the value of the American oil. But the hon. gentleman says that Canadian oil is quite as good in value and quality as the American oil. I do not desire to take exception to that statement; but I would simply point out the fact that in the city of Toronto American oil brings on the average 25 cents a gallon, while the Canadian water-white is quoted at 20 cents a gallon. But taking 5·20 cents as the difference in the cost, and multiplying that by the 10,000,000 gallons which we consume, that amounts to $520,000, which, added to duty paid on imported oil of $415,124, proves that it costs this country each year $935,125 to maintain the oil industry; and I submit that these figures, if anything, are rather under than over the mark. Now let us look at the benefit which we derive from this industry. I have endeavoured to show fairly what the cost of it is, and let us suppose that the hon. member for East Lambton has been as fair in showing the benefit. Just here let me remark that whenever hon. gentlemen opposite make extravagant and unreliable statements, and when we on this side endeavour to correct those statements, they immediately endeavour to fasten on us the stigma of trying to decry the interests of this country. So far as I am concerned, I feel it to be my duty to take exception to some of the statements of the hon. member for East Lambton, and I am not to be deterred from doing so by any insinuations of that kind thrown across the House. I find that the hon. gentleman made the following somewhat remarkable statements:—

"But if you estimate the 4,000 wells in existence to-day at $500 each, that will amount to $2,000,000; put the machinery at $500,000, the land—100 acres at, say $100 per acre—$10,000,000"——

The hon. gentleman must be misreported here, as he is out $9,990,000 in this calculation——

—"and the abandoned wells at $2,500,000. That would make altogether about $15,000,000."

This statement is so utterly extravagant that I do not think it necessary to go into any argument to disprove it. Speaking in regard to the revenue, the hon. gentleman said:

"Now, Sir, what revenue this oil industry returns to that district in a year? The total net proceeds of the oil refined in the country are $7,500 a day—that is, from the sale of refined oil and its different products."

Now, the hon. gentleman had stated before that only 10,000,000 gallons of oil were refined in this country. He told us that the price was about 12½ cents at Petrolia, but that there was a better quality of oil that was worth 16 cents. If we put 7,500,000 at 12½ cents and 2,500,000 at 16 cents this would give us a revenue of $3,450 a day, or only about one-half of what the hon. gentleman states. But it is only fair to take into account, in addition, a small quantity of crude oil which is sold for other than refining purposes, parafine, and refuse to make up the other half, or $3,850; but this would not make up one-third, or even one-fourth of that sum. The hon. gentleman goes on further to say:

"In the town of Petrolia a large warehouse company has established tanks to carry the surplus oil from time to time, which have a capacity for storing half a million barrels of oil. There are several refineries, representing a capital of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. Then there are large cooper shops that make the barrels. There are chemical works in the city of London making acids for the purpose of refining oil of petroleum and employing their component of hands. There are two large manufactories at Petrolia for manufacturing nitro-glycerine, which give employment to a large number of hands. There are also boiler works established there, amongst the largest in the Dominion, and these works have been busy for years past, not only supplying Petrolia, but shipping carloads of boilers to Australia itself. They have shipped carloads of machinery to Australia, to Gallicia, to Italy, and foreign countries. There are large machine shops there."

Now, I would like to ask any hon. member of this House who is not acquainted with the facts what size he presumes the city to be in which all these machine shops are situated and all this capital invested. When I tell you that nine-tenths of the oil-refining interests of this country are confined to the town of Petrolia and the village of Oil Springs; and when I tell you that in the town of Petrolia, according to the census of 1888—the last that I can find—the population was only 3,497, and the total assessment, in which all these millions must be included, was only $988,150; and when I tell you further that the total population of the village of Oil Springs in 1888 was only 918, and the assessment $231,233, you will see how much ground there is for the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman also makes the statement that there are 5,000 hands employed in manufacturing oil and the necessary articles in conjunction therewith. Now, Sir, outside of Petrolia and Oil Springs I venture to say that there are not 300 men so employed, and I also venture to say that it will be found somewhat difficult, in the present total population of these two places, amounting, at the very most, to 6,000 people, to account for the 4,700 men who, the hon. gentleman says, are employed in the oil industry. It seems to me that the proportion is too great. I say there are not 2,000 men so employed; I say that there are not 1,500; and I doubt very much if there are 1,000 all told employed in the way the hon. gentleman states. But if we assume that 1,000 men are employed in these industries, and take the cost of the oil, as I have shown it to be, at something over $900,000, the conclusion at which we must come is that the people of this country could afford to pay every man, woman and child employed in that industry $500 a year, and at the same time be able to keep in their pockets nearly as much money besides. Now, Sir, a few words in regard to the comparisons of prices made by the hon. gentleman. He says:

"The hon. member for Huron—although I desire to give him credit for having given the prices very fairly—would find in the *Globe* any day this week the following prices in Canada. Refined oil, 12½ to 13 cents f.o.b., 2 per cent. off for cash; American oil, 25 cents per gallon at Toronto, wholesale; water-white, photogene, the best quality of American oil, 27 cents."

Now, Sir, I submit that, according to this statement of the hon. gentleman, any proper comparison would have to be made between 12½ cents for Canadian oil and 25 cents for American oil. I took the trouble to turn up the quotations in the Toronto *Globe* of Thursday morning, the last quotations received before the hon. gentleman addressed the House, and I find the oil at Toronto quoted 16 to 17 cents, and not 12½ cents, as stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The words "at Petrolia" are left out of my remarks in the *Hansard*.

Mr. HYMAN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should have the words "at Petrolia" put in the *Hansard*.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I have done so.

Mr. HYMAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I did not know of the correction. We will proceed to take the next stage, in which he says:

"These quotations from the Toronto *Globe* are nearly correct, but they are rather under the mark. If you take 25 cents per gallon as the price in Toronto, and deduct from it the whole duty, 7 1-5 cents, it will be found that the merchants would charge 17 1-5 cents ex-duty. Photogene, which is equal to our oil, selling at 16 or 16½ cents, would be sold at 19 4-5 cents ex-duty."

I see there is a mistake of ⅘ of a cent, but I presume that is not material. It is very easy to see that the hon. gentleman is not used to importing goods, for if he were he would not, when endeavouring to figure up the cost of the goods and the cost of the duty on those goods, start at the wrong end, but would figure up on an entirely different principle. I have taken the trouble to figure it out in order to show this House what the cost of the duty of 7⅕ cents per gallon is by the time the oil reaches the consumer. I have taken, for the purposes of comparison, the average cost of the American oil which this country imported in 1890, and which I have shown the House to be 9·30 cents per gallon. If we add to that 7⅕ cents per gallon of duty, that makes a total of 16·50. Now, I have added the importer's profit of 15 per cent., and I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House will say that goods can be handled at less profit. That would make the cost to the retailer of 21·27. Then I have given the retailer a profit of 20 per cent., which is not a high mark, which would make the cost to the consumer 25·52. Let us see exactly, under the same conditions as to freight and profit, what that oil would cost, provided we had reciprocity, taking 9·30 as the first cost in the American market. I add no duty, and add the same freight, 2 cents per gallon, and the importer's profit of 15 per cent., which brings cost to the retailer at 13 cents, and then add the retailer's profit of 20 per cent., which makes the cost to the consumer 15·60. Therefore, we find that this duty of 7⅕ cents which is paid in the first place by the importer, when the importer's profit and the retailer's profit is added, costs the consumer, apart from the value of the oil itself, 9·92 per gallon. That is the extra charge on the consumer which the duty amounts to; and I will tell the hon. gentleman that if, in the future, he desires to figure backwards instead of forward, in a matter of this kind, he will have to deduct from the price to the consumer 9·92, or the price to the retailer, 8·27, if he wishes to get at the cost of the oil. This statement is so interesting that I have prepared one, showing the working of the same principle in *ad valorem* instead of specific duty; and I have taken an average duty of 30 per cent. We find that an article which would cost $1 in the United States, if we add 30 per cent. duty, would cost $1.30 here duty paid. Then the 15 per cent. importer's profit makes the cost $1.50, and the 20 per cent. retailer's profit brings the cost to the consumer at $1.80. If we take the cost under reciprocity, we will find that while we would pay the dollar, we would have no duty to pay, and the 15 per cent. importer's profit would make the cost $1.15, and the 20 per cent. retailer's profit would bring the cost to $1.30 to the consumer. So that an article upon which the country received a duty of 30 per cent. would, by the time it reached the consumer, have cost him 42 per cent. I have here an invoice sent me by a wholesale firm, in which the actual transaction has already taken place. The goods were purchased in the market, they were sold to the retailer, and then to the consumer. The average duty paid by the importer was 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, but by the time those goods got into the hands of the consumer they cost the consumer, in the one case 50 per cent., and in the other case 55, and in a third case 60 per cent. on original cost of goods. A good deal has been said on the other side of the House with regard to differences existing on this side with reference to our policy. Now, in any broad, comprehensive policy there must be some differences of opinion amongst the different promoters thereof. Doubtless there are some on this side of the House in regard to our policy, and certainly differences exist on the other side with regard to theirs. But, Sir, I do think that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), whom I see just entering the Chamber, must be accorded the palm in this particular. Surely he has reached the highest point of inconsistency, because he has succeeded not only in differing with almost every gentleman on the other side of the House, but in differing with himself. I find that in the speech which he delivered in the present debate he says, in the first place:

"It is of the very greatest importance to our farmers that, in the first place, we should retain control of our own markets. Our own markets are our most important and our most valuable markets at the present time."

There is no expression of anything but certainty here. The hon. gentleman is sure that our own are our most important markets. He then goes on to say:

"I admit that in deciding that question—(referring to the question of reciprocity)—there would be great diversity of opinion. If I may be allowed to express my individual opinion, I believe the balance of the advantage, if there were any, would be very small indeed in favour of the farmers of this country."

Now, the hon. gentleman is not very sure in regard to this, but he believes the advantage would be very small indeed in favour of our farmers. Discussing the effect of the McKinley Bill, the hon. gentleman then says:

"That additional protection is of no advantage to the farmers; it does not increase their prices in ordinary years; it does not tend in any way to develop the agricultural interests of the country."

He is quite sure here that protection is of no advantage to the American farmer. It does not increase their prices in ordinary years, and does not tend in any way to develop the agricultural interests of their country. Then he goes on to say:

"If we wish to give the farmers of this country the largest possible home market and the very best market which they can have, we can only do it by adopting and maintaining the protective policy."

And he winds up by saying:

"I beg to say to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that I do not oppose, I never have been opposed, and the Government which I am supporting, I believe, have never been opposed to extending our trade relations with the United States. On the contrary, I am desirous, and I believe the Government is desirous, of seeing our trade extended to the very fullest possible extent."

In the first place, he points out the great import-

ance of keeping our own markets; in the second place, he is not very sure whether any advantage will accrue to our farmers from reciprocity; in the third place, he is certain that protection does not help the farmers on the other side, but he is positive it does help the farmers on this side; and he ends practically by saying that he believes in reciprocity in natural products. And I desire to add, lest there might be some hon. gentleman here who might not thoroughly understand the policy of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), that previously in his speech he declared that in principle he was a free trader. In the course of the address which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) made to the House the other day—one which I am sure we all enjoyed very much—he read the following somewhat remarkable document:—

"To the Indians:—The Queen has always loved her dear, loyal subjects, the Indians. She wants them to be good men and women, and she wants them to live on the land that they have, and she expects in a little while, if her Great Chief, John A., gets into Government again, to be very kind to the Indians, and to make them very happy. She wants them to go and vote, and to all vote for Doctor Montague, who is the Queen's agent. He is their friend, and by voting for him every one of the Indians will please Queen Victoria."

The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) objected to this statement, and, rising to a point of order, he said:

"Mr. Speaker, I think I am in order. It is a personal explanation. I do not object to the hon. gentleman having his joke; I am sure we all enjoy his pleasant banter across this chamber."

Later on, he says:

"I rise to a point of order. I have already stated that I did not pen that circular. I have stated that it is a matter of record before the courts that I had nothing to do with it. After I made that statement, the hon. gentleman said that I did draw it up. I must ask him to withdraw that."

Now, I have taken occasion to follow the course of the hon. gentleman, and I have gone down the halls of memory and have extracted certain evidence which the hon. gentleman gave before a certain court, and I find in his own evidence the following occurred:—

"Dr. Montague, sworn: I recognize circular; think I saw it the first time the day before the elections, and can almost swear it was the first time I saw it."

He is not so very sure, but he can almost swear that was the first time he saw it. He goes on:

"It was on the Sunday before the polling day that circular was written."

Surely the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) must have had this in his mind when he introduced his Bill in reference to Sunday observance. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to state under oath:

"I wrote part of the circular; I do not think I wrote more than one-half of it. I was aware on election day that they were distributed."

I submit that this is conclusive proof that the hon. member had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to pursue the evidence still further, and to read the finding of the court on the question.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the finding of the court here, but I have the sworn evidence given by the hon. gentleman before the court. Of course, if the hon. gentleman says that what he swore there was wrong, I will apologize. He goes on to say:

"I must have got the circular on Monday morning. I gave a few away to show what nonsense they were."

Then we have the statement of Mr. R. W. Muchmore, and he says:

"The doctor wrote it; I dictated it."

What a fund of humour the hon. gentleman must have had in those days, when he was writing and distributing circulars just to show what nonsense there was in them. In later years his bump of humour seems to have given away to his bump of imagination. In fact, I only know of one other who has as great a bump of imagination.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That question was investigated in connection with the contested election when I was the respondent in 1887. The whole question came before His Lordship Chancellor Boyd, and so far from any condemnation being passed upon me in relation to that matter, I received the compliments of the court for my course in connection with it.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure that, after the denia of the hon. gentleman in the House that he wrote the circular and his sworn testimony in court, the finding of the court has nothing to do with the question. He gave his word in this House that he did not write the circular, and I bring forward his own sworn evidence that he did write at least a part of the circular.

Mr MONTAGUE. Give the balance of the evidence.

Mr. HYMAN. If he can draw any consolation from having made one statement in this House and another in the courts, he is welcome to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Give the balance of the evidence.

Mr. HYMAN. In the few remarks which I still desire to make I would like to consider the fiscal policy of the Government almost entirely in its relation to manufactures. Before we fully consider the protectionist policy of 1878 I would like to ask, what is protection and what is the proper principle on which it should be applied? As I understand it, protection is simply a tax and a burden of taxation undertaken by the many for the certain and sure benefit of the few, with a possibility that it may indirectly be for the benefit of the many. If this is conceded, and if in the one case the tax is actual, and in the other case the benefit is only possible, should not the greatest care be taken in the application of the principle? I would ask, as an illustration, if you, Mr. Speaker, happened to be the mayor of this fair city of Ottawa, would you not, with that acute business ability and that vigilance for which you are so noted, and which, if I may be permitted to digress, in addition to your courtesy and amiability of temper and impartiality, have rendered our stay in this House so pleasant during this session, if a manufacturer should come to you desiring to establish a manufactory in this city, and should ask that you should pay him a certain bonus, would you not consider that, while the bonus was certain, the benefits to be derived from the manufactory were uncertain, and would you not go into the question of the machinery to be used and the capital and abour to be employed on the one hand while count

ing up the cost on the other hand, remembering the certainty of the cost and the uncertainty of the benefit? I admit that, if this policy, from the time of its adoption in 1878, had been carefully followed out on the principles then enunciated, if the principles of protection had been applied only where the benefits were certain and the cost distinctly and decidedly within the benefits, we would not have the state of affairs we now have; we would not have the monopoly in sugar, the monopoly in cotton, and the other monopolies which bear so hard upon the consumer. It is only at this late date that the Government have thought of proceeding upon this principle. It appears to me—and I am open to correction if I am wrong—that this is the first time since the inception of the National Policy in 1878 that the Finance Minister has applied that principle to his policy. In his Budget speech he says:

"There is another article in which we have decided to make a change, and that is the article of salt, which is now at 10 cents and 15 cents per 100 pounds, and which we propose to reduce one-half, making it 5 cents and 7½ cents. This we have been impelled to do because we considered that, owing to the protection which was given and certain combinations which have been entered into, it is a wise and prudent thing for us to meet that state of things by reducing the duty one-half."

If I am not in error, this is the first time in thirteen years that the Government have attempted to apply this principle. Will the Minister take us into his confidence, and will he tell us if he intends to proceed upon that policy in the future? Will he tell us the particular reasons that this industry was selected, against which were to be directed all the forces of the Government, so far as protection applied? What were the principles upon which this industry was selected? Was it because in this case the benefits were the smallest and the costs were the greatest? It has been charged during this debate that the subscriptions made to the Conservative party campaign fund by some of these largely-protected manufacturers have been very numerous and very large, and that has not been denied. And so, in the absence of other information, we surely have a right to know if the Government have proceeded upon that principle in dealing with this case. We have a right to know whether the salt industry has not subscribed to the election expenses of the Government, and whether they have found that other sources of revenue from which subscriptions were derived are in danger of being closed, the Government have threatened to leave the monopolists to their fate if they do not continue their subscriptions. Now, let us consider for a moment the additional burden which the National Policy has imposed upon the country since its inception. It is to be remarked that all the arguments which have been used on the other side of the House are directed solely to show the advantages of the National Policy, and in no single instance that I can remember have those hon. gentlemen considered the cost of that policy. I will endeavour, in part, to supply that deficiency in a table which I have prepared; and I have prepared it under the supposition that this country, under a prudent system of government, could have maintained since 1878 the same rate of taxation which was in force in that year. The rate of taxation in that year was 14·03 per cent. on the total importations entered for consumption. That was over ¾ per cent. higher than the average of the four years of the administration of the hon. member for East York, and I have taken 1878 as being the highest of the whole four years:

Year.	Duties.	Annual Duty under Percentage of 1878.	Additional burden of Taxation under N. P.
	$	$	$
1879	12,929,540	11,271,927	1,667,613
1880	14,138,849	10,083,690	4,055,159
1881	18,500,785	12,853,108	5,647,677
1882	21,708,837	15,804,644	5,904,193
1883	23,172,308	17,276,123	5,896,185
1884	20,164,963	15,177,740	4,987,223
1885	19,133,558	14,410,215	4,723,343
1886	19,448,123	13,974,257	5,473,866
1887	22,469,705	14,821,211	7,648,494
1888	22,209,641	14,429,448	7,780,193
1889	23,784,523	15,387,184	8,397,339
1890	240,14,908	15,821,011	8,193,897
Totals	241,685,740	171,310,558	70,375,182

This amounts to a total average per year of $5,864,598, to which we must add the cost to the consumer of the goods manufactured in Canada caused by the increase in duty. Now, when we consider the arguments advanced in favour of continuing the National Policy we should also consider that, taking the last year as a basis, that policy cost this country between eight and nine million dollars. If we look at the effect of the policy upon our exports of manufactures we find that in 1878 we exported $4,127,000, and that was not the largest sum in any year reached under the administration of the hon. member for East York; in 1890 we exported $5,741,000, or an increase of $1,613,000. And, Mr. Speaker, if we analyze the exports for 1890 we find that the largest item which appears in the Trade and Navigation Returns is the item of household goods, amounting to $818,001. This item finds no place in the returns of 1878, and surely, for purposes of comparison, it is not an item that should remain there; so I have deducted it. There is also another item that seems very strangely to have found its way into the Returns, and that is the item of ice. Now, I do not understand that ice is exactly what may be considered a manufactured product of this country; if it is, we should expect to find supplies and machinery for its manufacture, and we should be able to find who is the proprietor of that industry. I am sure that if we did find the proprietor, whatever may have been his position in the past towards the political parties of this country, I think that, in the light of the events of the present day, we could confidently count upon his support on this side of the House. Now, if we deduct these two items from the total of the exportations of 1890 we find that the balance amounts to $4,676,000, or only $584,384 greater than in 1878. Surely there is nothing here to prove that we have received, in that particular at least, any great benefits for the extra burdens which the people have had to bear. Now, let us consider for a moment what is the general effect of that policy as applied to our own market. A great deal has been said during the debate of the advantage and the desirability of retaining control of our own markets. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the only object to be desired it is no great stretch of statesmanship to attain that

object; if that is what our manufacturing industries require, all you have to do is to make the tariff high enough to shut out all foreign trade. But what follows that? In the first place, we would find, and we have found, and we would find again, that all these industries which were in command of the market at the time the tariff was established would benefit very largely, outside competition being withdrawn, at least until such time as they had competition at home. You would find, in the second place, that the cupidity of capitalists would be aroused when they found these industries making more profit than the value of the money which they had invested would otherwise bring, and you would find other investors going into the same line of business. Then would come the over-production, and, unfortunately, the Government having framed their tariff solely for the purpose of keeping our own market, they would have no safety-valve for over-production, because we could not export anything, because we could not compete in foreign markets on account of the high tariff. Now, I submit to this House that that has been exactly the history of a very large number of industries in this country. Those who know the facts of the case know perfectly well that this has been the cause of combines: when the manufacturers get into the position I describe they combine, and the fittest survive. We know that has been the history of the sugar industry; we know that has been the history of the binding twine industry; we know that has been the history of the oil industry, of the rubber goods industry, of the agricultural implements industry, of the stove and tinware industry, and we know that it will be the history, if we continue this policy, of a great many other industries in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the amendment which he moved in this House divided it into two parts. The first states:

"That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers."

Some members on the other side of the House have gone so far in their arguments as to freely translate the words "forthwith reduce" to mean "free." But surely there is no license of debate which will permit so free a translation as that. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that there is nothing definite in this, that they cannot find out what it means. Surely there is no difficulty in telling what this means. It seems to me it means that the time had gone past when the tariff should any longer be manipulated in the interests of the many. It means that we should not continue to keep the duties on cheap goods at so high a rate and the duties on dearer goods at so low a rate, comparatively speaking. It means, on the one hand, that there should not be a duty on shirts of cotton, 50 per cent.; on the other hand, velveteens, 20 per cent.; socks and stockings, over 40 per cent.; against linen damask, 25 per cent.; winceys, 40 per cent.; against feathers, 25 per cent.; hoes and scythes, 50 per cent.; against mineral waters, 20 per cent.; spades, 43 per cent.; against precious stones, free and 10 per cent.; coal oil, over 70 per cent.; cheap wall paper, 60 per cent.; blankets, 50 per cent.; cheap tweeds, 50 per cent.; against doeskins, 30 per cent., and finer tweeds, 30 per cent.

Let us consider for a moment the effect on manufacturers, and in a general sense what they would have to fear providing the second part of the resolution became a matter of fact. In the general argument the Conservatives allege the fact that because American manufacturers have been long established, because they have larger establishments, our manufacturers would not be able to compete with them. I am quite willing to admit that they could not compete certainly so long as they manufacture a hundred different kind of cottons in a mill, so long as they manufacture three or four hundred kinds of shoes in a factory, and so long as they manufacture one hundred kinds of machinery in a factory. But there is no country on the face of the earth other than Canada in which manufacturing is carried on in this way, and sooner or later the consumer will demand that our manufacturers be placed in a position so that they at least can continue their trade and manufacture as cheap as their neighbours. I desire, for one, to see that change brought about while our tariff is at least lower than the American tariff, rather than it should be left until the tendency which we know prevails in the United States to reduce their tariff is carried into effect, and their tariff became lower than our tariff. While hon. gentlemen opposite, in their general arguments, argue in favour of protection and against reciprocity, when they come down from the general to the specific arguments they always demolish the chief argument that can be alleged against reciprocity. I have found in the course of the debate two special cases in which this is most clearly shown. The member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), in his speech, stated:

"The relative difference in values of granulated sugars made in New York and Montreal is 12½ cents per 100 lbs. If you will take these items into the calculation you will find that, instead of comparing as near as 4·19 per 100 lbs. in New York with 4·50 per 100 lbs. in Montreal, as he said, 4·38 in Montreal compares with 4·52½ in New York, showing a difference in favour of Montreal of 14½ cents per 100 lbs."

If I may be permitted to use the expression which peculiarly belongs to the hon. member for St. John, and if I may ask, what is the logical conclusion of this? surely it is not very hard to find. If we take Montreal and compare it with New York as a distributing point, I have no doubt that Montreal, so far as relates to a very large portion of the people on the other side of the line, is the better distributing point of the two; and I say that the logical conclusion must be, that, if the sugar manufacturers of our country can deliver their sugar at Montreal at 14½ cents cheaper than the sugar manufacturers on the other side can deliver sugar at New York, our manufacturers can, without doubt, not only retain control of their own markets, but, from the special facilities they possess, they can reach Chicago, and from that point the southern and western states, and also by water and rail the northern and north-western markets, and have no real reason to fear the adoption of our policy. We had exactly the same argument from another hon. gentleman. While the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) directed his general argument against reciprocity, when he came to the specific part of the argument he said:

"The hon. member who says 'no' does not know anything about it. No man can show an invoice for Canadian oil in which the barrel is charged extra. I have dealt in it for twenty-four years, and I never heard of such a case. The barrel costs about 3 cents a gallon, and if you add that

to the 9 cents, that brings the cost of American oil up to 12 cents a gallon."

I may say that this is very unfair, for he does not credit the value of the barrel, which is about two-thirds of the 3 cents—

"Then add the freight, which will be a cent or two, and you will find that the price of American oil is really higher than the price of Canadian oil, which costs from 11½ to 13½ cents per gallon.

That the price of American oil imported is higher than Canadian oil is the specific argument, and it affords a strong argument in favour of reciprocity. It must not be supposed that all, or nearly all, the manufacturers are opposed to reciprocity. I have the honour to represent in this House what may be termed a peculiarly manufacturing constituency, and in the election just passed we fought the battle fairly and squarely on the ground of reciprocity as opposed to the National Policy. I found that the manufacturers of the city were very largely divided in their opinions. There were those who, while they felt that after a time they could compete with American manufacturers, gave, as the main reason of their opposition, that a certain time must elapse between the abrogation of the National Policy and the time they could bring themselves into the manner of manufacturing that the Americans follow. But, in addition to that, there were a very large number of manufacturers who gave me their hearty support, feeling and believing that with the extended markets, with the raw material at the same price as the American manufacturers, with the same condition of market and the same size of market, they could compete, and compete successfully. I submit that, when the people of this country are giving a decision on this question, they should remember this fact, that while the manufacturers who desire protection say to the people: "You must continue paying taxes and continue paying tribute, that we may do as we are doing," those who desire reciprocity say: "We do not desire your taxes, give us an extended market and we are able and competent to increase our trade." The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) seriously complains that our policy is very indefinite; he asks for information in one breath, and in the next he answers it. He asks how we propose to arrange the tariff details, and how we propose to reconcile the difference in the American tariff on those articles on which we seek reciprocity and our own tariff; and he answers by saying that he presumes it will be arranged by a tribunal of fourteen in which the United States will have a representation of thirteen and we will have a representation of only one. Does the hon. gentleman forget that they on the other side of the House have a reciprocity scheme on their hands, too? Have the Government of the day taken the hon. gentleman into their confidence, and have they told him that that is the way in which they purpose making their arrangements? If they look they will find that if they bring about reciprocity in the articles which I understand they desire to; that is, in articles which are named in the schedule of the Treaty of 1854, they will find the following difficulties in the way. They will find that the Canadian duty on wheat is 15 cents per bushel, while the American duty is 25 cents; they will find that the Canadian duty on wheat flour is 75 cents per barrel, while the duty on the other side is 25 per cent.; that the duty on barley is 15 cents here and 30 cents per bushel in the United States; that the Canadian duty on horses is 20 per cent., and the United States duty 30 per cent. on horses up to $150 value; that the Canadian duty on bacon is 2 cents per pound, and the United States duty 5 cents; that our duty on slates is 80 cents a square and their duty 25 per cent.; that our duty on flax fibre is 2 cents and their duty 3 cents; and so on through the whole list. The last article which the hon. gentleman desired special information about, that of flax, is an article which is one of the scheduled articles in the Treaty of 1854. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just say that when the time comes we are quite capable of arranging that question, but I further say, that we will not do as the hon. gentleman assumes the Government will do. We will not agree to any commission of thirteen Americans and only one Canadian; we will make a treaty one to one, and we will make a fair treaty to both countries. We will make an honourable treaty, or we will make no treaty at all. Now, Sir, the Government of this country took the responsibility of dissolving this House; and what did they give as a reason for the dissolution of the House? Why, Sir, they gave as the main reason for the dissolution of the House, that they desired a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries. So, Sir, no matter what the hon. gentlemen may say on the other side of the House, both parties in this House are committed to reciprocity. The only possible difference, then, is as to the degree of reciprocity that the two parties are committed to. But, Sir, let me tell you, that whatever discrimination against England is in the reciprocity that we desire on this side of the House, that very amount of discrimination is in the reciprocity they desire on the other side of the House. Whatever of disloyalty there is in the reciprocity that we desire from this side of the House, there is the same measure of disloyalty in what they desire on the other side of the House; unless, Sir, they are prepared to lay down the principle that all the loyalty of this country is contained in the schedule of articles in the Treaty of 1854, and that all the disloyalty is contained in the articles outside of that treaty. And, Sir, if you lay down that principle what do you find? You find that while it may be lawful to sell the people of the United States a chicken, which is one of the articles included in the Treaty of 1854, we would be disloyal on this side of the House if we sold them a baby-carriage; while on that side of the House it would be loyal to sell them pop-corn, on this side of the House it would be disloyal to sell them a coffin; while there would be no discrimination in selling them a carrot, on that side of the House, there would be discrimination, if we on this side of the House sold them a tallow candle. While on the other side of the House there would be no disloyalty in selling them a pumpkin, on this side of the House there would be disloyalty if we sold them chewing-gum. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, where does their discrimination start, and where does their discrimination end; where does their loyalty start, and where does their loyalty end? Does their loyalty start at a mule, which can be sold to the Americans under the Treaty of 1854, and does it end at a cake of soap, which we desire to sell? Does their discrimination start in buttermilk, and does it end in molasses?

Now, Sir, as regards the second part of the resolution, surely it is explicit enough, and there cannot be any mistake as to the meaning of its language. Are the Conservative party a unit in regard to their reciprocity scheme? If they considered that reciprocity scheme of sufficient importance before the election, to give it as the chief reason to warrant the dissolution of the House, why is it that we have not heard one single gentleman on the other side of the House stand up in his place and defend that reciprocity? It was of sufficient importance before the election to warrant the dissolution of the House; but, Sir, it is not of sufficient importance after the election to warrant one single word being said in its favour. I ask, Mr. Speaker, have the Conservative party met the point, and have they boldly faced the dilemma of their policy of reciprocity? I say, Sir, they have not. I submit, Mr. Speaker, in all humility, that they have not boldly taken the bull by the horns, but, in my opinion at least, they have preferred to take the animal by the tail, believing that by that means they could get just as good a grip, and that they could let go whenever they pleased. Mr. Speaker, the greatest contrast between the party on your right and the party on your left, is not, I submit, the difference in regard to their respective policies, but rather the difference in regard to their leaders. I do not suppose that on that side of the House at this moment, there is a gentleman who can tell us who the actual leader of the Conservative party is. We know very well who the nominal leader is, but I doubt if the actual leader can be found. If we were desirous of finding him, we might have quite a journey. If, Sir, we desire to find the Conservative leader, I would like to know whether we would have to go to the Chamber which is so gorgeous in scarlet and gold on the other side of this building, or would we have to go across the ocean to find that actual leader? Would we have to go to the Court of St. James, and would we there find him disporting himself in most gorgeous apparel; at one time advocating such a chimerical policy as that of Imperial Federation, and at another moment bolstering up bogus joint-stock companies? Have we to go outside to look for the leader of the Conservative party, or are we to look for the leader on the Conservative benches in this House? Are we to look for their leader in the serene and tranquil person of the hon. the Minister of Justice, or are we to look for their leader, sinking amidst the stormy and tumultuous waters which surround the hon. Minister of Public Works? Or, have these special and peculiar Chinese methods which the hon. Minister of Finance has developed this session of Parliament, so endeared him to the Conservative party, that in him and in him only, they see their saviour and their hope? Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, to turn from the discordant elements of leadership over there, and see what you find upon this side of the House. We, Sir, have a leader of whom we are proud; we have a leader in whom we recognize a man whose kindly disposition has endeared him to every one of us; we know him, Sir, as a man to be all that he should be, and we know him as a leader to be honourable to his trust and faithful to his principles. I speak the feelings of every member on this side of the House, when I say we honour him as a leader, and we revere him as a man, and I believe, and I think we all believe, that the large majority of the people of this country see in him, to-day, the one man in public life who is pre-eminently fitted to occupy the highest position in their gift.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this session the hon. leader of the Opposition accused this side of the House of having a hazy, misty, undulating, fluctuating, shifting, contradictory policy. Now, if there is any Government or any party which has stood by its policy year in and year out, it is the party on this side of the House. It has stood constantly by the National Policy for years and has gone to the country upon it repeatedly; and I think it does not become the hon. leader of the Opposition to charge this side of the House with want of steadiness in its policy, because I am certain that monotonous uniformity cannot be charged against the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as various hon. members on this side of the House have proven. Now, there is one thing in the hon. leader of the Opposition that I admire, and that we all admire, which is, that he never preaches blue ruin to the country, as do some of his most important and trusted lieutenants. I must say this, however, that there is this session a certain despairing petulance about the hon. gentleman's fault-finding that is unusual to him. I believe that the hon. gentleman thinks himself to be the man of destiny; but he may rest assured that so long as unrestricted reciprocity is the main plank in his platform, the signs of his future will not be read in the political heavens. Now, with regard to the past history of his party. Many of us who have been in this House for some years, know that the ex-leader of the Opposition handed over the reins of his party to the present leader of the Opposition, just as an eminent English statesman is stated to have done to a junior member of his party, and was compared to an old coachman handing over the reins to a promising novice. He gave the novice the box seat, but sat beside him in order to see that the coach was driven properly. This was done in this House; but the ex-leader saw that the coach was being driven more wildly and erratically than he wished—in fact, that there were other hands guiding the reins, that the leader of the Opposition was between good and evil counsellors—that he was between the angel of light and the angel of darkness, and that the angel of light did not prevail. So the ex-leader became at war with the tendencies of his own party. He saw that to win votes by a deliberate sacrifice of principle, or by paltering with economic truths, was deliberately to sow to the wind with a certain knowledge that the whirlwind would be the harvest; and what attitude did he assume towards them? Only one of mere sympathetic aloofness. After the elections he retired; and there he is waiting for the reaction to set in in his own party, in favour of sound economic principles, just as he had waited for years for the reaction to set in throughout the country in favour of his party and the principles he advocated. It is true, the hon. gentleman took a gloomy view of the situation, and of the destiny of his own country; but there is one way to explain that. As animals often take their colour from the food they eat, and shells from the rocks to which they adhere, and as, according to the saying of Macauley in writing of Dante that the Sardinian soil was so

noxious that even its bitterness was found in its honey, so the ex-leader of the Opposition, having sat for years in the impenetrable gloom of hon. gentlemen opposite, and beside the hon. member for South Oxford, how could he but take a gloomy view of the situation? But the hon. gentleman has now thrown off the environment of party exigencies. He has taken a trip to the far west, where he will see monuments erected like milestones over the graves of promises broken, pledges unfulfilled, predictions unrealized, and calculations gone wrong, all made by the Opposition, and before starting out he doubtless read some of the speeches made by himself in this House, and also some by his former lieutenants, as well as some of the editorials which appeared in the prominent papers of his own party, predicting blue ruin to the Canadian Pacific Railway, predicting that that railway would never run to the north of Lake Superior, which they asserted was such a wilderness that no road constructed there would ever pay; and if constructed large portions would be annually carried away by ice. He doubtless also remembered that they had described the far west as a perfect desert, which would not yield enough to the railway to grease the axles; that they had declared the road would never cross the Rocky Mountains, and that if it did it would be returned to the befooled tax-payers, that the railway would never be built across the Selkirks to the Pacific Ocean, and that if it should be it would be returned to the Government and the people of Canada, and they would have to keep it up, which would be a great burden on the country. It was also predicted that the trade with China and Japan was a perfect myth and would never pay. Now, he will doubtless learn that the section running to the north of Lake Superior is to-day becoming one of the best paying portions of the road, and that one of the richest mining countries in the world is being opened up there. He will also learn that in Manitoba the people are contented and happy, and are doing well. He will also hear that the people are returning from Dakota, that land which to the hon. gentlemen's party is the materialization of the land of Beulah, as seen in a vision by John Bunyan. He will also find in the great west, which his party so loudly asserted to be unfit for settlement, towns and cities springing up all along the line; and he will discover that British Columbia, which was described as a sea of mountains, has potential resources, which will make it one of the strongest provinces in the Dominion—that new towns are springing up there and the old towns growing enormously. He will also find that the Chinese trade, which his party predicted would never amount to anything, has already developed into vast proportions, and that to-day the Canadian Pacific is doing as much trade with China and Japan as the Union Pacific, which has been established for many years. He will also remember that in the very year and week that the railway was to have been finished by contract, the largest and finest steamship on the Pacific Ocean arrived at Vancouver, and rendered possible the carrying of the mails between Yokohama and Liverpool in several days shorter time than they had ever been carried before. He has returned, doubtless, with more faith in his country and its future. Now, with regard to unrestricted reciprocity, what is it? It is an amphibolia, meaning one thing in Canada, another in the United States. Who are its fathers? It has a sort of three-fold fatherhood. First, there is a wealthy Canadian living on the other side of the line, who, for reasons best known to himself, espoused the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. But to-day there is a rift in the Wiman lute. The second father is a peripatetic professor and nebulous politician, a man who suffers from intense splenetic egotism, who is at war with everything except it be that of his own creation, needless to say I refer to Professor Goldwin Smith. The third father is the hon. member for South Oxford, the embryotic Senator from Ontario, who evolved this policy from his own inner consciousness, and not because the people desired it. The embryotic Senator from Ontario, in dealing with our North-West, in his speech this year, has made statements which are not founded on facts, and he has misrepresented the evidence to a great extent. There is one thing, however, that I should say of him, and that is he believes thoroughly in the potency of audacity as a motive power in politics. Grenville, contemporary of Pitt, was called the raven of the House of Commons, always croaking defeat, ruin, bankruptcy in the midst of peace and plenty. Burke compared him to the evil spirit whom Ovid described as hanging over the stately temples and wealthy haven of Athens, and she could scarcely refrain from weeping because she could see nothing at which to weep. Grenville has a worthy successor in the member for South Oxford. Now, Sir, he said that the people of this country were decreasing in numbers in the farming districts, and that, therefore, there should be a change in our trade policy. Well, if the principle advocated by the hon. gentleman were carried to its entirety, what would be the state of things in England? According to the last census taken in England, the farming population in nearly the whole of England and in large portions of Ireland and Scotland have decreased considerably in numbers; and if the hon. gentleman's contention be correct, then the people of England should change their trade policy and go in for protection. If we go to the United States, we find that in nearly every state, even in the Middle States, the farming population has decreased considerably; and if it be true that in England and the United States the trade policy existing in those countries should continue in order that both countries may prosper, then there should be no change in the policy of this country, because our farming population has decreased. There are three reasons for this decrease, both in Canada and the United States. One is cheap lands in the West; the second is increased railway communication between the East and West, and the cheapness of transportation; the third is the saving in labour by the use of improved agricultural implements, which were not in use twenty or thirty years ago, and by means of which the number of men employed on a farm to-day is not at all equal to that required formerly. Those are the three reasons why, to-day, in the eastern and older states of the Union and in some parts of Eastern Canada, the farming population is decreasing. If we look to the United States, we find that in New York State, according to the census of this last year, the farming population decreased, between 1880 and 1890, to the extent of 62,459. In Massachusetts, the farming population decreased

67,034, and in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont taken together it decreased 54,129. Illinois, which is comparatively a very new state and which has vast prairies, shows a decrease in the farming population in 1890, as compared with 1880, of 2,823. In Ohio, which is a new state, the farming population has increased but 2 per cent., according to the last census. In Connecticut, it has only increased 3 per cent.; in Indiana it has only increased 3 per cent.; in Dakota, between 1880 and 1885, it increased 207 per cent., but between 1885 and 1890, it increased only 23 per cent., showing a great change. In looking at the crop reports recently issued in Manitoba the estimated returns, per farmer, will be from 1,000 to 1,200 bushels of wheat, a showing that has never been equalled by any state in the Union, and I believe has never been equalled by any country in the world. In Dakota, in 1885, which year gives the best showing to the farmers of that country they ever had, the average yield per farm was only 450 bushels. In 1881, when they had a population about equal to that in Manitoba at present, the yield per farm was only 200 bushels. In Minnesota, in 1870, when that state had a population of 439,706, the number of bushels grown amounted to 16,000,000 less than we are growing this year, and only equal to our crop of last year. In Iowa, in 1870, with a total population of 674,913, the total crop was 20,445,000 bushels, just about our crop of this year, although it had four times our population. In Kansas, with a population of 1,500,000 (and Kansas is a wheat-growing state) this last year their crop only amounted to 28,000,000 bushels. It, therefore, cannot be said that we are suffering in Manitoba to any extent in comparison with other countries. The farmers of that province are doing much better than those in Dakota. In fact, the people are moving from Dakota to our North-West, and every farmer who comes over says that the farmers get more for their produce on this side than on the other, and that farm implements are bought at about the same rate here as there. Mr. Lounsbery came across as a delegate from two townships of Dakota last year, and he said in an interview:

"I was a Reformer in the County of Elgin, and moved to Dakota through the representations of the United States Government and railway agents. I am convinced the representations of the press of my own politics in this country are misleading and untrue, as a farmer can live just as cheaply in Manitoba as Dakota, considering food, clothing and implements, and he has four times the return in crops for his labour. There is no grinding of the tariff or taxation here. In the States, in addition to taxes on the farm there are taxes on every chattel a man possesses. Even his household goods are taxed, the gun he shoots with, and the watch in his pocket—there is none of that here."

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the National Policy had resulted in a most pitiable failure, in the development of the North-West, and in Manitoba particularly. I think I can effectually disprove that statement with regard to Manitoba. In 1881, when the census was taken, there were only 230,260 acres cultivated in Manitoba. In 1891, this year, there are 1,334,697 acres under cultivation, showing an increase in ten years of 500 per cent.; and whereas the yield of wheat in that year was 1,039,673 bushels, the yield this year is estimated at from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 bushels. Now, the increase of acreage cultivated from last year to this year is 267,141 acres. That is the number of acres cultivated this year over last, according to the return of the Manitoba Government, shows 25 per cent. of an increase, which I consider a most favourable showing for Manitoba, and which proves that we, at any rate, are not suffering in any respect whatever. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in a speech he delivered in Toronto two years ago, declared that the population of Dakota was 1,500,000. Now, the actual population of that state, according to the census taken one and a-half years later, and after nearly two years of immigration going into that country, was only 511,527, or about one-third of the number stated by the hon. member for Queen's. The hon. gentleman may declare that he was speaking in hyperbole, but we maintain that it is just by such hyperbolical statements hon. gentlemen opposite seek to mislead the people. Now, in Maine, according to the report of the Bureau of Industrial and Labour Statistics just issued, the abandoned farms in 1890 numbered 3,318 and the number of acres in those farms amounted to 254,513. Reports were sent out to the various counties to ascertain how many farmers were making a living and how many were losing or gaining by their occupation. Out of 370 farmers who sent in returns to the Bureau, 98 only were making profits, the number showing a loss was 270, and two were stationary. These are the facts in the State of Maine, and I do not believe that in any province of Canada, or in any portion of any province, will such results be shown as are shown to-day in that state. That is also the position of the farmers in a large portion of Dakota, and this spring, when a whole train load came over from Dakota and settled in the North-West, what were the mottoes on the cars? Here were the mottoes: "Good-bye, Dakota," "No more oxaline fuel," "No more five-mile water haul," "No more grinding machine agents," "No more 6 per cent. per month," "Free land, plenty of timber, pure water, good crops, interest 8 per cent. per annum," "Hurrah for Southern Manitoba," "Bound for the land of freedom." Another charge which has been made with reference to Manitoba is that we are at a disadvantage with regard to the people of the south, as to our land laws. I have stated time and again in this House that in Manitoba we have had for some years past the most liberal land laws in the world. It is true that in the past we have had some obnoxious land regulations, and I will refer to them. The first was passed by an Order in Council of the 26th December, 1874. The Government which was then in power passed an Order in Council by which all lands for twenty miles on each side of the railway could not be allowed for settlement. You could not buy them, or settle on them. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who was then Minister of the Interior, visited our country in 1877. A number of us waited on him and represented the hardships of the case to him and told him it was utterly impossible to get settlers into that country so long as no settlement was allowed within twenty miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. He heard our statement and came back to Ottawa, and what was the change he made? The change was that settlers were allowed to go into possession of lands within the twenty-mile belt, but

they were not told what they were to pay. When they made their entry they had to pay $1 an acre, and when all the lands in this belt were taken up and settled upon, then, and only then, the Government would fix the price and grant them their patents. They did not get any information as to what they would have to pay when they settled upon these lands. We asked for bread and got a stone. This was the land policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and this was the first of the obnoxious land regulations put in force in the Province of Manitoba. That obnoxious law was in force from the 26th December, 1874, to the 28th June, 1879, five years. The next obnoxious land regulation was passed by the present Government, by which the number of acres for one settler was reduced from 160 to 80. That was passed on the 28th June, 1879, and was repealed on the 9th October of the same year, so that it was in force only three months. Hon. gentlemen opposite had their obnoxious land regulations in force for five years, and the first of the obnoxious regulations of the present Government was only in force for three months. The next obnoxious regulation was the reservation of the mile belt, which was passed on the 11th March, 1882, and cancelled on the 29th November, 1883, so that was in force just a year and a-half. Contemporaneously with that, there was the reserve in Southern Manitoba, which was passed on the 5th July, 1882, and cancelled on the 29th November, 1883. Both of these were cancelled at the same time and were in force only one and a-half years, while the obnoxious land laws of hon. gentlemen opposite were in force for five years. This is a comparison between the obnoxious land laws passed by the two parties in this House. Another statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), was that the people were leaving the country so rapidly that the Canadian population in the United States had reached enormous proportions. It is true that the Canadian population are leaving faster than they should, or than we desire them to do, but this did not commence with the adoption of the National Policy, or with the coming into power of the present Government. It has been going on ever since Confederation, and even before Confederation as much as it is now. During the time of the Mackenzie Government, it was as great as it has been since this Government came into power, and I believe, in the last three or four years, it has not amounted to anything like it did ten or fifteen years ago. According to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), there are from 1,200,000 to 1,400,000 Canadians in the United States. I do not believe there are so many. I do not believe there are more than 1,000,000. He refers to the number of Canadians who have left Manitoba and gone into the United States, and he makes it out that tens of thousands have left that province for the south. I have the reports of Mr. Nimmo, who states that in the ten years ending 30th June, 1884, there were only 4,637 Canadians who crossed the line from Manitoba and settled in the United States. From 1850 to 1860, there were 102,000 who went from this country to the United States; from 1860 to 1870, there were 23,000 a year, and from 1870 to 1880 there were about 22,000 a year who went to the United States. This is according to the American statistics taken every ten years. With regard to the statement of the hon. member that we in the North-West have cost the country $100,000,000, and he adds a number of other things to show that we are an annual charge of $7,000,000 a year, I desire to say that we have not cost the Dominion anything of the kind. The first cost was $1,500,000. That is the £300,000 which the Dominion of Canada paid to the Hudson Bay Company for the North-West Territories. I suppose the next charge the hon. gentleman makes is the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That railway cost the country a great deal, but it was not built for the Province of Manitoba or for the Province of Ontario, or for the Province of New Brunswick, or for any other province, but for all the provinces, in order to bind them together by an iron band and to unite them in one Confederation. If, however, we are charged with what was expended throughout Manitoba and the North-West, let us see what the cost was through Ontario, because the road through Ontario, north of Lake Superior, opened up a very valuable mineral region and valuable farming lands, and Ontario is reaping the benefits. From Callander to Port Arthur, the subsidy amounted to $10,000,000; from Port Arthur to Cross Lake, the cost of the work was $10,084,145; the total cost in Ontario being thus $20,084,145. From Cross Lake to the Gap in the Mountains through Manitoba and the North-West, the cost was as follows:—Cross Lake to Red River, including the Pembina branch, $6,767,419; and from the Red River to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, the subsidy amounted to $9,000,000. Therefore, the cost through Manitoba and the North-West Territories only amounts to $15,767,419. In British Columbia, from the Gap to Savona's Ferry the subsidy amounted to $6,000,000; from Savona's Ferry to Port Moody, the cost of the work was $13,483,874. Therefore, the total cost in British Columbia was $19,483,874. It will, therefore, be seen that the entire cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway was $55,335,438, so that, if we were charged with every cent which that railway cost in Manitoba and the North-West, in Ontario, and British Columbia, it would only amount to a little over $55,000,000. But I claim that we should not be charged with one cent more than any other province, and that, even if we are, Ontario should charged just as much for the money which was spent in that province as we would be charged for the amount spent in Manitoba and the North-West. The hon. gentleman further said that literally we find hundreds of people in Manitoba and the North-West where there ought to be millions to-day. Now, Sir, does the hon. gentleman know what that means? Hundreds of people only where there ought to be millions—as we have about two thousand hundreds, therefore, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, we ought to have two thousand millions in Manitoba and the North-West, which is five hundred millions more than the entire population of the world. But the hon. gentleman will say this is hyperbole again, or perhaps it is an orientalism. However, what we object to is that these statements should be scattered broadcast throughout the country to its great detriment, and especially when these statements are not correct. Now, the hon. gentleman further stated that

Canada was a bad country in which to try the experiment of the National Policy, on account of the extent of our territory, and the fact that our population is scattered. He says:

"If there be one thing clearer than another it is this: that the position of the United States is such, the extent of their territory is such, the mass of population is such, that there cannot possibly be conceived a country in which the experiment of protection, the mistaken and mischievous experiment, I believe, can be tried with less risk to the inhabitants than in the United States; and *per contra*, and conversely, there is no country on the face of the earth of which I have ever read, heard, or seen, so utterly unsuited to try the experiment of protection as this Canada of ours."

Now, what are the facts? In the United States they tried the experiment. In 1789, the first tariff Act was passed, and signed by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton, their great financial authority, said it was a protective policy that would be continuous, that it had come to stay. Now, at that time the United States had not the population we have now, or they had at most very nearly our present population. Their population was scattered over a vast extent; their 13 states covered a territory extending into the unknown west, still they adopted the experiment. In 1816, they further enlarged the protective policy; in 1824, they still more enlarged the principle of protection; in 1828 they went on enlarging that policy; in 1830 they reduced it to a perfect system, just as we have done with our National Policy. In 1832 there was a reverse, and the Nullification Act of South Carolina was passed, and the reverse amounted almost to the adoption of free trade. In 1833, there was a compromise, and in 1842, the United States again returned to the principle of protection. In 1832 and in 1846, there were victories for free trade in the United States, and what was the result? The mills were closed, the furnace fires were put out, the merchants became bankrupt, and the labourer became a tramp; but after this experience they returned once more to the policy of protection, under which they have gone on progressing, and the result has been that in the last nine years the balance of trade in favour of that country has been $1,300,000,000, and the 13 original states of the Union have multiplied until they cover the whole belt of the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. At first their manufacturing plant amounted to only $500,000, but now it has reached the enormous value of six billions of dollars. This is the result of the adoption of protection in the United States, and we can safely try that policy in our own country, because our country is in circumstances very similar to theirs; we have a great west, as they have, and we have a very large extent of fertile country, as they have. There is this further similarity in our circumstances, that in the United States the very party that was in favour of a high tariff was also in favour of making a strong central government, while the low tariff party was the party in favour of increasing the power of the various states, and believed in state sovereignty; the party that was in favour of a strong protective policy was the party that was in favour of a strong national government and a strong national sentiment. In our country the party that is in favour of free trade, or something bordering upon it, is the party that has always been in favour of sectionalism and fostered it. In the United States the sectional feeling existed the same as it does here, and it was only crushed out after a civil war. Lincoln grappled with the spirit of sectionalism and throttled it, and to-day there is no more united people on the face of the earth than the people of the United States. They look upon their country as a whole, and not upon each state as a separate country. Now, in reading the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford I have come to the conclusion that no public man in this country makes speeches that bristle more with statements, inaccurate in substance and theatrical in form; startling phrases, a grandiloquent programme, promises incapable of realization, a thorough belief in himself and in the gullibility of his fellow-countrymen are his stock-in-trade. And the disproportion between his denunciations and the facts with which he supports his denunciations, is painfully obvious to the country. There is only one excuse for that hon. member, "hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and he has been struggling so long to get at the Treasury benches and he has been so often disappointed, that he reminds one very much of the mythological hero Sisyphus who was forever and forever uselessly endeavouring to roll a stone up the mountain. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be satisfied with the result of the elections; we on this side are also satisfied with the result. Of course, they have not come up to the expectations of some, but on the whole we are satisfied. Some of the counties have gone wrong, but doubtless on the first opportunity they will return to their first love, and perform works meet for repentance by returning gentlemen to support the Conservative party. Now, after the elections were over the hon. member for South Oxford wrote a letter in which he spoke of "our opponents' array." Although it has been quoted before, I will venture to quote it once more:

"Our opponents' array, on the other hand, is mostly, literally a thing of shreds and patches, made up of ragged remnants from half a dozen varied provinces, the great majority of whom do not even pretend to be actuated by any principle save that of securing a good slice of booty for themselves and the sections or constituencies they respectively represent, and who know besides that popular feeling in those very provinces is strongly and distinctly in favour of our policy, though actual cash in hand or in the shape of railway subsidies has proved too much for the virtue of a majority of the voting population in many instances."

Evidently the hon. gentleman's desire is to arouse local prejudices, and he would have this great country gangrened by provincial jealousies. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are possessed with the strong conviction that Canadianism as a whole is going to do away with provincial differences and jealousies; we are looking to the interest of Canada as one country from ocean to ocean. This is the principle that has been distilled into the members of the Conservative party, and it is a principle which we will never desert. At the opening of the session the leader of the Opposition stated that the methods of carrying elections on this side of the House were very doubtful; he speaks about bribing the constituencies, about the iniquitous measures passed in previous Parliaments, and about all the methods which have been adopted in order to sustain our policy. Now, I do not know whether that hon. gentleman has adopted the role of an American humourist or not, but I can say this, that in our province and in the North-West there was no device in election matters which can be thought of,

which the Liberal party did not adopt, there was nothing to which they did not condescend in order to win votes. They can be charged on one hand with misrepresentations, and on the other hand with unfulfillable promises. In my county I know that policy was adopted to the fullest extent, as I can say in the words of the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain: "The Opposition lied with a freedom and an unanimity which raised mendacity to the rank of a fine art." The line of argument we adopted in the North-West was this: We were opposed to the McKinley Bill; we believed the McKinley Bill was passed largely with the object of coercing Canada, and for that reason we could not agree to any measure of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union with that country, as that would be tantamount to allowing ourselves to be coerced. We preferred to bear the ills we have than to submit to dictation from the United States. We are not a class of people who will submit to any infamy, no matter from what quarter, or how great, and we would rather submit to our present taxation than to adopt the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite and surrender our commercial independence to a foreign country. In the North-West the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite went about saying that the country was going to ruin, that everything was going wrong, not only in the North-West but throughout Canada; in fact, they reminded one very much of the grandmother of Satan in the Scotch proverb, "who laughs at all ills and cries at all good." Now, with regard to Manitoba, the issue was one largely of unrestricted reciprocity. When we went to our constituents the people were saturated with the idea of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. But the more and more that question was discussed the more and more the people came to the conclusion that they would have none of it, and the fact that the people in Manitoba and the North-West returned the members representing them in this House by such very large majorities was largely owing to unrestricted reciprocity being the policy of the Opposition; in fact it was more largely owing to that circumstance than anything else. The self-complacent member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) never would have been here had it not been for his own attitudinizing and the enormous amount of padding given him by the most powerful paper in the province, the Manitoba *Free Press*. Although that paper was in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, or some liberal measure of reciprocity with the United States, we went to the country with that paper opposed to us on that question, though partly supporting us on some other grounds, and yet the Conservative members were elected against all this power, simply because the people of the North-West, after reading the question, intelligently came to the conclusion that they would have none of unrestricted reciprocity but would stand by Canada as a whole and by the National Policy. One factor that made us determine to adopt that line of policy in the North-West was this: On reading the papers in the United States, and the statements made by leading politicians, our people came to the conclusion that those views were not in the interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-West. The San Francisco *Call*, for instance, says:

"The success of the Liberal party in the coming March election would probably be considered a declaration of a desire on the part of Canada for such commercial union as is outlined in Mr. Hitt's resolution. In Canada it will be called unrestricted reciprocity instead of commercial union. * * Political union is, in fact, the only condition which will secure to Canada free trade with the United States."

Mr. Goldwin Smith says:

"I never conceal my belief that the ultimate result of commercial union will be political union, and England must be content with our friendship."

The New York *Evening Post* says:

"If Canada agrees to have the same tariff as the United States the making of it must of necessity be left to the American Congress, or, in other words, the power to tax the Canadians must be ceded to the United States, and the power to tax soon carries all other powers with it. It is just as well for everybody who is interested in this movement on either side of the line to bear this in mind. The United States cannot allow a small province like Canada to say what their import duties thall be."

The Chicago *Times* says:

"It must not be forgotten that this proposition implies a complete surrender by the Dominion Parliament to the American Congress of all control over the principal sources of the Dominion's revenue, the tariff. Whatever it may please the American Congress to do regarding the tariff, that the Dominion Government must forthwith accept. Our Congress would have even more power over the Dominion under this arrangement than it would in the event of political union, because the people of the Dominion would have neither vote nor voice in Washington under the proposed commercial union."

The Chicago *Times* reports Erastus Wiman as saying,—and it will be observed that Mr. Wiman expressed one set of views before the Canadian electors and another set of views before the American people:

"What Michigan has done for the East in the shape of development of natural resources, what Minnesota has achieved towards the enrichment of the West—that Manitoba and the North-Western Territories would do for Chicago and the North-Western States. The exhaustion of arable lands in the North-West is a fact which Chicago and all who are interested in trade and transportation in that region are intensely interested in. The good God above us all has provided in the Canadian North-Western Territories a magnificent stretch of the most productive wheat-growing soil in the world. Here is room for the accommodation of the immigration of 50,000,000 of people, who should all be customers of the manufacturers, merchants and transportation agencies of the Western States. It seems pitiable that people do not arise to a comprehension of the fact that a limitation of the United States is reached by the northern line of Minnesota, and that Chicago, Milwaukee, the twin cities, and all the vast aggregations of people in these Western States, in order to have room for expansion, must have the barrier obliterated that divides this continent in twain."

The Chicago *Times* again says:

"If the Dominion will take our tariff laws as they are and as Congress may choose to modify them, and as our Treasury Department and courts may construe them, well and good."

The Chicago *Tribune* says:

"The main point, however, is for Congress to come to the support of the Liberals. They are in splendid fighting condition."

The Chicago *Inter-Ocean* says:

"Short of commercial absorption, we see no safe basis of reciprocity."

Senator Carlyle says:

"There is now, as everybody knows a very powerful political party in Canada in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and a large part, at least, of the members of that party are now, or will be ultimately, in favour of political union.

"I think it is our duty to encourage and support this sentiment as far as we can without injustice to our own people."

The Washington *Post* says:

"It should be understood, however, once for all, that the only reciprocity which would be deemed desirable or satisfactory on this side is a full commercial union between the two countries, which would inevitably pave the way for a political union."

Here it is evident that unrestricted reciprocity and annexation is intended to form a *palindrome*. The Buffalo *News* says:

"Every vote cast for the Liberal candidate in most of the constituencies at least, will be, in effect, a vote for annexation, since commercial union must lead to that."

President Lane, at a banquet given by the Boston Chamber of Commerce, said:

"Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley, of Nova Scotia; Davies, of Prince Edward Island; Mercier and Laurier, of Quebec; Cartwright, of Ontario, and a host besides, look to us, and the people of the United States, for 'the sign by which they shall conquer.' Can we deny them?"

Judging from the manner in which the "signs by which they shall conquer" was distributed throughout the counties, they did not look in vain. With respect to predictions made, one hon. member said that we on this side had made predictions that have never come true. That may be. The difference, however, between predictions made on this side of the House and predictions made by hon. gentleman opposite is simply this: On this side of the House there have been predictions made which have not come true in the time they were predicted to be verified, but many of them are going to come true after all. Even the prediction of 600,000,000 bushels of wheat raised in Manitoba and the North-West will come true. Predictions made by hon. gentlemen opposite have not come true, the time has passed for their verification, they have been denied by the facts that have occurred since. I come now to another phase of the question on which we in the North-West are in some respects not at one with the Government. I look upon it that the Act of Confederation is but the vestibule to the temple to be erected. There are other parts to be completed. One is the building of railways, another is the construction of canals, another is the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is one of the most important portions of the work, another is steamship lines, and still another is the adoption of the National Policy—all these are to complete the building which was intended to be erected by the fathers of Confederation. It is still incomplete, and because it is incomplete to-day, hon. gentlemen opposite would with rude hands tear down the scaffolding before the building is finished, because it does not come up to promised splendour. But we will not allow them, nor will the electors give them an opportunity. They are like men who stand with their backs to the rising sun and gaze mournfully at their own shadows. There are two subjects of very great importance to this country, in the opinion of the people of the North-West. And these two most important subjects to deal with are, first, immigration, the settling and filling up of the fertile plains of the North-West; and second, the development of our vast latent resources. On the question of immigration we believe that frugality may become profligacy and that saving money is not the true policy to adopt in regard to immigration, because "there is that scattereth and yet increaseth and there is that withholdeth more than is meet but it tendeth to poverty." On no question is this so true as on the question of immigration, especially in a country like ours, where we have such vast lands to be settled and resources capable of being developed. Yet the people of Canada to-day are not up to the mark on this subject, and our policy at present is largely one of "do nothing" and "masterly inactivity," whereas a great deal might, could and ought to be done. We believe, in order to fill out the National Policy and to complete the scheme of Canada as a great country, that a wide, liberal, broad, progressive and vigorous immigration policy should be adopted, and that is the only way the work can be accomplished. We have various countries competing with us, which have similar vast fertile lands to ours. In Queensland the Government last year spent $1,250,000 for immigration purposes. Mexico is spending money, so is New Zealand, and the Argentine Republic is spending over a million dollars a year for immigration purposes. The *Canadian Gazette*, London, speaking on this subject, says:

"Canada is not doing what she might and ought to do, because, as a matter of fact, she is doing practically nothing at all as compared with the other caterers for European immigrants."

We believe that immigration is simply a matter of business; it is not enough for us to say: We have got the land, go and possess it; but, on account of this competition for immigrants on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain, we must do more than that. We must bring the people here, no matter how they are brought, so long as they are fit settlers. We do not want paupers unable to work; we want energetic men, men of energy and muscle, who are prepared to put up with whatever is in store for them, and who are willing to seek and make a home for themselves amongst us. If we get a class of people, whether they are poor or not, who are determined to work for themselves, we will accept them, for our country is so great that we can absorb an enormous number of them. We have in the North-West millions and millions of acres ready for the plough, we have the largest coal-beds in the world undeveloped, we have vast petroleum regions which, so far as is known, are unequalled in the civilized world, and which can be easily developed, and would be if we had sufficient people. The members for Manitoba and the North-West look with deep interest on this question of immigration; we do not wish to be "faddists" upon it, but we are determined to "prod on," and to get the people into that country, because we believe it is the hope of Canada that our western country should be successfully settled and developed. We consider that Canada will never become as great and prosperous a nation as she is destined to be, unless the North-West is filled up with people as it should be, then the North-West will be the glory of our common country. We believe that Canada possesses all the elements of a great country which are possessed by the United States; and that there is only one way of developing our country to its fullest extent, and that is by erecting a building on the foundations which were laid by the fathers of Confederation, and helping the policy of the present Government in developing the progress of our great North-West. Some say: You have railways running into that country, and why not leave it to the people to avail themselves of its advantages. As I have said before, the different nations of the new worlds are competing so fiercely for immigrants in the old world, that we must enter into the competition energetically and do something to bring the people to our country. I believe that all the questions which vex us now, of whatever kind they may be, will be solved the moment the North-West is developed and filled up with a prosperous, happy and contented people.

We have great advantages for promoting immigration in our country to-day. In the old days of the United States the settler had to travel in a prairie schooner for hundreds of miles often, and he had to break camp every morning, but to-day we can bring our settlers into fertile regions in a sleeping car, so that even out of the sleeping car window they can almost see the homesteads which are destined to be their future homes. We have every means to bring people into the North-West, but, at the same time, we should not rest on our oars and do nothing further. It is true we have had ills and troubles in the North-West, but we have now got rid of them. Our ills were only like spots on the sun, which neither obscure nor impair the light of day; we have got over them, and the country is now prosperous. There is no more prosperous people in the world to-day than are the people of Manitoba during the present year. We are midway between Liverpool and Yokohama, on one of the highways of the commerce of the world, and on the highways of commerce you always find wealth and an enterprising and intelligent people. When we get the people into that country, all the rest of our advantages will follow. The United States in the past has been the granary of the world, but it is gradually ceasing to occupy that position. The able writers of that country tell us that, in ten years from now, the United States will cease to export any wheat, and the North-West of Canada will then assume the position of the granary of the world, if we have the people to develop the soil. With the rapid railway development we now have going on in that country, and with a large number of immigrants going in there, should we adopt a vigorous immigration policy, it cannot be told how rapidly we will progress, because, as I pointed out in a former part of my address, the people of the North-West to-day are prospering as much as they are in any other part of the new world. What we want to do in this whole Dominion of Canada is to get rid of our sectionalism, to feel that we are Canadians bound together by the broad tie of our nationality, to feel that Confederation is not a rope of sand, but a broad band of union between the people of the different provinces. I think that in the North-West that bond of union is being created and developed more than in any other part of Canada; for the reason that in the North-West we have people from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario pouring in there, settling side by side, and working out their destiny together as Canadians. We in the North-West will encourage that sentiment of Canadianism more than in any other part of Canada, and when the North-West is settled up, we will have a prosperous, a happy and a contented people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. On this side of the House we believe in the policy of Canada for the Canadians, in frowning down sectionalism, in obliterating as far as we can the boundary lines of prejudice between the various provinces. We believe in standing by the National Policy in its development of native industries, in keeping Canada an integral part of the British Empire and in standing by our country. We do not go in for disintegration. We do not believe in giving up our control over our own finances or revenue, but in keeping that for ourselves. Then, Sir, by maintaining our national rights, by remaining a part of the British Empire, by remaining true to our country and what God has provided for us, by supporting the policy of this side of the House, which has pledged itself to the development of the North-West in railway and other matters, we believe that the entire population of Canada will become great, and prosperous, and a contented and happy people.

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) now under discussion, I will only ask for a brief indulgence on the part of hon. members while I state my views on this subject. This question has been very ably and fairly discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and it would seem, at this late stage of the debate that little room remains in which to introduce new matters. I feel, however, that I would not be doing my duty by the county which I have the honour to represent in this House, did I not openly state what I believe to be in the interests of the country generally, and my own county in particular. The motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, and the motion, in amendment, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), involve a discussion on the so-called National Policy, a policy which was given to this country twelve years ago, as a Tory remedy for the commercial evils then said to exist. Sir, I will not take up the valuable time of this House in discussing the merits or demerits of the political contentions of that remote period in our political history, but I will largely confine my remarks to the general, well-known results which have flown from the National Policy adopted in 1879, and which is the policy still insisted on by the Government of the day, and supported by hon. members opposite. The county which I have the honour to represent has long held a prominent, honourable, and enviable position among the oldest and most influential of the Eastern Townships; a position honourably attained by the intelligence and industry of its inhabitants, and although considered as an agricultural county, it is none the less remarkable for its various manufacturing industries. And I wish it to be distinctly understood, that nothing would please me better than to see all of our industries flourish as they deserve to do. I desire here to remark, that I have sufficient confidence in the business ability of our manufacturers and business men, to believe that if they are placed on an equal footing, they need not fear competition with any other people on this continent. I believe that the business of the world at the present day demands the removal of all limitations and restrictions on trade. There is no good ground for contention between the manufacturing and farming industries of this country: unless it be a friendly competition as to which will best serve and promote the interests of the country, but we must not lose sight of the fact that agriculture is the only safe and sure foundation of our country's prosperity. My county, fortunately in some respects, unfortunately in others, is situated on the American border, a position which enables the farmers there fully to comprehend the desirability of having the fullest and freest commercial relations with our neighbours in the United States. Now, I know of no better way to determine the value of a market than by considering the use we make of such a market. I am, therefore, compelled

to trespass on the indulgence of the House while I inflict on it a number of figures, gathered from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1890. The total imports entered for home consumption were $112,765,584. The total imports from Great Britain, the United States and all other countries were respectively as follows:—

	Imports.	Duty paid.
Great Britain	$43,390,241	$9,576,665
United States	52,291,973	8,126,625
All other countries	17,083,370	6,217,643

In other words, we imported from Great Britain $8,901,732 less than from the United States, upon which we collected a duty of $1,450,040 more. Now, in order to be as brief as possible, I will confine my comparisons to Great Britain and the United States, these being the two principal countries with which we trade. I find that our exports in 1890 were as follows:—

	To Great Britain.	To United States.
Produce of mines, fisheries, forests, animals and agricultural produce	$39,677,650	$30,547,152
Miscellaneous	5,252	76,773
Manufactures	1,816,147	2,667,282

If we include our exports of coin and bullion, and the amount estimated in the last Trade Returns as short at inland ports, this will bring the total of our exports to the United States for 1890 to $38,653,061. Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is my duty on the present occasion, in what I have to say on this important subject, to speak with reference to the farming industries of our country, and the statements I give have reference principally to the productions of that industry. I find that in horses we exported to Great Britain 125, valued at $17,925; to the United States 16,118, valued at $1,887,895; and to all other countries 307, valued at $30,253. Now, this is an industry which is of great interest to the county which I have the honour to represent. The County of Stanstead has, for a long time, enjoyed the reputation of raising fine horses, for which we have an excellent demand from the United States. Our position on the border is not only convenient, but owing to the high reputation which our horses have attained, we have been able to sell them at good prices in the United States market; and the horses best suited to the American market are the only horses which a Canadian farmer can in a general way afford to raise; because the most profitable horses are those which can be utilized while they are being raised, and there is always a good demand on the other side of the line for our light draught horses. In sheep we sent to Great Britain 57,006 head, at a valuation of $486,299; to the United States, 251,640 head, valued at $761,565; and to all other countries, 7,285 head, valued at $26,083. This is another industry in which my county is particularly interested, as nearly all the lambs and sheep raised in the Eastern Townships find a profitable market on the other side. The system of farming adopted generally in the Eastern Townships is mixed farming. All our farmers so divide up their business, some specially raising sheep, some cattle, butter and cheese, and some horses, that we find it makes a great difference to our people whether they have a free entrance into the market which is best suited to their needs, or whether they are hampered by trade restrictions imposed by the McKinley Bill; and we feel that the fiscal policy of the late Government has in a large measure brought us face to face with the McKinley tariff. As the duty levied on sheep going into the United States has to be paid by the Canadian farmer, our people understand that that means so much less to them in the results of their production. We have the opportunity of knowing this on account of our close proximity to the American border, for the American buyers offer two prices. They will give so much for lambs on the Canadian side, but, if they are delivered two feet further on the other side, they will give 75 cents to $1.50 more per head for them. Now, this seems to me to be positive proof of the advantage of freer commercial intercourse. With regard to horned cattle, we sent to Great Britain 66,965 head, valued at $6,565,315, and to the States 7,840 head, valued at $104,623, and to all other countries 6,649 head, valued at $279,479. In connection with this trade, Mr. Speaker, we have been told by a gentleman very prominent in the cattle export trade, Mr. Bickerdike, a cattle shipper of Montreal, that nearly 60 per cent. of the cattle shipped from Canada are what is known as "stockers," and the reason he gave is that Canadian farmers could not compete with British farmers in the fattening of cattle, owing to the difference in the cost of corn; because, while the Canadian was paying 7½ cents per bushel duty on his corn, the English farmer was getting the same corn duty free, and this compelled our farmers to part with their goods in an unfinished condition and leave the profit of fattening to the foreign farmers. In this respect I maintain the farmer is a manufacturer. If a farmer is converting his corn into beef, pork, butter, cheese, &c., he is, in that sense, a manufacturer, and should enjoy every other advantage enjoyed by the manufacturers of this country. Now, the corn is the raw material of the farmer, and when he has more to pay for his corn than his neighbour on the other side of the line, he is driven out of the market since he cannot produce his beef or pork as cheaply. The best way to protect the farmer is to give him the opportunity of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest markets. Referring to grains, I find that we shipped barley to Great Britain to the extent of 27,132 bushels, at a valuation of $12,017; to the United States, 9,939,745 bushels, valued at $4,582,561; and to all other countries we sent 9,031 bushels, at a valuation of $3,830. We were told by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) that it would be a very bad thing to allow the free importation of corn, because it would compete with our coarse grains and drive them out of the market; but we find by the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, one of the best commercial and financial papers published in the United States, that in the New York market, while other barley is quoted at 90 to 92 cents per bushel, Canadian barley is quoted from $1 to $1.05 per bushel; and at the same time, we find that corn, Western mixed No. 2, which is a good quality of corn, is worth from 70 to 71 cents. It will be seen by this that one bushel of our Canadian barley, fit for malting purposes, is really worth a bushel and a-half of corn. Now the corn is worth, according to the present quotations, about 20 cents per bushel more for feeding purposes than barley, and, therefore, it would be greatly in the interests of our farmers if the restrictions on trade were

removed to such an extent that they could exchange their barley, for the raising of which our country is so admirably adopted, for American corn. Of beans we exported to Great Britain none, to the United States 183,638 bushels, valued at $249,323, and to all other countries 357 bushels, valued at $721. Of potatoes we exported none to Great Britain; to the United States we exported 1,053,230 bushels, at a valuation of $308,915, and to all other countries 405,567 bushels, at a valuation of $184,830. Now, it seems to me that, so far as our trade in potatoes is concerned, the only natural and convenient, the only market to which we can export them profitably, is the United States. This is a matter which is of great interest to the farmers in many parts of Canada. It was brought to my attention very particularly this past winter, when I saw an actual illustration of how the duties are adjusted. Buyers came to us from the New England States and offered our farmers from 40 cents to 50 cents a bushel on the Canadian side of the line, but said if our farmers would take their potatoes two feet further and cross into the United States they would give 65 to 75 cents per bushel. This meant an evident loss to the Canadian farmers of 25 cents a bushel. With regard to wool, we send to Great Britain none; to the United States we send 1,046,891 lbs., valued at $235,466, and to all other countries we send 863 lbs., valued at $203. In connection with this allow me, Sir, to here draw your attention to this fact: that the farmers, in the question of wool like most of other questions, are given very poor consideration indeed under our National Policy. Although they are contributing more to the wealth of the country, although they are the very best distributors of wealth we have in the country, yet, for some reason unexplained by hon. gentlemen opposite, they are given no consideration whatever in connection with the so-called National Policy. Now, wool is allowed in free. This is an advantage to the manufacturer, but it seems that the kind of wool which it is most profitable for our people to raise finds its best market in the United States, and upon it there is now a duty of 12 cents per pound, and the need of that market is made very clear to us when we find we have used it to the extent I have just quoted. Now, with regard to the item of eggs, though this item has been several times brought to the notice of the House, I could not pass it over when I found there was such a great difference in favour of more free and extensive trade arrangements with the United States. I find that we shipped 3,600 dozen of eggs to Great Britain, at a valuation of $820, while we shipped to the United States 12,825,735 dozen, at a valuation of $1,793,104, and to all other countries we sent 10,325 dozen, at a valuation of $1,290. Now, with regard to maple sugar, we shipped to Great Britain 958 lbs., valued at $103; to the United States, 233,958 lbs., at a valuation of $16,644, and to all other countries 255 lbs., at a valuation of $21. I must confess that, when I had the pleasure of listening to the able and exhaustive argument of the Minister of Finance in moving his resolutions on the Budget, I had a little glimmer of hope that in this article at all events he was going to do justice to the Canadian farmer. When he spoke about sugar, he acknowledged there was a necessity to provide a little compensation by way of assistance to the farmers who were labouring with the crop of sugar beets that they had sown, and, that there may be no mistake, I will quote his words on that subject. He said:

"So that I have this to recommend, that for one year, this season only, whatever beet-root sugar is made wholly from the beet in the Dominion of Canada, shall be paid, out of the finances of the country, a bounty equal to the protection which it would have enjoyed if the tariff had remained for the year as it was when the farmers planted their beets and went into that industry. When I make that statement, I also wish it to be accompanied by this emphatic statement: that this proposition does not commit me or the Government to the principle of bounty with reference to the culture of beet root sugar in this country. We do not propose to commit ourselves to that principle, and the legislation we ask for now is for this season only."

In reply to the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who asked:

"What about maple sugar?"

Mr. Foster replied:

"Maple sugar remains just as sweet and just as good as it was without any bounty."

It seems to me, if I may be allowed the expression, that this is very shabby treatment, indeed, for our Eastern Township farmers especially. Maple sugar is a very important product of the farmers throughout the Province of Quebec, and particularly in the Eastern Townships, and when the Government under which we live cannot extend to the people of this country as many inducements to remain here and toil as they see their brothers enjoy on the other side of the line, there is very little inducement for them to remain. On the other side the farmers are encouraged to raise maple sugar by a bounty of 2 cents a pound, and that is granted not for one year only, which is no inducement whatever, but for five years. It seems to me that, if we could by any reasonable inducement get our farmers to produce sugar at home, even if we gave them a bounty to induce them to start the industry, the amount of the bounty would be spent at home where the country would get some benefit from it, rather than that which is sent to the Sandwich Islands or the West India Islands by the inducements held out to obtain raw sugar from them. I find that of coal we shipped to Great Britain 28,974 tons, valued at $78,417; to the United States, 574,856 tons, valued at $2,126,000; and to all other countries, 111,534 tons, valued at $243,519. It seems to me that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), who has just taken his seat, should be pleased to have a larger market for this valuable production of the North-West Territories and British Columbia. It appears from these figures that the United States, although it is a great producer of coal, yet, owing to the means of communication, finds it convenient to take from us coal to the amount of 574,000 tons, at a valuation of over $2,000,000. Now I will briefly refer to the goods which are imported into Canada for home consumption. I find that of Indian corn there was a quantity of 3,242,391 bushels imported, at a valuation of $1,170,022, on which a duty was paid by the people of this country of $243,174, being 7½ cents a bushel. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) was perfectly satisfied with the justness of this duty. He claimed that he was a manufacturer and paid 7½ cents a bushel the same as others on all the corn he used in his business, and he seemed to have a smile on his face when he approached this subject. That smile seemed to have some connection with the remark made by the Minister of Finance in explaining the increase in the Excise

duties on spirits, when he made the following statement :—

"I propose to ask the distillers to consent to the imposition of a slight increase in the Excise duty upon distilled spirits, which will add but very little, 20 cents per gallon, to the cost of that article : and if it is necessary, I want to ask the distillers, and the wholesale sellers, and the retail traders, and the drinkers as well, to divide this equitably among them and make a pleasant face over the operation."

It seems to me that the hon. member for West Hastings was well satisfied with this. He could realize clearly that, though he paid the duty, he charged it over to the dealers, that this duty did not come out of his pocket, and that was no comparison at all with the position of the farmer who converts the corn into beef, pork, butter or cheese, and, when the product is ready for the market, has to sell it at the market price, whereas the distiller can hold his production in woodlen casks, and it is said that, like some other things, it improves with age. It is, therefore, very clear to my mind, at least, that the comparison is hardly a fair one. In order to more fully understand this matter, I have taken the pains to find out the amount of whiskey which has been exported from this country, so as to make a comparison and arrive at the volume of the business as between the distiller and the farmer. I find that the export of whiskey, or "distilled damnation," as it was termed by the Minister of Finance at a former period, amounted to the value of $25,383. The farmers' exportations during the same time amounted to $37,015,025 ; and I must submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is as great a difference in the character and desirability of this business, as there is in the amounts involved, and it would seem that in this case at all events, it is no particular hardship to the brewer. Then, in regard to bituminous coal, I find that we imported from the United States 1,346,678 tons, upon which $808,009 were paid in duties ; I find that the Province of Ontario consumed of this quantity 1,304,867 tons, upon which a duty was collected of $782,920. Now, it would seem that the absurdity of placing a duty of 60 cents a ton on coal is fully illustrated, because this will not compensate for a difference in freight. The convenience to the American market compels the people of Ontario to get their coal from the other side, and virtually compels them to pay this duty ; therefore it is a tax upon the manufacturing industries of Ontario without affording any relief whatever to the coal producers of the Lower Provinces.

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

After Recess.

Mr. RIDER. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to show the value of a freer and broader trade arrangement with the United States. I will now call your attention to another very important item, that of kerosene and coal oil, of which we imported for the year mentioned, 5,033,580 gallons, upon which duties were paid to the extent of $365,450. Now, the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff), who represents in this House the principal coal oil-producing section in this country, speaking to this item the other evening, used the following words :—

"In fact I believe oil to-day is made too cheap ; I do not believe there is half a cent profit per gallon on it."

Now, I submit, if this is the result that flows from the National Policy, why should we subject the people of this country to a taxation upon an article so largely used by the farmers generally, when it affords a meagre profit to the producers of only half a cent per gallon ? We must remember that this is the only available light in use by the farmers and wage-earners of this country ; in cities the rich are favoured with electric lights and gas lights, but in the country parts the only available light is to be had from the use of kerosene oil ; therefore, it must seem very clear that with all this duty upon oil it yet fails to protect the oil producer of this country. Again, the same result is found with oranges and lemons, upon which we find the people of Canada are taxed to the extent of $56,664. Now, it can be truly said that this tax protects no Canadian industry. The climate is against us, and it is very evident that this is taxation pure and simple. Well, now I believe that the people of Canada would be quite willing to submit to whatever taxation is necessary to carry on an economical and an honest system of Government, but they do feel that in face of the extravagance which is being brought to light by the investigations now going on by committees of this House, they are unjustly taxed, and they are taxed not to build up any industries of the country, but that the Government of the day may have so much more funds to dispose of. It has been well and truly stated that we are possessed of great natural wealth, consisting of mines, fisheries, forests, &c. Now, in regard to the item of logs, of which the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) spoke so truthfully the other evening, I find this article was the subject of about the first attempt ever made by this Government towards negotiating something like a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The export duty was removed from logs as a concession for a portion of the duty being removed from the manufactured lumber imported into the United States, and what is the result ? We find that our forests, hitherto so valuable, are fast disappearing under the woodman's axe, and instead of logs being manufactured in this country, instead of being worked up here and thus furnishing labour to the very best classes of our wage-earners, and thereby providing a home market for the produce of our farmers, the raw material is being taken away from our forests to the other side of the line, and with it goes our labouring men, and there they build up homes and settle with their families to the great loss of this country. Our minerals are passing in the same way. We see not only car-load after car-load, but train after train taken away in a raw and unmanufactured condition. And what does this mean ? It means that the present trade barriers are so arranged as to compel the exportation of natural products in a raw and unmanufactured condition. Had we a freer and broader trade arrangement with the United States, such as is sought by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it would not only admit but would really compel the manufacture of these valuable products in our own country. The saving in freight alone would bring those who now use those valuable products to manufacture them here and help to build up this country, and thereby create not only a home market for our labouring men, but for our farmers who have produce to spare.

From what I have been able to learn during the progress of this discussion, the charge of disloyalty so industriously, and if I may be allowed to add, so dishonestly hurled against the leaders of the great Liberal party during the late election for advocating freer and broader trade relations with the United States, is rapidly passing away, and the people at large, if not hon. gentlemen opposite, are beginning to realize that the so-called National Policy is proving to be a most mischievous piece of legislation. It seems that any policy which would assist in the manufacture of our raw material in our own country could not but help to build up the industries of the country. When we talk about loyalty to the mother country, when we talk about disloyalty, what do we find when we go over to the other side of the water? Do we find that there is where the first breath of disloyalty is raised? We find her capitalists leaving England with their capital, their energy, and their enterprise to build up industries in the United States. Why? Because we have no market to offer them. With all our vast natural wealth would it not be far better had we trade arrangements which would admit of our raw materials being manufactured in our country? Again, it does seem to me, that when we do not enjoy so many privileges as our neighbours living alongside of us, we cannot expect peace to prevail. Why are the people of this country, after paying 50 per cent. more for postage than do our neighbours, also called upon to pay so much more also for almost all necessary articles entering into our daily wants? It would seem from all that has been said that it would be greatly in the interests of Canada had we freer trade relations with the United States. Our interests are in common, we are of the same stock, and it seems to me that in the interests of the two countries our trade relations should be widened. We might as well endeavour to erect trade barriers between the provinces or between the municipalities of this country. We were told by the Minister of Finance that inter-provincial trade was growing. It seems to me that international trade should also be growing. In conclusion, I have to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, the House, for the kind attention which has been extended to me by the hon. members of this House.

Mr. CRAIG. If it were not for the kind indulgence which is always extended to new members, I would not venture to address the House on this question, which has been so thoroughly discussed already. However, I have a few remarks to offer, and I will not occupy very much of the time of the House. I wish to say, first, that I was exceedingly gratified, as I think every one must have been gratified, with the speech of the Minister of Finance. I was exceedingly pleased with his thorough and clear exposition of the finances of this country. I was pleased to learn that the predictions he had made some time ago had been fulfilled, and that a balance between expenditure and revenue was now established. I was also pleased with the hopeful tone of his speech—hopeful, but not extravagant. I was pleased to learn, as no doubt we all were, that the credit of Canada stands so high. But I believe that what pleased the greater part of the people was the announcement that the Government decided to take the duty off raw sugar and thereby relieve the country of great taxation. I am satisfied, also, that among the farmers general satisfaction was felt, as it was among members of this House, that the Government was about to take part of the duty off salt. During the late election, we heard a good deal of complaint in regard to the price of salt, arising, not so much from the duty, as from the monopoly that existed in that article, and we are glad to learn that the removal of part of the duty on salt has led to a reduction in the price of the article. I was also glad to learn that the Government intend to make up the greater part of this deficiency, not by imposing any new taxes on the people, but by the practice of economy in all departments of the public service. I am sure that we on this side of the House, and I believe members on the other side, will give their assistance in carrying out this economy. While I do not believe in the charges of extravagance which are sometimes made, and made for party purposes, by hon. gentlemen opposite, still I am gratified to learn that the Minister of Finance and the Government desire to economize as much as possible, at the same time seeing that the public service does not suffer in any respect. During the short time I will occupy the attention of the House, I do not intend to go into any details. I think we have had a great array of figures presented to us. I think we have had a sufficient number of statistics presented; but I wish in a very brief space of time to say why I support the policy of the Conservative party. The first reason that occurs to my mind is this: the policy is a definite policy. I know what it is, and I think the people of the country understand what it is. We recognize that this country must have a revenue. I have been reminded of this fact, because in some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite they have talked as if a revenue was quite unnecessary in the government of this country. They have talked as if we could get along without any money at all; they have talked a great deal about free trade, about people being relieved of almost all their burdens, about goods coming in without paying any duty, and I wondered where the revenue was to come from. We do not talk in this way, because we know, as every one knows, that no country can be governed without a revenue. Then our policy is definite, because when we find we have to raise a revenue we place it where it will do the most good. We believe in a revenue, and we believe in placing our revenue where it will protect home industries. I have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about protection; they do not seem to like protection at all, they look upon it as if it were a great evil, and they talk of protection as if it raised the prices to a very large extent. I do not agree with that at all. There is no doubt that protection in some cases does raise the prices of articles, but I believe that if a careful examination is made, we shall find that in the great majority of the articles manufactured in this country, protection has not raised the price at all. In fact, I know that some articles are lower in price now under the policy of the Conservative Government than they were under the policy of our predecessors, which policy, it may be remarked, was a policy of protection in part. A great many articles that have now a duty of 20 per cent. on them, had a duty of 17½ per cent.

under the Mackenzie Administration, so that it does not very well become hon. gentlemen opposite to talk so much about free trade. However, I am arguing the point that protection, in a great many cases, does not raise the prices at all. What is the effect of protection? It keeps the market for the home manufacturer, and instead of having goods made outside of this country, instead of having goods manufactured in foreign countries and brought into Canada, these goods are made here and our artizans and labouring men have the benefit of doing this work. That is what I consider the true policy, and the true effect of protection. After listening to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Rider), I must admit that many of his statements were correct, and I do not wish to dispute them. We all admit that in some things the McKinley Bill was a great disadvantage to us, but this Government is not to blame in any way for that measure. We have always been ready, and we are ready to-day, to negotiate a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States; our Government and our party have always taken that stand. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said that they do not believe we want reciprocity at all, and that in fact we are opposed to it. Well, Sir, I do not know where they find their authority for that statement. It may be that certain individual members have made the statement, but the policy announced by the Minister of Finance, and the policy announced by the Government, is, that we are ready to-day, and that we have been ready all along to make a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States. I believe, Sir, that in many things a reciprocity treaty of that kind would be of advantage to this country. I know that in the section of the country from which I come, a great deal of barley is raised, and a large trade has been done in horses and in eggs, and I know that many of the farmers feel the effects of the McKinley Bill. But, Sir, at the same time I have been told—I do not know it from my own knowledge, but I have been told—by those who live in other sections of the country, that a reciprocity treaty in all products would not be an advantage to some parts of the country. However, I am willing to say here, that we are in favour, and that I myself am in favour, of a fair reciprocity treaty in natural products. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Rider) say that this country does not object to taxation, but that the taxation which is now levied is not levied to protect home industries, but is levied to give the Government a corruption fund and more money to spend dishonestly. I am sorry to hear a remark of that kind made in this House, and I may say now that I am also sorry to see and read in some papers, the wholesale charges of corruption made against the Government. I believe, Sir, that the Government in power at the present time is an honest Government, and that they desire to do what is right. We all admit that there have been irregularities, we cannot close our eyes to that fact; but, Sir, I wish to say, that if we were to look back to other Governments, for instance the Government of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House when they were in power, we might find just as grave irregularities there. Now, Sir, I say that I believe in the policy of the Conservative party, because it is a definite policy, and I cannot endorse the policy of the Opposition because it is an indefinite policy. I find their policy has been called commercial union, it has been called unrestricted reciprocity, it has been called continental free trade, it has been called a general reduction of the duties, and some have gone so far as to talk about absolute free trade itself. When hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were asked the question how they would raise the revenue, the reply was made: Change places with us and we will tell you. I do not think the country will be satisfied with an answer like that. I think that before hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House ever come to occupy the Treasury benches, they will first have to explain definitely to the country what their policy is, and how they intend to raise the revenue required for carrying on the public service of this country. It seems that their policy is a secret, because all they tell of it is: Change places and we will tell you what that policy is. Why do not they announce their policy now, for I am sure they cannot be ashamed of it? Why do not they tell us how they will raise the necessary revenue? We say that if hon. gentlemen opposite adopt this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, they must have direct taxation. They do not seem anxious to face that, yet under their policy they must face it, and if they have some other method, it is only fair to the country and fair to us on this side of the House that they should tell us what their policy is. Now Sir, what do they mean by unrestricted reciprocity? Do they mean a discriminating tariff against Great Britain and all the rest of the world in favour of the United States? That has been announced by some members of the Opposition, but it has been denied by others. I maintain that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite do mean discrimination against England, and I maintain that their coadjutors in the United States do mean it also. They mean that if we have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we must have commercial union; and that we cannot have our own duties with Great Britain and all the rest of the world, if we have free trade with the United States. I object to the policy of the Opposition, because I believe that unrestricted reciprocity, whatever it may mean, means taking the protection away from our manufacturers. It cannot mean anything else but that. I object to that, because I believe that if protection were taken away from our manufacturers they would be ruined. It has been said by some hon. gentlemen: Surely Canadians are able enough and capable enough to compete with the manufacturers in the United States. Undoubtedly they are able to compete in natural ability; but, Sir, I say that they have not the plant, and they are not doing the amount of business which would enable them to compete successfully. You take a factory in this country that is doing a business of $100,000 a year, and a factory in the United States that is doing a business of $1,000,000; and I maintain that the factory doing the business of $100,000 is not able to compete with the factory doing a business of $1,000,000. Not only do I say this, but I will add my own experience of what I have seen in the past, and I state that if our markets were thrown open, if there was absolute free trade between this country and the United States in manufactured articles, the manufacturers of the United States would swamp our markets. They would sell their

goods in this country below cost, in order to kill out every manufacturer in Canada, and when they would have the market to themselves they would charge their own prices. That is no fanciful picture; it is what has been done before and what these men would do again. Hon. gentlemen opposite may smile, but I am satisfied that every manufacturer in this country will tell you that this is the case. I heard lately about a manufacturer in Peterborough, who does quite a large business, and who is a Reformer belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. This gentleman had never before the last election cast anything but a Reform vote, but when he was told that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was to throw open the markets of this country to the manufacturers of the United States, then for the first time in his life he cast a Conservative vote. He had to vote that way because he was voting for his own interest; and while hon. gentlemen opposite may tell us that unrestricted reciprocity would not injure our manufacturers, and that they would be able to compete with the manufacturers of the United States, I maintain that the manufacturers themselves know best whether that is the case or not. Now, Sir, suppose our manufacturers were blotted out, our young men, our labouring men, and our artizans, working in these factories would have to go to the United States. Then the home market, which the farmers of this country appreciate so highly, notwithstanding the attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite to belittle it, would be entirely gone. But I can imagine hon. gentlemen opposite saying: Why could not the manufacturers of this country enlarge their mills and do a larger business? I answer that it would not be safe, for this reason: that that treaty might terminate at any time. How could we know how long it would last? I was myself talking to a manufacturer some time ago when this question first came up, and he said to me: "I would prefer annexation to unrestricted reciprocity, because I would know what I was doing, whereas under unrestricted reciprocity I might enlarge my capacity so as to compete in the larger market, but I might be obliged soon to close down again and lose all I invested." But I approve of the Liberal-Conservative policy, not only because it is definite, but because it is progressive. What do I mean when I say it is progressive? I mean that it keeps pace with the requirements of the country. I mean that it is not a cast-iron system. It sees the needs of the country and applies the remedy. Why, Sir, a few days ago a member of the Opposition taunted the members on this side with applauding when duties were put on and applauding when duties were taken off. That is just what we do. Our policy is to put on duties when it is in the interest of the country to put them on, and to take off duties when it is in the interest of the country to take them off. We have no cast-iron rule. We believe in protecting the industries of this country. We believe in encouraging every part of the country. We believe in encouraging the manufacturers, the labouring men, and the farmers, too. This differs very much from the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. Why, Sir, they would not listen to advice at all. They knew all about the situation without anybody telling them anything; and when the manufacturers came to them and represented that Canada was being made a slaughter market and that their trade was being ruined, the Government offered them no relief at all; a deaf ear was turned to them. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was one of blindness and inaction. But I believe in the policy of this Government, not only because it is definite and progressive, but because it is patriotic. Now, I am not going to discuss the question of loyalty, or deny the loyalty of hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe they are loyal; I hope they are loyal; I have no right to arrogate loyalty to myself, and I do not intend to do so, while denying it to others. But I am not referring at this time to loyalty to the Empire, but I am referring to loyalty to Canada. What is the difference between the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and the policy of the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite? The party on this side of the House are hopeful of the future of this country They recognize its resources; they believe that it is a great country; and they believe that it is to become a great nation. Sir, we see the good features of this country; we see that it has good prospects; but what do we find hon. gentlemen opposite doing? We find them gloomy and dispairing; we find them depreciating our country. This may be denied by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not mean to say that all of them do it, but I do mean to say that their representatives do it, that some of the leaders of their party do it, and the leaders to whom we look for the exposition of their policy. In order to prove this, as it may be denied, I intend to read a few selections from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite; and in doing so I shall not go back to ancient history, but I shall read from the speech made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this very debate. In that speech, the hon. gentleman, referring to the hon. Minister of Finance, said:

"Although the hon. gentleman in his time has been a professional philanthropist, nevertheless I have never believed he was at bottom a cruel-hearted man, and therefore I think it is ignorance on his part which has induced him to describe the present condition of this country as one of considerable and great prosperity, what he called a united, a happy, a prosperous, a right-minded, a progressive people. He described our prospects as of the brightest, the condition of trade a sound one, and everything was going well. Sir, I take issue in the strongest possible manner with the hon. gentleman. I do not mean to say that to-day in Canada we have reached the last stage of degradation."

The hon. gentleman was asked where all this degradation was, and he replied:

"From one end of Ontario to the other, in what were the most prosperous portions of Canada."

Again, he says:

"Well, Sir, after all said and done, why should our hon. friend desire reciprocity so long as the Government has funds? So long as the till is full that is all that the hon. gentleman feels bound to regard. It is no concern of his, it is no concern of his colleagues, it is no concern of his colleagues' paymasters and bottle-holders, how the mass of the people fare."

Sir, that is a very fine picture to draw of Canada and the Government. Then he goes on to say, and I wish hon. gentlemen opposite to notice this particularly:

"Sir, I hope and trust that the anticipations of the hon. gentleman as to a good harvest, may be fulfilled. I hope and trust that all over this country there will be a good harvest, although I am bound to say that the accounts which have reached me do not entirely confirm the statement which I understood the hon. gentleman to make."

You see the hon. gentleman is taking the pessimistic view. Then he says:

"Certain towns and cities have done well so far, although it is extremely likely they will speedily experience a check."

Then he draws a most doleful picture :

"I tell the hon. gentleman this, that were an honest national balance sheet to be struck, were we to set on one side the additional national debt, the additional municipal debt, the additional provincial debt, the additional railway debt, the immense depreciation of farm property in all the older provinces of Canada, the immense depreciation in the value of real estate in almost all the towns and villages in Canada during the last twelve years, and were we to put on the other side all that can be imagined as to the growth of wealth in a few hands, and as to the growth of wealth in two or three pet towns and cities—if such a statement were made, the result would be a demonstration that we have made no progress at all during the last twelve years in national wealth ; at the best we have been but marking time."

I have but one more selection to read from the speech of the hon. gentleman. Talking about chattel mortgages, he says :

"If that proportion be extended to the other counties, it means that in prosperous Ontario, a county which, under good government, under honest government, ought to be among the most prosperous sections, not merely of North America, but of the world, one farmer in every twelve is reduced to the extremest distress, is hoisting what is a true equivalent to the black flag."

Now, Sir, I will ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, whether this is a true picture of Canada to-day, whether it gives a true representation to people outside of the country, in England, in the States, in other parts of the world ? I think not. I prefer the picture drawn by the hon. Minister of Finance, a picture which I maintain is not at all exaggerated, but which represents the true condition of affairs. I shall read a very few selections from that speech to confirm what I have said. The hon. Minister of Finance says :

"The decrease in trade with some of these countries was because of reasons which I have previously stated, and I may say as well in this connection, that carrying out the promise of the preceding year, the current year which we have now completed will show, not a slight but a large degree of increase of exports over the very large increase of the previous year. Our home trade, taking our country through so far as it appears to one looking with a broad glance at it, is, on the whole, in sound condition. Some branches of our industries are flourishing, while others are not so fortunate in that respect. But taking it all in all, I think it is an opinion which will be borne out by financial men, that the trade condition of the country is a sound one if it is not a very flourishing one. Our inter-provincial trade, which year by year has been becoming more and more a factor and an incident of our development, has its steady increase, and although we have not at hand an unerring means of denoting by statistical records what the exact increase in volume of this trade is, yet from certain large indications that we get we are assured that it is a constantly increasing factor, and that it carries with it all that increased energy and life and prosperity which comes from such a branch of industry."

Then the hon. Minister of Finance says again :

"I think we can congratulate ourselves upon the buoyant nature of the revenue of the past financial year, a revenue the largest in the history of this country, a revenue which did not come from increased taxation as a result of changes and additions to the tariff, but which is an evidence of the power of the people to buy, and consequently marks to a certain extent their prosperity and the soundness of their financial condition."

He adds further :

"I think we may say that we have a happy, a united, a progressive, and a right-minded people, who are glad to live in this country and under these institutions, who have a hopeful regard with reference to the future, and who are full of progress and activity at present."

And with reference to our exports, he says :

"And I do not fear to assert and stake my reputation on the future turn of events, when I say that, just as that market which, for live stock, cheese and certain other commodities, was a few years ago, very limited and has since expanded until to-day it gives to our trade millions of dollars and the certainty of remunerative prices, so it will, in regard to these other articles, follow the same line and be productive of equal profit to this country."

I have only two more selections to read from what follows :

"It, therefore, appears that the statement I made in this House three years ago, and which met with severe ridicule from hon. gentlemen opposite, comes out very nearly verified. I stated that I thought by 1891 an equilibrium ought to be had between the expense and income, taking in capital expenditure as well as expenditure on Consolidated Fund account, and this has taken place with the simple exception of $3,170, which is merely nominal."

Then, referring to the debt of the country, he says :

"The average *per capita* on the net debt, which is the burden of the debt on the people as shown by the payment for interest, was, in 1887-88, 1·79 ; in 1888-89, 1·74 ; in 1889-90, 1·65, or only 6 cents more per head than it was in 1879, before the Canadian Pacific Railway was begun to be built or the vast expenditure on canals was made."

I have read these selections from these speeches to show the difference in the picture of this country as presented by hon. gentlemen on this side compared with that presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, and to confirm what I have said regarding the gloomy and despairing view of our country taken by the Opposition. In reading over the selections from the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I ask myself what must be the effect of these speeches abroad and what must be their effect at home. I thought, if such speeches are read by young Canadians, who are ambitious to get on, they would say : This is no country for us, a country that is sinking down lower and lower is a country we must leave ; and such speeches would have the effect of driving Canadians out of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have many times complained that people were not coming into our country as fast as had been predicted by hon. gentlemen on this side. I believe the reason why many have not come is that they have read the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford and the articles in the organs of the Opposition. I know that if I was living in England, Ireland or Scotland, or in any other country of the old world, and was looking out for a country to go to, I would, after reading the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford, say that Canada is a country I must keep away from, because I have no wish to go to a country where people are hanging out the black flag, where they are burdened down with mortgages, where distress is visible on every hand. But I deny the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I believe that his view of the situation is not taken by very many members on his own side of the House. When I read these selections from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, I was reminded of a story I once heard about a missionary from India, who attended a dinner in the city of London, England, and at this dinner was a certain officer who had also spent some time in India. The missionary was talking about his work in that country, and the officer said : I have lived in India many years and have been round the people a great deal, but do not believe that missionaries do much good there, because in all my travels I never saw a single convert. The missionary was nonplussed, but controlled himself and said not a word, patiently waiting his opportunity. After a while the

officer began to talk about tigers, and his exploits chasing these animals. The missionary quietly said: I have lived in India many years and have travelled around a great deal, yet in all my travels I never saw a tiger; and he came to the conclusion that people only saw what they looked for. The hon. member for South Oxford, in looking over this country, seeks for depression and mortgages and chattel mortgages, and wants to see these things, in order to show the people that they are being ruined by this Government. It is all done for party effect, but I think it is not at all patriotic. I think it is the very opposite, and I do not approve of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, because it is not a patriotic policy. I say that this policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their gloomy and despairing speeches, have the very effect of preventing any good trade relations being made with the United States. I maintain that their speeches lead the people on the other side of the line to think that we must come some day and ask to be annexed to that country. I had occasion to spend a short time in the State of California, and while I was there I made several friends, and many of them asked me: Do you not think Canada will soon be annexed to the United States. I said: "No." They were surprised, as they thought there was a strong annexationist sentiment on this side. My children were there attending school, and the teacher taught in the school that Canada would soon be annexed to the United States; and not only that, but on a holiday there, Washington's birthday, they had a celebration in which a great many ladies belonging to the school were dressed to represent the different states of the Union; and at one part of the performance a young lady came representing Canada, and asked if she would not be admitted. I mention these facts to show that the people of the United States, many of them, do think that in a short time we must come into the Union, and, therefore, they do not care to make a treaty with Canada at all. Where do they get this idea? Not, I am sure, from any speeches made on this side; not from any speeches made by Conservatives, not from any articles written in Conservative organs, but from speeches made by gentlemen on the other side, representing this country as going down so fast that it will soon be willing to drop into the arms of the Americans. After all, Sir, annexation is the logical inference to be drawn from the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, if the United States are so prosperous as hon. gentlemen opposite keep repeating to us they are, and if we are so impoverished, if in the United States prosperity reigns supreme at all times and everybody becomes rich and there are no depressions, and if Canada is going fast to ruin, what better could we do than to join with them; and the people of the United States see that and argue from that point, and judge entirely Canada from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal-Conservative party does not believe in the ruin and despair cry. We have faith in our country. There are not so many millionaires here as in the United States, but I do not believe that is any disadvantage. I believe that, take the masses of the people all over the country, and I have had some opportunities of observation, they are as prosperous as the people of the United States. Our record in the past few years has not been one of standing still. I might point to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I might point to the many towns which to-day are growing rapidly. I have in my mind to-day one town which is rapidly advancing, which I have occasion sometimes to see, and I do not doubt many other towns all over the country are advancing just as rapidly. Our prospects for the future are bright. We have a great deal to contend with, there is no doubt of that, but Canadians are not easily daunted, and what we want at the present time is a rest from new schemes and new plans. I believe these new schemes have been a great drawback to the country. The country is frequently agitated by one thing and another being brought forward in order to disquiet the people. What we want is a progressive and economical Government, and that I believe we have, and, if we wish to succeed, the people must have what gentlemen on this side of the House have, faith in our country and a patriotic desire to serve it.

Mr. FLINT. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, listened as I did with a great deal of interest to the very straightforward and pleasing address of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Craig), but I have no doubt that you, like myself, were somewhat surprised and perhaps pained to learn that so patriotic a gentleman is educating his children in the neighbouring republic, and that these interesting scions of his flock are growing up amid such dangerous surroundings. I have no doubt that my hon. friend, who has no greater admirer in this House than myself, will soon withdraw his children from such dangerous associations and will bring them up more correctly from a political point of view. The bulk of his remarks in reference to the trade policy of the country will doubtless be more or less extensively referred to by other speakers, and I will not, therefore, dwell at length upon his speech in that respect. The first observation I refer to is not peculiar to the hon. gentleman himself, but has, I believe, been dwelt upon with more or less effusiveness and declamation, in proportion to the disposition and temperament of the speaker, by every hon. gentleman on the other side who has addressed the House, and that refers to the relations of the Liberal party to the neighbouring republic. The opinion is advanced without hesitation on the other side of the House and has been elaborated by almost every speaker on that side, that the leaders of the Liberal party and the bulk of the Liberal party are at heart annexationists, and that the whole tendency of their policy is to bring about political union with the United States. Of course we do not expect those hon. gentlemen to produce evidence of this. They produce what they think is evidence, but it can be easily shown that the few scraps of what they call evidence are unworthy of the attention of any candid mind. The House must have been amused at the solemn manner in which that eloquent gentleman, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), warned this House against the machinations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his friends. He was followed by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), whose abilities are known and respected in this House, and who, notwithstanding the calm and deliberate manner in which he gave his views, uttered them with a force and an intensity which probably gave more weight to

them than if they had come from almost any other member of this House. The hon. member said, referring to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) :

"The hon. gentleman tells us that he has read the speech three times, has read it from beginning to end, that he only regretted that time did not permit him to read it in this House. No doubt the House would be glad to hear that speech, but the hon. gentleman can have it printed and circulated throughout the country. I will give the hon. gentleman another suggestion. He may perhaps have read the whole proceeding at that meeting. He may have read the speech delivered by Governor Bullock on that occasion, when he said that the object the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was advocating could best be accomplished by making that hon. gentleman a Senator for the State of Ontario. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should incorporate Governor Bullock's speech in his pamphlet. There was another speech delivered on that occasion to which I would also invite the hon. gentleman's attention, as it may have escaped him. That is the speech delivered by the chairman of that meeting. The chairman said :

"'Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley in Nova Scotia; Davies, in Prince Edward Island; Mercier and Laurier in Quebec; Cartwright in Ontario, look to us, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer.'"

I desire to say, and I think I am speaking the unanimous sentiments of the members on this side of the House, that we recognize in the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) not only an able and consistent but a truly patriotic public man, and that we fail to discover in any line that he has addressed either to the people of Canada or the people of the United States, either at banquets in the United States, or in this House, or on the hustings, or the public platform in the late campaign, anything which will give cause for the animadversions which have been cast upon him. I have carefully studied the course of that hon. gentleman, and I believe there is no more devoted servant of the people of Canada, no truer friend of the best interests of the people of Canada, than the hon. member for South Oxford. I defy any hon. gentleman opposite, by any fair mode of criticism, to place his finger upon one syllable or one line which will give colour to their contentions in respect of his loyalty to Canada and its people. Though it may take some time, I propose to read those portions of the speeches at the meeting in Boston which have been so severely animadverted upon. The banquet was given by some of the prominent merchants of Boston for the purpose of promoting reciprocity in trade between this country and the United States. That was the object of the meeting. A great many very influential gentlemen were invited to attend it. It was presided over by one of the foremost merchants of Boston, the Hon. Jonathan Lane, who is well known in many of the cities in this country. The first speaker called upon was the Hon. Henry H. Sprague, president of the State Senate of Massachusetts, who, after referring to the general trade relations which the United States had with several countries, said :

"The people of Massachusetts especially rejoice to clasp the hands of their neighbours to the north and the south, who share the same desires for constitutional liberty."

That is, that those in Canada share the same feelings and desires for constitutional liberty in Canada as those to the south do in their respective countries.—

"For that liberty protected by law which our ancestors sought to secure, and which promotes the political, social and material welfare of all the people. Difference of climate, of geographical position, of race, make our fruits, our products, our manufactures often diverse, but a common continent and common wants and common aspirations unite us by ties stronger than those of race or climate. And so the merchants of Boston and all the citizens of Massachusetts cordially sympathize with the recent efforts which have been made to strengthen the bonds of brotherhood between the nations of this continent, to open great highways by land and by sea from Hudson Bay to Cape Horn, and to unite all the people——"

To unite the people in political union? No, but—

—"to unite the people in friendly and commercial alliance. They believe that locomotives and ships are the messengers of peace, and steel rails the bonds of friendship."

Do gentlemen opposite deny these statements? Are they prepared to say that there is one syllable in the observations of the President of the State Senate, which looks even remotely to political union? He went on to say :

"I assure your guests that the state unites with you——"

The hon. member for South Oxford was one of the guests.—

—"in welcoming them here to-night in the bonds of reciprocal interests and extend to them its heartiest hospitality."

The speech following was by a prominent alderman of the city of Boston, Mr. Carruth, and he stated, after his introduction by the president, that it was an agreeable duty to him to extend to the honoured guests the welcome of the city of Boston. He went on to say :

"To our friends and the representatives of our kith and kin beyond our northern frontier, partners with ourselves in the development of this magnificent continent, I bid a most hearty welcome. To our brothers from our sister commonwealths of the south who have been the promoters of that magnificent development of that section which causes a joy and rejoicing to every true American heart (applause) I bid, also, a most hearty welcome. Mr. President, the merchants of Boston are practically a unit in favour of a larger and a freer, and in fact the freest possible trade with our neighbours of Canada and of Mexico."

Will hon. gentlemen opposite stand up and say that there is a scheme going on for the political union of Mexico with the United states, and that the speeches at this meeting which were to promote reciprocal trade, had also the underhand design of promoting the political union with the United States, of Cuba, of the South American Republics?—for the observations in the speeches and the addresses made at the meeting treated Canada in precisely the same terms and in the same language as they treated these other great states and republics in various portions of the world with which they were seeking reciprocal trade relations. The president finally addressed the meeting in introducing the honoured guest of the evening, and if there is one line or syllable in the whole of his address which even remotely looks to political union, I, for one, would be thankful, and I believe gentlemen on this side of the House would be thankful, if those who are so constantly quoting from that speech, giving shreds and patches here and there from his remarks, would quote a word or two, which looked even remotely to a connection of a political character between Canada and the United States. At the risk of being tedious, I will read quite extensively from the remarks of the president of that meeting. He says :

"And now, gentlemen, we are about to present to you one of the most eminent of the Liberal party of Canada, and the subject upon which he will speak—'the unrestricted exchange of all the products of both countries'—will insure to the man and the cause alike your instant

appreciative and, I trust, enthusiastic confidence and good-will."

The "cause" that he refers to, the cause that all the speakers at the banquet are referring to, is not political union, to which there is not an allusion or a hint, but the cause is unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States.—

"Indeed, I may say that the Liberal Englishman is an old friend to all of us. He makes us recall those early days when on the school-house rostrum we declaimed the stirring words of Isaac Barre and Edmund Burke, those ancient Whigs and Liberals of the days of George III. And in our own generation how thoroughly identified he is in our minds with his contemporaries in the mother country, Bright, Foster, Cobden, Tom Hughes (your illustrious townsman), Goldwin Smith, and a host of others, who saw so much clearer and wiser the nature of the conflict in our great civil war, and to whom north and south are alike indebted for its safe issue.

"In this presence may I not appropriately add that we deem it just to include in the great political influences which in this struggle we count on the Liberal side, the steady, sagacious mind, and the truth-discerning womanly heart of England's illustrious Queen."

Is that a sentiment expressed by the chairman of this meeting which would not be received with rapturous applause by any audience in the Dominion of Canada, that he counted in favour of reciprocal trade relations and the cultivation of this brotherly feeling between the two countries which was alluded to throughout the meeting, upon the noble influence of the Queen of England? Would any man, standing before an intelligent and cultivated audience in the Athens of America, venture to treat his Canadian guests with that disrespect which would be implied in his alluding to political union? He goes on to say:

"The situation and the question, so far as Canada is concerned, are not what they were three years ago, when on this spot we had so vigorous and varied a discussion of the subject, which we then called 'better commercial relations with Canada,' with special reference to the fishery difficulty.

"There has been a great onward movement in the public mind. Nobody here thinks of a new treaty, and, although the Conservative party of Canada may cling to that hope, it is in vain. Note Mr. Blaine's reply to Representative Baker in this morning's papers. A free exchange of all products is the simple plan embodied in that well-known resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and now lying on the Speaker's table of the House of Representatives at Washington."

He goes on, speaking of this Bill:

"If it shall pass both Houses of Congress it would become the vital issue in the next general election in Canada."

Then comes in the quotation that has been harped upon by intelligent and educated gentlemen on the other side of the House, that has been torn entirely from its context and read to this House time and again as if it referred to political union. Immediately after referring to the resolution which was reported to the House of Representatives, and which lay upon the table of the House of Representatives at that moment, he says:

"Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley of Nova Scotia, Davies of Prince Edward Island, Mercier and Laurier of Quebec, Cartwright of Ontario, and a host besides, look to us, the people of the United States, for 'the sign by which they shall conquer.' Can we deny them?"

And yet gentlemen sitting in this House have the assurance to quote this language away from its context, as if the eloquent chairman of that meeting was referring to some scheme of political union between this country and the United States. The remark made in that connection by the chairman of that meeting was perfectly just and proper. If we, upon this side of the line, are looking for better trade relations than hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to ask for or to seek, then is it not perfectly justifiable that we should look to the merchants of the United States, that we should look to influential members of Congress of the United States, for the sign by which we should endeavour to encourage our own people in the hope and expectation that we could secure the relations that we believe to be most favourable to the interests of the people of this country? Are we not constantly taunted from the other side of the House, and upon every political platform in the Dominion, that we have no evidence that the people of the United States would ever accept unrestricted reciprocity? Are we not told time and again that we are seeking an illusion, that we are chasing a will-o'-the-wisp, that the people of the United States will have nothing whatever to do with our scheme? I could give hundreds of quotations, if time permitted, from public men and from the press of the United States, which show abundant signs that we have great reason to expect that the people of that country will go in for full and unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries. But the chairman went on further to speak of the Dominion of Canada:

"The whole region of Canada will, when this commercial union is established, become as if she were so many vast territories added to our domain."

And yet hon. gentlemen take this from its context and state that it refers to a political union. There is not a syllable in all the speeches made on that occasion to give any hint that any such meaning was intended. Canada was to be added commercially to their domains. Is not the opposite entirely true, that if we, under a treaty of reciprocity of any kind, are added to the domain of the United States for commercial purposes, then the whole vast continent of the United States is added to our domain likewise, and because we commercially add a population of 65,000,000 to our domain for commercial purposes, are we therefore disloyal to the people of Canada, disloyal to the manufacturers of Canada, or disloyal to any interest of Canada? I think, on the other hand, it is clear we are most loyal to the true interests of the Dominion of Canada and of every man seeking to obtain a livelihood in this country. He adds:

"This plan does not mean Customs union."

Mr. Lane's opinion is in direct opposition to the opinion advanced by many hon. gentlemen opposite. He says:

"The Custom-houses are likely for a time at least to remain, and so far as importations of non-American goods and products are concerned, can well frame a tariff to meet her needs."

These are the views of the chairman of the meeting, a man of great intelligence and wide influence. He also went on to speak in high terms of a gentleman connected with this House at one time, and of Conservative leanings, and he spoke highly of the late Senator Macdonald, of Toronto. He alludes to another matter:

"We are not unmindful of the fact that the agricultural interests of this country are claimed to be opposed to this Canadian reciprocity."

I believe that is correct. I have quotations which I may read to show that the great obstacles which we have to meet, and the great obstacles which the Government will have to meet, even in their partial

reciprocity, are the objections made by the agricultural interests of the United States. And the reason why the agriculturists of the United States are imbued with these objections are the very reasons which are actuating hon. gentlemen opposite to oppose reciprocity in natural products. They are saying of the farmers of Canada precisely what hon. gentlemen opposite are saying of the farmers of the United States. Both of these statements cannot be true. Either the farm products of the United States are so much cheaper than our own, that they will come in and ruin our farmers, or the farm products of Canada are so much cheaper that they will flood the United States and reduce the prices of farm products in that country. We will leave hon. gentlemen opposite to argue themselves out of the dilemma in which this statement places them. He goes on to say:

"To this demonstration against Canada we reply: These votes against Canadian reciprocity, by the returns, are shown to have come from the farmers of New England and the Middle States, a majority of whom, no doubt, honestly imagine they will lose a real present advantage, while the central, north-western, western, Pacific and great southern states either are not heard from to any extent in this tabulated statement or vote the other way. Again, I beg to suggest what would be the probable result of the same enquiry, put to vote among the 1,250,000 people living in the cities alone of this commonwealth."

There is no doubt of the substantial truth of this statement. The agricultural products of the Dominion will be sold to a very large extent in the great cities which are located and developing along and near the boundary between the United States and Canada. Then, after the observations made by those gentlemen on commercial topics alone, without the slightest allusion being made to political topics, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose to accept the honours which were conferred on him by that fine meeting. I must say that I am surprised that hon. gentlemen of the education, of the talent, and of the influence of some of those who have spoken on the other side of the House, should have referred to the able, masterly, statesmanlike and patriotic speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, delivered in that distant city, in the terms they have used. One would suppose the hon. member for South Oxford had offered to sell his country, to give it away freely to the United States, and had generally acted the part of a craven and a traitor before an alien people. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) used very strong language in reference to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford on that occasion. I will read a few remarks from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, although they may have been read already, because I think any candid student of these speeches could not find in it any statement which would convey the idea that the hon. member was less patriotic than the most burning patriot on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman opened his observations by stating that this matter of reciprocity between the two countries had two aspects, a business aspect, and a political aspect, and speaking to an assemblage of business men he would only speak of its business aspect. Consequently, throughout the whole of the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, it must be borne in mind that he was speaking solely and purely upon the business aspect of unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States. He says:

"As to the advantages which perfect free trade with the United States would confer on Canada it is not necessary for me to speak here. It is pretty certain you all entertain a wholesome belief that it would be a very fine thing for Canada, and I will not dispute the fact—on the contrary, I recognize it fully and frankly. Only while I admit it will be a good thing for us, I think I can show that it will also be a good thing for you."

He continues:

"But of late, Sir, there has been a curious inversion of ideas, the old doctrine, of which I confess myself an humble believer, was that all true commerce was a mutually profitable exchange."

But hon. gentlemen opposite are arguing constantly as if they believed that trade and commerce meant loss to the purchaser inevitably, and inevitably loss either to the purchaser or to the seller. They speak of a certain amount of purchase of goods by the people of Canada from the people of the United States as if it meant some great sacrifice and loss, as if a purchaser would purchase one dollar's worth if it was not to afford him either some fancied or some real profit, either some pleasure to the imagination or some actual physical benefit to himself personally. All trade, then, must be considered as mutually profitable to the buyer as well as to the seller, to the consumer as well as to the producer. He continues:

"By which both parties benefited, and that the fewer obstacles between such exchange the richer the world would be."

He went on in eloquent and strong terms, that I need not quote here, to elaborate this thought. He says:

"Sir, I have no wish to mislead you. The trade of the United States is certainly worth more to us collectively than ours is to them. That is a manifest truth. But so is this also—free trade with Canada will benefit quite as many of the people of the United States as of the people of Canada, and to quite as large an extent. Man for man, you will gain quite as much as we will, and Canada does not come as a beggar, asking for the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. Canada offers and Canada desires only a fair exchange and no robbery, and I for one am as anxious as yourselves that in such exchange you make dollar for dollar, because I know well that thus, and thus only, can any lasting and permanent arrangement be secured."

For about two pages in the most eloquent eulogy I ever read of the resources, of the hopes, of the aspirations, of the boundless capacity and ability of the people of Canada, the hon. member for South Oxford regaled that influential and intelligent assembly. He spoke of what Canada had to offer by way of trade, of her mighty water stretches, of her great resources in the North-West, of her fisheries, of her mines, of her shipping and her agriculture, and he painted Canada as she has never before been pictured to the American mind, probably in language not surpassed since the famous speech of the famous Nova Scotian orator at Detroit. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite stand up and say the hon. member for South Oxford and his followers are always preaching blue ruin and taking a pessimistic and gloomy view of the situation. I could quote from the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford, if time permitted, and if it were appropriate, more eloquent remarks on the resources, and abilities, and energies, and hopes, and aspirations of Canada, than could be cited from all the observations made from the other side of the House during the last ten years. Speaking of Canada, after enlarging on her resources, he says:

"I think I may claim that we have something to give as well as you, and that there is very good reason to think that between two such countries as yours and ours there is room for much profitable exchange. As to who on your side would profit most, I cannot speak as to the future. But in the present, I take it the immediate gainers would be, first, the whole northern belt of states which adjoin the Dominion of Canada, and second and especially the group of North-Eastern States, of which your good city of Boston may fairly be called the commercial capital. The advantages of your position for securing a very large part of our trade are great. You own, as I have said, much of our mineral wealth. Many of our chief trade routes centre here. You are the natural shipping port, especially in winter, for very large sections of our territory. You lie within very easy distances of our chief cities, and of the most populous portions of our Dominion. In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position in some respects of a frontier city, with no great extent of trade territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you."

And yet, gentlemen on the other side of the House have quoted these words, as if they meant that the city of Boston, that the States of New England, and that the entrepot of New York were to take away the trade of the whole Dominion of Canada. They quoted these remarks as if they meant ruin and decay to the people of the Dominion of Canada, instead of signifying as they do the upbuilding of vast industries, the incoming of unnumbered thousands, the development of the mines to an unlimited extent, and the awakening up of the whole of the Dominion of Canada, to new hopes, new life and new possibilities. Gentlemen on the other side of the House take a narrow, a dismal, and a hopeless view of the situation under reciprocal trade arrangements. If there were any charges of narrowness to be made, I think we could easily show that these charges could be levelled with great force against gentlemen on the other side of the House. They do not seem to appreciate the position under free trade: they are looking upon the state of things which would exist under a full measure of reciprocity, with narrow and purblind vision. They seem to think they will then be living under the stagnant and restricted conditions under which we are living at present, when, on the contrary, the whole continent will be awakened into new life and vitality, when our railways, our canals and our water reaches will be alive with traffic, and all kinds of unlimited possibilities are opened up by this free, full, easy and natural interchange of all products between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. I might here refer to the speech of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in which he took the same despondent line of argument, and in which he referred to the leaders of the Liberal party in this House, and to some who professed to act with the Liberal party outside of this House, but who are not the exponents or spokesmen of the Liberal party. He spoke of the visits of politicians and others from the Dominion of Canada to the United States; he referred to letters passing back and forth, and he indicated that they were signals directing how the plot was going on to annex this country to the United States, and that these interchanges of communications were nothing but signals thrown out by which these conspirators and plotters could betray their country. I can tell the hon. gentleman that all that has been done by the public men of the two countries has been done openly and above board, and I will quote some of the remarks made by prominent politicians on the other side of the line, in connection with this subject, to prove to him what is intended by the leading men on both sides of the line. We have the reports of Congressional Committees on this subject, and let us glance at them to see how far the insinuations, for they are nothing else: how far the suspicions, for they are nothing else: how far the fears, for they are nothing else, of hon. gentlemen opposite are supported by the remarks of gentlemen on the other side of the line, who spoke on the question of reciprocity between these two great countries. The resolution moved by Mr. Butterworth of the United States Congress was called "A Bill to provide for full reciprocity between the United States and the Dominion of Canada." The preamble recited amongst other things:

"Whereas controversies have arisen and are now existing between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, growing out of the construction of treaties affecting fishing interests; and whereas, by reason of the contiguity of the two countries and the similarity of the interests and occupations of the people thereof, it is desired by the United States to remove all existing controversies and all causes of controversy in the future, and to promote and encourage business and commercial intercourse between the people of both countries, and to promote harmony between the two Governments, and to enable the citizens of each to trade with the citizens of the other without restriction, and irrespective of boundaries, as fully and freely as though there was no boundary line between the two countries: Therefore, be it enacted that when it shall be certified to the President of the United States by the proper officials of the Government of the said Dominion of Canada that the said last-named Government, by Act of Parliament, has authorized the admission into the ports of said Government of all articles of trade and commerce produced in the United States, free of duty, the President shall make proclamation thereof, and shall likewise proclaim that all articles produced in the said Dominion of Canada shall be admitted into all the ports of the United States free of duty, and such articles shall be so admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty so long as the said Dominion of Canada shall admit the products of the United States, as herein provided for, into her ports free of duty. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President of the United States, in connection with the proper officials of the Government of the said Dominion of Canada, to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, and to protect the said respective Governments against the importation of foreign goods through either, into the other; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall furnish to the Customs officers of the United States such rules and regulations for the purpose of guiding them in the discharge of their duties in respect to the protection of each of the said Governments against improper importation of foreign goods as herein contemplated."

Could anything be more laudable on the part of the United States than that? We have a formal letter written by Mr. Hitt on this subject, and we see that, throughout the whole of that letter, dealing very thoroughly with this question, there is no allusion, no intimation, that political union is looked to or intended:

"Partial arrangements and half-way measures must fail hereafter, as they have all failed heretofore, and troubles arise again. The reason lies in the position and circumstances of the two nations. Canada, however large it may appear on the map, is really a long, unequal strip of population, extending from east to west thousands of miles, everywhere right beside us. The portions or provinces along the line differ widely, in many respects, but they agree in this, that they seem to be less to each other than to the states close at hand.

"The natural lines of commerce for the exchange of products are not so much east and west as north and south. It is the unlike products coming from different latitudes that seek exchange. Intercourse, active and profitable, there will always be between this country and Canada. Restrictions irritate, and are always liable to breed troubles. Now, if they can be removed without injury to either party the Canadian question will disappear, and two harmonious peoples will flourish beside each other with mutual good-will and respect."

Does that look like a scheme to mingle those two harmonious people into one nation? He goes on to say:

"Many of our people distrust reciprocity treaties and changing revenue laws by diplomacy. That is the proper work of Congress, and of Congress alone. Some would fear that a common tariff with a foreign country would make the whole system unchangeable in any particular without the consent of both, and thus practically put it beyond the power of Congress, where the constitution puts it. But we can at any time withdraw from a commercial union if it works unfairly, and no power can be taken from Congress, or be even limited, except by the action of Congress itself. Perhaps a vague apprehension of annexation would be felt, but with general discussion of the subject, and its business aspects, this would disappear. They would soon realize that our citizens are no longer eager to incorporate new peoples. * * *"

If time permitted I could give a large number of quotations from the statements and writings of leading men of the United States, who favour reciprocity solely upon the grounds of its commercial advantages, of its removing all causes of dispute between this country and Great Britain, or between Great Britain and the United States, and its creating a brotherhood of nations upon this continent. While upon this subject it may perhaps be well to finish my remarks which come within the limit and scope of the argument I intend to propose to-night, on the whole question of loyalty or disloyalty as connected with reciprocity. It has been pointed out from this side of the House, how absurd and ridiculous it is to say that upon one side of a trade line, you will find loyalty, and by the addition or subtraction of some other elements in that trade, you will find the most blatant disloyalty. The subject of reciprocity between Canada and the United States is one of the most familiar to the political student of Canadian history. From 1854 to 1866, we had a reciprocity treaty which on all hands was acknowledged to have been of great advantage to the Dominion of Canada, and on many hands, to have been of great advantage to the United States. After that treaty expired, negotiations were on foot, on four or five separate occasions, looking to a renewal of that treaty, with extensions and modifications, as suggested by the Government preceding the late elections. I would like to call the attention of the House to the very peculiar circumstance, that the predecessors of the Liberal Government, led by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), actually entered into negotiations, through formal channels, with the people of the United States, for the very unrestricted reciprocity that the Liberals upon this side of the House now advocate; in fact that they entered into negotiations for reciprocity of a character more open to criticism than that which the Liberal party to-day is advocating in this House and in the country. In 1870 Mr. Huntington moved a resolution demanding the right on the part of the Dominion of Canada to negotiate treaties on its own behalf, and also in favour of more extended commercial relations with other portions of the world, including the United States of America. In the course of his very able speech, Mr. Huntington said:

"I say that in the preliminary negotiations between the Hon. Mr. Rose and Mr. Secretary Fish it was agreed that the manufactures of both countries should be admitted duty free, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it. * * * It was the intention of the Government to include the manufactures of the United States in the preliminary agreement for reciprocal trade. * * * I was placed in possession of these facts."

Mr. FLINT.

This startled the House somewhat, because the public were generally unaware that such negotiations had been entered into. Sir Francis Hincks stated that the hon. gentleman had been misinformed as to the scope of the negotiations. The Hon. Mr. Huntington then repeated his statement, and Sir John Macdonald stated in reply:

"The communications were altogether unofficial and confidential, and the hon. Minister of Finance would be guilty of a breach of honour, &c., if he revealed confidential communications, unless he had the consent of the parties."

The Hon. Mr. Huntington nevertheless repeated and insisted upon his statement. The Hon. Mr. Dorion, since deceased, then advocated a large measure of reciprocity between the two countries, looking to an exchange of manufactured goods as well as natural products. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, during the same debate, referred to the arrangement proposed in 1865, mentioned by Mr. Huntington, and stated that, in his opinion, the Government of the day had gone too far in seeking reciprocity of the character they had. Sir John Macdonald stated that it was not the Canadian Government which had sought the extended reciprocity alluded to, but that it had been proposed by the United States Minister, the Hon. Mr. McCullough, the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Mackenzie said:

"The hon. gentleman will not get away from me in that way. There was a Minute of Council which I saw when I was invited to join the Government—which proposed a system of reciprocal legislation."

He went on to say:

"What I wish to point out is: that this hon. gentleman at that time was willing to go beyond his powers in order to accomplish by unlimited reciprocal legislation the objects which a treaty would otherwise have obtained."

The subject then seemed to pass from discussion. There was the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Huntington that in the negotiations between the Conservative Government of that day and the United States Government, the former had offered to admit United States' manufactures free of duty on reciprocal terms, together with assimilation of the Excise and Customs tariffs of the two countries, the enlargement of the canals, and a joint arrangement for the management and keeping in repair of the canals, and other particulars; but the matter had to rest on the assertions of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and the Hon. Mr. Huntington on the one hand, and the partial denials of the late Premier on the other hand. In 1875 this whole subject was revived by the late Hon. George Brown in the Senate of Canada; and I will quote at length the language he used on that occasion in describing the nature of the negotiations which had been undertaken. Mr. Brown said, confirming the statements of Messrs. Huntington and Mackenzie:

"Since 1866 there have been several negotiations with the United States for the renewal of the old treaty. * * In the negotiations of 1865-66 for a renewal of the treaty, offers were made to the American Government by our then Finance Minister, Sir A. T. Galt, which, in my opinion, ought not to have been made. The Government then existing in Canada was the Coalition Government, formed in 1864 for the special purpose of carrying Confederation of the whole British North American provinces. I was a member of that Government, and, as is well known, it was in consequence of the policy adopted by my hon. colleagues in the conduct of the reciprocity negotiations, that I felt compelled to resign my position as President of the Executive Council. I resigned because I felt very strongly that though we in Canada derived great advantage from the treaty of 1854, the American people derived still greater advantage from it. I had no objection to that, and was quite ready to renew the old treaty, or even to extend

it largely on fair terms of reciprocity. But I was not willing to ask for a renewal as a favour to Canada—I was not willing to offer special inducements for renewal, without fair concessions in return—I was not willing that the canals and inland waters of Canada should be made the joint property of the United States and Canada, and be maintained at their joint expense. I was not willing that the Customs and Excise duties of Canada should be assimilated to the prohibitory rates of the United States, and very especially was I unwilling that any such arrangement should be entered into with the United States, dependent on the frail tenure of reciprocal legislation, repealable at any moment at the caprice of either party. * * * My colleagues determined to proceed in the manner I deprecated: I could not be responsible for such a policy, and to avoid responsibility for it I resigned office. * * * More than one effort was made by the late Government for the renewal of the old treaty between 1866 and 1869. In 1869 formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government, and the project of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. This project included the cession, for a term of years, of our fisheries to the United States; the enlargement and enjoyment of our canals; the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence; the assimilation of our Customs and Excise duties; the concession of an import duty equal to the internal revenue taxes of the United States; and the free admission into either country of certain manufactures of the other. This negotiation ended abruptly in March, 1870, but it is instructive to observe * * * the Government has always held the most liberal views as to the considerations in any treaty of reciprocity."

What will the country and this House think of hon. gentlemen who are now so vigorously denouncing as traitors of the blackest dye men who are proposing a scheme of reciprocity by no means as extensive as that proposed by Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues on two occasions to the Government of the United States—a scheme wherein they offered and pressed their offer, notwithstanding the warnings of the Hon. George Brown and his resignation—not for a treaty for a definite term of years, with powers of extension, not a treaty which must be adhered to only so long as the terms were kept by the two countries, but a scheme of reciprocal legislation by which the Customs and Excise taxes were to be assimilated, and canals enlarged and managed jointly by the Governments of the two countries? And I venture to say, from the temper that I have noticed on the part of a large number of Conservatives of the Dominion of Canada for the last few years, that if the present Government were now to wheel around and accept such a proposition as this, their supporters would follow them blindly without a word of remonstrance. At any rate, the whole Conservative party of that day, for the purpose of building up this Confederation, among its first acts, pressed upon the United States Government a scheme of reciprocity infinitely more dangerous, even from their own standpoint, than the scheme of reciprocity advocated on this side of the House on the present occasion; and I would like to know how hon. gentlemen opposite, having this piece of history in their minds, are able to laud to the skies the patriotism and the nobility of character of their late lamented leader, and in the same breath denounce the hon. member for South Oxford as the craven of cravens for advocating a scheme of reciprocity infinitely superior to the scheme proposed by the Government of that day. But hon. gentlemen insist and continue to insist that at the present time they are united, that they are a happy family, that they know exactly what they want, that they have definite views on all these subjects, and have always had them. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in his able speech, said that the Government, as far back as 1878, when in Opposition, had well-defined views as to what they wanted and the results to which their policy would lead. But, Sir, we had the strange spectacle no later than last session, or, at any rate, the session before, of a Government openly divided against itself—of leading members of the Government opposing the policy of the Government upon this very ground. We found a number of members of the Government pronouncing in favour of reciprocity in natural products, and we found at the same time Mr. Colby, then the President of the Council, openly denouncing reciprocity in natural products. We found the esteemed Minister of Marine and Fisheries denouncing upon every platform in Nova Scotia, particularly in the eastern portion of that province, the very idea of any reciprocity in coal; we found him scouting the very idea that the duties would ever be taken off coal, to the detriment of the mining interests of the eastern portion of Nova Scotia; and we found him stating that, no matter what sort of reciprocity would be adopted, the coal duties would be retained. But, on the other hand, we found his then leader, the late Premier of this country, putting himself upon record in a letter to a congressman, dated July 1890, in which he lays down his views with regard to the duties on coal, as follows:—

"My Dear Sir,—In answer to your esteemed note of this date, I desire to say that I am assured that the Parliament of Canada will be ready to take off all Customs duty on coal, ores and lumber imported from the United States whenever Congress makes these articles free of duty.

"The Canadian Government has already authorized Sir Julian Pauncefote to state to the American Government that they will be prepared to take off the export duty on logs whenever the Canadian lumber is admitted to the United States market at the reduced rate of $1.50 per thousand per measured mille.

"You are at liberty to show this to such members of Congress or the Government as you please. It should not, for obvious reasons, be published in the press or quoted in Congress.

"In the United States Tariff Act provisions might be made for making the above-mentioned articles free, whenever made free by the Canadian Parliament.

(Sd.) "JNO. A. MACDONALD."

What a spectacle have we witnessed during this very discussion in this House? The Government went to the country upon the express desire to secure the opinion of the people upon the subject of reciprocity. While everyone must deprecate the terms and the tone in which the proclamations were made through the press and by the Government in connection with that subject, and must feel humiliated at the position in which the Government has been placed by the statements of the hon. Secretary of State of the United States regarding who made the first overtures, yet there is no doubt the Government professed itself before the people of this country to be in favour of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 substantially, with some modifications yet undecided. Yet we have seen member after member at the back of the Government rise in this House and denounce the very idea of reciprocity, in language as strong as that used by the ex-president of the Council. We find a divided party, and we are not certain at this hour whether there is not a divided Government. We have had no declaration from the members of the Government on this important subject; and I think that long ere this in the debate, there should have been a strong and clear declaration made on the part of the

Ministers themselves as to whether they are united and the extent to which they are united upon the project of reciprocity with the United States. What guarantee have we that, at this very hour, the Government are not divided when we find their followers are divided? At any rate, we know that, at the very time the elections were going on, at the very time the people were being summoned to pronounce their opinion upon the important subject of reciprocity, dissensions of a most extraordinary character existed in the Cabinet itself. Do they exist to-day? It is fortunate, perhaps, for the consistency of the Government that it is called by courtesy a new Government, yet I will quote the language used in this House by a very distinguished man as to the immorality and impropriety of a Government standing before the people when they are not united upon the main principles of their policy connected with trade or other great questions. A certain statesman, in 1878, used this language in this House. It was perhaps none too strong as an assertion of principle, although it did not apply particularly to the case at that time in question. As an abstract statement of principle, however, I think we can accept it:

"But, however we may differ on the question of coalition from that point of view, there is one ground upon which we all agree, or ought to, and that is—that no more demoralizing spectacle can be exhibited in this country than the formation of an administration or a combination of men, who, on important leading public questions, are in open and avowed antagonism. * * * There can be nothing more monstrous, nothing more corrupt, and nothing more disgraceful than that of a combination of men who take office for the sake of office, and who, for the sake of office, sink their differences upon leading and important public questions, doing all this for the sake of combining together and sharing office and power."

We find hon. gentlemen on that side, at this very hour, differing on the most important public question before the people, and yet combining together for the sake of office and power to uphold an Administration in favour of which we have every evidence to lead us to believe they are not united. I am quoting the language of Sir Charles Tupper, and I think hon. gentlemen on that side, at any rate, will not say that his opinion is not worthy of their serious attention. At any rate, it is a very extraordinary spectacle which is here displayed of a Government staking its existence upon a policy which is repudiated by nearly one-half of the gentlemen who are professing to support it. Now, when I glance over the record and find how the present Administration came to occupy the position they do, I would like to allude to the boasting statements of hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that this Government, when it obtained power, had a well-defined policy on which they were agreed and upon which the people pronounced, that they always took a hopeful view of the situation of the country, and that in consequence of the position that they took during the tenure of office of the late Liberal Ministry, and in consequence of the confidence they inspired among the people, they were replaced in power. Now, I differ from a great many members opposite as to the duties of the Opposition. I have no doubt whatever that it is the duty, the solemn and bounden duty of the leading members of the Opposition, to indicate, whatever they find grounds for doing so, the failure of the policy of the Government and point out that it is not working the effects claimed for it. It is their duty to show, when the facts exist, that there has been an increased exodus, that the debt has been increased beyond all propriety, that taxation has been unduly increased and that the people are feeling the effects of this taxation. I contend that the Opposition are simply doing their duty in pointing out these evils. According to the doctrine laid down or hinted at by the previous speaker, it would seem that no matter what rascality we might discover in the administration of public affairs, no matter what extraordinary extravagance we might see in the conduct of any department of Administration, no matter what evil effects we might find produced by the policy of the Administration, it is our duty to keep profound silence and to declare that all is well, and prosperous and happy. No nobler duty can be performed to the public than that of showing up public abuses, and revealing the rottenness of the administration of public departments, and although it may look somewhat harsh to those outside, yet the ultimate effect is curative and beneficial. Although we are always glad to hear representatives speak highly of the resources and prosperity of any portion of the country, when they have evidence to support them, yet, it is the duty of members who differ from them, to indicate where failure may exist. We have heard statements throughout this debate and in almost every debate in connection with the subject of trade, as to the terrible conditions of things across the border. And yet it is almost as much as the political life of a gentleman on the Opposition side is worth if he undertakes to combat such statements. No matter what foul slander is uttered as to the prosperity of any of the states of the union, no matter what observation is made detrimental to the people of the United States, if any hon. gentleman on the Opposition side stands up in the interest of truth and veracity, he is pointed out as an annexationist at heart and as being disloyal to Canada. Scarcely a speaker has risen on the other side without flinging taunts of this kind at the two states of Dakota. I know very little about those states. I simply believe them to be, like most of the new states of the union, struggling with some difficulties, having occasional drawbacks here and there of a temporary character, but upon the whole we know that those states have been and are prosperous, and though they have the same difficulties to contend with to some extent that we have, difficulties caused almost entirely by the high protective policy of the United States, yet we know that they are prospering more than our own provinces which are situated near them. While the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) was speaking so very fluently the other night, and was referring to Dakota as if it were a wilderness, I had the curiosity to send to the Library for the Statistical Abstract of the United States, and even while he was trying to prejudice the people against obtaining reciprocity in natural products with our neighbours in the United States by referring to the State of Dakota, I glanced over the statement I found in that abstract. I found that in 1870 there were 14,000 people in the Territory of Dakota, in 1880 there were 135,000 people, and in 1890 there were 511,000 people, and that territory had become two states of the union. We find, therefore, that in twenty years this wilderness of Dakota has grown from having a population of 14,000 to over 500,000, and has been admitted among the great sisterhood of states as two states of the union. Is this a

sign of decay or lack of prosperity? Look at some of the agricultural products of Dakota. I know that I am laying myself open to being charged with being disloyal to this beloved Canada of ours and with being an annexationist in disguise because I make these references. In 1890, I find that Dakota had $20,000,000 worth of horses, $1,500,000 of mules, $5,000,000 worth of hogs, $14,000,000 of cattle and oxen, and $2,500,000 of sheep. In these few articles they had a value of nearly $43,000,000. Is this an indication of decay, and of the horrors which we have been told the people of Dakota are suffering from? Is this the reason why these train loads of immigrants are rushing to Manitoba from that state? I must say that I receive with a great deal of suspicion the statements of hon. gentlemen from the North-West as to the rush of immigrants from Dakota to Manitoba. We hear it from them, and we see it nowhere else, and I think it is very improbable, to say the least, that a train load of immigrants would, without any influence brought to bear upon them, take the trouble to placard their cars with the mottoes which were read this afternoon by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). It looks very much like the tricks of land agents and boomers. I think it is not unlikely that, taking advantage of depression in some parts of Dakota, land agents and boomers may have endeavoured to get up a land boom for Manitoba in this way. In 1890 Dakota produced $6,000,000 worth of Indian corn and $8,000,000 worth of oats. Comparing the population of those two states with the population of our fair Province of Manitoba, which I do not wish to disparage in any way, whose prospects are great, whose future I hope may be bright, and whose prosperity I crave, still I do not think it lies in the mouths of representatives of the North-West to throw taunts against Dakota with its 500,000 population as compared with the Province of Manitoba with 150,000. We had a Liberal Government in power in Canada during five years, and during that time the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Minister of Finance. We know that he had great difficulties to encounter. There was a widespread depression throughout the whole civilized world. The Dominion of Canada was under obligations to carry out great public works at the time the Liberal party came into power; and, to spare the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will not refer to the circumstances under which that party came into power, because the circumstances which are now surrounding us are so similar that I would not like to harrow their feelings. But, during that period, when the Liberal party were struggling with all the difficulties they had to encounter, how were they met by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition of that day? Did they stand up and say that this country was prosperous, that it had a great future before it? Was it not exactly the opposite? Did they not, with all the ability at the command of the High Commissioner and of the late lamented Premier, denounce, in every possible way and at every possible time, in every mood and tense and on every occasion, the conduct of the Finance Minister at that time, and preach the bluest of blue ruin during those five years? Did they not alarm the people and did they not make the most extravagant promises as to the economy which would be practised when they would be returned to power? A glance at the Debates will show. On the 20th February, 1877, Sir John Macdonald said:

"The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) knows, because he is, of course, owing to his position, in communication with Montreal and the great centres and manufactures in the country, that the cloud is darkening, and that, notwithstanding the hope expressed by the Premier——"

You see the Premier then was hopeful that we might pull through the depression.—

—"notwithstanding the hope expressed by the Premier there is no light in the sky——"

No gloom there, no pessimism.—

—"there is no light in the sky as yet, and no sign exhibited of the disappearance of the present state of depression and distress. Sir, all these industries, and not only the manufacturing classes, but the workingmen, the labouring classes and the whole commercial community were looking forward for financial relief as a consequence of the meeting of this legislature, and I say that when the news is flashed over the wires to-morrow, west, east, north and south, that there is no such alteration as is required, and no relief——"

That is, no protective tariff.—

—"many a man who has been keeping up his heart and keeping open his warehouse and place of business at a ruinous sacrifice in order that his workmen might not starve, will be obliged to close his factory and dismiss his employés and perhaps be driven to the insolvent court owing to the policy adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite."

There is no preaching of blue ruin there. We never knew such a thing from hon. gentlemen opposite. I doubt if you will find in the whole records of this Parliament such a pessimistic speech as that delivered by Sir John Macdonald on the 20th February, 1877, except the equally pessimistic speeches of Sir Charles Tupper who was aiding him at that time. In 1878 Mr. Charlton seconded the Address, and, speaking hopefully of the state of manufacturing industry, he thought they were comparatively prosperous. The Address contained the following clause:—

"We receive with pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away."

This was the Government resolution, a hopeful resolution and an optimistic resolution. How was this met by the late Premier, the then leader of the Opposition? He said:

"I do not hear the passing bell. I think the depression still exists. If hon. gentlemen will look at any of the evidences that are patent before them, I think they must agree with us that the depression exists still. Look at the city of Montreal, at the state of the lumber trade in Ottawa, at the number of insolvencies here compared with the number in the United States, look at all or any of the evidences and you will see we are called on to be most desperate believers to believe that the depression is passing away. I would be glad if I could agree with that opinion, I would be happy to think that our abundant harvest or any other cause would remove the commercial depression or was likely to remove it. The members of the Government are very modest. They claim no merits for removing it themselves. The 'fly on the wheel' policy still exists. The Government still feel they must trust to the harvest, trust to atmospheric influences, trust to everything but statesmanlike conduct and administration."

And so on, followed by Tray, Blanche and Sweetheart, one after another, in denunciation of the

Government raising the cry of blue ruin from session to session up to 1878. The result was, taken in connection with the extravagant promises made by the Opposition, that it had a large amount of influence in returning that Opposition to power. Now, let me call the attention of the House to some of the promises made at that time which influenced the public mind, and let us see how these promises were subsequently fulfilled. In 1877 the following resolution was moved by Sir John A. Macdonald, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper:—

"Regrets that the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burthen of taxation on the people without any compensating advantage to Canadian industries; and further that this House is of opinion that the deficiency in the revenue should be met by a large diminution of expenditure aided by such a readjustment of the tariff as will benefit and foster, &c., &c."

Upon that Sir Charles Tupper made the following observations along with others:—

"I have shown that they have increased the expenditure of the country nearly $3,000,000, in three years, over our largest expenditure. I trust I have satisfied the House that it is not a question of high taxation or low taxation any further than this, that inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power. All we ask is—not that the taxation of the people shall be increased (because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite), as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practise in the future * * * What we ask is not the increase of taxation but the readjustment of taxation."

I had the curiosity to look over the speeches, and I see he was followed by an hon. gentleman who is not present in the House, but I presume it would not be improper to mention his name. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said:

"We had to raise a certain amount of taxation, $22,000,000 to $23,000,000.

"He did not propose that one dollar more should be raised; but to so distribute it as to afford protection to the industries of the country."

I have every reason to believe that the member for Simcoe is one of the most honourable, straightforward and upright men on the other side of the House, and I have no doubt whatever that he was completely deluded and mystified by his leaders in their statements upon this question, and I do not blame him in the same way that I do the High Commissioner and the late Premier, for making these assertions by which the people were then deceived. He was followed by Mr. Gibbs, who appeared to be a gentleman of considerable strength in the same line, influenced, no doubt, by the statements and arguments of his leader. He said, in 1878:

"These gentlemen, when they addressed the House and when they addressed their constituents, when they went forth to public meetings, endeavoured to instil into the minds of the public that the Opposition desired to increase the taxation of this country. They wanted such an arrangement of the tariff as should take off the duties on goods which they could not produce and put them on those which they did. The revenue would not be altered; all the Government required was that a revenue of $23,000,000 should be raised."

Again, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"Now, what is it that the hon. gentleman says: He says that because our policy is a protective policy we must necessarily be in favour of high taxes. The hon. gentleman assumes that it is the tariff that imposes the taxation on the country. * * * Why, the tariff does not impose taxation."

Now, here are some of those broad and statesmanlike political economics laid down by Sir Charles Tupper, which are quite characteristic of that gentleman:

"The tariff does not impose taxation."

Well, we will all be delighted to know that. He says that the tariff only collects taxation. I thought it was the Custom-house officers who collected taxation, and that they collected it for certain purposes, on a scale regulated by the tariff. However, it appears we were mistaken:

"The tariff collects taxation. What does impose it? The taxation is imposed by the debt of the country. The taxation is imposed for the purpose of maintaining the public credit * * * Taxation is already imposed by the debt. Customs duties are merely the best mode of collecting taxes."

We all remember the howls made by Sir Charles Tupper during the whole of that period over the extravagance of the then Government. While I am upon this subject of taxation, I might as well illustrate it by showing how they kept their promises. The average amount of taxation from 1868 to 1872 was $15,170,185; the average amount of taxation during the Mackenzie period for five years was $18,989,668, or nearly $19,000,000. Now, this was the taxation that was denounced in every mood and tense, with all the eloquence, and power, and fervour which those distinguished men could bring to bear upon the subject. They stated emphatically that this taxation would not be increased; it would only be readjusted in the interests of the people and in the interest of certain manufacturing industries. The average taxation of $19,000,000 for the five years of the previous Administration sprang up to an average taxation of $23,500,000 during the next five years. But that was not sufficient. During the last five years the average taxation has sprung up to $28,858,000—in other words, the enormous taxation under which the country was groaning, and which caused these good men to weep and wail, during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration, amounting to $19,000,000, has, for the last five years, reached an average of nearly $29,000,000. Yet, in face of this fact hon. gentlemen in this House will stand up and say that the Government had a definite policy when they entered upon this propaganda, and that they fulfilled all the promises they made to the people at that time. But perhaps some may say that these large amounts were not a fair measure of the annual taxation of the country. Taking the Customs taxation alone, which was only to be readjusted and not increased, we find that the average percentage of duty, from 1868 to 1879, amounted to 13·67, and during the five years from 1880 to 1884 the average percentage of duty on imports was 17·38, and during the last five years 19·74, showing that in Customs duties on the total value of goods imported the taxation had sprung up from 13·67 to 19·74. But, perhaps, that may not be considered a fair way of measuring it, as some of those goods were subsequently sent to other countries, and this tax may be paid by some other persons. Now, take the Customs duties on goods entered for consumption,

and we find the average from 1874 to 1879 was 13·88, during the next five years 19·10, and during the last five years 21·03—in other words, the average increase upon goods entered for consumption is about 8 per cent. higher in 1890, during the last five years, than it was during the five years of the Mackenzie régime. The Customs duties per head during the first seven years of Confederation were $3.15. Owing to the depression and falling off in prices and values of exports, and consequently the volume and values of imports, the Mackenzie Administration were compelled to increase slightly the taxation of the country, in order to preserve its credit. They were denounced, of course, in the usual strong language to which we are accustomed from the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite for increasing the taxation from $3.15 to $3.31 per head; and some of the people of that day, perhaps the larger number of them, thought this to be a large increase. Could they have looked forward and seen that during the following five years the very men who had denounced this increase would have themselves advanced the amount from $3.31 to $4.54 per head they might have been somewhat astonished; and at that average it remained during the last five years, the amount being $4.48 per head as against $3.31 per head during the Mackenzie régime. We had during the whole period the extravagant promises I have described. Not only so, but during the period the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power the expenditure of the Government was made the subject of the most minute and exhaustive criticism. The expenditures were denounced as extraordinarily extravagant, and the Opposition of that day promised that, should they ever be entrusted with power, a great reform in the matter of expenditure would immediately follow, and that the people of the country would have no more of such extravagant expenditures. In 1887 Sir Charles Tupper, referring to this subject, said:

"The true and just comparison would be to compare the last whole year we were in power with the first whole year these hon. gentlemen were in power, and what does that show? The House will be startled when I tell them that our expenditure was $19,174,141 in 1872-73; but no sooner were these hon. gentlemen for one whole year in power than they managed to spend a much larger sum without any difficulty. Their enormous additional taxation, the greatest extravagance, the most wasteful expenditure of the public money—and not only wasteful, but corrupt—and levying that out of the additional taxation wrung from the people of Canada."

The increased expenditure of the Mackenzie Administration was denounced, and changes were rung on it every session of Parliament by the able critic of the Opposition of that day. Sir Charles Tupper would gloat over the fact that Civil Government cost $10,000 more in 1875 than in 1874, that the administration of justice had increased $38,000, that superannuation had increased $13,000, militia, $35,000, ocean and river service, $45,000, miscellaneous, $39,000, Customs collections, $24,000, post office, $134,000, mounted police, $134,000, North-West organization, $14,000; and upon these increases, made under circumstances over which no Administration could have any control, the able, industrious, indefatigable financial leader of the Opposition harped from session to session. The people were led to believe that the Administration were ruining the country by the most unheard of extravagance. But what do we find? We find the following averages:—

	1874-1879.	1880-1885.	1886-1890.
	$	$	$
Civil Government	850,000	1,000,000	1,250,000
Administration of Justice	550,000	605,000	687,500
Superannuation	100,000	178,000	215,000
Militia	788,000	*834,700	1,250,000
Miscellaneous	93,000	256,000	444,000
Ocean and River Service	452,700	415,700	225,000
Customs	712,000	758,000	841,651
Post Office	1,272,000	2,167,000	2,048,000
Mounted Police	347,000	437,000	1,000,000
Inland Revenue	210,000	284,000	350,000
Indians	337,000	1,330,000	1,123,500

* Deducting Rebellion expenses.

Yet hon. gentlemen say that during the time of the Mackenzie Government the Opposition had a definite policy, and that they have since abundantly carried out their promises. Is it not clear that when they made those denunciations of the Government they promised that if they were entrusted with power they would make a decided reform? But the figures clearly show they have not done so. The elections of 1878 came on, and all these questions were argued before the people. The first declaration was that the Conservative party would establish a policy which would not increase the taxation, but by readjusting it in such a manner as to meet the requirements of certain interests would benefit the general interests of the country. We had every evidence that they intended to reduce the expenditure instead of increasing it, and that an era of economy would be introduced, which, taken in connection with the readjustment of the duties, would greatly benefit the people. We all remember well that during the elections a remarkable telegram was sent to St. John by the Premier, saying that those who stated that taxation would be increased slandered the Opposition; that taxation would not be increased, but only be readjusted. Sir Leonard Tilley, who afterwards became Minister of Finance, stated on the public platform, and it was heralded far and wide during the election, that the annual expenditure would not exceed $22,500,000. He promised that the expenditure would probably be reduced, and that the incoming Administration, if entrusted with power, would carry on the Government of the country at a reduced expenditure as compared with that of their predecessors. Now, the expenditure during the régime of the Mackenzie Government for five years was $23,935,656 per annum. This was denounced by the Conservative party as being utterly extravagant, and details were entered into in Parliament, in the press, and upon the platform, to show that it was extravagant, and that the Government of the country could be carried on for less. The country had every reason to expect, if these were honourable men, and if these were the statesmen they professed to be, that after making due allowance for the increase of population and other expenses that that expenditure would not be materially increased. The Conservatives were pledged to keep the expenditure at $22,500,000, but during the first five years, after they came into power, what was the result of their policy? It was an increase of Customs

taxation, an increase of Excise taxation, an increase of the interest upon the debt, an increase of the debt itself, an increase in the expenditure, and an increase in the revenue from every quarter. Instead of spending twenty-two and a-half millions a year they spent on an average $29,489,000. But that was not sufficient, for during the last five years of the administration of the present Government the average expenditure of the party, brought into power upon the solemn pledge of distinguished men like Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Charles Tupper, and the late hon. Premier, upon the solemn pledge of these men before the people of Canada that the expenditure of the country would not exceed $22,500,000, yet, notwithstanding that, the average expenditure during the last five years has been $36,820,000. We find the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) stating a short time ago, on his own responsibility as a member, that, from this time henceforward, the average expenditure must be considered to be about $40,000,000 per annum, and that in the face of the declaration upon which this Government and party came into power in 1878. If they had carried out their promises substantially, as I maintain that honourable and upright public men should endeavour to carry out the promises upon which they obtained power, we would find this result: The average expenditure for the last eleven years at twenty-two and a-half million dollars a year would have been $247,500,000, but the actual expenditure has been $356,595,000, showing an increase over the amount they promised the country the expenditure would be of $109,000,000. For the sake of having round numbers, I will throw off about $9,000,000, caused by the expenditure in the North-West, for which this Government was entirely blamable—money which need not be expended and which was a waste caused by the cruel, callous neglect and misgovernment of the Conservative party in relation to that country. I will throw off $9,000,000, and we find, that after the solemn promises made by the leaders of the Conservative party, promises upon which they obtained power, the net amount of increase in the expenditure has been $100,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the people of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, how have the party opposite administered the affairs of this country after having come into power on these promises? Election followed election, and members opposite are never tired of standing up in this House and, as I presume it is natural, of boasting of the success they have had at the polls. Well, probably an examination of the means by which this success has been obtained would not be so creditable to the Conservative party as they endeavour to make out. The success in 1878 certainly does not redound to their credit, after the brief exposition that I have made of the manner in which they then obtained power; and we all know, that having once obtained power under these extravagant promises, and after the hopes they made to spring up in the public mind, they then had in their hands the power, which they have used mercilessly ever since, to retain possession of the Treasury benches. I entirely differ from a great many, even of those on my own side of the House, who are disposed to give credit to the Conservative Government for an honest desire to have a protective tariff. My own opinion has always been that the word protection, and the term protection, and the policy of protection, has been only the secret and insidious means of levying enormous taxation upon the people of this country for the sake of retaining themselves in power, and placing themselves in a position where they could gratify their friends, and gratify that lust for power and office which has always characterized that party. I maintain that under the guise of a protective tariff they had a high taxation policy, which has taken enormous sums of money out of the people of this country, and which really did not have the effect they themselves profess to have in view, as the figures I have given to the House will show. Another election came on in 1882, and the Conservative party again went to the country under a false issue, and with false promises, and falsehoods in their mouths. The Governor General was made to say that he dissolved Parliament because large amounts of capital were awaiting investment in the Dominion of Canada as the result of the verdict of the people as to whether the National Policy should stand. Leading members of the Administration, and the leaders of the press supporting that party, even went so far as to give the figures: and Sir Charles Tupper, or, at all events, one of the prominent leaders of the party, stated that $200,000,000 of foreign capital were waiting investment in the Dominion of Canada if the protective policy was upheld. Large numbers of thoughtless people were carried away by these statements, and that, in addition to the undue influences of which we have always complained, resulted in a large degree in keeping the party in power. Where did the $200,000,000 come from? I venture to say that not $100,000 of that imaginary $200,000,000 of foreign capital ever came into the Dominion of Canada as the result of the protective policy. There may have been some foreign capital come in, to assist in buying out institutions already in existence in the country, by way of combines, but even of that we have very little evidence. However, our friends opposite came into power, and after another brief period they dissolved Parliament before its time had expired, upon the false pleas that have been already exposed in this House. The Premier dissolved Parliament on the plea that overtures had been made to the Government by the Government of the United States for a reciprocity treaty, a plea which is now known to be a brazen falsehood in the face of the world, and a statement which is a disgrace to the Administration, and a disgrace to the men who used it. Sir Charles Tupper has been obliged to go virtually on his knees, like Uriah Heap, before the Secretary of State of the United States, and apologize to him for having made that statement. I say that no proud Canadian can read the interview described by Sir Charles Tupper himself with Secretary of State Blaine without being mortified and humiliated at the abject prostration of the man when the subject of these negotiations was discussed between them. We have the repudiation of the American Secretary of State, and the apology of the high-minded embassador from England, as regards the conduct of the Canadian statesmen in this matter. At any rate, the Government went to the country under a false plea that an overture had been made to them for a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and the Premier, in his eloquent card to the electors, stated he was about appealing as a British subject to the young hope of the country, but he took mighty

good care to go to the country on old lists. He took mighty good care to exclude the young hope of the country from the polls. He was afraid that a moribund Parliament would not be qualified to deal with the subject of reciprocity, but he had no fear of moribund voters' lists. And so, what with the old voters' lists, and what with the revising officers appointed by the Government, and what with the contributions of the "Red Parlour," and what with the money wrung from public contractors, and what with other undue influences, the Government again secured a small majority in this House. Well, the hon. member for Westmoreland and other hon. members have endeavoured to place the hon. member for South Oxford in a false position in regard to something he wrote in a letter about the outlying provinces; and that letter has been read so many times to the House, and such false accounts have been given of it, that I would like to make a few comments upon it. The words quoted were that the majority in this House was made up of shreds and patches from divers outlying provinces. The hon. member did not apply the phrase "shreds and patches" to those provinces. If it was a reflection on anybody at all it was on hon. gentlemen opposite, who were elected from those provinces to support the Government; and I, as one from the Maritime Provinces, am prepared to say, so far as I have any responsibility for the Province of Nova Scotia, that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford was perfectly correct. I say that the influences made use of in the lower provinces were such as do not redound to the credit of any statesman or any party claiming to govern on high-minded principles. The statement of the hon. member for South Oxford that majorities were obtained in many counties by promises of Government favours is satisfactorily borne out by abundance of facts which could be produced in this House. But I will make a quotation directly confirmative of the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford, as showing the view held by one prominent member of the party opposite. When my hon. friend, whom I esteem very highly for his many excellent qualities, was elected for Cumberland County, I believe he was ill and was not present at the election; and the High Commissioner, who swung around at the bidding of the Government, and left his palatial residence in London, and, like a howling dervish, went up and down this country attacking the leaders of the Liberal party, made a speech at Amherst on the result of the elections on the day of declaration; and how did he treat this subject on that occasion? What relation did he hold the representatives of the outlying provinces to occupy towards the present Government of the Dominion? I will read his remarks, and if they are open to any other interpretation than that given to them by the hon. member for South Oxford and myself, I will ask any hon. gentleman opposite to explain what it is. The High Commissioner was reported in the Amherst *Gazette* of the 12th of March, 1891, as follows:—

"To-day we see the parties in Ontario and Quebec nearly balanced, and the other provinces not only holding the balance of power, but in a position to claim the first consideration for the noble manner in which they had supported the Government."

I would like to ask what the hon. High Commissioner meant by claiming the first consideration for the noble manner in which they had supported the Government. Will some hon. gentleman opposite explain that phrase before the close of this debate, if it does not mean that they had a right to claim favours from the Government which they would otherwise not have the right to claim?

"Another fortnight would have considerably increased our majority in Ontario, but after his thirty-six years of experience he preferred a majority of forty to one of eighty."

And he must be intensely satisfied with a majority of twenty, for the following reason, which he gave at the time:—

"The Government had not so many people to provide for with the lesser number."

So it seems, according to the views of this man of the world, this experienced statesman, that the question of a Government majority simply resolves itself into how many they have to provide for, and what means they have at their disposal to provide for the number. So that the majority of 20 in this House may hold themselves entitled to very high hopes, owing to the noble stand their constituents have taken in electing them to this House:

"He dared say Mr. Dickey would tell us he occasionally gets a hint from some person that he wants a certain piece of work done by the Government."

Is not the whole story given away in these words? Do we not know that underlying these words is a declaration of the policy of the Government, which has been observed with regard to the elections in the lower provinces, at any rate, for the last twelve years? Scarcely an election has been held there during that time but the public press supporting the Government has boldly and openly announced that it would be no use for any county to send here a representative supporting the Opposition and expect to get anything for the needs of the county. I know it was said to me that when Yarmouth came to ask the Government for anything the fact that its representative was in opposition would injure its claims. But I believe that the people I represent, and the people of many other counties, would sooner take up a subscription to build their own public works than to receive Government assistance at the expense of the principles they believe in. While reading this quotation from the speech of the High Commissioner, I may perhaps refer to another subject which does not strictly come in here; but as the quotation is before me I will give it. Hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever they want a reciprocity treaty, pose as the great friends of the American people; and Sir Charles Tupper, in his interview with Mr. Blaine, undertook to prove to him that of all people in the Dominion of Canada he was the man who went furthest in the interest of reciprocity and in his desire to bind together in brotherly love the people of Canada and the United States. But he did not talk in that strain in the general election; and even after the election was over, in the speech to which I have referred, he spoke of our American neighbours in these terms:

"He did not forget the enormous influence of this 65,000,000 of Americans. We had not only beaten our opponents here, but the 65,000,000 to the south of us."

According to the view of the hon. High Commissioner, the result of the last election was to defeat the schemes and machinations of 65,000,000 of people to the south of us to land us into the American union. Now, the question before the House more particularly appertains to the two motions made,

one by the hon. Minister of Finance and the other by the hon. member for South Oxford. In regard to the Budget brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance, I am not disposed to be very critical. I think upon the whole the Budget is fairly satisfactory; but I do not think the hon. Finance Minister's friends ought to plume themselves with such a great amount of enthusiasm upon the very great feat of reducing the duty upon the lower grades of sugar coming into Canada, when it is apparent, on the face of it, that no other course was possible to them. When almost every man in the country knew, for the last ten or eleven months, at any rate, that some such course as this must be followed, considering the attitude taken by the Government of the United States in the same connection, we can only express our regret that while the duties were being taken off the still higher grades of raw sugar were not dealt with. The amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford asked:

"That the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, and fishermen and farmers: and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products."

Now, this has brought before the House, of course, the whole question of reciprocity in natural products alone, as contrasted with reciprocity which may include manufactured products. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in his criticism of the Budget speech, referred as follows to the question of sugar:—

"I congratulate the Finance Minister upon having had the courage, I may say the self-denial, to take off $3,500,000 from sugar."

I think the hon. gentleman's congratulations might have been somewhat modified when he considers the fact that no other course was open to the Finance Minister under the circumstances. But the hon. gentleman went on to say that the taking off of $3,500,000 from sugar was really, when one looked into the matter, a reduction of taxation or measure of relief to the people amounting to $5,000,000; in which statement he supported the views always held by the Opposition, namely, that the duty placed upon these sugars really inflicted a burden upon the people of a far larger amount than the tax itself collected by the Government, and we have the gratifying announcement made by other gentlemen who followed, that the immediate result of the reduction was a fall in price of sugar in Montreal and other centres. This, probably, was perfectly true; but is it not a peculiar feature in connection with the sugar trade, that whenever the Minister of Finance of a Conservative Government makes a change in the duty, whether that change be an increase or a reduction, simultaneously the price of sugar goes down in Montreal. It looks as if there was a secret wire between the office of the Finance Minister and the office of the Redpath sugar refinery in Montreal. As far back as 1879, Sir Leonard Tilley, in referring to his addition to the sugar duties in order to give better protection, said, on the 23rd of April, in reply to a very severe criticism by the hon. member for South Oxford—a criticism which would read very well and would apply to many other matters in connection with the Government tariff to-day—as follows:—

"As to the reduction in the price of sugar, he could state, as a fact, that the price of sugar had gone down half a cent a pound in Montreal since these resolutions were submitted to the House."

Exactly the same thing took place when Sir Leonard Tilley placed the increased duty on sugar, as when the Finance Minister of to-day took the duty off. Another hon. member, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), then a member of the House, denied the statement that sugar had risen, and said he had bought sugar in Montreal and the price had since increased. Mr. Desjardins, who is not now a member of this House, supported the Finance Minister of that day, and said:

"Redpath was now selling refined sugar at 8½ cents per pound, while, before this tariff was proposed, they sold this same sugar at 8¼ cents per pound."

The Hon. Mr. Anglin asked whether the hon. Minister of Finance seriously pretended that the imposition of duties or the increase of duties would reduce the price of sugar. But Sir Leanord Tilley insisted that it did, and I will quote his words:

"The hon. gentleman from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) asked if it was possible that the Finance Minister could stand up here and say the imposition of duty could possibly cheapen the article to the consumer. Why, they knew it was argued here last night that the imposition of a 50 cent duty on coal, if it led to the output of 300,000 tons of coal more in Nova Scotia, would result in coal being supplied cheaper to the people of the other provinces than it was to-day. If they looked at the experience of the United States they would find beyond a question that the imposition of high duties had decreased the price of the article to the consumer."

He was followed by Sir Charles Tupper, who stated that the market had fallen just as they said it would. As soon as it was known that the Minister of Finance had determined to protect the industry of Canadian sugar refining the market had in consequence declined. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) moved a resolution for the purpose of reducing this great burden on the people. Mr. Farrow asked him:

"Is not sugar cheaper now than it was before?"

Mr. White (Cardwell) argued that the effect of the duty had been to make sugar cheaper. He said:

"We have secured for the people of Canada as cheap—aye, cheaper—sugar than if we had not refineries in Canada at all."

So we see that the congratulations of the hon. member for Albert are entirely in the same vein as those which were lavished on Sir Leonard Tilley, when he increased the duties on sugar, although the subject-matter in each case is opposed to the other. It will be of no particular advantage at the present day to go into the history of the sugar duties, but we know that in Great Britain, where there are no duties on sugar, either raw or refined, the prices fluctuate very rapidly, year after year, owing to circumstances which no tariff could control. The price in 1878 was 29·25 shillings per quarter; in 1884 it had fallen to 20·89. In 1886-87 it had fallen to 15·63 shillings, showing that the decrease in the price of sugar had been caused by other considerations, such as the supply of raw sugar from the East and West Indies, the supply of beet root sugar in the European markets, and other causes. We find also that sugar has fallen in the United States as well as in the Dominion, and the decline there is due to other causes than that which is claimed to have produced the decline in this

country. The hon. member for Albert also attacked the hon. member for South Oxford for the gloom and despondency of his opinions with regard to the Dominion of Canada, but as this point has almost been treated *ad nauseam*, I will not dwell upon it; but the hon. gentleman went on to say that:

"Trade had gone down by leaps and bounds, and when the Conservative party came into power the tide turned, and trade has steadily gone up by some forty millions. That the hon. gentleman should have had the courage to remind this House of a decline in our foreign trade of from forty-one to forty-two millions, which occurred during the four or five years when he was Finance Minister, is almost passing belief."

The hon. member for Albert, however, had the candour subsequently to state that these changes were due to great economic causes, entirely beyond the control of Finance Ministers. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite will calmly go on and compare the trade of the country during the Liberal régime with its trade during the Conservative régime, as if the decline and the increase had been caused by the policy of either party. Now, one of the great arguments made in favour of a protective tariff, as all will recollect when this policy was initiated, was the argument of the balance of trade. Sir Leonard Tilley declared that one of his objects in introducing a protective tariff was to change the balance of trade, and Sir Charles Tupper and the late Premier were never tired of pointing out that the balance of trade was against Canada, and that this was a disaster which must be cured. In order to show the views of the Government and the party supporting them, when this policy was introduced, here is what Sir Leonard Tilley said as to what would be the result of the adoption of the policy in this particular. In 1879, on the 14th March, in this House, he observed:

"There are other difficulties, the volume of imports has not been materially reduced. I look upon the large imports, ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large volume of trade against it, as one of the causes of the troubles with which we have to contend—one of the difficulties which it is our duty to remedy—they have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large, showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought to be still further diminished. * * *

"Under these circumstances it appears to me we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of our imports from all parts of the world."

Now, the Government, actuated by these noble impulses, proceeded to place upon the Statute-book the high tariff and protective policy under which we have laboured since. From 1868 to 1873, before the Liberal Government took office, we had a balance of trade against Canada on an average of $19,000,000 a year. From 1874 to 1878, inclusive, the average balance of trade against Canada was $26,699,000, and it was this terrible average balance of trade against Canada which it was said was the necessity for changing the fiscal policy of the country. It was $38,000,000 in 1874, and ran down to $10,000,000 in 1879, but it was with this that the new Government was determined to grapple and which was to be reversed by the adoption of a protective policy which would thus place Canada in a proud and prosperous condition. From 1881 to 1885, the average balance of trade against Canada was over $20,000,000. Whereas during the last years of the Mackenzie régime, the balance was only $10,000,000 against Canada, in the year 1875 it was only $19,000,000, and in 1883, it was $34,000,000. But the average balance against Canada has been greater since that. During the last five years, the balance of trade against us, which the protective policy was to reverse, has been nearly $23,000,000. and last year it was $25,000,000, showing that the Finance Minister of that day had not the first conception of what the effect of his tariff policy would be as to its result in regard to the balance of trade or in regard to trade generally. He was supported by all the leaders of the opposite party in his contention that this adverse balance of trade would be turned in favour of Canada by the adoption of a protective policy, and yet there has been only one year since the adoption of that policy when the balance of trade has been in favour of Canada. The total balance against us for the last five years has been over $113,000,000. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) commenting upon the trade under the régime of the Liberal Minister of Finance, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that during his time the trade of the country had gone down by leaps and bounds. I had the curiosity to look into the statistics, and I found that the average trade during the first seven years of Confederation was $174,000,000 a year. The average during the Mackenzie régime of five years was $175,000,000, showing that on an average trade had about held its own, notwithstanding the great depression which existed throughout the world. Our hon. friends opposite then came into power with their new policy which was to improve and change the whole face of nature, and the average volume of trade increased from $175,000,000 to $207,000,000 showing an average increase of $32,000,000. During the last five years this has fallen about $5,000,000 a year. It might be asked, if the National Policy had been the great success in this particular which was predicted and boasted of, why was this increase not continued: why, with the increasing population and wealth and enterprise of this great Dominion, has the trade fallen off by $5,000,000 a year instead of increasing, as it ought, by from $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 a year. But let us look at the points in which the trade increased or decreased. From 1875 to 1879, the exports averaged $77,000,000 per annum, and the imports averaged $98,000,000. The increase during the next five years in the exports brought them up to an average of $95,500,000, while the imports reached $112,000,000. During the next five years the exports averaged $90,000,000 and the imports remained at an average of $112,000,000. What does this show as to the effect of the National Policy? It certainly has never been contended by any candid speaker that the National Policy would have an effect upon our exports, which are in the main of raw material, and the volume of our exports is to a large degree fixed by the price and by the demand in the great markets of the world, Our exports increased from an average of $77,000,000 during the Mackenzie régime to an average of $95,000,000 during the next five years, and then fell off to $90,000,000 in the last five years, but the National Policy could have had very little effect upon that. But what has been its effect upon the volume of our imports? One would imagine that a high protective policy would have a tendency, as it was intended to have, according to the statements made at the time, of reducing the volume of our imports; but what

are the facts? The imports during the Mackenzie régime amounted to a total of $490,000,000, or an average of $98,000,000. The high tariff came into force, which, according to Sir Leonard Tilley, was to reduce the volume of imports and compel our people to manufacture what they required at home, and the imports rose from a total of $490,000,000 to $560,000,000 and during the last five years to $674,000,000, showing a steady increase in the volume of our imports. It is evident that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), had not seen the inconsistency in which he was involved, because the effect of the National Policy has been to increase our imports, and, of course, to increase the burden on the people of the country who have to pay the enhanced duty on the imports. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), in defending the National Policy, descended to particulars. He followed the hon. member for Queen's, New Brunswick, who had enlarged upon the effects of the National Policy in regard to certain industries in the Province of New Brunswick, but there is one portion of the speech of the member for Westmoreland which I will take the liberty of quoting, and I would like to hear at some future time some comments of the members from New Bruswick upon the figures which I will give. The hon. member said:

"In one particular, at any rate, the trade of the port of St. John, N.B., had increased 25 per cent. in the last ten years, and is to-day greater than the trade of any other seaport between New York and Eastport, except Boston."

Now, this was a bold statement, it was a captivating statement for the representatives from the neighbourhood of the port of St. John; but at the same time it was a misleading statement, much more misleading, I believe, than the hon. member had any intention of making, for I believe him to be in the main a very straightforward and upright representative, who would not make any statement for the purpose of misleading. He stated that the trade of the city of St. John was greater than that of any seaport between New York and Eastport except Boston. The fact is there is no other seaport except Boston that amounts to anything at all, so that he makes an apparently enthusiastic statement that really amounts to nothing. St. John has a larger population than Portland, and it has the noble River St. John running to the sea through it, a river which taps a magnificent territory through the whole length of the Province of New Brunswick, one of the richest territories of its size, perhaps, in the whole Dominion of Canada, and the seaport of St. John covers the trade of that whole rich region, and transmits it through its channels as a distributing centre; consequently, it would not be fair to compare even Portland with St. John as a distributing centre. But let us look at the effect of the National Policy upon the trade of St. John, and I would be happy to have an explanation of the figures I shall give from the representatives from that city and county. Now, the total trade of the port of St John in 1879, the last year of the Mackenzie régime, was $7,174,577. The total trade of the port of St. John as far back as 1872, was $11,184,278. The total trade of the port of St. John during the five years of the Liberal regime was $46,602,829, making an average of $9,320,565 per annum. If the trade of the port of St. John had increased at the ratio stated by the member for Westmoreland, we ought to have some larger figures than these to show for it; but the facts are that during the last five years, from 1885 to 1890, the aggregate trade of St John, imports and exports together, amounted to $39,702,281, showing a falling off during the whole period of over $6,000,000. There was an average trade of $7,940,000 during the last five years as against $9,320,000 during the nine years of Liberal policy. I am not going so far as to say that this falling off is the effect of the National Policy, because I am not prepared to go that far without further investigation of figures. But I am prepared to say this, that the boast of the hon. member for Westmoreland is not carried out by the trade returns. Now, here is another peculiarity in connection with these figures: The exports of the trade of St. John during the five years of the Liberal régime, were $16,319,000; during the last five years the exports were $19,466,000. Now, no one claims that the National Policy has any great effect or can have, upon the export trade of a port like the city of St. John; but there was a falling off in the import trade of $10,000,000; it was $30,000,000, during the Liberal régime and $20,000,000 during the last five years. The $30,000,000 of imports before the introduction of the National Policy, an average of $6,000,000, paid $970,000 in duty per year. The average of $4,275,000 of imports during the last eleven years, paid $876,000 in duty; in other words, the average duty upon imports in the port of St. John during the period previous to the introduction of the National Policy, was about 14 per cent., while the average duty upon goods during the existence of the National Policy, was over 20 per cent.; in other words, the trade of the port had actually decreased, while the burden upon the people of St. John, or the purchasers of those goods that came to St. John, was vastly increased. While I was looking up the trade of St. John in order to see if the statements made by the hon. member for Westmoreland would be verified—and I regret to find they were not verified—I thought I would look at the trade tables for the capital of Nova Scotia, and I found the following to be the result of the National Policy upon the volume of trade at Halifax. It was not quite so bad as in the case of the sister city of St. John, but still it was not sufficient to induce the representatives of that city and that county to make any great boasts as to the effects of the National Policy upon their trade. From 1875 to 1879 the total trade of Halifax, during the Liberal régime, was $51,378,481; during the last five years the total trade had increased to $55,065,733, a very small and very insignificant increase, only amounting to about $3,000,000, between the two periods. Surely if the National Policy was to produce any very appreciable benefits upon the total volume of trade, for a port like Halifax it ought to have increased a great deal more. But let us analyze the nature of this increase. The whole of this increase is represented by exports and not by imports. The export trade of Halifax had increased about $4,000,000, representing the whole amount of the increase of the total trade, while the imports had remained stationary. But here is another peculiar feature which is worthy of attention, as showing the burden upon the consumers of those goods that had to be imported for the benefit of the people coming to the port at Halifax. It is strange that the amount of

imports during the Liberal régime was substantially the same as it was during the last five years, $31,632,333, which paid in duties $4,917,145. During the last five years almost the same quantity of goods were imported, amounting to $31,393,584, which paid a duty of $7,921,659; in other words, upon the same importations the ultimate purchasers of those goods had paid an increase of duty of something over $3,000,000. This is extraordinary, and a peculiar commentary upon the benefits of the National Policy on these two ports and upon the people who purchased the goods which come through those ports. Now, Sir, the alternative policy which has been offered to this House by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, is that of a fuller and freer reciprocal trade with the United States. I would like to call the attention of the House to this peculiar fact, that with the exception of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and, I think, the hon. member who spoke just before him, almost every representative on that side of the House admits a state of unrest, they admit that something must be done for the benefit of the people of this country, if it is going on to prosper as we desire to see it do. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is properly esteemed as one of the most honourable, fair-minded, and straightforward members in this House, was kind enough to admit that, in his opinion, with the exception of some unimportant details, the present situation was fairly satisfactory; but in that opinion he was scarcely seconded by any representative on that side of the House, and certainly not seconded by any hon. member on this side. But both sides of the House have pratically admitted that there must be some change in the direction of trade reform in connection with our neighbours across the line if this country is to reach the high destiny marked out for it by the fathers of Confederation. The great question is how is this unrest to be satisfied; how are these aspirations to be fulfilled? We say that a large degree of prosperity will be promoted by accepting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And here we are met at the outset by the criticism that we do not agree upon a policy, and hon. gentlemen roam back and forth over all the literature of the last seven or eight years to find opposing statements to full and free commercial relations with the United States. I am willing to admit that they may find declarations that are inconsistent, and that the party to-day does not stand precisely and in every particular on the same platform and basis in every detail as it did during the first nebulous stage of this agitation. When the question was first up there was large latitude of opinion, opinion was in process of formation, while outside of the House, not inside of the House, a large number of prominent Liberals thought commercial union was the sole solution, but subsequently the majority of them, I believe the whole of them, have come to the conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity is the safe solution of the question. To the cry that commercial union was the policy of the party on this side of the House, I would in reply ask hon. gentlemen opposite who may speak on this subject to point to one resolution moved in this House, to one official declaration from the leader of the Liberal party, made as leader of the Liberal party, which presents the scheme of commercial union as the proper solution of this question. It has never been accepted by the Liberal party, and is not to-day part of the platform of the party. The scheme of unrestricted reciprocity itself is susceptible of modifications and changes, and so is any scheme of reciprocity, because there are two parties to the bargain, and there must be a certain amount of elasticity permitted in carrying on the negotiations. But the main and essential principle, and it is the only distinction I can find between the parties, is whether manufactured goods to a greater or less extent shall be admitted or entirely excluded under a reciprocity treaty.

Mr. DAVIN. If any modification is permitted, how can it be unrestricted reciprocity?

Mr. FLINT. The Liberal party are perfectly in favour of going as far as the Americans are willing to go in order to obtain a reciprocity treaty, and they are willing to arrange their tariff and financial arrangements with respect to the nature of a treaty which can be secured from the people of the United States. But it is an entire assumption on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Liberal party in office would give up the power of enacting such a tariff and raising such taxation as the expenditure of the country requires. All these matters in connection with levying taxation and reserving to ourselves power of levying such taxation, are matters which must be considered and adjusted during the progress of any treaty negotiations. I can easily understand, although we may agree upon the principle of a policy of absolute free trade with the United States, that there are means of raising a revenue which would not be open to objection. Hon. gentlemen here attack the principle and insist that we must have direct taxation. I for one am not at all adverse to the principle of direct taxation. I think it is a principle which might be feasible in case it were properly applied to the circumstances of the country, but at the same time it is not a practical question at present, because the people have not been inculcated with the idea, and it would take a long period to readjust our relations in financial matters to bring about direct taxation and so raise our revenue. Direct taxation in England was severely attacked the other day by hon. gentlemen opposite; but I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to take their arguments against direct taxation as practised in the mother country, and present them before any intelligent audience there, and they would find how much acceptance they would meet with. I admit that the question of direct taxation is not a practical question in the politics of this country; but, as an abstract principle, direct taxation, if it can be enforced with the hearty concurrence of the people, is much more honest, fair and equitable than the present system under which this country is governed. The great argument presented against a reciprocity treaty is that we cannot obtain it from the United States. We have ample evidence that we are more likely to obtain a reciprocity treaty which will admit manufactured goods from one country to another than that hon. gentlemen opposite can obtain a reciprocity treaty in natural products only. The evidence from the other side of the line is overwhelming that the American people will not listen for one moment to any scheme for a reciprocity treaty which will embrace

natural products only. I am in favour of unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada, because all the physical conditions of the country point in that direction. We have now unnatural and arbitrary barriers to trade between the peoples of the two countries. We are spending enormous sums upon our canals, upon our railways, upon subventions, upon steamship lines, and at the same time we are carrying out a policy which tends to restrict and hamper the trade which those railways and other facilities were calculated to increase. Strike down those barriers, and we will find that every interest we have subsidized in these directions will at once become prosperous and open wide fields of industry and enterprise. The boundary line of this country extends some 3,500 miles. Near British Columbia we have California, Washington and Oregon. Opposite Manitoba we have Dakota and Montana. Opposite the great Province of Ontario and the district of Algoma, we have the great and populous states of Minnesota and Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. Near the great Province of Quebec we have the whole of the New England States; also very convenient to them by water are the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The people of the United States require in great abundance all the commodities we can produce. The great outcry of the people of this country is for a larger market for their products. The population of the Dominion is small, while its resources are practically unlimited, and if we are to confine the products of these practically unlimited resources of the soil, the mine, and the water, to the small population of the Dominion we certainly are hampering the industry, the trade and the development of the people. As an alternative policy we have sketched out to us by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and by some other hon. members, a policy to be inaugurated in the mother country by which she will discriminate in favour of colonial produce, and they have some hope, admitting the unrest and the unsatisfactory state of trade at the present time, that the mother country will be disposed within a short period to place the products of the colonies on a more favourable footing in the English markets than are the products of other countries. That this is an illusion, an idle expectation, it is scarcely necessary to point out. The mother country has always proceeded on the broad principle of granting no favours in matters of trade; her colonies have no advantage in the markets of the mother country over the United States, or any of the nations of Europe or of the world. If she should change that policy, she would change her whole relations with the rest of the world. What is the trade of the mother country with the world? In 1888 the export of domestic products from England, to foreign countries, was in round numbers £150,000,000 sterling, and the export to all her possessions, was £84,000,000 sterling, showing a difference in favour of the outside world of about £66,000,000. Can it be supposed that England is going to imperil her trade relations with the other countries of the world, for the sake of her colonies; when the only result would be to place herself in a worse position than she is to-day? It has been contended that the mother country is finding certain markets in the world closed to her; it has been shown that Germany and France have become protective countries, and that the United States and other countries are also protected to the disadvantage of England. Is she going to enlarge the area of attack upon herself by creating discrimination in favour of her own possessions, when her trade with the rest of the world is so much more important to her? While upon this subject of the trade of Great Britain with the colonies, let me call the attention of the House to the position assumed by a great many gentlemen on the other side, with regard to the effect of a discrimination by us upon Great Britain. They say that unrestricted reciprocity will discriminate against Great Britain, and that this will lessen the bonds of amity and friendship between us and the mother land, and tend to bring about annexation, so that to that extent it is disloyal. I believe that in all probability, under a large and broad reciprocity treaty with the United States, there will a certain amount of discrimination against the mother country, and I am perfectly prepared to vote for any policy which will benefit the people of this country, no matter what its effect may be upon the people of the mother country. I say we are not here to legislate in the interest of the people of Great Britain; we are here to legislate in the interest of the people who sent us here, and if we can prove that it is to the interest of our people, that there should be even a certain amount of discrimination against Great Britain, I believe that by adopting this policy we will be sustained by the people of this country, and sustained and applauded by the people of the mother country as well. Do gentlemen imagine that because we may for a temporary period only, possibly diminish the volume of exports from Great Britain to Canada, that the people of the mother country are so foolish, as not to see at a glance, that if this country becomes the great prosperous country as we predict it will become, then in a very short time their trade relations, and financial relations, and international relations with us will be placed on a much more satisfactory basis, and that in the vulgar matter of trade alone, we will be far better off under unrestricted reciprocity with the United States than we are at the present time? The total amount of exports from Great Britain, in 1889, was £249,000,000, of which she sent to the Dominion of Canada £7,798,000 sterling; a mere nothing in comparison with the large volume of her trade with the outside world. Suppose the profit to British manufacturers upon the exports to Canada amounted to £1,000,000 sterling, can it be supposed that, for the sake of that profit, even though the whole of this trade were lost, that Great Britain would imperil the harmony that now exists between the mother country and the people of Canada? Having once conceded to us the right to settle our own trade relations, having once squarely abandoned all control over our trade policy and our trade system, can it be imagined that the mother country would, for the sake of a million pounds sterling, disturb the relations existing between us, and produce an ill-feeling among the people of this country? We have abundant evidence to prove that British statesmen would applaud a system of interchange between this country and the United States, even at the expense of a temporary discrimination against the mother country, if that policy would redound to the ulti-

mate prosperity and advantage of the people of Canada, and the people of Great Britain as well. Reciprocity will wonderfully benefit the iron trade of this country. It is admitted upon all hands, that in the matter of mineral resources, the Dominion of Canada is daily giving evidence of possessing remarkable capacities. We have in Nova Scotia coal and iron lying side by side; we have iron mines of almost unlimited extent in the Province of Ontario, and throughout the newer territories of the North-West and of British Columbia; and every day, and almost every week, brings to light new resources in various portions of the country. Therefore any policy which will tend to develop these great resources, must do more for the Dominion of Canada than almost the mind of man can conceive. But, Sir, unfortunately, while we have beneath the soil these rich and extensive deposits, we have not an opportunity of making use of them, even if we had the capital to develop them. Why is this? It is because the population of our country is limited, and because the requirements of the country are also limited. We imported in 1890 over $10,000,000 of iron and steel, and manufactures of iron and steel, upon which the country paid a duty of $2,927,776. This vast amount of duty enters into the expenses of almost every man in the country, and affects his welfare. Our people in almost every relation of life, in every trade, in every art, and in every enterprise in the country are beholden to the iron and steel trade for some measure of their prosperity and success. If it could be so managed by any legislative machinery that we could produce from our mines and manufacture into iron and steel all the products of these mines that the people of this country required, it would be a great achievement; but we know that it is beyond the power of man and beyond the power of any legislation to enable us to do so profitably. But the Government of this country, in undertaking to maintain a protective tariff which should develop this industry, has made most extraordinary efforts; yet we found that, notwithstanding the high duties always levied on iron and steel and their manufactures which were required for revenue purposes in this country, and which were to a certain extent protective, the production of ore and pig iron has been always very limited. But in order to stimulate this industry, as late as 1887, the Finance Minister of that day placed still higher protective duties upon these manufactures and upon pig iron, and also gave a bounty to the existing industries of that nature. Now, I will read some of the predictions held out to the country by the Finance Minister at the time of the increase in these iron duties, and I will ask how these predictions have been fulfilled, and what has been the result of that tariff legislation? Sir Charles Tupper said:

"What I propose to ask this House to do, in adopting the policy of vitalizing this great industry for Canada—is to take the duty off anthracite coal and make it free."

Now, the duties levied on the people of this country by means of those coal duties amounted to a great many millions of dollars, the object of which was to compel the people of Ontario and the other upper provinces to buy and use the bituminous coal of the lower provinces. Up to that time it did not seem to have dawned upon the capacious mind of the Minister of Finance that he was doing great injury to other industries in the upper provinces. At all events, after the people had paid many millions on their coal, he concluded suddenly that another policy was necessary; and in order to reconcile the people generally to the heavy duties on iron and steel, he struck off the duty on anthracite coal, very much to the benefit and satisfaction of the people of the upper provinces. He said:

"The moment that is done, we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, at all events, served by anthracite coal, making that description of anthracite iron which is so highly valued."

I appeal to my hon. friends behind me, and to my hon. friends in front of me, to say whether they know of the existence of these furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston. Three or four years have passed since that prediction was made, and we find it still unfulfilled, and not likely to be fulfilled for a long time to come.—

"We shall have settled the problem that nothing shall be easier than to establish blast furnaces in the Province of Quebec, and in the Province of Ontario, by which you can not only manufacture unlimited quantities of charcoal iron, but manufacture the iron by the use of anthracite coal, * * * All it requires is the adoption of this policy in order to establish, at an early day, industries for the manufacture of iron in the North-West, as well as in other portions of the country. * * * * * Now, Sir, the result is, that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men, numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls."

One would have supposed that by this time there would have been some such result from the adoption of that policy, something to show for the exaggerated promises of the Finance Minister. The fact is that none of these promises have been redeemed. There are in existence in the Dominion of Canada only four small furnaces, one in British Columbia, the Londonderry Iron and Steel Works in Nova Scotia, and one or two in other portions of the country. As far back as 1879, shortly after this Government came into power, we had the promise of the Finance Minister who preceded Sir Charles Tupper, with regard to the iron industry. He said:

"It may safely be said that it is the basis of every other industry. It is true we have not developed it to a great extent yet. We have an establishment in Nova Scotia. There is no reason why we should not supply the whole trade in time."

These were the views and the reasons which actuated the Government in placing these enormous duties on iron and steel, and taking the duty off anthracite coal. What has been the result? The result has been that whereas our imports of iron and steel have reached an enormous sum, though fluctuating to a certain degree, the actual production of iron in the country has increased but slightly. The value of the imports of pig iron has increased from $566,000 in 1885, to $1,120,000 in 1889; showing that although we have placed these enormous duties upon iron and steel and their manufactures, and upon pig iron, yet the importations continue to increase in quantity and value to an enormous extent, taking an immense amount of money out of the pockets of the people, while the value of iron produced in the Dominion only increased from $127,000 in 1886, to $155,300 in 1890. The number of men which the Finance Minister predicted would be employed in the production of iron ore and pig iron and in the running of the blast furnaces under his policy was about 20,000, but the latest returns show the total number of men employed in these industries to be about 390. In other words,

we have had an enormous burden placed on the people of the country to promote the manufacture of pig iron, and while the production has scarcely increased the importations have largely increased, and we have lost the whole opportunity of selling our ores in the outside markets of the world. But give us the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, let us induce the people of the United States to strike off their enormous duties on iron ore and pig iron, and then every acre of mining land in this country will at once increase in value, and possibilities of great brilliancy will open up in every portion of the Dominion of Canada, because then we shall have an enormous market for the sale of these products. It is a market that the people require in order to develop these industries; and the opening up of a large market for our Canadian iron ore and Canadian pig iron will be of almost incalculable benefit to every man, woman and child in the country. Now, there was no subject upon which, during the period of the Liberal régime, the critics of the Opposition were more delighted to taunt the Government than upon the effect their policy was supposed to have upon the shipping industry. There was a certain decline in shipping, in some particulars, during that régime, and it was predicted that the National Policy would have a great benefit upon the shipping industry of this country. Well, I am not prepared to go so far as to say that the National Policy has injured the shipping industry to the extent to which it has been injured, but, I make no doubt whatever that the National Policy is responsible for a fair proportion of it. It has shut off, or tended to shut off our trade with the United States; it has prevented, to a large degree, the growth of the shipping industry which would be engaged in carrying our goods and American goods back and forth between the two countries. But give us unrestricted reciprocity, with all that implies, open the coasting trade of the United States to our vessels, and you will at once give a great impetus to our shipping industry. But in order to show how the National Policy has failed to benefit the shipping industry of the Dominion, I will call your attention to a few of the statistics in connection with that subject. The tonnage built in 1874 amounted to 174,000; the tonnage registered in that year amounted to 163,000. The average tonnage built from 1868 to 1874 was about 116,000 tons per year, and the average tonnage registered during that period was about 131,000. It increased during the régime of the Mackenzie Administration from 116,000 to 138,000, and the tonnage registered increased on an average from 130,000 to 134,000 tons. Then we had the National Policy, which was to do great things for the country, and was in particular to do great things for the shipping industry. At any rate, it was to do it no harm. But the average tonnage built since 1878 instead of being 138,000 tons, which it was during the Liberal régime, only amounted to 52,000 tons for the last eleven years. The total tonnage of Canada from 1873 to 1879 stood as follows:—

1873	1,073,719
1874	1,158,363
1875	1,205,565
1876	1,260,893
1877	1,310,468
1878	1,333,015
1879	1,332,094

showing an increase of 258,000 tons from 1873 to 1879, which, valued at $30 per ton, shows an increase in the value of the shipping of the Dominion, from 1873 to 1879, of $8,750,000—a very substantional increase to the wealth of the people. But the National Policy came in, and following it came a falling off in our shipping. Whereas in 1880 we had 1,311,218 tons of shipping in Canada, the amount fell off yearly, until in 1890 we only had 1,024,974 tons, showing a decrease of 307,000 tons, representing a decrease in the value of shipping alone of $9,213,600; but the difference between the two periods represents a change to the people of Canada of something like $18,000,000. Now, whatever the National Policy may have done, it is quite apparent that it has failed to benefit in any way or to influence for the good of the people the shipping industry of the country. But we are answered: the shipping industry has been injured by causes outside the National Policy. Whenever there is any falling off hon. gentlemen opposite are only too anxious to shift the burden somewhere else, and pretend that the National Policy is not to blame; but when they can point out to any apparent advantage in any particular, they hold up both hands and say the National Policy is entitled to all the credit. But when we compare the position of the Dominion in shipping with the position of other nations—let us look to Great Britain, a free trade country, which cultivates a commercial policy that tends to develop the shipping industry—we find that whereas in 1880 Great Britain had a tonnage of 6,579,772, in 1889 she had a tonnage of 7,724,149, or an increase of 1,204,377, representing an increase of wealth to the people of free trade Great Britain of $36,000,000, at the same time when, under the National Policy, our shipping showed a falling off amounting to a decrease in our wealth of $9,000,000, thus proving that the National Policy has not benefited the shipping interests of this country, while the free trade policy of England has benefited her shipping to the extent of $36,000,000. There has been an increase of tonnage since 1880, not only in Great Britain, but in Norway, Hamburg, the German Empire, Belgium and France. In fact, Canada is one of the few countries in which the shipping industry has gone down. Now, Sir, if the National Policy was to be of any benefit, I do not see why the shipping industry should not share in it. Give us unrestricted reciprocity, give us the coasting trade of the United States, which we would obtain under a fair treaty of unrestricted reciprocity, and we will find every ship-yard throughout the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick busy building vessels. We will find a great impetus given to the coasting trade and the ship-building business of the country, and we will find all over the great lakes and throughout the vast water-stretches between the United States and the Dominion the shipping industry would be vastly promoted. In the matter of fisheries, what would be the effect of a treaty of reciprocity with the United States? Can any man calculate the great advantages which would accrue to the fishing industries of the Dominion by the opening up of free trade relations with the United States. Why, Sir, the fishery wealth of the Dominion is past calculation. There is no wealth, not the mining wealth of the country, not the agricultural wealth of the country, not the forest wealth of the country, which can compare with the fishing wealth in our great lakes all through the North-West, and in the waters

along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and these sources of wealth can only be cultivated and developed to their full extent through the means of reciprocity with the United States. Notwithstanding the hampering restrictions to our trade with the United States, our exports to that country are about one-third of all our exports of fish. Give us free trade, and we will obtain access to an unlimited market, and we will have opened up to our hardy fishermen in every province, and particularly in the Maritime Provinces, a vast source of wealth. Now, in the United States the returns of fish sold to the United States are as follows:—

In 1885	$3,500,000
1886	2,500,000
1887	2,717,000
1888	3,163,000
1889	2,840,000
1890	2,671,503

while to all other British possessions we sold about the same quantity. The United States returns show that our returns are substantially correct. The value of dutiable fish we sent to the United States in 1890 was $1,519,315, on which we paid, as far as I can gather from the American statistics, a duty of about $500,000. That, upon our limited trade, was a direct loss to the fishermen, mostly of the Maritime Provinces, because had the fish been free the price would not have been affected, and this half million of dollars would have gone into the pockets of the fishermen of Canada. In this connection let me relate a curious incident which took place during the late election. I was canvassing the captain of a fishing vessel, a particularly intelligent man, and I spoke to him of the benefits of reciprocity in regard to the fishing industry. To my surprise, he expressed himself as being entirely opposed to fish entering the United States free. I was amazed. I said: Are you not in favour of our fish going into the United States free? He said: No. I said: Why? He said: I am captain of a Gloucester fishing vessel, and I do not want Nova Scotia fish to go into Gloucester free, and to compete with the fish which I catch on my own boat. Here was the peculiar spectacle of a Nova Scotian, who was the captain of a Gloucester fishing vessel, voting against reciprocity because it would interfere with his trade. Of course, I laughed heartily when I heard his reasons; but it shows that those fishermen who sail from United States ports are opposed to the interests of their own brethren in the Dominion of Canada, because they are afraid of the fish that might go in in Canadian bottoms. But give us free trade, and the fishing industry of the lower provinces and of the whole Dominion will at once obtain prosperity, and so will every other industry. Let us take higher considerations, those which should actuate us in desiring to establish harmonious relations with the people of the United States. Not only are we interested in this matter for the sake of our own prosperity, or the prosperity of the people of the United States, but the whole of the British Empire is interested in the peaceful solution of these questions in the interests of the empire. England sits on the other side of the ocean peculiarly surrounded by great and warlike nations, and she is interested in acting as peacemaker and harmoniser among those nations and in seeking to prevent a European war, and to bring the great force of her wealth, her influence and her military and naval power to bear upon them in the interests of peace. She, therefore, desires that all these difficulties between the United States and Canada shall be amicably settled. In addition to being actuated by the great trade question, let us unite to cultivate the fullest and most harmonious relations with the people of the United States, marching forward together in the cause of progress, in the cause of humanity, to the benefit of all the nations of the earth; and then, instead of having taunts thrown against a people who live alongside us for 3,000 miles, of being an alien people, of seeking to wrest us as one of the jewels from the British Crown, we will find harmony and peace, and we will find our mother country blessing us with both hands, and thanking us for the part we are taking not only in advancing our material interests but in promoting peace and harmony in the world.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That all accounts for salaries and extra services or otherwise with the Post Office Department in regard to the following persons, namely:—J. G. Poston, A. C. McDonald, M. P. Wright, E. A. LeSueur, Miss Kate E. Falconer, Miss J. Craig, Miss A. Graham, and A. E. Meghen, together with all cheques given in payment of such accounts, and any and all cheques, vouchers, receipts and other papers in any way relating to their respective services, for the fiscal years 1887-88 and 1888-89; and all the cheques, accounts and receipts for payments of every kind in connection with the Emerson, Deloraine and Gretna Immigration Stations in the North-West, for the financial years 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1889, be produced forthwith for the use of the Public Accounts Committee.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149) respecting the Inspection of Ships. He said: This is the measure in reference to which there has been considerable discussion in the country on the part of sailors in regard to the insecurity of tackle. At present we have no means of regulating the tackle or equipment of ships, our Inspection Act having special reference to the hulls of vessels. This Bill proposes no new tackle on shipping, but it gives the officers of the Marine Department additional powers, so as to secure the inspection of the equipment and tackle of ships as well as the hulls.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In this connection I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a Bill which was carried through the Senate last year,

and which is germane to the object of the present Bill. It was introduced into the Senate by Mr. Power, and is entitled an Act for the better securing of the safety of certain fishermen. That Bill came down to this House last year, after having passed the Senate unanimously; but owing, I think, to the late period at which it reached the House, and owing to the intimation which the hon. gentleman gave that he would take the subject into his consideration, it was not pressed. This year it has again passed the Senate unanimously, I believe, and I have taken charge of it so far as to move the first reading. It is now on the Order paper, and it is perfectly plain that there is very little chance of reaching it this session unless it receives the attention and approval of the hon. gentleman, and is taken charge of by him. I would like to ask if his attention has been called to it, if he will give it the consideration which he promised last year, and if he will adopt it and see that it is carried through this session?

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is somewhat mistaken as to what was promised last session. I may say that I have given careful attention to the subject. I have discussed the Bill in all its phases with the hon. gentleman who took charge of it in the other House, and I have also had the benefit of very full reports upon it from the officers of the Marine Department. Just previously to the Bill coming before the House, I was called away, and was away for most of the session, as the hon. gentleman will recollect. Mr. Colby, who was then acting for me, expressed quite fully the views of the Marine Department, which induced the Government to come to the conclusion that the Bill should not become law, and the Bill was defeated. I do not think it is possible that Mr. Colby on that occasion held out any undertaking or promise to further consider the measure, as he was then in possession of the fullest evidence, that while the Bill was philanthropic in intent and had a good object in view, namely, the safety of the fishermen, it was, from the fishermen's standpoint, a Bill interfering with operations that had been left, so far as statutory legislation is concerned, exceedingly free in the past. It was my intention, if the Bill came up during the present session, to oppose it in every possible way on that ground, because, instead of assisting or benefiting the fishermen, I think it would inconvenience them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall take the earliest opportunity of inviting the opinion of the House on the measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HARBOUR OF PICTOU.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) to amend the Acts respecting the harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia. He said: At present the harbour is managed by four or five officials appointed by Order of the Governor in Council, and this Bill is to create the Harbour Commissioners a body corporate and to give them power to borrow for the purposes of harbour improvements.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that Government Orders have precedence on Mondays for the remainder of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a motion which is generally made when prorogation is within sight, and as far as I can see we have not yet reached that period. We have a good deal of business on the Order paper yet to be discharged, and certainly, even with every endeavour to abridge it, the session must last yet several weeks. Therefore, I think this motion is premature and should not now be pressed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object is to hasten the work of the House. Of course there is a good deal of private business on the Notice paper, but the hon. gentleman must have seen that during the last two or three sittings, the work done, with regard to private measures, has not been very marked. Last Monday we discussed but one measure, and under the circumstances if we were to give Mondays for the purpose of hastening the work of the House I think we would be doing the proper thing. I thought the hon. gentleman would have suggested that next Monday might not be interfered with, and that this motion would take effect for the Monday following.

Mr. LAURIER. I thought of taking next Monday and leaving the following Mondays to the Government, but I think it is premature to make this motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the Mondays after that, the questions by members might be heard first.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that the motion be not proceeded with until we see what progress can be made on Monday next.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case I would say, let the motion remain on the Notice paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me it is a pity that the Government have departed from the proper rule which was practically established a good while ago, that when a notice of motion was reached, unless there was some very important reason to the contrary, that notice should be proceeded with. I have observed during this session that the Government have asked that notices of motion be allowed to stand, not once, but a score of times, and without, it appears to me, any sufficient reason. I think that should not have been done, and it is a pity the rule is not more regularly enforced.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see any reason why the notice should not remain on the Notice paper.

Motion withdrawn.

IRON BOUNTIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the hon. Minister of Finance, if he has looked into the matter touching the necessity of bringing down the reports about iron bounties to which I called his attention the other day?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe that comes within the department of the hon. Minister of Customs, and I

handed a note to him about it. I think the returns are made necessary by the Act.

COMMISSIONER HERCHMER.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice when the report of Mr. Comptroller White into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer will be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report was finished and handed to the head of the department during last week, and I will get it in a day or two.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd June, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). In the few observations I intend to make on this matter, I will endeavour to be as brief as possible and to confine my remarks to the amendment to the resolution now before the House. The discussion has assumed a very wide range, and while very much has been said, and eloquently said, on both sides of the House, which is interesting and instructive, I cannot help thinking that very much which has emanated from the other side of the House might have been more properly addressed to the Congress of the United States during the discussion on the McKinley Bill. While I do not imagine for a single moment that the woes and troubles of our fellow-countrymen, which have been so pathetically portrayed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, would have had any effect upon the determination of our American cousins, it might be said that these arguments were addressed to a legislative body who had power to deal with their difficulties and who might have struck off the duties these gentlemen groan under. I humbly suggest that this fallacy runs through the speeches of very many hon. gentlemen opposite. They act and speak as if we had some control over the United States Congress, and as if we could affect the legislation which they have the power to adopt. This, of course, needs no argument to refute. Hon. gentlemen opposite would at once admit the absurdity of such a contention, and would repudiate it; and yet, day after day, and hour after hour, these hon. gentlemen have not only endeavoured to make us believe how much more our people would be able to obtain from the people of the United States under altered circumstances, but they have been vehemently blaming this Government because these duties were not taken off. The first portion of this amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, to a great extent, been lost sight of in this discussion, and hon. gentlemen opposite have said very little on the subject, though, if the proposal is feasible and can be practically carried out, it requires our very careful consideration. The first portion of the amendment to which I desire to call your attention at the present time, is as follows:—

"That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers."

This point ought not to be slighted. This proposal, if it be practicable, comes home to our whole population, and I think the hon. gentleman who propounded it should give us all the details in connection with it so that we might form a just judgment on the subject, but I ask the House how much wiser are we after all the discussions we have heard on that subject? Has any one told us what the total amount of the reduction is to be, or whether there is to be any reduction at all? Has anybody intimated upon what articles the reduction is to be made, or upon what other articles the duty is to be increased? No doubt the resolution will sound very well when read on the public platform. It may be a matter with which hon. gentlemen opposite may successfully conjure at some of the by-elections, as it appeals to all portions of our population, and the hon. gentleman has named the classes of the population who he says are affected and to whom he appeals, though he has not named the articles on which he proposes to reduce the duty. The ambiguity of this amendment will enable hon. gentlemen to pose in their respective constituencies in opposition to any duty which may be unpopular there, leaving their colleagues to take the opposite course and the opposite argument in other constituencies. What are the articles upon which the duties are to be reduced? The hon. member for King's—a solitary figure, it is true—was bold enough to mention flour, but after all that has been said and admitted on that subject surely that article need not be discussed now. I prefer to leave that to be dealt with by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who no doubt will do the necessary catechising of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who seemed to be very much afraid of him during the debate. Nearly all the necessaries of life are now free or moderately taxed. Hon. members on this side have shown the favourable position of the farmers and artizans, and the great privileges they enjoy. Passing by the farmers and the artizans, and leaving the miners to be dealt with by those gentlemen who represent mining constituencies, and are therefore more conversant with their wants than any one else can be, what about the fishermen? Well, the fishermen have not only in common with all their fellow-subjects a free breakfast-table, but their fishing gear, their provisions and fishing supplies are free of duty, they get a considerable drawback on the materials they use in the construction of their vessels, and $160,000 bounty is distributed promptly and satisfactorily amongst them. No one feels more than they do that their industry has been supported and developed by the Government from day to day, and they know that they are indebted for this to the National Policy and the care the Government has shown in regard to their interest in the prosecution of their arduous and perilous undertaking. Look at the figures. Our revenue amounts to $31,500,000. We raise from liquors, tobacco and the better class of woollens, cottons and hardware, which the fishermen do not generally consume, $23,500,000, leaving a balance of $8,000,000. This year $3,000,000 have been taken from that by the reduction of taxation, leaving a balance of $5,000,000, or a little more than $1 per head of the population. An amount of 80 cents a head is paid to the Local Government to enable it to defray the expenses for roads and bridges and education, saving that much of direct taxation. Deduct from

that the $160,000 bounty paid to the fishermen, and I would like to know if we are in a position to say that the fishermen are not fairly dealt with, and taking the cost of the protective service and the expense of keeping up the various fish hatcheries, if we should say that the fishermen are in such a position that efforts should be made at once to reduce the duties on articles of prime necessity in their interest? I do not wonder that this part of the amendment has not had a prominent place in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. In fact, their speeches have shown a total absence of any definite scheme for a reduction of the duty. Some gentlemen have said it was impossible to formulate a definite scheme. It may be impossible in regard to a reciprocity treaty, because that is a matter of negotiation with the American Government, but I think, when hon. gentlemen put before us a resolution of this kind, stating that duties are to be reduced on articles of prime necessity, they are bound to give us some details of what they propose, and not, as a fisherman would say, to give themselves so much leeway. They should state where the reduction would be made and upon what articles they would make that reduction. Now, Sir, if it is not out of place, I think it would be very well to say—perhaps, with bated breath and whispered humbleness—that such a thing as a revenue is necessary in this country, and we cannot get on very well without it. The interest on the debt must be paid, the necessary expenses of the Government must be met, the subsidies to provinces provided for, and we are not at all opposed to public works. I, for one, heartily approve of the Government aiding and assisting in the construction of public works, and I know, Sir, that very many members on the opposite side of the House are equally in favour of it. But while I am ready to aid and assist in the construction of railways in different parts of the Dominion, I also ask, and I know that my Liberal friend from Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes) will join me in that request, that we should have Government assistance in building a railway in the isolated Counties of Queen's and Shelburne. I would ask, how are these things to be provided for if the revenue is to be reduced and the duties taken off? Perhaps I cannot better close the remarks I have to make on this portion of the subject than by reading an extract from one of the speeches of the Hon. Edward Blake, made at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite had not only the benefit of his sympathetic eye, but when he was actually their leader, and it was their pleasure to follow him. Now, Mr. Blake said:

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of absolutely free trade in Canada he may be, has yet suggested, no man, I believe, can suggest, a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make, or can make, within our bounds; or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free-trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada. I have not believed it soluble in my day; and any chance of its solubility, if any chance there was, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

Now, Sir, the second part of this amendment, I think, is equally vague. The Toronto *Mail* the other day very properly characterized it as being adroitly worded. What is this unrestricted reciprocity? It has gone by a great many names; we have heard it called a Customs union, commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, and some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House the other day wanted to make out that instead of being unrestricted reciprocity, it was restricted reciprocity. Why, Sir, the very fact that they have felt themselves obliged to give so many names to this political bantling is a very peculiar circumstance in itself. But however the views of hon. gentlemen may now vary, I take it that the signification we are to give to unrestricted reciprocity is to be derived not only from the name itself, but from the explanations that have been given to it during the last campaign, upon various platforms and in the press of the country. Now, Sir, what did Sir Richard Cartwright say about it in Boston:

"Briefly, Sir, it this project can be carried out, it will mean for you the addition of half a continent for commercial purposes, and the creation of a new tier of Northern States, with an enormous area of unoccupied land, with very great mineral resources, with a present population of 5,000,000, but with a capacity of maintaining 50,000,000. * * * * * The advantages of your (Boston's) position for securing a very large part of our trade, are great. You own, as I have said, much of our mineral wealth. Many of our chief trade routes centre here. You are the natural shipping port especially in winter, for very large sections of our territory. You lie within easy distance of our cities, and of the most populous portions of our Dominion. In one word, given free trade with Canada and you rise at one stride from the position, in some respects, of a frontier city, with no great extent of trade territory secured you, to that of a central entrepot, with a practical monopoly of a great region behind you whose commerce no man can take from you."

Or listen to Mr. Longley, a gentleman who occupies the position of Attorney General in the Local House of Assembly of Nova Scotia. He has been associated with the hon. member for South Oxford in this enterprise and others, and with their colleagues, Mr. Wiman, Mr. Hitt, Mr. Murray and their supporters. Here is what Mr. Longley says:

"There has been introduced into the Congress of the United States by one of the most influential members of that body, Mr. Butterworth, of Ohio, a measure of the most comprehensive character. In two or three clauses he proposes to settle the whole difficulty by striking down the Custom-houses between Canada and the United States. The measure he proposes is a treaty of the most absolutely free and unrestricted commercial intercourse. He proposes that there shall not be a Custom-house between the United States and Canada. A line of Custom-houses between the United States and Canada is the most unnatural and unphilosophical thing that can be imagined. If the people of the United States were a nation of Patagonians or savages, there might be some reason for our not having intercourse with them, but the people of the United States are a nation speaking the same language that we do; they sprang from the same race that we do; they have a common fatherhood with us in the English-speaking race, and to-day nothing but an imaginary line separates the two peoples. * * * * It is true that $8,000,000 of the revenue we collect is derived from imports from the United States, but a commercial union implies more than the absence of Custom-houses, It implies the establishment of a common tariff against the rest of the world; and therefore the commercial union proposed by Mr. Butterworth implies a common tariff against the rest of the world. That tariff, of course, will be adjusted by commissioners representing the two Governments; but it is unnecessary for me to say that the American tariff in such a case would largely prevail, and that we in Canada would be practically under the American tariff against the rest of the world."

Now, Sir, Mr. Longley most certainly was in favour of a common tariff, and he was in favour of striking down all the Custom-houses between the two countries of discrimination against Great Britain. Now, let us see what Mr. Wiman says upon the subject:

"Unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada would be practically the same kind of reciprocity that now exists between the states of the Union or between the provinces of the Dominion. There would be no taxation, no restriction, or let or hindrance to the freest and fullest exchange of everything each country produces, whether natural or manufactured. True, it is proposed to keep up the Custom-houses along the border in order that smuggling from outside should not be permitted, and especially that Canada should not be the back door by which foreign goods could be brought into the United States free of duty. But the tariff of Canada must necessarily be as high as that of this country, against the outside world, for by the free admission of American goods (even now with a heavy duty on half her imports) the revenue from Customs would be so reduced that as against foreign goods the rates must continue fully as high as those in the United States. Indeed this condition of equality of tariff must always prevail, else there would be no safety for the revenue of either country. * * * The Customs line that now cuts the continent in two will be lifted up and placed right around the continent."

Now, let us see what Mr. Longley says with regard to the question of fish. Speaking in Boston, he said this:

"Please take home with you this fact, that the Liberal party of Canada has adopted unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, as the chief and supreme plank of its political platform. Upon every platform and upon every hustings, from now until the day when the next general election is over, that will be the one supreme question discussed. The success of such a policy means an end in fishery squabbles and an end to bond squabbles. Under such a policy as that, American fishermen may enter Canadian waters at will and take all they can find. Under such a policy they can enter Canadian ports for bait and supply, and send all the fish they require to markets at home."

This is what unrestricted reciprocity is. Even if the hon. gentlemen opposite desire to get away from this construction of those two words, I think it would be utterly impossible to do so after they have put their views on record. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who addressed the House last night, informed us among other things that the policy of the Opposition, the policy expressed by this resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not tend to annexation. Well, Sir, I should like to know what view any one would take on that point after reading the remarks made by Mr. Wiman, by the hon. member for South Oxford and by other hon. gentlemen? If we need anything more than that, let us see what Mr. Blaine says about it. I need not read his words in full as they have been quoted already, but he virtually said that the only reciprocity that he will accept, that is worth considering, is a reciprocity which gives the United States entire control of the tariff, and which must eventually end in annexation. I should like to ask what view it was that Mr. Blake took of this matter? Did he not think that this policy would lead to annexation? Was that not the very reason he refused to run at the last general election and gave up the leadership of the Liberal party? I am free to say, as other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have said, that I am strongly in favour of reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States, but, of course, those arrangements must be based on a solid and just foundation. I believe that reciprocal trade relations would be very beneficial to this country and more especially to many parts of it. Take, for instance, the fishing industry. The fresh fish industry, particularly, is growing and increasing daily. The only market for our mackerel is the market of the United States, and, therefore, it is that the fishermen as a class are very anxious, indeed, to have reciprocal trade relations with the United States. But they are not willing, and their representative is not willing, to pay too much for those trade arrangements. If we see that it places our country in the hands of the United States, if we have to give up control of our tariff and allow them to regulate it to suit themselves, if we have to let the Americans come in and use our inshore fisheries, I believe the occupation of the fishermen would very soon come to an end. The policy of allowing the American fishermen to come into our inshore fisheries and, as Mr. Longley says, do as they please, would not only ruin the business in a very few years, but while it was being ruined, it would make competition so great in the United States that the price of fish would come down to a mere nothing. The hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their views very much about reciprocity. They tell us we have no definite policy, they intimate to us that we have shifted our ground from time to time: but, if we look at the history of reciprocity, we will find that in making that charge they are judging us by themselves and it is they who have been shifting their ground and now advocate a principle very different from that which they urged some time ago. I think we may answer them by their own speeches. I can turn up an address made by the hon. member for South Oxford, in which he expressed himself as opposed to reciprocity, or at all events to the view now taken by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. That hon. gentleman said:

"They say we must have reciprocity and cannot live without it as a Dominion. I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships and will carry the war into Africa. We will find new markets for ourselves and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

What did Mr. Jones, a former representative in this House, say in 1878? He said:

"These men who tell you that it is impossible to exist as a commercial people unless you have reciprocity, might as well tell the United States that if they want to drive you into the Union all they have to do is to refuse you reciprocity for a certain number of years longer, which is the very best way that can be adopted of inducing the American people to enter into commercial relations with us. For my part, I will deny that we are dependent on them, one way or another. No Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among a great number of his fellow countrymen."

Again, the hon. gentleman said in 1872:

"He felt, as a representative of Nova Scotia, that however anxious he might be for the establishment of improved trade relations with the United States on fair terms, he was not willing to give the United States everything that we had to offer as an inducement for reciprocity. If we gave them permission to fish in our waters, we put them in competition with our own fishermen and reduce the value of their fish. He stood here not to represent one county or one province, but the whole interests of the Dominion, and in that capacity he would feel it his duty to vote against the ratification of the treaty."

And again:

"We would lose more by the competition of these Americans than we would gain by the reduction of the duty."

We have been told notwithstanding the express announcement of their policy that the Government are not sincere in their desire for reciprocity, and that they have never been in favour of it. I think they

have always been the most successful advocates of it. The first treaty, that in 1854, was negotiated under their direction. The Washington Treaty of 1871 was obtained in a great measure through our late leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, and he was bitterly attacked by the Liberals of that day for selling the country by the provisions of that treaty. Then, again, the Treaty of 1878 was negotiated by the party in power, and efforts have been made from time to time—it is true they were made in vain—but still efforts have been made, and everything has been done that could be done honourably and fairly to obtain equitable reciprocal relations in trade with the United States. I have said that were we to follow the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be ruinous to our fishing industry; and if we were to do as Mr. Longley suggested, namely, open our inshore fisheries to the Americans, it would result most disastrously to us. I have, Sir, a few details here which I would like to submit, to prove my statement. Since the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty were abrogated by the United States in 1885, and the Americans kept out of our fishing grounds, the catch of mackerel by the United States fishermen has fallen from 478,000 barrels in 1884 to 19,042 in 1890, and their catch of codfish has fallen from 1,001,303 quintals in 1884 to 436,650 quintals in 1890, clearly showing that we have the supply and therefore virtually fix the price. In 1879 the price of "No. 1" mackerel in the Boston market (as stated in the report of the Boston Fish Bureau) was from $7 to $15 per barrel; the price of "No. 2" mackerel, from $3 to $8 per barrel; the price of "No. 3 large," from $3 to $7.50 per barrel, and the price of "unculled," from $2.50 to $9. In 1889 the prices of mackerel, according to the same authority, were as follows:—"No. 1," from $22 to $35 per barrel; "No. 2," from $16 to $24 per barrel; "No. 3 large," from $12 to $19 per barrel, and "unculled," from $13 to $33 per barrel. This shows conclusively that, since the repeal of the Washington Treaty, and the consequent exclusion of the United States fishermen from our fishing privileges, the United States fisheries have declined enormously, while Canadian fisheries have greatly increased, and the prices of fish are much larger now than they were before that period. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Yarmouth has said that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, or the fishermen of the Dominion I should rather say, have paid some $500,000 duty on the fish they sent into the United States. It may be that, in the first instance, when they delivered their fish in that market, they actually paid the duty; but, Sir, we must remember that the price of fish has very largely increased in the American market. If the inshore fisheries were open to the Americans a very much larger quantity of fish caught by the Americans themselves would go into the market, and the price would immediately come down; so that virtually, after all, it is the consumer in the United States who pays the duty, because he pays a much larger price for the article in consequence of the limited supply. Now, Sir, I can cite an authority on that subject which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will hardly dispute. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when Minister of the Interior in the Mackenzie Administration, discussing the question of who pays the duty, gives this statement:

"It is an incontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

And as a further proof of that, we find that Mr. Ed. Atkinson, of Boston, Chairman of the Commercial Union Committee in New York, made the following statement four years ago:—

"Last year the imports of fish into the United States were valued at two and a quarter million dollars. We taxed the fish $500,000. Who pays it? Mainly the working people of New England, who need the fish most, and who have the least wherewith to pay it. We imported last year $650,000 worth of potatoes; we taxed them $292,000. A few years ago when the crop of potatoes in New England was very short, the people paid in that year a tax on Canadian and Irish potatoes, of over $1,250,000. All these taxes on fish, potatoes, meats and other provisions which Canada provides for us, enter directly into the cost of the manufacturing and mechanical arts in the United States."

So, Sir, according to the dictum of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and also of Mr. Atkinson, the Chairman of the Commercial Union Committee of New York, we find that both these gentlemen agree that the people of the United States actually paid this $500,000 duty on the fish, and that the fishermen of Canada did not pay it. I am glad to find that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) was somewhat candid last night, when he was discussing the question, as to where the revenue was to come from; and when it had been suggested that direct taxation would be the only result of the Liberal policy, he was candid enough to say that direct taxation was not objectionable; and in that respect I believe he only reiterates the principle which has been suggested by the hon. member, the mover of this resolution, (Sir Richard Cartwright). I believe, Sir, that direct taxation is the only outcome of the reduction of these duties and of an arrangement such as is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite with the United States, and that the sooner the people of this country know this fact the better. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), after stating that the policy of the Opposition did not lead or tend to annexation, bestowed a good deal of time and labour in explaining away the utterances of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the celebrated Boston dinner party. Although none of us were there on that occasion, we have read their speeches, and there was a gentleman there who took in the situation, and who made his comment upon what passed, and the conclusion that he came to was: that the proper way for obtaining what Mr. Wiman, and what Mr. Hitt, and what Mr. Murray desired, was to make the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) Senator for Ontario. It reminds me, Sir, very much of the remarks that that hon. gentleman made himself, when he was told that his policy was not a definite one, and when he was asked what his policy was, he replied: Put me in power and on the other side of the House and then I will tell you. The answer of these gentlemen at the Boston dinner party is: If you want unrestricted reciprocity, make the hon. gentleman Senator for Ontario. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that their policy does not lead to annexation, but it is a very peculiar thing, that it is difficult to tell, who exactly is the father of this very amendment of the hon. member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) which we are now asked to consider. It is true, that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford moves that resolution in the House at this present time, but it has been foreshadowed ever since April, 1889. Why, Sir, Mr. Hitt said at that time :

"There is some logic in what Mr. Farrer says of not making two bites of a cherry, but going for annexation at once, but I think he is misled on that point in a way that often occurs. Where a man is thinking much on a point and discussing it, he is liable to narrow his horizon to those within his reach; and his own mind, and, perhaps, those he meets, having passed on by discussion to distant results, he takes it for granted that the wide world, which is so wonderfully slow, has kept up with him, and has the same results in sight. We must be very patient with the slow-moving popular mind. If the Canadian public of farmers, artizans, lumbermen, miners and fishermen——

The very people who are mentioned in this resolution——

—"can be in three years argued up to the point of voting commercial union, and giving sanction to the movement in Parliament, it will be great progress."

Well, Sir, I presume that we are going through that progress now. This is certainly the resolution which was foreshadowed by Mr. Hitt. Whether the hon. gentleman has taken his inspiration from Mr. Hitt and accordingly framed and proposed this resolution, is best known to himself; but at all events the two utterances are extremely alike. The hon. member for Yarmouth grew very eloquent over the State of Dakota. He felt almost as its representative that he was bound to stand up for it in this House, and he undertook to dispute the fact that a large body of immigrants are coming into this country from Dakota. But, Sir, does he not know that the statement about a train load of immigrants coming into this country was made by the agent of Mr. Greenway, the present Liberal Premier of Manitoba, whom I suppose he would look upon as a good authority? Yes, Sir, he could stand up for Dakota, but he had not a word to say in favour of Nova Scotia. He did not resent the insult offered to Nova Scotia and its people by the hon. member for South Oxford; but he justified that hon. gentleman's remarks, while he felt it incumbent upon him to stand up for Dakota, and contradict the well-founded statement which was made with respect to that state. Now, Sir, we were told by the hon. member for Yarmouth that the Conservative party had made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity to the people of the United States—that in fact we had made an offer which went further than he was prepared to go; and he cited the Hon. George Brown as an authority. But, in the researches which his curiosity led him to make I think he must have discovered that that was contradicted. He must have known that Sir Francis Hincks, Sir John A. Macdonald and other persons stated that no such thing as that had happened at all. The matter was brought up, I think, by Mr. Huntington, and Sir Francis Hincks stated :

"Hon. Sir Francis Hincks said most distinctly the hon. gentleman had been totally misinformed. All communications that passed between Messrs. Thornton, Rose and Fish were of a strictly confidential character, but not because it was so desired by the Government of this country."

Sir John A. Macdonald on the same occasion said :

"He thought the hon. gentleman was carrying this matter beyond parliamentary propriety. The hon. Finance Minister had informed the House that communications were altogether of an official and confidential character, and this has been said last week, and the hon. gentleman in reiterating his statement was discourteous, though he had disavowed such an intention."

The statement made by the hon. member for Yarmouth was nothing more than a reiteration of the charges made by Mr. Huntington. If he had looked farther, he would have seen that the leaders of the Conservative party not only denied that any such offer had been made, but they were opposed to what was called a Customs union. Sir George E. Cartier said :

"He pointed to the United States, and they could not expect a Customs union without collecting an equal tariff with theirs to the exclusion of all foreign goods."

He also said :

"By committing ourselves to commercial union with the United States, the result of the hon. member's plan would be to commit us to a political union. There was so much in the resolutions that he was forced to vote against them all, good or bad."

And the Hon. Joseph Howe, of whom the hon. gentleman spoke so highly, and who, as he has truly said, was one of the greatest statesmen Nova Scotia has ever produced, said :

"We could not enter into a zollverein with the United States without raising our duties so high above what they are now that our country would be borne down by taxation. And besides that, we would be called on to do that which would be a stain upon our legislation, namely, to give advantages to our neighbours across the line at the expense of England. I will not discuss this matter from a sentimental point of view. I pass over all reference to the old flag, to the old sentiments and associations. I put everything aside with what we have been accustomed to stir each others' hearts, and I will speak of this question only as a question of interest. I consider it evident that a zollverein could only be maintained at the cost of our connection with the British Empire."

So that, not content with only repudiating the statement made by Mr. Huntington, and repeated last night by the hon. member for Yarmouth, the leaders of the Conservative party combatted the very views that they were charged with holding, and showed that they were not in favour of commercial union. The hon. gentleman also had a great deal to say about taxation. He said that we had been deceived—that those who had proposed the National Policy in the first instance had told us that the taxation was not to be increased, whereas instead of that it was now nearly double what it had been. He gave us some figures to prove this; but the figures he gave with regard to the Mackenzie régime were not at all correct, for the reason that he took no account of deficits. He only told us what the taxation was upon the revenue collected, but he did not add what ought to have been collected. He did not increase the percentage by taking into account the deficits which were rolling up every year. Now, Sir, it is a fact that our taxation has increased about 68 cents a head since that time. In 1879 the taxation was $5.32 a head, and in 1890 it was about $6. But what have we got for the additional 68 cents a head? Not deficits; but we have developed the country. Look at the railways that have been built; look at the Canadian Pacific Railway; look at the public works, the lighthouses and breakwaters which have been constructed since that time. We have given increased subsidies to the provinces and financially aided the fisheries and other industries. Why, Sir, there is no comparison between the state of the country to-day and what it was in 1876. Does the hon. gentleman suppose for a single moment that the country should remain at a standstill? He actually complained

that the expenses of the Customs and Post Office Departments had increased. Surely, Sir, he would not be opposed to the location of new post routes and new post offices. He must have expected that, with a very much larger revenue and a material development of trade, the expenses of the Customs would greatly increase. The hon. gentleman, in winding up his speech, grew eloquent on the imaginary benefits that would arise from this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity. He told us, among other things, that our shipbuilding would greatly improve. Well, it is a rather singular conclusion what has become of the merchant marine of the United States. Suppose we go to the State of Maine and see what has become of the shipping of that State. It does not appear to me that uniting ourselves with a country like that would be very apt to increase our shipbuilding industry. But we have not been standing still by any means. Take the figures for Nova Scotia:

In 1887	Nova Scotia	built..	87	vessels	12,300 tons.
1888	"	"	116	"	12,900 "
1889	"	"	106	"	19,645 "
1890	"	"	148	"	33,746 "

Then take our fishing industry. In 1882 there were 11,972 claims for fishing bounty, and these claims were paid to 20,932 fishermen. In 1889 there were 17,098 claims paid to 38,343 fishermen, an increase of 5,106 claims and 8,411 fishermen. During the eight years since 1882 the average number of vessels that claimed bounty was 837, representing a tonnage of nearly 32,000 tons and the average number of boats 13,493, and of fishermen 27,000. The number of men employed in the fisheries in 1879 was in vessels 8,818 men, and in boats 52,577 men, making all together 61,395 men employed in the fisheries. In 1889 the number of men employed in vessels was 9,621, and in boats 55,382, making a total of 65,003. The value of the fisheries in 1879 was $13,529,284, and in 1889 $17,655,256, showing a steady increase from 1879 to 1889. I think, therefore, it cannot be said that our fishing industry or shipbuilding industry has suffered, or that they would be very much benefited if we were associated with the people of the United States, whose fisheries and merchant marine are both going down. The hon. gentleman, following the example of many others on that side, also found it necessary to have a fling at Sir Charles Tupper with reference to the remarks which Sir Charles made at Amherst just after the elections. All I can say is that I was astonished to hear an attack of the kind coming from the hon. gentleman, and to hear him desiring to make this House believe that Sir Charles Tupper and the Government of the day only took into consideration the constituencies which supported them. Why, Sir, there is not a constituency in the Province of Nova Scotia, perhaps, which has received more benefits from the public treasury than the County of Yarmouth, although that county, as we all know, is not only essentially Liberal, but perhaps the strongest Liberal county in Nova Scotia. Only lately some $600,000 have been paid out for the Western Counties Railway, which is of great benefit to the County of Yarmouth, and to the very town where the hon. gentleman lives. We find that large subsidies have been given to the Yarmouth steamboats, and that dredges are sent to that harbour to make it fit to receive the steamers subsidized, and that, at this time, applications are being made for surveys and works in that very place. Considering, Sir, all the circumstances, considering the liberal manner in which the Government have dealt with the County of Yarmouth, they afford really the very best answer to the charge made by that hon. gentleman, as well as by others in this House. I am sorry, Sir, that I have occupied so much time, and thanking you, Sir, and the House for the kind attention you have given me, I will gladly make way for the next speaker.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) My intention is not to discuss at length the whole fiscal policy of the Government, to show its strong and its weak points; to point out in what respect it has helped or retarded the development of public or individual prosperity during the last twelve years. The census, which must be finished, will enlighten us on the subject, and I fear that the waking of the confident sleepers may be painful. I will not touch the question of reciprocity either. I have already had the occasion of treating it in 1888. The arguments which I then made have now acquired a new force. I have therefore nothing to add to, nor to withdraw from, what I said then. My only object is to draw the attention of the House and of the Government to the result, the certain, inevitable, fatal, result of the measure just adopted concerning sugar. The hon. Minister of Finance thought he could secure a cheap popularity in allowing the free importation of raw sugars intended for refining, while keeping a duty of 18 cents per 100 lbs. on imported refined sugar. At last, does he say we are going to have a free breakfast-table, the so much desired free breakfast; for there is no longer any taxes on tea, on coffee nor on sugar. I need not point out the fallacy of this expression. For breakfast does not consist only of tea or coffee, sweetened with brown sugar; but also includes bread, butter, cheese, meat, potatoes and white sugar, all of which are taxed, and even heavily taxed. I understand that is one of those metaphores, one of those hollow but sonorous phrases of which the hon. Minister has the secret, and of which he sometimes makes a veritable abuse. The abolition of the duties on raw sugar is not due to a desire on the part of the Government to make the breakfast free, nor to reduce the public burden. It has its origin in the pressure exercised by the refiners, the monopoly of profits of whom were threatened by the American policy. Everybody knows that last year the American Congress abolished the duty on sugar; that this measure was followed by a drop of 2 cents per pound in the United States, and that it had become a profitable practice to smuggle sugar into Canada. In a few months the Canadian refiners had experienced a shrinkage of 25,000,000 lbs. in their sales. Moreover the fact of sugar selling at 5 cents in the United States and 7 cents in Canada, was not of a nature to render the Government's policy popular. The Minister of Finance had to yield to this double pressure. He abolished the duties on sugar intended for refining purposes; but maintained them on refined sugar, with this double result: first, that the Canadian refiners have regained the monopoly of the market while losing nothing of their excessive profits; second, that the treasury has lost three millions and a-half of dollars per year, which had to be partly made

up by additional taxes on whiskey, beer and tobacco. The hon. Minister of Finance stopped too soon in his imitation of the United States. The American Government by opening their market to the foreign article, by reducing the price of sugar for the general consumer, did not mean thereby to bring on the ruin of the home producer. It maintained him in his position by granting him a premium equal to the duty abolished. In short, the American Government, by the McKinley Bill, grants for the fifteen years which are to end on the 30th June, 1905, a premium of 2 cents per pound on all the home produced sugar intended for refining, be it maple, cane, beet, sorghum or any other sugar. It allows, besides, the free entrance, for two years and a-half, of all the machinery intended for the production of beet-root sugar. The Canadian Government has no such concerns for the farming classes. When these are concerned, the protection principles have no application. They are ready enough to tax the importation of refined sugar at a rate of 80 cents per 100 lbs. in order to protect the four or five refining establishments in existence in Canada, and secure them the monopoly of the Canadian market, but they see nothing to be done for the protection of hundreds of thousands of Canadian farmers whose hopes are to be ruined by the free import of the foreign sugars. For it is very evident, and no one knows it better than the hon. Minister of Finance, that the abolition of the duty on raw sugar, without a compensation for the Canadian producer, is the ruin irretrievable and complete of all the attempts, of all the sacrifices, which have been made to establish in this country the cultivation of the sugar beet and the manufacture of beet-root sugar, which it was hoped would make up for reciprocity and partly repair the losses due to the McKinley Bill. Is it necessary to go back once more to the past, and show that before the treaty of reciprocity of 1854, our agriculture was suffering, our population was emigrating, and that the country was in distress? That under the régime of reciprocity, from 1854 to 1866, Canada enjoyed an era of prosperity without example in its annals; that agriculture specially took an extraordinary development; that wealth and population increased at an unprecedented rate? That from 1866, the date when reciprocity came to an end, until 1890, the farming interests became impoverished, the farmers got into debt, the farms were mortgaged, then abandoned; hundreds of thousands of Canadians emigrated to the United States; the prices of all the farm products having lowered, the price of land lowered all over the country? That in 1890 the American duties on the products on the products of the farm were almost doubled; that, as a consequence, the American market, which was already hard to reach, was practically closed to us; and that a part of the last crop has not been sold yet. That vain attempts have been made, and are still made, to find a substitute to the American market for a great part of the products of our agriculture. That of our farm products, England buys only wheat, cattle, butter and cheese, in large quantities, while the United States take almost all our horses, our hay, our eggs, our vegetables, our barley, our potatoes, our wool; that, in short, the Americans are the best, and, for many, the only buyers of the farm products of Canada. The following table, taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ended 30th June, 1890, will superabundantly prove it:—

ANIMALS AND THEIR PRODUCTS.

Articles.	Total Exportation.	To the United States.	To England.
Horses	$ 1,936,073	$ 1,887,895	$ 17,925
Sheep	1,227,347	74,565	486,289
Fowls	111,904	105,612	1,623
Bones	57,215	46,873	.....
Eggs	1,795,214	1,793,104	821
Skins and horns	499,229	470,466	28,482
Wool	1,047,754	1,046,894	.....
	$ 6,674,806	$ 6,112,309	$ 534,750

FARM PRODUCE.

Flax	$ 175,563	$ 175,563	.....
Barley	4,600,409	4,582,562	12,017
Beans	250,044	249,323	.....
Hay	1,068,554	922,797	109,634
Hemp	26,568	26,568	.....
Malt	150,380	149,310	.....
Maple syrup	16,768	16,644	103
Straw	24,231	24,118	30
Vegetables of all sorts	101,329	93,169	1,383
Potatoes	495,745	308,915	.....
	6,909,591	6,348,969	123,167
Grand totals	$13,584,397	$12,658,278	$657,917

So that, of a list of eighteen farm products exported to the value of $13,584,397, the United States bought for $12,656,278; England for $657,917; and the rest of the world only $271,202. It is, therefore, true to say that for these eighteen articles, the American market is the only one where they can be profitably disposed of. Again, is it necessary to recall the striking results which followed the inauguration of reciprocity in 1854, and its repeal in 1866? In 1853 the total exports of farm produce to the United States from Ontario and Quebec were figured at $4,247,288. In 1866, after twelve years of reciprocity, they reached a total of $24,482,749, showing an increase under reciprocity of $20,235,461. The very year, 1867, which followed the repeal of the treaty of reciprocity, these exports fell to $14,871,418, showing a decrease of nearly $10,000,000 in a single year. What is more, in 1890 the export of animals and agricultural products to the United States, for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, were only $11,966,432, or nearly twelve and a-half millions less than in 1866; and that after twelve years of the national policy and an expenditure of a hundred and fifty millions for the construction of railways and canals. The future is still darker. For let us not forget that the figures which I have just quoted are previous to the operation of the McKinley Bill. The last report of the Customs Department only goes to 30th June, 1890, and the McKinley Bill came into operation in October, 1890. One needs to be no prophet to foresee that the year 1891 will show results still more disastrous, and that these will still be outdone by those of the fiscal year 1891, which shall have been passed in entirety under the McKinley régime. The falling off in the sale of our agricultural produce will be figured by millions. These facts are known by all of the Government as well as by the Opposition. And it is because they clearly foresaw the future, that the Ministers went before the people with the platform of reciprocity for agricultural products, a year before the date fixed by law, in spite of the pledge given this honourable House. They did not want to wait until the results of the McKinley Bill should have time to be felt. For several years already the most clear-sighted and the most patriotic men have seen

the necessity of a change in our agricultural production, if reciprocity with the United States must be longer refused to us. Knowing that the cultivation of the sugar beet and the manufacture of beet-root sugar, at first established at the cost of the greatest public sacrifices, has become one of the best sources of wealth of France, Germany, Belgium and Russia, their attention naturally turned in the direction of that industry. Specialists invited to visit the Province of Quebec found its soil and climate favourable. They found that the sugar beet yielded well, that its quality was excellent, and its sugar yield satisfactory. On the strength of such information, the Quebec Legislature voted, in 1874, a subsidy of $5,000 per annum for five years to any one who would establish a beet-root sugar manufacture in the province. The next year this grant was increased to $7,000 per year for ten years. This liberal offer decided several French and Canadian capitalists to try the undertaking. Three companies were formed and erected important manufactures at Berthier, West Farnham and Coaticooke. Nearly a million and a-half of dollars were spent in the building and plant of these three manufactures, the estalishment of which was greeted with enthusiasm by the whole population. The farmers turned to the raising of the sugar beet with entire success. Unfortunately, the administration of these establishments fell into either incompetent or dishonest hands. The sugar beet was either spoiled, or unpaid for; the farmers ceased contracting with people in whom they had lost confidence, and, naturally, the factories had to suspend their operations. However, the attempt made was not altogether lost. The trial had proved that our soil and climate are favourable to the raising of the sugar beet, that its yield is abundant, that it is of good quality and of a satisfactory richness. After having fully satisfied themselves with these facts, a new group of French capitalists undertook, in 1890, to resume the suspended operations. The Farnham factory was rented, the cultivation of the sugar beet encouraged, and the cultural and industrial results were so satisfactory that the syndicate took measures to continue their operations in 1891. These facts were brought to the knowledge of the hon. Minister of Finance in June last, by Mr. Alfred Musy, manager of the Farnham factory, in a memorial, of which the House will allow me to read the following extract:—

"Fortunately, our group of French capitalists, who had caused all the questions relating to this industry in Canada to be thoroughly studied during two years, did not hesitate to take up the Farnham sugar factory in 1890, and to work it in October with the sugar beet obtained with difficulty and at a high price from the farmers, and those which they raised themselves on more than 200 acres under cultivation."

The year 1890-91 closed, not by a financial success impossible to be obtained under the conditions at hand, but by an undeniable cultural and industrial success, notwithstanding the exceptionally bad weather of the spring of 1890, and the deteriorated state in which the Farnham factory was found on resuming its operation. Feeling sure that the Federal Government would at the proper time take steps to secure for this industry the protection which it deserves, the French capitalists immediately decided to run a new season which is now promising well. After the trial of 1890, the French capitalists had arrived at this conclusion: That the beet-root sugar industry would undoubtedly succeed, if the quantity of sugar beets brought to the factory was sufficient to run it. It was now but a question of inducing the farmers to extend their operation. The matter was therefore taken before the Committee on Agriculture of the Legislature of Quebec, which after a thorough investigation, recommended a grant of 50 cents per ton on sugar beets brought to the factory. This recommendation was adopted unanimously by both sides of the House without distinction of parties, with the proviso that the factories should not pay less than $4.50 to the farmers for their sugar beets, the minimum price of which was thereby fixed at $5 a ton. Now, as the mean yield is fifteen tons an acre, this would give a result of $75 per acre, which is certainly better than can be realized from grain or hay. Moreover, the House ordered a special commission to Europe to study the best means of cultivation, in view of teaching our farmers and permitting them to get from their land the greatest possible yield. This judicious policy was already beginning to bear its fruit. The cultivation had considerably increased last spring and excellent results were expected, when the resolution offered by the hon. Minister of Finance came to render useless all the sacrifices of the past and destroy all the hopes of the future. For there is not a sensible man who will contend that beet-root sugar may be produced, especially at the outset, at a rate of 2½ cents a pound, which is the price at which the raw sugar from the West Indies, the United States, or Cuba, is delivered in Montreal. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is on the growing of the sugar beet and on its sale to the factories that the farmers had a right to depend to meet the disasters of the McKinley Bill, replacing by the national market the American market which the policy of the Government closed for them. Canada imports annually 225,000,000lbs. of raw sugar for refining. It means, in round figures, $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 which go abroad for an article which could as well be supplied by our agriculture. Why do the Government, who pride themselves on their so-called National Policy, who claim to keep the Canadian market for the Canadian producer, content themselves to work the fortune of the manufacturers, and deprive agriculture of all advantages and protection? The farmers are taxed for all they consume. Their natural market is closed for them, and when they make an effort and find a way to their former prosperity, the Government wrest away from them this their last hope. Why two weights and two measures? Is the farming community only good to be ground down? Is it not the most numerous and the most important of our population? Is it not the basis of our society—the most solid stratum of the nation? Should the raising of the sugar beet become established in this country, not only would it create a new industry, make up for the American market which we are losing, give a natural outlet, permanent and advantageous for our agriculture, but it would powerfully contribute to the improvement of the soil and of the cattle, and to the development of the production of all the cereals. Such is the experience of the European countries which have tried it. I may be allowed to quote with regard to this from the words of Mr. Déhérain, one of the authorities on this matter:

"There exists in the north of France a certain number of counties which have attained the maximum of agricultural production. When the season is favourable, localities are found in the Nord, in Pas-de-Calais, in Aisne (of 514 beet-root sugar factories which France possessed at that time, 354 were in these three departments), which yielded to the hectare 40 hectolitres of wheat (37 bushels per acre), 60,000 kilogrammes (22 tons to the acre) of sugar beet, 350 to 400 hectolitres (325 to 370 bushels to the acre) of potatoes, and we do not think much more could be done. What it this admirable prosperity to be attributed to? In certain localities, to the use of the Flemish fertilizer, which the farmers of the Nord have been utilizing for hundreds of years; in others, where this fertilizer is not used, to the cultivation of the sugar beet. It has been repeated in all manners, it will never be repeated enough, the cultivation of the beet is that which has the most contributed to the agricultural progress accomplished."

Mr. Max Leconte, a deputy to the Legislative Assembly for the Nord, the richest department of France, in industry and agriculture, uses language quite as strong. Taking for a basis the present figure of the importation of raw sugar in Canada, and supposing that our agriculture should supply our refining establishments with the same amount of raw material, Mr. Télesphore Bean, a distinguished agriculturist and manufacturer of the town of Berthier, spoke as follows last year before the Committee on Agriculture of the Quebec House:—

"In order to supply the present consumption of the country, it would take 60 factories of the importance of those of Berthier and Farnham; their consumption would be every year 1,125,000 tons of sugar beets, which would represent the mean crop of 94,000 acres of land; they would from the beginning of October to the end of March, give employment to at least 8,000 people, and they would burn about 350,000 tons of coal. In other terms, they would pay the farmers over five millions of dollars; for labour, and at the season when work is the scarcest, nearly a million and a half; to the coal mines, about one million. They would every year cause the opening of nearly 100,000 acres of land, and would furnish to agriculture, at a nominal price, a volume of pulp representing the fattening feed of 90,000 heads of cattle, and the production of more than 60,000,000 lbs. of meat."

Would not this result be marvellous, and would it not be worth some sacrifice? For it is evident that Canada cannot escape the common law to which all the other countries have submitted. A new industry such as that of the beet-root sugar cannot from the outset be implanted without it be given help proportionate to its importance, especially when the same industry outside of the country enjoys natural or legislative advantages such as are possessed by our rivals. The cultivation of the sugar beet is still in its infancy; our soil is not prepared, our farmers have not the experience, labour is much dearer, and it will be several years before we can reach the degree of perfection which will allow us to meet foreign competition on an equal footing. Before our farmers will turn to it generally, years of success will be necessary and the assurance of a lasting policy. What must then be done to secure such a desirable result? Just what I said before, that is, to follow to its limit the policy of the American Government, which the hon. Minister of Finance has only copied partly. It is as the consequence of the United States abolishing the duties on raw sugar, that the Minister of Finance decided to abolish them also in Canada. But, in taking such a step, the American Government did not mean, on its part, to make the position of the American producer worse; it did not leave them defenceless to face the free competition from abroad; it gave them a compensation equal to the import duties which it abolished, in granting a premium of 2 cents per pound for all sugar of home production, and that, not only for one year, but for a period of fifteen years. Moreover, it allowed for two years and a-half the free importation of machinery for the manufacture of beet-root sugar. Here are the words of the American law:

"That on and after 1st July, 1891, and until 1st July, 1905, there shall be paid to the producer of sugar testing not less than 90 degrees by the polariscope, from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane grown within the United States, or from maple sap produced within the United States a bounty of 2 cents per pound: and upon such sugar testing less than 90 degrees by the polariscope and not less than 80 degrees a bounty of one and three-fourths cents per pound. * * *

"Provided, further, that all machinery purchased abroad and erected in a beet sugar factory and used in the production of raw sugar in the United States from beets produced therein shall be admitted duty free until 1st July, 1892; provided also that any duty collected on any of the above described machinery purchased abroad and imported into the United States for the uses above indicated since 1st January, 1890, shall be refunded."

Such is the position of the American producer. Can we hope to be able to compete with him without being put on the same footing as he is? The mere idea of it is absurd. If it wants to be in accordance with its principles, the Government should not fall behind. But, perhaps, it means to prevent forever the creation in Canada of an industry which would ensure the independence of the country as to one of the principal articles of its consumption, and would at the same time give to our agriculture the prosperity which it is so sadly in need of. The hon. Minister of Finance will no doubt have two objections to offer. The first, the danger of introducing in our economical system the principle of premiums which may extend very far. The second, the considerable expenditure which such a policy would entail. The first objection could not be serious. The principle of premiums is already in existence; it has been introduced by the present Government. Has not a sum of $150,000 annually been given as premiums to fishermen, and this for several years? Is not the Minister of Fisheries proposing to raise the amount to $160,000 per year? Does not the Government grant to the producers of Canadian iron a premium of $2 a ton on the iron manufactured from Canadian ore? If in both cases this is in the interest of a great industry, of which it is important to ensure the development and prosperity, with how much more force does not that reason apply to the production of beet-root sugar? The second objection is not serious either, and cannot become so for many years. In 1890 about 6,000 tons of beets were delivered to factories. In 1891 the quantity will scarcely reach 10,000 tons. The beet yields about 10 per cent. of sugar. The production will not exceed 2,000,000 lbs. This would mean, at the rate of 2 cents a pound, a total premium of $40,000. It is not such a sum that can embarrass a budget of $36,000,000. No doubt the sum would gradually increase according as the industry would develop; but it would take several years of prosperity, and the establishment of absolute confidence in the future, before other capitalists would put up other factories. But even were the treasury to be somewhat burdened, is it not, after all, the farmers who pay the bulk of the taxes, and is it not fair that the Government should hand back to agriculture some of the millions which they levy on it every year? Besides, these millions will soon return to the treasury when agriculture is prosper-

ous, when the population ceases to emigrate, when the consumption of dutiable articles will increase. there will be compensation. In the end, the treasury will lose nothing, and the whole country, but especially agriculture, will benefit immensely. The hon. Minister of Finance and the Government cannot hesitate nor stop in the course in which they have entered in the wake of the United States, if they want to be consistent. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I say that in the absence of reciprocity with the United States our agriculture pines away for the lack of an advantageous market for the surplus of its products ; that, as a consequence, land diminishes in value, the people emigrate, our rural districts become depopulated, and it is urgent to find a remedy for this alarming state of things. That the farming methods are to be changed, since grain and hay will no longer sufficiently remunerate the farmer for his labour. That the cultivation of the sugar beet, and the manufacture of beet-root sugar, would partly make up for reciprocity, would create a permanent and profitable market for our farmers. That in presence of the difficulty of creating such a vast industry, a difficulty made still greater by the legislation of the countries which are competing with our agriculture, it is the duty of the Government to take measures and put our producers on a footing of equality with their competitors. That to this effect it is essential to give our sugar producers a compensation equal to that granted to the American producers, namely, 2 cents per pound on sugars manufactured from maple, sorghum or beet root. That this premium should be granted for a number of years, so as to permit cultivation, and to the manufacturer of sugar to establish themselves on solid basis, to develop themselves, and hold out against foreign competition. That the agricultural interest, which bears the heaviest burdens, which is taxed for all that it consumes, has a right to her share of the millions which it yearly pours into the public treasury. And I will add that the Government cannot refuse it this justice and remain consistent with the principles which they make a show of, as well as with their conduct towards all the other interests. The hon. Minister of Finance cannot at once be flesh and fish ; he cannot be flesh to the sugar manufacturers, whom he protects to the extent of 80 cents per 100 lbs., and to the cotton, print and woollen manufacturers, to whom he gives an extravagant protection, and be fish to the agriculturist, whom he leaves at the mercy of a foreign competitor, who is not only free from taxes, but also helped by Government premiums. The Government must put our farmers in a position to hold out against the competition of the American farmers if they want to be a protective Government in fact as in name, unless they want to make a show of their contempt and scorn for the agricultural classes.

Mr. SPROULE. In continuing the debate on this question, I trust I may be pardoned if I refer for a short time to some of the arguments advanced by those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the question. In starting, I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon the plain, practical statement he was enabled to make to this House and the country regarding its financial affairs in the past and the hopeful outlook for the future. It must be admitted, whatever may be said of the hon. gentleman's predecessors, that since he has taken hold of the situation, year after year, his forecasts have been proved correct and his predictions verified. Whether engaged in devising ways and means to raise revenue, or in adjusting the tariff to meet the wants of the country, or in predicting what revenue we might count on receiving from the different sources, in every instance time has verified the accuracy of his judgment and he is entitled to the congratulations of this House and the country. When the National Policy was introduced in 1878, what were the objections taken to it? The first was, I think, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who said it would not be successful in raising the revenue required. I need hardly tell the House that previous to that time the exertions of the Finance Minister, under the late Liberal régime, had been directed towards raising sufficient revenue to carry on the affairs of the country, and year after year he was obliged to come back to the House and admit that his efforts had been unavailing. Year after year he was compelled to make changes in the tariff in order to raise more money, and each change was invariably found unsuccessful in accomplishing its object. The old tariff was raised from 15 to 17½ per cent., and the then Finance Minister told the House that this increase would give ample revenue for all requirements. But after a year's experience, it was found there was still a large deficit to be provided for. At last, in 1878, he was obliged to tell the House that he was afraid another addition to the tariff of the country would not be successful in raising revenue, that the failure in the revenue was due to the hard times which prevailed, not only in this but in every other country, and we would be obliged to wait until good times would come around to have an increase of revenue. It was then that the leader of the Opposition in those days, who afterwards so ably directed this Government, announced to the country that if he were entrusted with the administration of its affairs, he could by a readjustment of the tariff, not only raise sufficient revenue, but also incidentally protect the waning manufacturers of this country and bring about a prosperous condition of things. It is for us to ascertain whether that has been effected or not. At that time it was announced, by the hon. member for South Oxford, that the National Policy, if introduced, must prove a failure in raising revenue ; but when we went back to the country in 1882 that hon. gentleman was obliged to admit that the National Policy had been successful in that respect, for it not only had raised the revenue, but it did more—it protected the interests of our people and gave them home markets. It was also said that, if the National Policy was introduced, it would not raise a revenue, but I need not turn to the Trade and Navigation Reports to show that it did raise ample revenue for the wants of the country. But it was said that it would not keep the markets of Canada for the Canadian people. Now, I have here a statement showing the returns for several years of the importations of foreign goods needed for home consumption, and I take the ten years before the introduction of the National Policy and the ten years after its introduction, and what do I find? I find that, in the ten years previous to the introduction of the National Policy, there had been imported into Canada for home consumption, though the people were raising more at home than was

required to supply the wants of their own people, of wheat and flour no less than $78,261,616 worth. All other breadstuffs in that ten years amounted to something over $40,000,000. We had the National Policy in force in the following ten years, and I will give the figures in order to show that the National Policy kept the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer. The wheat and flour entered for home consumption, which amounted in the preceding ten years to $78,000,000, amounted in the following ten years to only $12,000,000, or a saving in favour of the home market of $66,000,000. Will any hon. gentleman state that the National Policy was not instrumental in keeping the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer? Why are we told to-day that it has not enhanced the price of the products of the Canadian farmers? I need give no better argument to the House, or to the country, or to the Canadian farmer, to whom I am more directly addressing myself, than the fact that we saved that large market of $66,000,000 worth of wheat and flour and $21,000,000 worth of other breadstuffs under the National Policy. No doubt, an ample revenue was derived under the National Policy to pay the needs of the country, to continue the public works, while at the same time it saved the home market for the Canadian farmers. If it has accomplished that, why should it be said that it has been a failure, or why do we want any other change in our fiscal policy, as hon. gentlemen say we do?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You, yourself, say you do. How are you going to Washington in a month or two if you do not want a change?

Mr. SPROULE. I will not talk about Washington at present. I will give the hon. gentleman later some of his own literature in regard to the matter. It is said that we want to have unrestricted reciprocity. I would like to say a few words as to the changes which have been made in the resolutions which have been introduced from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1879, in 1882, and up to 1885, we were told that the National Policy was a failure and that it resulted in increasing the prices of everything that the Canadian consumer used. I want to draw a close distinction between that and the arguments which are used to-day, because there is a change which has come over the spirit of the dream of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were told that the National Policy had caused an increase in the price of factory cotton, denims, tea, sugar and coffee, the price of which they said was increased by the amount of the duty. We are able to draw a comparison between the prices of those articles in the past and in the present, and it is plain that a substantial reduction has been taking place in the commodities and the necessaries of life, which became so apparent that hon. gentlemen opposite who made that contention at first gave it up. What was the device which they adopted in order to convince the Canadian farmer that we wanted unrestricted reciprocity? We were not told that we required unrestricted reciprocity until 1886, when, for the first time, the member for Prince Edward County introduced a resolution in favour of commercial union, and he gave as a reason that we had not the market we should have for the various products of our country. At that time the hon. member and his friends could not say that the National Policy was a failure, because it was clearly a success, and so clearly that the then leader of the Opposition had to state that we were committed to a system of protection to native industries, but that what we wanted was a broader and more comprehensive market, and therefore we required commercial union with the United States in 1887. This was reiterated, but in 1888 it was changed to unrestricted reciprocity, because it was found that commercial union was the same as the commercial zollverein which was proposed by Horace Greeley many years before, but which was found, after discussion, to be unsuited to the two countries. So it was found that the cry of commercial union was unpopular, and therefore that was changed, and they said that we did not want commercial union but that we wanted unrestricted reciprocity. That was the suggestion of Mr. Wiman, Mr. Hitt and the other friends of the hon. gentlemen in this House, and it was after consultation with those gentlemen that they found out that they wanted unrestricted reciprocity. That was the ground upon which, to a large extent, the election was fought out in 1887; but the people said they did not want unrestricted reciprocity, and the Conservative party were returned again to power. In 1879 it was said by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his friends that the people were misled and deluded. The same statement was made in 1882, and again in 1887 we were told that the people were in darkness and ignorance, and we find that the same statement is made to-day by the hon. member for South Oxford. It is not very complimentary to the ability of these hon. gentlemen who have been trying to educate the people to the great changes in the fiscal policy which they say are required in the interests of the people that, if they have been so intelligent as they believe and as they profess to be, if they are as able teachers as they suppose they are, they should have left the people in the darkness and ignorance which the hon. member for South Oxford speaks of. We are now told that we require a change. Are we told that we want commercial union? No; but unrestricted reciprocity. If the duties were taken off, those hon. gentlemen leave out of sight the fact that we must raise a revenue, that we are living as neighbours with a people twelve times as numerous as we are, a people more wealthy than we are, and who have had the benefit of a protective tariff for many years to enable them to build up a trade. Yet they want us to take down the barriers and let our goods go there free and allow the American goods to come in here free in return. Do they tell the people what the results of competition in that case will be? They forget to tell the people that it is important to raise a revenue, that we must raise a revenue, and that is the easiest way to raise a revenue that has ever yet been devised; they forget to tell the people that if that scheme was adopted we would not have control of the raising of our own revenue, and we would practically be put in subordination to the 60,000,000 of people whose markets we are so anxious to get into. We are told the Government are endeavouring to find a market in various parts of the world, that they have failed to get a market in other countries, and therefore they are trying to get the market across the line, which is the very best market for us—that is the reason that is given. Now, to

substantiate that, they say: We want continental free trade, or we want unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk, before the last election, said: We have nailed our colours to the mast, and we stand or fall by unrestricted reciprocity. Well, I need not tell the hon. gentleman and the country that they went to the country with those colours nailed to the mast, and they fell, not like men, with faces to the foe, but like many others, with their backs to the foe; and they come back here, if not with a reduced number, at least in a sufficient minority to keep them in the cold shades of Opposition for the next five years, I believe. Now, then, to-day what do they say with regard to that? The hon. member for South Oxford comes back and tells us that the people have been misled, that they are in ignorance, and for fear I should be accused of using words that he did not utter, I will use his own words. Speaking of the Minister of Finance, who has given a financial statement that ought to be a credit to him and a credit to his party and the country, he says:

"Hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House are in ignorance of the condition of the people of this country; and I tell them that they do not know our actual condition of things in Canada."

He says one out of every three Canadians born in the country have been obliged to leave Canada on account of hard times; that we have very hard times in every part of this country. But did he try to prove it? Did he prove it by showing that the banking institutions of our country were doing less business than they did a few years ago? Did he prove it by showing that the people were in a worse condition? I have here a return giving the bank stocks in February, 1878, and in February, 1891, and what do they show? Do they show that the country is poorer because the bank stocks are less valuable? I will read the table:

Bank Stocks.	1888.	1891.
Bank of Montreal	160	225
Bank of Commerce	116	128
Merchants Bank	66	142
Bank of British North America	106	156
Bank of Toronto	140	218
The Molson's Bank	100	160
Imperial Bank	102	152
Dominion Bank	121	233
Bank of Hamilton	100	153
Ontario Bank	94	114

I need not go over all the banks, as I have given enough to indicate that the stocks have all gone up largely, and I say that in the case of every single bank substantial progress has taken place from the previous date up to the present time. Then, again, I find that the circulation of the banks in 1877 was $21,000,000, which was a sufficient sum to carry on the commerce of the country at that time, but in 1890 it required $35,000,000. In 1877 the public deposits in the banks were $63,966,000; to-day they are $134,000,000. Does that bespeak the abject poverty of the country? If I know anything about the condition of this country these figures bespeak employment and remunerative labour. Now, I have given you these figures as an evidence that the country is not so much impoverished as these gentlemen say, because money is much more plentiful, and it requires money to carry on the commerce of the country. In 1877 the discounts amounted to $125,000,000; to-day they amount to $188,000,000. Now, then, I say the evidence goes to show that the hon. member for South Oxford, instead of attributing ignorance to the Finance Minister in not understanding the condition of the country, was himself in ignorance of the condition of the country. I hold the bank statistics are a good test of the wealth of the country. If the hon. gentleman does understand it, he has been ingenious enough to hide his knowledge from the people of this country. Now, in every one of these lines there is a substantial improvement. Then, it was said that the people of the country want unrestricted reciprocity because everything that the consumer uses is dearer. Now, I need not go over that argument. I have before me a list of goods in almost every line that represents the necessities of life, and I find, as I said before, that they are very much cheaper than they were in 1878. In 1886 another change took place, and they propounded a new policy to the House. What was that policy? From 1879 to 1886 they held that everything that the consumer used was made dearer by the duty that was placed upon it, or, in other words, that the consumer paid the duty. It was found, however, that such was not the case. We showed in several instances that it was not the case, and some hon. gentlemen here have given us the very best proof that it is not the case. We said that the National Policy would not increase the price to the farmers in those lines; the Opposition held that it would, and that the farmers had to pay more. We said that foreigners wishing to sell their goods in the Canadian market will very often make their invoices of prices lower to the Canadians than they would to the people of their own country, and in that way the difference on the reduced article was more than the tariff that was put on. Now, then, the hon. gentleman wished to show that we wanted unrestricted reciprocity, and to prove that the member for North Norfolk propounded the theory that it is not the consumer who pays the duty but the producer who pays it; therefore, he says that the Canadian farmer pays the duty upon every dollar's worth of his goods that goes to a foreign market. That is not so. He does not say that it makes any difference whether the Canadian farmer sends it there, or whether the foreigner comes to Canada and buys it, but he says it is made dearer by reason of the duty, and that the Canadian farmer pays the duty. Now, this is the very reverse of the logic and of the reasoning that was adopted up to that time. And why is it adopted? It is adopted for the purpose of making the Canadian farmer believe that he requires a market where there is no tariff barrier, so that it will give him a larger return for his labour; therefore, he is told that he pays the duty upon every one of those lines. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford says that we have here in Canada somewhere about a million horses. He says that last year we sent 17,000 horses into the United States, upon which the Canadian farmers paid $546,000 to get those horses into the American market. If the hon. gentlemen was correct in his reasoning and figures, there might be some force in the argument. To satisfy myself, I took the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States, and I found that all the duty collected upon Canadian horses, irrespective of who pays that duty, instead of being $546,000 was only $336,000, or $230,000

less than the amount given by the hon. member for South Oxford. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford is perhaps quite as near right on this point as he generally is when he deals with this question; he jumps at it in a haphazard way, not by fair reasoning nor by correct figures, but according to the feeling that dominates him at the time. He goes on further to say:

"We have one million horses in Canada to-day, and every one of those horses would be increased in value by at least $30 if we had unrestricted reciprocity."

The hon. gentleman forgets that about one-third of all these horses are not over a year old, and that horses under a year old can generally be bought in Canada for from $30 to $50; but he argues as if all these horses were of full age and that the Canadian farmer had a market for every one of them in the United States. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at that conclusion? It is argued from the other side of the House that if we were sending horses to the United States and had a good market for them there, and if the duties were swept away, there would be an advance in price of $30 for each horse. Do we find that this is the case when horses are purchased in this country for the American market? No. Does the breeder realize the price obtained for his horses in Rochester or Buffalo or other American cities, less the amount of duty? No. The American buyer purchases them for the lowest amount possible in the locality he buys, and takes his chances of disposing of them in a good market, he paying the duty. Here is where the important difference between hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and hon. gentlemen opposite comes in. If a buyer comes here he purchases horses, if he buys at all, at the price obtainable in the home market, irrespective of what they will sell for abroad. A very good example of this is seen in the case of potatoes. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke on this point, and said we lost 25 cents per bushel for lack of reciprocity with the United States. In January last there were in our village buying potatoes a buyer from Buffalo, one from Cleveland and one from Brooklyn. They were paying from 35 to 40 cents per bag, while the price in Brooklyn was $1.12 per bushel. According to hon. gentlemen opposite, the Canadian farmer should have obtained the Brooklyn price, less the 25 cents per bushel. Did the Canadian farmer get that price? No. The dealer paid 45 cents per bag, which is equal to 30 cents per bushel, and they retained the difference between 30 cents per bushel and $1.12 per bushel, the price at which they were sold in Brooklyn. If we had unrestricted reciprocity we would not obtain the highest price of the American markets, nor do we get it to-day less the duty. And it is the same with respect to barley and grains. When an American buyer comes here he pays the market price ruling in the locality and he takes his purchase to the best market on the other side. I have stated that potatoes were selling at $1.12 in Brooklyn while they were selling in our village at about 30 cents; but competition commenced between American and Canadian buyers, and the prices ran up as high a $1.05 per bag. One farmer sold 500 bags at the rate of $1.05 per bag, and these were taken to the United States and sold afterwards at a profit in Cleveland. What better evidence is required that, even if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our farmers would obtain not the highest price of the American market, but the market price in the district. We are told that the Conservative party does not want reciprocity and is not in earnest in this regard. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, who negotiated all the reciprocity treaties that have ever been in existence between the United States and Canada? During the last election we heard people declare that the electorate were being misled, that the Government would not obtain reciprocity, and would not even make an effort to get it. I would again ask the House and the country, who negotiated the reciprocity treaties between Canada and the United States? The first that I will refer to is that made in 1850 by Sir Francis Hincks, who was then associated with Sir John A. Macdonald and the Conservative party. That treaty went into effect in 1854. It was the first treaty negotiated, and it was negotiated by the Conservative party. We had that treaty in existence from 1854 to 1866. Notice to abrogate it was given in 1865, and an effort was made by the Conservative party to obtain its renewal, but the attempt failed. We had next the Customs Act of 1868, which made an offer to allow certain products of the United States to come in free when a similar concession would be extended to Canada. This proposition was not accepted. In 1869 Sir John Rose, with Sir Edward Thornton, British Minister at Washington, endeavoured to negotiate a treaty at Washington, but the attempt proved a failure. In 1871, when the Washington treaty was negotiated, an attempt was made not only to settle the difficulties covered by that treaty, but to obtain a renewal of the commercial treaty. This proposition was refused, and again the attempt was made by the Conservative party. The first and only attempt made to obtain a reciprocity treaty by hon. gentlemen opposite was in 1874. The Hon. George Brown with Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister at Washington, attempted to negotiate a treaty, and although this Parliament carried out their part of the bargain the treaty was not ratified by the United States. In 1879 an offer was made in the provisions of the Customs Act for a basis on which to negotiate a treaty with the United States, but although it remained in the Customs Act from that year up to last year no effort was made by the Americans to meet us half way and negotiate a treaty. In 1887 Sir Charles Tupper attempted for the last time to negotiate a treaty to settle all disputes respecting the fisheries question on the line of extended trade relations between the two countries, but it was a failure. So, every one of those efforts, from 1850 to 1890, and they were numerous, have been made by the Conservative party, with one exception; and the only treaties ever successfully negotiated were negotiated by the Conservative party. Are hon. gentlemen opposite justified in saying that the Conservative party is not sincere, or that its members do not want a reciprocity treaty or trade relations with the United States, provided we could get it on fair terms; moreover, that we were not honest, and misled the people when we advocated reciprocity with the United States? We cannot have better evidence than I have given that the Conservative party alone have negotiated reciprocity treaties; and the people have a right to assume that we will now be equally willing to negotiate treaties, not only with the United States, but with other

countries on equitable terms. We were told at the late election that the question was fought out fairly and on the lines of the tariff. I have here a pamphlet that hon. gentlemen opposite used at the last elections, and it tells a different tale. It is rather amusing to see the line of argument hon. gentlemen opposite adopted when they went to the people on the last occasion. What were the instructions given by the leaders of the party to their friends? We are told in those instructions that the Government were seeking to secure victory by an unfair Franchise Act, by gerrymandering, by misleading the people, by deceiving them, by using voters' lists that were in favour of the Conservative party; but when speaking to their friends respecting dissolution, they said it was not objectionable on party grounds, as the voters' list had been attended to by their friends, and was, therefore, more favourable to them than it was for the Conservatives. Are we told that to-day? Are we told now that they had not a fair chance when they went to the people of the country? They say one thing in this House, and another thing in the country. They tell us here that they were handicapped in the election because they had not a fair voters' list, and they tell in another place that they had the best chance in the election, because their friends had attended to the voters' lists and the Conservative had not. Then they go on further in this document, and they say: Point out to the people:

"That the practical effect of the dissolution of Parliament has been to disfranchise 116,000 young men between twenty-one and twenty-three years of age, computed on the basis of the census of 1871 and 1881, or about one-eighth of the voting population of Canada, and that of this number there are 55,000 in the Province of Ontario, nearly two-thirds of whom are farmers' sons; although the professed reason for dissolving Parliament is one in which the young men of the country, and farmers' sons in particular, are most deeply interested. Point out how this accords with the statement in Sir John Macdonald's address to the electors of Canada, that the destinies of the future rest with the young hope of the country."

Then they go on to say:

"Tell the people that, above all things else, dissolution was decided upon in order to delude the rural population with a sham offer of reciprocity; that the Government in making this offer have been warned beforehand by the most distinguished leaders of the Republican and Democratic parties in the United States; and that neither the Government or the Congress of that country will listen to anything short of absolute and unrestricted reciprocity."

After these manifest false statements they go on to say:

"Take up the language of Lord Stanley's despatch to show how utterly useless it is to attempt to extract any clear idea of the policy of the Government from its terms, and to intimate that the only construction to be put upon this document is that Sir John Macdonald desires to secure the money of the manufacturers first and betray them or the farmers of Canada afterwards, as may suit his purpose. Compare the Governor General's despatch with the address of Sir John Macdonald to the Canadian electors, and direct attention to the fact that the address does not contain a word of reference to a joint commission or reciprocity negotiations."

Tell the people:

"That the intention of the Government was fraudulent, their manifest object being to appeal to the people on a false issue, and to prevent the wide divergence of opinion between the members of the Cabinet becoming known."

That is the reason they assign for the dissolution. Then they refer to what they call the prevarications of the Government. They say:

"Point out that the proposals of the Canadian Government will be looked upon in the United States as mere impudent prevarications, unworthy of serious consideration, as evidenced by the contemptuous manner in which they are alluded to in Mr. Blaine's letter quoted above, and that Canada can have unrestricted reciprocity or none at all. Point out, also, the exceeding impolicy of the Government towards the United States if they desired to secure reciprocity."

As to the trade policy of the Liberal party, they say:

"Impress upon your audiences in the strongest manner that the Liberal party mean to get unrestricted reciprocity, and can get it, and that they have received positive assurances from the most distinguished men of both parties that the Government and Congress of the United States are abundantly willing to treat with Canada on the terms which the Liberal party has indicated by its motions in Parliament."

They say here that the Canadian people should be told that the Reform party are sure to get reciprocity, and that they have been assured of this by the most prominent men representing both political parties in the United States. Is not this the best evidence we can possibly have to show that they were carrying on secret negotiations in the United States through their friend, Wiman, and Farrer, and Hitt, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who went down picnicing there? Is their own statement not the best evidence in the world that they had secret negotiations going on with the United States? They told the people that they meant to get unrestricted reciprocity, that they would get it if they were returned to power, and that they were assured of this by the ablest men of both parties in the United States. Is that not good evidence, I ask, that there were secret negotiations going on by the party opposite, represented by the gentlemen who went to Washington, and that the object of these negotiations was to hand over Canada to foreigners? Are we not justified in saying that there are indications of disloyalty in the ranks of the party opposite when we find them secretly negotiating with foreigners to destroy the industries of our country, to subordinate our country to the Americans, and virtually to put us in bondage to a foreign nation?

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the allegations of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the people had been deceived by the Conservative party in their appeal to the country; not only in the last election, but in previous elections since 1878, that they had placed before the people of the country unfair election cries, that they had made misrepresentations, that they were dishonest in what they undertook to carry out, and therefore the people were deluded. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in endeavouring to prove this, adopted certain arguments that were not in keeping with the pamphlet that they issued to their own supporters in the country, who were expected to go on the platform throughout the country and educate the people. In the first place, they told the people: "We are handicapped in this contest on account of the defective voters' lists;" but they told their own friends privately. "You can look with confidence on the situation; we are not afraid of dissolution now, because we have an advantage in the voters' lists, seeing that our friends attended to them while the supporters of the Government did not." That is a

different story from what they told here. The next thing they do is to tell the people wherein the Conservative party were endeavouring to mislead the people:

"An appeal on a false issue. That the intention of the Government was fraudulent, their manifest object being to appeal to the people on a false issue, and to prevent the wide divergence of opinion between the members of the Cabinet becoming known."

And to prove that, what do they give? A portion of the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Colby when he said in this House a few years ago that, in his opinion, it would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmer to have unrestricted reciprocity, because the products of the American farm coming into competition with his would be injurious to him. That is the ground they give for that statement. They go still further, and point out how the Conservative party are not in accord with themselves; that the offer of reciprocity is a sham offer; that it is not an honest one; that it is never intended and is never expected. Then they go further, and say:

"Impress upon your audiences in the strongest manner that the Liberal party mean to get unrestricted reciprocity, and can get it, and that they have received positive assurances from the most distinguished men of both parties that the Government and Congress of the United States are abundantly willing to treat with Canada on the terms which the Liberal party has indicated by its motions in Parliament."

And yet, when we mention about disloyalty on that side of the House or about intriguing with prominent men to sell Canada to a foreign country we are told that it is not found in the Liberal party; we are told that they have no alliance with men on the other side; that Erastus Wiman is running on his own line, and is not responsible to the Liberal party here; that Farrer, in telling prominent men in the United States how they can best coerce Canada, is not speaking the voice of the Liberal party; that the Liberal party are standing on their own platform and on their own representations. In the meantime, numbers of prominent members of the Liberal party go to Washington and hold conferences with those prominent men; and I say, in view of that fact, and in view of this information which is given to them privately, are we not justified in supposing that they are in some sort of alliance or intrigue with prominent men in the United States? Then they give a few extracts from resolutions moved in this House by the Liberal party to show that they are anxious to get unrestricted reciprocity. After that they go on to talk about the gravity of the situation:

"Dwell strongly upon the gravity of the relations subsisting between Canada and the United States during recent years, on the frequent efforts made by the Liberal party in Parliament to permanently settle all differences between the two countries upon fair and honourable terms, and the persistent opposition given by the Government to such settlement."

Is that the experience of the hon. gentlemen in this House, that the Opposition, an irresponsible body, who are not entitled to speak on behalf of the country, are the parties who are carrying on negotiations, while the Government, who are the only responsible advisers of the Crown, are opposing them in every possible way? Is that consistent with the situation of the two parties in this House, and with the efforts made by these two parties to settle these difficulties? I gave you before six o'clock a history of the efforts made by the Liberal party to secure reciprocity with the United States, and I told you that only once did that party attempt to get reciprocity. That was in 1874. But from 1854 up to 1890 the Conservative party have carried on these negotiations. They negotiated the Washington Treaty and the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. They have two or three other times brought the negotiations almost to the verge of completion, and they would have been completed had the United States carried out *bonâ fide* the arrangements which had been entered into. And are the Reform party justified in saying: "We have been endeavouring to negotiate a reciprocity treaty in the interest of Canada, and our efforts have been frustrated by the Conservative party?" I say they are not. Then they give their proposals for reciprocity. After that they go on to show that the action of the Conservative party was rather insulting to our neighbours than otherwise, and was calculated to make them retaliate:

"By the deliberate challenge to the United States to retaliate, through the imposition of heavy duties on many articles of farm produce under the Foster tariff of 1890, which became law fully six months before the McKinley tariff had passed the Senate or received the sanction of the President."

These hon. gentlemen very conveniently forgot to tell the Canadian people that the provisions of that McKinley tariff had been arranged and introduced into Congress long before the Minister of Finance had introduced his financial policy here, or announced to the Canadian people his intention of increasing the duties on certain articles. If the hon. gentlemen opposite desire to deal fairly with the Canadian people, as they profess to do, you would expect that in all fairness they would not delude the people of Canada into the belief that the American people had been exasperated by the proposals of the Minister of Finance to increase the duties here, and had, as a result of that exasperation, introduced the McKinley Bill. Then they go on to say, under the heading of "Insulting our neighbours:"

"Show that not only have the subsidized press and many supporters of the Government given utterance to uncalled-for insults to the United States, but that Sir John Macdonald himself, no longer ago than last October, speaking to a great audience in Halifax, had the effrontery to declare that the Canadians would sneer at the struggles of the fierce democracy of the United States, and would sit by and laugh to see that neighbour country torn by revolution. Comment upon the obvious fact that such language, in addition to its wickedness, was an action of incredible folly, certain to bring the speaker into the worst possible odour with the Government of the United States, and to explain that contemptuous language with the United States was caused and justified by the language used by the Canadian Premier at Halifax."

Now, I want particularly to draw the attention of the House to a couple of sentences in this portion of the instructions. They say that Sir John Macdonald "had the effrontery to declare that the Canadians would sneer at the struggles of the fierce democracy of the United States, and would sit and laugh to see that neighbour country torn by revolution." Now, in the report of the speech of Sir John Macdonald taken from the Halifax *Herald*, I find that his actual words were:

"They will have revolution, while we can sit calmly and quietly under the British flag and look with philosophy upon the struggles of a fierce democracy."

Is there any similarity between that language, "we can sit calmly and quietly under the British flag and look with philosophy upon the struggles of a fierce democracy," and the words they put into this pamphlet, "that Canadians would sneer

at the struggles of the fierce democracy, and would sit by and laugh to see that neighbour country torn by revolution?" One is offensive; the other is a fair and moderate explanation of the situation. The one is intended to be offensive. It is intended to prove to the Canadian people that the late Premier was not disposed to use conciliation in any question between the United States and Canada or to speak fairly regarding the situation. They endeavour to delude the people and convince the electorate that there was a disposition on the part of the Government and the late First Minister to exasperate the people of the United States rather than endeavour to negotiate with them on fair terms. Then the pamphlet writer goes on to say:

"Call attention to the gross corruption so prevalent at Ottawa."

He then enters into a great deal of elaborate statements that are not justified by the facts or the information in his possession:

"Tell the people that the extravagance of the Government is ruining this country. Contrast the periods from 1867 to 1874, from 1874 to 1878, and from 1878 to 1890, and emphasize the fact that if there be any financial difficulty in obtaining unrestricted reciprocity it is solely due to the Tory Government's own deliberate extravagance. Point out the effect of that extravagance, which would never have been caused had Mr. Mackenzie been retained in office; and point out the fact that whereas the total annual expenditure of the United States, when it had a population of 20,000,000, was only $23,000,000, that of Canada, with a population of 5,000,000, is $36,000,000."

I would like to ask hon. gentlemen if that is a fair comparison regarding either the taxation or the state of affairs in Canada. I say it is intended to deliberately mislead the people, and this was given to men who were expected to go out and instruct the people; so that the promoters of this pamphlet were corrupting the fountain head in order that they might then delude the people. We are asked to believe that Sir John Macdonald and his party, in appealing to the Canadian people, were endeavouring to mislead them. Leaving that subject, they take up another, and talk about the effects of the McKinley tariff:

"Illustrate the operation of the McKinley tariff upon Canadian farm products hitherto chiefly exported to the United States, and compare the outlook for the Canadian farmer under that tariff on the one side and unrestricted reciprocity on the other.

"A COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

"The following table, taken from the Commerce Report of the United States for the year ending June, 1889, gives the quantities and values of the principal agricultural imports of the United States from Canada in that fiscal year, together with the duties levied upon them under the then existing tariff:

"The first column in the following table shows what these values would be under free trade; the second column shows what the amount of duties levied upon them would be under the operation of the McKinley tariff, and the third column (being the values in free market, less the duties imposed by the McKinley tariff) shows what the Canadian farmers would realize upon their products in the United States under the new tariff, computed on the basis of exports for the year ending June, 1889."

Then he gives a table to show that in 1889 the cattle exported to the United States amounted to $551,251 in value, and that the duties on the same cattle under the new tariff would amount to $699,744, or $148,796 more than the cattle sold for. Did ever any one see logic or reasoning carried to a greater absurdity? They actually tell the Canadian people that the amount of cattle they exported, and which realized $550,251 in 1889, if exported to the United States to-day would be all absorbed, and $148,000 besides, by the McKinley tariff, to pay the duty. Is it not a wonder that men of experience and intelligence should think for a moment that the Canadian electorate would be so dull or simple as to believe any such contention? What is the ultimate conclusion? It is that the Canadian farmer, if he wants to reach the American market, must not only sacrifice the full price he receives for his cattle, but pay in addition $148,000 for the privilege of going into the American market. They have taken cattle, horses, sheep, barley, wheat, beans, potatoes and other articles, and compared them on the same line. They then go on to say:

"At those prices it would take the whole value of the cattle and $148,493 besides to pay the duties under the new tariff."

I give that to show that it is not my calculations but their own figures which lead to this result. These are the figures with which they would delude the Canadian farmers. Then they go on to say:

"Show how our farmers are fleeced by the National Policy tariff and combines, and give list of extortions extracted from them under these two agencies. Show also that the tariff is the parent of combines. Instance the ruinous effect of the system of high taxation and artificial prices by the loss of rural population in Ontario."

Then they go on to show that in every county there is a decrease in population:

"The following table gives the rural population of Ontario by counties for the years 1879 and 1890, as enumerated by the ownership assessors."

I find my own county is reported to have had, in 1879, 56,263, and in 1890 only 52,789, or a reduction of 6,000; but I notice that in my county, as the townships send deputy reeves to the county council in proportion to their numbers, they are increasing the number of deputy reeves, thereby showing that the voters' lists contain a larger number of voters this year than in previous years. Where they got their figures and how they worked them out I do not know; but no doubt the calculation was made in the hope that it would be accepted by the people as correct without examination. I find the same condition of things existing in their other lists, showing that the country is being depressed, that lands are going down in value, that the farms are diminishing—all for want of unrestricted reciprocity. Then they go on to say:

"Point out the iniquity of the Gerrymander Act and the Franchise Act, in defeating a free and honest expression of public opinion."

And yet, in the beginning of that same pamphlet, they tell their friends that by the Franchise Act they have an advantage in the situation to-day, and are not afraid to appeal to the people, because they have more men on the lists than the Conservatives have:

"Show how the farmers of Canada are pinched by the policy of high tariffs, and direct attention to the returns of chattel mortgages recently made by clerks of the county courts in Ontario to the Minister of Agriculture at Toronto, a number of which are presented on the following pages. The figures have been obtained from 28 out of 44 counties, and they show an increase of more than 1,000 in the number of instruments recorded last year. Assuming that there are as many bills of sale as of chattel mortgages registered in the province, and doubtless there are, it follows that more than 20,000 farmers in Ontario, or an average of 500 in each county, are practically in the hands of the sheriff. For this state of things, reciprocity with the United States is the only remedy. One year of the McKinley tariff means irretrievable ruin to thousands of Canadian farmers."

They give a list of those counties; but while they recite 48 counties, they only mention 28 where the figures seem to show something in their favour. I

would like to refer the House to the statistics given the other night by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who showed clearly that the chattel mortgages and the mortgages upon farms in Ontario only amounted to 15 per cent. of the value of the land and chattles. Is that an evidence of bankruptcy or of being in that deplorable condition which the hon. gentleman says the Canadian farmers are in? It is unnecessary to go further with this pamphlet, which is filled with inaccuracies, is untruthful, misleading, dishonest and disingenuous; and this is sent out to the country by the people who are to instruct the electorate, and who tried to do so at the last election. Is it a credit to hon. gentlemen who call themselves statesmen, and who desire to be looked upon as able men of the world, to publish such statements as that? We have the answer made by the hon. member for South Oxford to the speech of the Finance Minister, and it is the same doleful song applied to the same old tune and ground out by the same organ that the people of Canada are so familiar with. We have heard up and down the country the same mournful wail, and we have heard the same tune played. In Ontario the hon. gentleman says the distress is amongst the people of the Maritime Provinces, or the North-West, or British Columbia. In the Maritime Provinces the distress is amongst the farmers in Ontario, and there, he says, that not one out of two is without a mortgage on his farm. Has the hon. gentleman travelled extensively through Ontario? I know that, when I go amongst the farmers of that province—and the farmers are the class that hon. gentlemen are especially trying to delude—I can get a good substantial meal and find them supplied with the necessaries of life, and I see healthy children around the farm house, and no sign of poverty or starvation. I see that they are fairly well clothed; I see the reapers and mowers and other implements on the farm, and this shows that they are not in such an impoverished condition as is represented by the hon. gentleman. I do not see any of the evidences of starvation and poverty which we so often hear of, and in Ontario especially you can find in the rural districts or among the farming population no such evidences of want of which we hear so much in this House. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) gave us a doleful picture of the state of things in his riding, and I live in the hon. gentleman's constituency. It was not long ago that an agricultural implement agent met me in the town in which I live, in the township of Artemisia. I asked him: How do you find collections this year? He said: Very good indeed; I am handing in the last instalment upon the goods I have supplied in this township or in the south riding of Grey. Here were the obligations of the farmers met, not one being obliged to ask for time or to renew his note. Is that an evidence of want? It is the very reverse; and that is only a fair sample of what might be found in every part of our western country. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said the best farmers in his part of the country found at the end of the year that they had not one 5 cent piece to rub upon another. I understand that part of the country pretty well, and not long ago I attended an old patient of his, and she told me that the difference between the County of Grey and the County of Huron was that in her part of the country they were all well-to-do, and were not so poor as they were in the County of Grey, and therefore Huron was a much better county to live in. How does that accord with the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the poverty which prevails in the County of Huron? I think if he were to tell the farmers of Huron that he would insult them, and they would soon call him to time. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) said we wanted reciprocity because we required free corn in order to feed our cattle, and he went on to show how much we had paid in duty on corn last year. In speaking on the corn question before, I said there was a great difference between the interests of the hon. gentleman and those of his constituents. The ordinary farmer lives by selling his coarse grains, and then he sells his cattle, but he does not make a business of fattening cattle generally. He will sell a few cattle, whether they are good for the English market or are only good for stockers. He does not depend on the beef solely. Not one man in a hundred of our farmers turns his attention to feeding cattle for sale, as the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) does. I admit it would be to the advantage of that one man in a hundred to have his corn admitted free, but he would buy that corn from the Americans and would send his oats and his pease and other coarse grain to England, or wherever he could get a market for them. Any one in the position of the hon. gentleman is antagonistic to the ordinary farmer in the respect to which I have alluded. The hon. gentleman told us last year that he was feeding a hundred head of cattle, and this year he tells us that he shipped a hundred head of cattle. Free corn would be to his advantage, but it would not be to the advantage of the ordinary Canadian farmer. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said practically the same thing, but I do not know any one in South Grey who would be benefited by the free admission of corn. Their coarse grains are what they look to for a return, and for their profit. If you admit American corn free you reduce the price of oats and barley here, and that is not for the benefit of the Canadian farmer. If he was feeding cattle for export, no doubt it would be for his advantage; but so long as the Canadian farmer is a raiser of coarse grains, and of general produce, so long is he interested in keeping up the present duty. Now, it is said that the National Policy did no good. Well, at any rate it did this much good, that the last year before we had the National Policy we brought into Canada over 7,000,000 bushels of corn. How much did we bring in the next year? A little over 3,000,000 bushels. We brought in over 2,000,000 bushels of oats that took the place of Canadian oats that were exported to foreign countries. After the National Policy was introduced we brought in only 232,000 bushels, and the next year 68,000 bushels. Did the National Policy do no good to the Canadian farmer? Did it not give him his own market? Then we are told that we raised the duty on pork, but that it did the Canadian farmer no good. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that whatever benefit we receive from the National Policy it is the manufacturer that gets it, and not the Canadian farmer. He says the manufacturer has been benefited, but the farmer has been entirely neglected. Is that a fact? Only

a few years ago, when we found that pork and fresh meat were coming in to feed the Canadian people to the extent of 29,722,000 pounds in one year, we raised the duty upon these articles of food; we raised the duty upon pork, not as high as the farmers wished it to be raised, but we raised it to some extent, and we wished that we could raise it a little higher, because we wanted to make clear what the duty would accomplish. Before that we had fresh meat coming in from Chicago and being laid down every week in London, Woodstock, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, to feed the people of those great cities, whereas they ought to have been fed by the Canadian farmers. Consignments were coming in every week, and being taken out of the cars to feed the people of those cities to the extent of 29,000,000 lbs. in one year, and in this way the market was taken away from the Canadian farmer. We said: It is time that the Government should step in and do something to preserve the market of Canada for the Canadian farmer; and they did do it, and what was the result? During the very first year—and the operations did not extend over a full year—we kept out 14,470,000 pounds of that meat, and we shut up those American stalls. I do not believe there is one of them to-day to be found in those towns or cities throughout Ontario, and the Canadian farmer is feeding the Canadian labourer to-day, the Canadian manufacturer, and the Canadian artizan. Now, then, in the face of these facts hon. gentlemen still dare to tell the Canadian farmer that the National Policy is of no use to him—that it may do some good to the manufacturer, but it is no use to him; it has only been a delusion to him. Then, again, we know that wheat and flour were coming in here in large quantities, and a duty was put upon flour. Did it keep out that flour? I say it did, to a very large extent. I have here a return showing how much of it was kept out in one year. I find that the last year before we put on the duty the imports of wheat for home consumption was 133,883 bushels, and the imports of flour amounted to 45,876 barrels. Now, we find that in the year following, in 1890, there were only $169,000 worth brought in altogether; or, in other words, we shut out nearly three-fourths of previous importations by raising the duty on flour 25 cents per barrel. Yet we are told that it did the Canadian farmer no good, that he receives no benefit from the National Policy, and we are asked to give the Canadian farmer unrestricted reciprocity. We are asked to open up our markets to the American people and allow them to flood our country with the produce of the Yankee farmer, which would take the place of the produce of the Canadian farmer in our own country. The member for North Wellington went on to say that the Canadian farmer was handicapped, because everything he bought was dearer by virtue of the National Policy. But did he attempt to prove that? He attempted to prove that the Canadian farmer would be benefited by unrestricted reciprocity, because, he says, if we had no duty we could get goods from the other side much cheaper than we are getting them to-day. He goes on to give the price of those goods; he goes on to show that in the town of Ann Arbor there is a large manufactory of ploughs, and when they send a plough over to the Canadian farmer they sell it to him for $9, whereas they charge the American farmer $18. They sell the Advance plough to the American farmer for $8, whereas they sell it to the Canadian farmer for $4. Then he gives the price of a mower, which is sent over to Canada and sold for $40, whereas it is sold to Americans for $65; horse rakes are sold to Canadians for $17 and to Americans for $25; and so on, he goes over the list. What does he prove? He proves exactly what we said years ago, that if you put on that duty the Americans will pay that duty, and more than that duty, to get into the Canadian market. Do you want any better evidence than the figures the hon. gentleman has given? I say you want no better evidence. The Canadian farmer is benefited by virtue of the National Policy because he gets his plough $8 cheaper, according to the figures of the hon. member for North Wellington, than the Yankee farmer gets it over in Ann Arbor; and I may tell him that I am pretty well acquainted with that manufactory. I take his own figures, and they substantiate the argument that we have used from time to time in this House, that the value of the manufactured product will not be increased to the consumer here to the full extent of that tariff, because American manufacturers will pay more than the duty to get their goods into our country, and he showed himself by these figures that that is what they are doing. Then, he tells the Canadian farmer that he wants the duty taken off because he could then get his goods at the same price as the Yankee farmer. Then, if he did, he would pay more for them. Now, that is the logic of the hon. gentleman. He goes on to say:

> "My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson) claims that he made a very good point. He shows that the increased price of the product is equal to the duty imposed upon it."

He says virtually the consumer pays the duty. Now, he forgets that in the beginning of his speech he tried to prove to the Canadian farmer that it is the American producer who pays the duty to get into the Canadian market; but when he deals with the other part of the subject, and wants to prove that the Canadian farmer is injured by the National Policy, he tells him that he pays more for everything that he uses, because the price of the article is increased to the consumer in proportion to the duty that is imposed upon it. The hon. gentleman is not consistent in his arguments, and the two parts of his speech do not hold together. I say that his argument is inconsistent, and it is illogical and very unfair. The hon. member for Huron did the same thing. You may go over his speech from one end to the other, and you will find that he contradicts himself in four different places, so that if you believe one part of his speech you must discard the others; and he depends upon the short memory of the reader to be able to induce him to believe that unrestricted reciprocity is a panacea for all ills that the Canadian farmer is heir to. Now, I said in the earlier part of my speech that from 1878 to 1885 we had the principle laid down, as we were told, according to Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, and all the great writers on political economy, that the consumer paid the duty, that the duty was added to the price of the article and the consumer paid it. But from 1885 down to the present time we find that a new political economy has been preached in this House; and who is the author of it? It is the hon. member

for North Norfolk, who has gone all around the compass on all these questions—who is one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow ; one thing this year and another thing next year ; a free trader this year and a protectionist next year ; a reciprocity man this year and a commercial unionist next year ; an unrestricted reciprocity man this year and a continental free trader next year. Then he lays down the principle that because everything the Canadian farmer has to sell in the American market is so small in proportion to the amount of that same line of goods on the American side that therefore our exports do not disturb the American market, and consequently the Canadian farmer has got to bear the cost of taking his goods to that market, and the duty. Now, I said before, and I repeat it again, that if the Canadian farmer starts here with a load of wheat and goes across the line to sell it in New York he has got to pay the duty when he gets to that line ; but if he does that, remember he gets the full benefit of the American market whenever he reaches there, whatever that may be. But a man was buying potatoes in my village only last winter at 30 cents per bushel, when he took them across the line and paid 25 cents a bushel duty. That brought down the price of his potatoes to 55 cents, but when he reached the American market he got $1.12½ per bushel. I, therefore, say he would have had to pay the duty ; but would he have got the full benefit of the market when his products reached the market ? On the other hand, when the American purchaser comes to buy potatoes in Canada he does not pay any farmer what the Brooklyn market affords, less the duty and the cost of freight to take them there. He bought them for 30 cents per bushel, paid the freight himself, went into that market, and got the full benefit of it. I have thus given instances in which the producer pays the duty, and in which the consumer pays the duty. As the price of our articles is regulated principally from Europe, they can often be purchased here cheaper than in the United States, and the buyer can take them over the line, pay the duty, and still have a profit. It was so with our barley this year. Notwithstanding the McKinley tariff, Americans bought our barley and took it over the line, and our farmers received as much for the barley as before that tariff was imposed. It is not, therefore, true to say that because the McKinley tariff is in force the value of our products has fallen to such an extent that it takes all the money a beast will realize to pay the duty, as is shown in the very suggestive pamphlet issued by the Liberal party.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman give the reason why barley fell 20 cents per bushel in Canada during one day ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not aware of it. The barley purchased in my own village did not fall 5 cents during the week after the adoption of the McKinley tariff. If the hon. gentleman disbelieves it, I have here the prices paid by McKay Bros., of Toronto : 9th February, 1890, 44 cents ; 9th February, 1891, 53 cents ; barley No. 2, 5th February, 1890, 40 cents ; 8th February, 1891, 50 cents. Does that show that barley fell 10 cents a bushel in consequence of the McKinley tariff ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell us the price of barley 8th September and 8th October ?

Mr. SPROULE. If I had the prices I would give them to the hon. gentleman, and they would bear out the statement I have made. I now take barley, No. 3, February 8, 1890, 36·8 cents ; February 9, 1891, 45 cents. These figures show in every instance that after the McKinley tariff was in operation the Canadian farmer obtained more for his barley, as shown by the purchases of McKay Bros., of Toronto. If the hon. gentleman disputes the figures he can appeal to buyers in Toronto, who will justify these statements. Thus, hon. gentlemen opposite are not justified in telling the people that they require unrestricted reciprocity because the McKinley tariff causes a reduction in the price of their products. Hon. gentlemen opposite also went on to prove that every Canadian farmer who raised an acre of barley, oats or wheat did so at a loss. Is it not a wonder that a farmer having nothing to start with should lose money year by year, and yet be able to hang on and appear to be well-fed and clothed. It is a wonderful kind of logic which brings out this result. Surely the Canadian farmer cannot believe it. I have been carrying on a farm, only 400 acres, for a number of years, and I have been running it at a profit, and can continue to do so, notwithstanding the McKinley tariff, and in fact I am equally as well able to do it to-day as before that tariff was enacted. This is, no doubt, the experience of many farmers in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite say : We want the tariff taken off because we seek a wider market. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) said that last year he exported a hundred head of cattle, and when his son came back he reported that the difference between American cattle and Canadian cattle in the English market was only $2 or $3. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell the Canadian people he was taking finished beef cattle, and not stockers ?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I said I had a son who came home last week, and he stated that in the market the difference between Canadian cattle was only 10 shillings ; and further, that a good many of the cattle sold there were Canadian cattle shipped from Boston, the Americans foregoing the benefit of Canadian cattle not being slaughtered at the port of arrival.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that exactly what I am saying ? It makes little difference, as regards the finished beef, whether the cattle are shipped from the United States or from Canada. Those American buyers referred to bought Canadian cattle to ship from Boston because they were ready to be killed on arrival in England. Of the entire number shipped last year, how many were finished cattle ? We shipped over 90,000 animals that were not ready to be killed, and each of these would have been reduced in value atl east $10 if the shippers had been obliged to kill them on arrival in England. In giving his figures the hon. member for Huron was innocent enough not to inform the House that this comparison was drawn between finished cattle shipped from the United States and from Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN. I took beef cattle in both cases.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the hon. gentleman say they were beef cattle ? Every head shipped from Boston was finished cattle. Canadians are buying stock and shipping them to the old country in large

numbers, and I claim they save $10 per head because they are allowed to finish them in that country instead of killing them on landing. Unrestricted reciprocity would kill out that trade. When the hon. gentleman goes among the farmers and endeavours to convince them that there is not the difference I have stated in value between Canadian and American cattle, and tells them that the difference is only 10 shillings per head, he had better state that it is not a proper comparison. It matters little whether the Americans buy a few thousand cattle and ship them from Montreal or from Boston, if they are to be slaughtered at the port of landing. It is not so, however, with respect to that important trade out of which Canadian farmers obtain so much. Of stockers we shipped last year 123,000 head, and this year we will probably ship 140,000 or 150,000 head. Therefore, it is important for the Canadian farmers that we have the full advantage of the market without being scheduled, and that we have not unrestricted reciprocity, under which this privilege would be denied us in England. I say it is misleading our Canadian farmers, and it is unfair and deplorable that a man who professes to understand the wants of the Canadian farmers, and who is connected with farming himself, should make such statements.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that during the time he was speaking——

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to say, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order ; sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I raise this point of order : he is misquoting my figures.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about the hon. gentleman's figures at all. I am talking about the Trade and Navigation Returns, which are something more accurate than the hon. gentleman's figures.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order ; sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen that this constant interruption is entirely out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He is misrepresenting me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is, that no member can interrupt another, except on a point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Well, when he is misrepresenting me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am in order.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) entertained this House for about two hours with what he pleased to call facts and figures, and any hon. gentleman in this House could have contradicted his statements every fifteen minutes, and shown him that he was inaccurate in his reasoning. No person took the trouble to do so, and I sat through the whole of it, and made no interruption ; but when the hon. gentleman now sees that his arguments are proven to be wrong he gets very restless under it. He is like a boy taking unpalatable medicine. I would like him to sit still and take his medicine like a little man. He has administered many a bitter pill himself, and he is getting one of his own now. I say that the hon. member who made the comparison in reference to the price of cattle made a mistake, and it comes with worse grace from him, because he professes to be a farmer, and therefore I will deal with his argument more particularly than I did with the argument of the other hon. gentleman. If time would permit me I could show him that his arguments were just as fallacious, his reasoning as incorrect, and his figures as inaccurate, as those of the other gentleman, and if they were addressed to the Canadian farmer they would only mislead him.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; sit down.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The hon. gentleman says——

Some hon. MEMBERS. You are out of order. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I trust the House will sustain me in endeavouring to maintain order.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman raising a point of order. I have already intimated to the House that when a member is speaking another can only interrupt on a point of order.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I rise to a point of order, and it is this : When the gentleman refers to the Trade and Navigation Returns that there were 122,000 cattle——

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is not a point of order. Sit down.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron)—he is not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no point of order, that I can see, in what the hon. gentleman is stating.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentlemen opposite are getting very impatient. They do not like to hear these things, because they come too close to them. They do not like to get a rehearsal of what they have been saying in the country during the last campaign, nor do they like to hear facts and figures, and therefore they become restless and try to interrupt. I may now refer for a few moments to the arguments of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). He said, at first, that he would endeavour to give the House some information upon the question under discussion, but he did nothing of the kind. His first argument was something about inconsistency in the Conservative party ; his next argument was upon the temperance question and my friend the Minister of Finance, and he wasted about half an hour reading extracts—I don't know where he got them—to show there was some inconsistency. He then struck another attitude of recklessness and facetiousness and he then endeavoured to show want of harmony in the ranks of the Conservative party. He went on from that, and he suddenly brought out something about passing down the halls of memory, and he went back again to the harmony and unity of

the Conservative party. Then he gave a lurch from side to side, and the Regina *Leader*, and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) came in for a portion of his extensive knowledge. He left that on a sudden, and he went back to Haldimand and the Indians, and something about a speech that was made out there, and a circular which was sent to the Indians. Then he eulogized the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and Sir Richard Cartwright for a short time, and he swept on to taxation, and he talked about the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said: We, the Canadian people, built that road; but he says that the Government which built it made it pass through a corner of the State of Maine, and that they had cut the throat of the Intercolonial Railway by building a competing road. He said: We, the Canadian people, built it; and his argument was in effect that if there was any *éclat* to be derived from that work the Liberal party should share in it, but if there was any wrong the Government must be responsible for the whole of it. Then the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) talked about the member for Halifax, and he suddenly drifted away to the Ottawa River, and something about steamboats and tugs on that river. After all this, he said he would come to the question, and he dwelt for exactly two and a-half minutes on the question. I kept the time closely. He gave us a strong eulogy on the Mackenzie Government and he dropped down in his seat exhausted, but he never gave us a single argument on the question at issue. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that after all this he was enlightening the Canadian people on this question. No doubt that is what he calls logic, and argument, and reason, and he will no doubt go home and tell the electors: I raised my voice on behalf of the Canadian farmer; I have talked until I was exhausted on behalf of the Canadian farmer, but the Government were obdurate, and they will do nothing, and you will have to suffer; they throw the money into the Red Parlour at Toronto; they give millions to the manufacturers, but they will let you remain in poverty and they will do nothing for you. I have no doubt that he will tell that to the people when he goes home, but I hardly think they will believe him. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) professed that he was going to give a dissertation on the financial aspect of this country, but what did he do? He started out to tell us about petroleum and coal oil, and he quoted the price of the American and Canadian oil to try to show that the hon. member (Mr. Moncrieff) who spoke on this side of the House had been misleading the people. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) gave us the quotation of the price of American oil in Oswego, but he gave the quotation of the prices of wine gallons there, as against the prices of the imperial gallons in this country. Was that a fair or just argument for any gentleman in this House to use. I have no doubt that any farmer reading that would not understand that the quotations were quoted for different kinds of gallons of oil, but hon. gentlemen sitting in this House knew very well the difference. That hon. gentleman would like to stand well before this House and this country as an honourable man, as a man of integrity and honesty. He impugned the truthfulness and veracity of the hon. members on this side of the House, and then he turned around and gave what purported to be the facts as an evidence that the Ontario farmer was unfairly treated. Although he knew that the wine gallon was one-sixth less than the Imperial gallon, he said that the coal oil was 6 cents a gallon on the American side and 9 cents a gallon on the Canadian side; and then he said: Look at the difference. Then the hon. member for East Lambton told us that there was so much money invested in land, in plant, and in the operations in coal oil, and the hon. member for London said: "I find that the assessment of the whole place is less than a million dollars all told." The hon. member for East Lambton, in speaking of that, took the trouble to tell the House, very fairly, I thought, that the assessed value is no criterion of the actual value of the property, because under the assessment law mining lands are allowed to be assessed as ordinary farm lands; therefore, although they have been sold at $4,000 an acre, they are only assessed at the price of the farm lands around them, and poor lands at that. The average price of these coal oil lands, I am told, is $400 an acre, although they have been sold at as high as $4,000 an acre. The hon. gentleman was justified in the figures he gave, and the hon. member for London did an injustice to his own part of the country in crying down one of the leading industries there and endeavouring to convince the Canadian people that the manufacturers of coal oil were becoming millionaires on account of the duty, and that if that duty were taken off the Canadian farmer would get his coal oil cheaper. Was that fair in the hon. member for London? I say it was most unfair. It was not reasonable in a man representing an important city like London to make such statements to this House, and I hope he will be more careful in the use of such arguments in the future. I will now leave that question. I believe, as I said before, that we are entitled to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance. For what? Because the National Policy is a success. It is a success because it raises a revenue. It gave us enough money to carry on the public works of the country, to build railways and develop the country, without to day increasing the taxes one dollar; and we have reached that stage of development that our national debt is not running up any more. What more did it do? It kept the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer and manufacturer. What more did it do? It gave us the markets of the old country for some of the more important lines of Canadian farm produce. What more did it do? It enabled the Finance Minister to take the duty off those lines that represent the urgent necessaries of life. We are able to take the duty off tea and coffee, and off sugar, almost entirely. We are able, by taking off that $3,500,000 of taxation, to give the people that which is one of the necessaries of life much cheaper than they had it before. The hon. member for North Wellington said that taking off this duty is of no use to the Canadian consumer, because it goes into the pockets of the manufacturers; and yet the market reports show that on the very day, or two or three days after that duty was taken off, granulated sugar fell 1⅛ cents a pound in the Montreal market, and it is over 2 cents a pound cheaper to-day than it was before the duty was taken off. Does the consumer not get the benefit of that? When you can get twenty pounds for a dollar to-day, where you could only get twelve

pounds before the duty was taken off, will any man have the audacity to stand up in this House and tell the Canadian farmer that he receives no benefit from the removal of this taxation? Then the National Policy enables you to reduce the tariff on the necessaries of life. What more does it do? It enables you to raise the duties on spirits and tobacco, which are not necessaries of life. What more does it do? It in a large measure advances temperance sentiment and principles, which are so important in this country. I say the Finance Minister is entitled to credit, because in the readjustment of the tariff he has put duties on these things, and endeavoured as much as possible to break up the drinking customs of the people, and to stop the use of those things which are not necessaries of life, but rather contribute to obnoxious habits—the use of tobacco, snuff, cigars and liquor. Is that not in the interest of the Canadian people? I say it is; and as long as the Finance Minister is able to do this I am sure the country will appreciate him, and be grateful to him, and feel that he is the right man in the right place. Now, I say that we do not want unrestricted reciprocity. What is the amendment which has been moved in this debate? Is it unrestricted reciprocity? No; it is that we want reciprocity. I have told you that in 1885 they first proposed commercial union, but that was unpalatable. Then they called it commercial reciprocity; but the people still rebelled. Then it was continental free trade. After that they called it unrestricted reciprocity, and went to the country with their colours nailed to the mast. And now they come here and say, not that we want unrestricted reciprocity, although the whole tenor of their arguments is in that direction, but that we want reciprocity, and we want the duties reduced—not all the duties, but the duties on the prime necessaries of life. Is not that what the Finance Minister has done? If it is a fair reciprocity treaty that they want, we have always been willing to give that to the Canadian people, and I am sure the Government are still willing to have it, if they can get it on fair and equitable terms. But they do not intend to go further than that; they do not intend to go down on their knees and beg for what the Canadian farmer is able to do without. I have no doubt that in the by-elections these hon. gentlemen will go and tell the Canadian farmer that they want reciprocity, and they will turn up this resolution and point out that it does not say unrestricted reciprocity, but says reciprocity, reduction of duties on the prime necessaries of life, and a wider market. But the whole tenor of their speeches has been in favour of unrestricted reciprocity; and if their arguments mean anything, they lead to this conclusion, that unrestricted reciprocity, and unrestricted reciprocity only, is the remedy for the condition of this country to-day. Now, this is a very important question: What is reciprocity? It is a commercial question which we have always been willing to deal with. What is unrestricted reciprocity? It is a national question, a political question and a commercial question. Why do I say it is a national question? Because it would be destructive of our national life; because it would subordinate us to the United States; because it would cut the connection that unites us with the mother country; because it discriminates against that country which has always stood by us, and which has given us the most important market we have been enjoying for years for some of our most important lines of production. Then we are told that we are preaching disloyalty because we say that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity leads to annexation. What do the Canadian Reformers say? That it would not lead to annexation, but that it would remove the discontent which exists to-day, and satisfy the people, and do away with annexation sentiment. But they told the people in that notable pamphlet from which I have read: Go and tell the electors that we can give them unrestricted reciprocity, that we have the assurances of both parties in the United States that we can get it. If so, they must have entered into some compact with them. Now, what do the prominent men of the United States say about unrestricted reciprocity? They say: We will give it, because it would lead to political union and annexation. And there is not a prominent public man in the United States who has expressed himself on that question in the last five years but has said the same thing. Now, if they give it, what do they give it for? They give it, believing that it will surely lead to political union. I ask: Are we going to discriminate against the mother country? Are we going to sink our own nationality? Are we going to subordinate ourselves to the United States for the purpose of getting free admission into a market where they will compete against us in every line? We are told that we would get it, because England would not rebel against it. Is that the dispatch which Lord Knutsford sent out the other day? If I read it aright, that dispatch was to the effect that whatever negotiations might take place it was to be presumed there would be no discrimination against the mother country. Was not that an intimation that England would consider, if we discriminated against her, that we intended to cut the connection? Are we prepared to negotiate unrestricted reciprocity? I say we are not. What did Erastus Wiman say? He said, that provided we got unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, if Canada then refused political union it would lead to another Boston tea party. We would be then in their trap and could not draw back. In the face of such disclosures, are we not entitled to hold that it is disloyal to preach unrestricted reciprocity, that it is disloyal to the mother country and would lead to political union with the United States. I say it would be a sorry day for the Canadians when we got unrestricted reciprocity, because on that day we would sink our national independence and blot out from British North America that colony which is the brightest gem of the British Empire. In view of those things, I am prepared to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford. I am satisfied that when the Canadian people know, as know they will in time, the situation, they will vote against it. Why is it that during the last election, toward the end of the campaign, every day saw hundreds of the electors coming over to our side, because as soon as the question was fairly before them and they had time to consider it they ranged themselves in our ranks, and if that election had been postponed ten or fifteen days longer the Conservatives would have come back with a much larger majority. I shall not take up the time

of the House any longer. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not endeavour to put out another secret pamphlet to prove such absurdities as are found in the one I have just read, and then proceed to prove something else in this House. They attempt to prove one thing in the country and another thing when they are in this House. They attempt to prove one thing in Boston and a different thing on Canadian soil; and as long as they do that they will find themselves in the cold shades of opposition. When they come back fresh from the people they accuse the electorate of being ignorant, stupid and deluded, and not knowing their business; but at any rate the electorate know sufficient to keep these hon. gentlemen where they have been for the last twelve years, and where I believe they are destined long to remain.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to make a few remarks, Sir, on this question, since very few of my hon. friends from Quebec have so far taken any part in the discussion, and since the province from which I come is, I believe, the one which is, perhaps, the most interested in this question, and the one which has suffered, and is suffering, the most from the actual condition of affairs. We have had the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), who gave us, I must say, a fair-sized speech. It is true, Sir, that his oration was finally merged into still-born resolutions, but that accident did not impair the merits of his long effort, and he surely deserves some credit for it. We have also heard from my hon. friend the member from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). He promised us that he would deal only with a few points, and that very briefly; but, to my great pleasure, he did not keep his word, and in length was second to none. I must do the hon. gentleman the justice, however, of saying that, from his own standpoint, he certainly did very well. Now, Sir, these gentlemen do not represent the majority of the Province of Quebec. It has been a favourite argument with our friends opposite, one which has been very often repeated by them, that every victory meant that they were right in all their pretensions. If this argument is as strong in our mouth, I might say that the Province of Quebec this time has shown that she does not believe so. There is one point upon which we all agree, and that is, that a change in our fiscal policy has become necessary, but where we differ is as to the nature of the change. Some hon. gentlemen place their hopes in the fiscal policy of the British Islands. For instance, my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) told us:

"Further, I am proud to say there is on the English horizon a cloud the size of a man's hands, indicating a change of policy to our advantage. That may not afford our hon. friends opposite as much pleasure as it does us, but it excites in some of us the hope that, before we are many years older, we may, by means of new political adjustments, find in the old country, for the products of our farms, a larger market than we have hitherto found. A very small difference of duty, a duty of 5 or 7 per cent. in the English market in favour of our wheat, and our barley, and beef, and our mutton, and our poultry, and our eggs, and our lumber, would guarantee the very rapid building up of this country.

A little further on he said:

"Let hon. gentlemen read the speeches in the English *Hansard* of 1842-44 against this repeal, and then turn to the *Hansard* of 1846, and they will find that too much attention cannot be paid to these declarations of Mr. Gladstone and others.

The hon. gentleman might have told us that, if these men have changed their minds in a few years, in that very same year, 1842, there was a reduction made in the import duties on 750 articles, and four years previous the Anti-Corn Law Association was organized in Manchester, and that movement in favour of free trade dates as far back as 1830. It is certainly a great delusion in the mind of the hon. gentleman if he thinks that the English people are going to re-enact the corn laws. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman advocated such a policy at any public meeting in England he would not only be sneered at, but might possibly be stoned. Now, other gentlemen want reciprocity in natural products. That is a very fine thing, and I admit I would be in favour of it, but it is only a half measure; and not only is it a half measure, but it makes me think these hon. gentlemen are not very sincere when they say they will take reciprocity in natural products and in nothing else, because we are told, and I think we are perfectly well informed now, that it is impossible to have it. The only utterance which we have received from American statesmen is that it is useless for us to try to negotiate with them except upon the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, we understand that hon. gentlemen are ready for an indefinite policy in regard to reciprocity in order to retain themselves in power. On this side of the House we are unanimous in favour of the only policy which can be realized, and that is unrestricted reciprocity, which would also be of the greatest benefit to the people of Canada generally. There is no doubt that we are all agreed that a change in our fiscal policy is necessary. We find that in the manifesto published after the dissolution of Parliament and also in the message sent by His Excellency the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. This message has been often repeated in this debate, but you will allow me to read a few lines of it for the sake of the point I am making:

"1. Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interest of Canada and the United States."

It was then the desire of the Government to consult the people on that question of reciprocity. Dissolution took place, and, in all agricultural constituencies, wherever this issue was prominently put before the people, wherever the attention of the people was not diverted from the question of reciprocity, I believe I am right in saying that the people gave no uncertain utterance of their wishes in this regard. As far as I am concerned, the only issue submitted to the electors of my constituency was the question of reciprocity, and it is no boast to say that they have given no equivocal opinion on that question. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Sproule) boasted in reference to the good results of the policy adopted by the party now in power, and I will say a few words on the situation of the country and more especially of the Province of Quebec at the present time. We have several means of ascertaining in what condition we now are, but allow me to read you a few words which I take from the record of the failures during the last six months:

"It is not a very encouraging one. The number of failures so far this year was 991, against 868 during the same period last year. This is an increase of 123, or over 14 per cent. The liabilities, too, show an even larger increase, being $8,702,789, against $7,224,503 for the same

period of last year, an increase of about 20 per cent. Every province but Ontario shows a slight increase in the number of failures, but by far the greatest increase has been in the Province of Quebec, where the number has increased 53 per cent. and the amount of liabilities is 50 per cent. greater."

Does this show a state of prosperity? We have other signs by which we may judge of our prosperity. Let us take the rate of interest. Speaking of the section where I live, at all events, we used until last year to have money lent on mortgages on farms at 6 and 7 per cent.; now it cannot be obtained for less than 8 per cent. Hon. gentlemen may say this is not true in all sections of the country, but I speak of the district where I live and the surrounding counties, and I say that the interest now charged on mortgages is at least 8 per cent. I know that gentlemen who are accustomed to deal with financial business will support me in this, that creditors are not to-day suing or foreclosing mortgages, because they are afraid they will have to buy in the properties. The Crédit Foncier in Montreal and in Quebec have taken out a large number of judgments, but they will not execute them, because they know that they cannot sell these properties. They believe they would be obliged to buy them in if they executed their judgments, and would have to keep them idle. In our townships all the farms that are valued at, say, $1,000, have decreased in value by one-half. Half of them are for sale. I have personal experience of this. A few years ago we could buy farms of that kind, speculate upon them, and sell them again at a fair profit. Now half of them are for sale and there is no demand for them. If hon. gentlemen in Ontario are more fortunate than we are I am very glad of it. Now, what is our position as to emigration. Never, I believe, was the exodus so great as it was last spring. Never have I seen so many carloads of people going away from the Province of Quebec every day to the United States. I was asked, why did they go? Is it not that they want to work in the factories? That is very true; but it is you who had promised to provide industries, to provide a home market, to provide work for all hands, cannot furnish work for these hands, or even a home market, and they have to go away in order to avoid starvation. My hon. friend who preceded me spoke of the great benefits of protection for the farmers, and my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) said that the farmers had been greatly benefited by this policy, that they sold in the market where it was dear to sell and bought in the market where it was cheap to buy. They buy cheaper everything they wish to buy, they raise their own food, they raise their own wheat, and they have very cheap labour. Well, Sir, I believe that my hon. friend knows a little better when he says that the farmers of Quebec—and he was speaking from a Quebec standpoint—raise their own wheat. I can tell my hon. friend from Sherbrooke that not 20 per cent. of the farmers of the Province of Quebec raise their own wheat; in some townships there are not 10 per cent.; in some townships there are not 5 per cent., and in my own county, which is not the poorest in that province, in some parishes there is not a single farmer who raises enough for his own consumption. Now, what have they done to favour the farmer? What have they done to give him cheap bread? They have taxed flour 50 cents a barrel; and not content with that, in 1889 they put an additional 25 cents on every barrel of flour. Now, they say we do not buy any taxed flour. Well, I do not know that we buy a large quantity; still, we do buy some, and the most of it is bought by the Province of Quebec. Last year we bought 167,000 barrels of flour, valued at $597,000, on which we paid a duty of $88,000, and more than half of that amount was paid by the farmers of the Province of Quebec, surely the most numerous class, and they all buy flour. Then the people of the Province of Quebec were beginning to buy corn, and to favour that province, I suppose, the Government taxed corn. Last year we imported 3,342,000 bushels, on which we paid a duty of $243,000. Now, what else did they do to favour the farmers of Quebec and Canada generally? They put a tax on cotton and woollen cloth; they also put a tax on agricultural implements, and they have put a tax on every article that the farmers buy in that line. Now, it may be said that these taxes do not apply only to the farmers, and let me read you a short statement to show how this taxation is distributed. In 1878 the average tax on cotton cloth was 17½ per cent., in 1880 the average was 30 per cent., and in 1889 it was 35 per cent. On agricultural implements the average in 1879 was 25 per cent., and in 1889 it was 35 per cent. The tax on stoneware, used by people of small means, is 35 per cent.; on china, 30 per cent.; on silver and gold plate, 20 per cent. The tax on spades and shovels is 46 per cent.: on forks and hoes, 53 per cent.; while jewellery is taxed only 20 per cent. Now, these figures give an idea of the love of hon. gentlemen for the farmers of Canada, and for the Province of Quebec especially. But it is not only in the way of making everything dear that the farmer buys that we have been ill-treated by this policy. It has brought retaliation from our neighbours, and now I may say that one-half at least of all the articles we have to sell have been so highly taxed that the farming industry is almost ruined. I will mention a few of the items. For instance, of horses last year we sold 16,000 to the United States, and of this number the Province of Quebec alone sold 7,691. Now, can we go on in this way? Since the imposition of the McKinley tariff a diminution in the value of horses of at least 25 per cent. has taken place, and when I say that it is not an idle statement. No longer than a month ago that statement was given to me under oath. A man sued a railway company for the value of a horse killed on the track. People came to give evidence as to the value of that horse, and they declared that last year $120 had been refused for the animal, but the price of horses having decreased, they did not consider that he could be sold now for more than $90. These people did not explain the reason of the lower price, but they all knew perfectly well that the price of horses had decreased about 25 per cent. Now, I say that the farmers of Quebec have no inducement to continue to raise horses. The same thing may be said in regard to hay. Last year we sold a large quantity of hay to the United States, of which the largest part went from the Province of Quebec, which province alone sold 85,674 tons. Now, what was the price of hay last year? Even then the price was low, and it was selling at $10 a ton just before the new crop of 1890 was put in. Now, I am credibly informed by a hay buyer who lives in my county,

and who last year bought about $100,000 worth of hay for the United States market from the farmers of my county and from the Counties of Bagot and Yamaska — this gentleman informs me that this year he has not shipped half that quantity, although the farmers' barns are full of hay. The price was $8 a ton about three weeks ago, before the farmers began to cut their new crop, whereas at the same date last year it was $10 a ton. What is the reason of that? The price of hay has not fallen in the United States market, but the lower price in Canada is caused by the effect of the McKinley tariff of $2 additional duty a ton. Now, these traders have to pay $4 a ton duty; they pay $3 freight, and $1.50 for pressing the hay; that brings the hay up to $8.50; they sell it in the United States for $18, which leaves them a margin of $1.50 as profit, commission and incidental expenses. Now we understand why the price of hay has come down so low, and why the demand for it is so small. I may use the same argument in respect to cattle and potatoes, and almost every article that the farmer sells. Now, these gentlemen want us to believe that they have done the Canadian people a great favour by reducing the duty on sugar. Well, I confess it is a step in the right direction, but it is only a half measure. I remember the time in 1882 when the hon. member who represented the constituency which I have now the honour to represent was fighting his election battle. Speaking on this question, he told us that the duty on sugar was for the purpose of protecting the maple sugar manufacturers, that it was for the purpose of helping our farmers, and that it enabled them to sell their sugar two or three cents per pound higher than they could obtain except for that duty. We did not allow ourselves to be deceived on that point by that plea; and we can now see clearly who were the parties protected by that policy, and who were the parties to be aided when that duty was imposed. We know well that hon. gentlemen opposite never trouble themselves to assist the farmers. We see that the taxes are imposed for the purpose of favouring a few millionaires, and perhaps a few hundreds of workingmen. As this is the case, we had better remove the tax altogether. If we have a surplus, give the farmers who manufacture maple sugar a bounty, instead of levying a duty to benefit five or six millionaires and 600 or 700 workmen. Such a bounty as I have mentioned would favour about 20,000 farmers who manufacture large quantities of maple sugar every year. In my own constituency perhaps one out of every two farmers makes sugar to the value of about $100 every year, and they do this work in a season during which they have nothing else to do. This would be more patriotic and more valuable to the farmers, of whom hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be such great friends, if they would thus favour that industry and also favour the industry which the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has mentioned and so well explained this afternoon. I am glad this tax has been removed; but if we are to keep part of it we ought to place a tax also on the raw material and favour the people who deserve to be favoured, and do that which will most benefit the country generally and the largest number of its people. Hon. gentlemen opposite always tell us that since the inauguration of the present tariff they have always obtained a majority at the elections, and obtained the support of the people. I believe the causes which have kept hon. gentlemen in their seats are the same as some years ago; but perhaps we know them a little better. We might name them in a very few words: gerrymander, Franchise Act, appointing revising barristers and returning officers, railway subsidies, selling contracts, taking the peeple's money to purchase their support, retail and wholesale bribery, bribing railway corporations, and finally raising the loyalty cry. I desire to say a few words in order to give my testimony as to the condition of the farmers in the section of the country in which I live. I say we are far from being prosperous; that we have never been so badly off as we are now. What is the remedy—for what do we look? We believe that protection has killed half of our trade, and has at the same time increased the price of everything we have to buy. The remedy for these evils will be found in the adoption of the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and in negotiating, according to the terms of that amendment, a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. What is the objection urged? The cry of loyalty is a childish one. It is one you may put before the people, but it is perfectly useless and childish to repeat that cry in this House. The main objection is the decrease that would occur in our revenue. We are asked how we would provide for that decrease in our revenue on account of the removal of taxes on American goods. Hon. gentlemen opposite have asked for an answer to that question. If hon. gentlemen will look at the expenditure in 1878, when the honest and economical Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in office, they will find the expenditure was $24,000,000, while this year it is $36,000,000, or an increase of $12,000,000. That is just the amount which hon. gentlemen think we will have to provide. I do not say that we could reduce our expenditure to $24,000,000, but I believe we could cut it down half way, or by at least $6,000,000. Why should we expend any more to-day for militia and mounted police than we did in 1878? We spend to-day $2,000,000 for militia and mounted police. The increase on that item, far from doing any good, if it has not brought civil war on the country, at least it has not prevented it. There is in that item alone a saving of one million dollars to be made. While I do not propose to enumerate every department, I am satisfied that in the aggregate a saving of $6,000,000 might be effected. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has answered in a very effective manner the objections of hon. members opposite. No doubt the volume of our business would be considerably increased if we had reciprocity with the United States, and the amount of our purchases from other countries would also be increased, and this necessarily would produce an increase of income. But, Sir, suppose that we have to provide for that decrease of revenue in another way, there is a very simple mode, and that is to put the tax on something else. When we will be doing an extensive business, when we will be making money, when the farmers of Canada will have a good market, when they sell their products at fair prices, when the tax of $4 a ton is taken from hay, when the tax on their sheep, and lambs, and horses, is removed, then, Sir, they will be better able to pay the same amount of taxes that they pay to-day.

Whether they pay it on goods which come from the United States or upon goods which come from other foreign countries, it is no matter to them at all. I say, Sir, that the answer, and the only answer, is this one: If we take away that tax we will put another tax on some other goods. The solution is as simple as that, and in addition we would have the advantage of this large trade with our neighbours. I will now close my remarks. I believe that anyone who is really desirous of the welfare of the farmers of this country, the largest class in our community, should support the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will not imitate most of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. I have noticed that the plan pursued in this discussion—if indeed discussion be the proper word to describe it—has been, that one hon. gentleman has risen after another, and having said a few words about what his opponent, or predecessor in occupation of the floor had said, he then went into a long essay on the Trade and Navigation Returns. In fact, I had the pleasure of listening to one hon. gentleman who only failed to have commenced with Noah descending from the ark, for he went back to the remotest history, and took us over a large tract of country. Sir, I will follow the hon. member from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) as closely as I can, in regard to all that portion of his speech which I think he might claim worthy of consideration at the hands of this House. He said that he came to give his testimony as to what was the condition of things in his own county, and how the policy of the Government affected the people in his county, and during his remarks he frequently used the phrase: "I am informed." Well, Sir, I am informed that the hon. gentleman is a distinguished lawyer, and he must know very well that even in political matters hearsay evidence is not very valuable. I should have much preferred had he given us exactly what he had seen himself, so that we might have had his direct testimony as to the dolorous effect of the policy of the Government in the part of the country to which he belongs. The hon. gentleman commenced by talking of "a cloud no bigger than a man's hand;" a phrase used by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), and he went on to refer to the Corn Laws, and he declared that the feeling in England to-day was very much the same as it was at the time of the Corn Laws, and that any attempt to ask England to modify her fiscal policy so as to meet the desires of her colonies in general, and this colony in particular, was utterly futile. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the tone held by the *Times* newspaper, the leading organ of public opinion in England? Is the hon. gentleman aware of the tone held by such a paper as the *Economist*, probably the greatest journalistic organ on fiscal matters in the world? Is the hon. gentleman aware that there is a great change of feeling in England, and that, in fact, that deification of Richard Cobden that once existed there has passed away, and that the general feeling prevails, as though Carlyle's estimate of him was the correct estimate, when he said in his humorous way, that he regarded Richard Cobden as an inspired bag-man who believed in a calico millenium. Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have here an estimate by a distinguished financial authority.

Mr. LAVERGNE.

Mr. AMYOT. That is hearsay evidence.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend will spare me his suggestions I shall be very glad, because I am sure neither light nor sweetness come from these. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a suggestion made by a distinguished financial authority, and it is a suggestion that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, or whoever representing the Government may go down to Washington, will do well to bear in mind. He is dealing with the McKinley Bill, and he points out cogently and powerfully how England ought to deal with the United States with regard to that measure. All he says bears on the very question raised in the first sentence of the speech of my hon. and learned friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). He regards the McKinley Bill as a retaliatory measure, and, *en passant*, he points out that it enables Brazil to favour the United States against England. He declares that the McKinley Bill is a retaliatory measure, and that England is bound to retaliate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to commit myself to the proposition that I would, under any circumstances, favour retaliatory legislation. I am not dealing with that point; I am discussing the point raised by my hon. friend when he said there was no change in opinion in England with regard to this matter, and as to whether we may or may not expect that England would modify her tariff in another direction than the free trade direction, with a view to affect other tariffs, such as that of the United States. I may say here, that I was perfectly astonished to hear from the hon. gentleman who so ably represents South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the statement that the Government of Canada, with bated breath and whispered humbleness, had to come down the moment a change took place in the tariff of the country to the south of the line. We konw very well, Sir, that the incidence of commerce is so delicate that if any nation on the continent of Europe were to modify its tariff in any given way it would be for any contiguous nation to consider whether it should not modify its tariff, too. There are some staples that we import from the United States that if we were to deal with in the spirit of this McKinley Bill it would be a matter for the Secretary of State of the United States to consider whether he would not in turn deal with the tariff on such article in an equitable way, corresponding with the change that had taken place in the contiguous country. Here let me pause to call attention to the closing sentence in the speech of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). I will speak in the spirit of that sentence, and I will ask that for the remainder of this debate hon. gentlemen on my own side of the House—and it is a very Irish position, because it is the other side—as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, will speak and act and vote in the spirit of these words. I will try to vote in their spirit myself; and if the hon. member for South Oxford were here I would ask him to analyse his resolution for me, to show me that the two parts of that resolution hang together, and then that the whole will be beneficial, and if he did that he might find me voting with him.

Mr. LAURIER. You are boasting.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is too egotistical to suppose that it would be boasting on my part to speak of voting on his side. This is what the hon. member for South Brant said:

"While I may not have convinced him, I trust that by examining each other's views from our different points of view, we may both find our minds enlarged, and may endeavour to promote legislation in this House which shall be for the best interests of the people of Canada."

No nobler words were ever spoken in any legislative assembly——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad hon. gentlemen cheer, and would to God men on both sides of the House would go into the debate in that spirit. Then we should not have the kind of debate which we constantly witness. I do not conceal—it may be impertinent on my part not to conceal it—that I utterly disapprove of the character of the debate. We should have a mutual discussion among ourselves as to what will be the best, instead of discussing a definite financial issue with all the heated passions of partisans. Every year we have a discussion on this financial issue, and it reminds me of the etymology of the word "debate." As the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, it is derived from the French word *débattre*, which in turn is derived from the old French word *battre*, which means to beat, to lay on; and it is in that meaning that we apply the word here, instead of in that proper meaning which now holds—to interchange opinions, to cross swords in argument, to fight out issues, and then come to conclusions. But what has happened here? There has been no joining of issues whatever, no swords crossed; but in fact we have been beating the air and talking wildly. Now, to show my hon. friend that it is possible that England might change, Mr. William J. Harris proposes retaliation, a tax on the corn and provisions of the United States; and he shows pretty clearly in the *Economist* of the 14th of March last, that this need not and probably would not cause the cry of dear bread to be raised; and we know that in the main free trade means cheap bread. Hon. gentlemen speak of England being a free trade country, as if everything came into England free. We know that that is not the case; that free trade there meant not the abolition, but rather the modification of the laws dealing with breadstuffs. Take wheat. England requires about 17,500,000 quarters, or 140,000,000 bushels annually. The wheat exporting power of the world, leaving out the United States, is 224,800,000 bushels. The export from Canada is about 5,000,000 bushels, and that from Argentine 8,000,000 bushels; and the output from both these countries is likely to increase enormously. Give Russia with her export of 96,000,000 bushels, and the other exporting countries preferential terms in the English markets, and they would prefer to direct their supplies to Great Britain rather than to Italy, Spain, Germany or France, all of which impose duties varying from 18½ cents to 25 cents a bushel. But, as a fact, England might soon rely on her own possessions. India exporting 32,000,000 bushels, Australia 12,000,000 bushels, and Canada 5,000,000, or 49,000,000 bushels out of the 140,000,000 bushels required by England. Anyway it is clear that action on the part of England, challenged by the McKinley Bill, would deprive the United States farmers of the English market. How serious a thing this would be may be gathered from the fact that in 1889 the United States exported to England 36·69 per cent. of the 140,000,000 bushels she required, and in 1887 61·45 per cent. It would be necessary, of course, to place an import duty on wheat and flour imported from Holland, in order to make the retaliation complete. With regard to maize and meat, of which last Great Britain is almost the sole importer, she would be still more independent. Roumania, Turkey, Russia and Argentine can grow maize quite as cheaply as the United States. Canadians would find a better market than they have even now in England, and we send six and a-half millions worth there. The American agriculturists would either have to keep maize and meat at home, or else compete in the English market with other countries on unequal terms. What a row there would be then in the United States! You would have the United States farmer pretty well discontented with McKinley Bills and the authors of them. England, then, is now in a position to retaliate. I do not say that she will retaliate; but she could without raising the cry of dear bread—and it is the cry of dear bread that Lord Salisbury is afraid of—effectively do so. Mark these figures. England requires $477,500,000 worth of farm produce and manufactures; take from this the raw materials of manufacture, such as wool and cotton, amounting to $167,500,000, and you have $310,000,000 worth of imports, on which, without doing the British people the least injury, an import duty could be imposed. Look at the other side. $151,500,000 is all that Great Britain exports to the United States, and this goes in over a tariff wall so high that it may be fairly described as prohibitive. England, therefore, has a fourfold power of retaliation if she wishes to use it; and the sooner, probably, she menaces the use of it the better, for the moment she menaced the use of it I believe the Americans would come down; because, after all, if I were negotiating with American diplomatists I would remember the American character; I would remember that it is a commercial character; that it is a character without the fighting quality or without the point of honour that belongs to a people partly military and partly commercial. Where you have a purely commercial community, you have some virtues that will not flourish in a military community. You will have a wide humanity, you will have the domestic virtues very strong, but the sentiment of honour will be weak, and chivalry will be at a discount; and you will find that the moment you point to their self-interest, the moment you show them they are likely, in any way, to suffer in the pocket, that moment they will come round to your views. My hon. friend beside me whispers that I am becoming too philosophical. If I have soared too high for my hon. friend, I will now come down to his understanding. The great Selden, when he used to go down to the old Bailey to defend a man, always took a half gallon of porter, in order, as he would say, to bring down his understanding to the level of the jury. And, Sir, whatever assembly a man is addressing he ought to bring down his understanding to the level of that assembly. Now, my hon. friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) will see that, when you find a man of the distinction of Mr. Harris and the *Economist* of London discussing the question, it is not at all such an unlikely thing that England, and it will be remembered that during the time of Napoleon we had a war of commercial devices between America, France and England—it is not at all unlikely that England

will take it into her head to retaliate, and she might menace retaliation with the utmost safety. If she did, the result would be that our negotiators, when they go down next autumn to Washington, would have a very easy course indeed. My hon. friend from Arthabaska, unfortunately for the value of his speech in this House, dealt with what he supposed to be facts. He told us something about the indebtedness of Quebec in general and his own county in particular. He told us something about the mortgages on farms and the men who are afraid to close mortgages, and he said the Crédit-Foncier was in a difficulty in consequence. Now, I happen to have, luckily for the value of the debate and luckily also lest the speech to which we have just listened might have carried away hon. gentlemen who may, during the course of this discussion, have been converted to the views of the Government—I happen to have here the Crédit-Foncier reports for 1891 ; and I find that the number given of those in arrears, against whom suits had to be taken, is 21, and of these 14 paid up before the execution of judgment, so that only 7 remained behind in meeting their engagements, and that on an amount of loans reaching a sum of over $6,600,000. If the rest of the hon. gentleman's facts are as shaky as those with regard to the Crédit-Foncier, the value of his testimony is very small indeed. My hon. friend went on to speak of the exodus. I am not going to deal with that subject. We hear so much of it, the dolefulness of it is such that even my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who lately has become more cheerful, is sometimes tempted to fall back on it in order to be in proper tune with his party. It has lain so heavily on the soul of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) whom I do not see here, that he is probably confined to his room for a few days. We hear this doleful story about the exodus and the condition of Canada, year after year, while, as a fact, we know that Canada is progressing, and no man who goes through the country can fail to know that it is progressing ; no man whose eyes are not wilfully closed can fail to see that its productions are increasing and that the comforts of life are more diffused, as may be seen by the amount of raw cotton imported to-day compared with ten years ago, and the small prices at which cotton sells as compared with ten years ago. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), the other evening, went over the figures in regard to these matters, figures similar to those I had myself from an independent source, and there cannot be the least doubt that we are progressing. What these hon. gentlemen remind me of is a story which those of us who have classical reminiscences will remember. I refer to the old Greek story of how Perseus sets out to get the head of the Gorgon, and he has to go to hyperborean regions, behind the north wind, to see the three grey sisters and ask from them where he shall find the Gorgon. And he finds the three grey sisters. There they are, beneath the moon, sitting on ice. They have only one eye among the three and one tooth, and they sing a doleful song of how the old days were better than the present, and they hate the sun and the presence of this young, energetic Greek, half divine, and of a heroism never surpassed—this Perseus who was bound on a most dangerous task, to get the head of that Medusa, which, once looked on, would turn the onlooker into stone. The sight of this energetic being angers them like the sight of the sun, and they sing the same monotonous wail of how the old times were better than the present, and how they hate the sun and the adventurous hero. When Perseus intrudes on them one wants the eye that she may see him, and the other wants the tooth that she may bite him, and they pass the eye from the one to the other, and they pass the tooth from the one to the other, just as our friends do here. The tooth which our friends pass round is the exodus, and the eye was made in a Yankee workshop and can only see ruin in anything Canadian. They hate the sun, the sun of Canada's prosperity, which at the present hour, is shining above them bright and clear—aye, bright and clear and in, as nations go, an unclouded sky—and the sun of the future may be felt by any man of prophetic vision, any man of prophetic temperament, so to speak ; but they hate it all, and they sing the same doleful song of how the old times of deficits were better than these days. Sir, these men are political fanatics who believe in a Yankee millenium and regard the city of Washington as the New Jerusalem. The hon. gentleman spoke about hay, and horses, and eggs. He knows more about civil law than he knows about tariffs on horses. The case he mentions is evidently one in which he was himself engaged, and the witness he examined was probably a witness in his own case, and as we sometimes have found—because I am a lawyer myself and have examined a few witness in my time—witnesses, although extremely conscientious, will lean a little to their own interests, somewhat like the witness that Daniel O'Connell examined. He asked the witness, of what profession are you ? The man did not understand ; so at last O'Connell said : "I believe you sell milk ?" "Yes," he replied ; and, then beneath his breath, he added, "and water too." Now, here is my hon. friend's calculation about horses. He says that 16,000 were sold to the United States, of which 7,000 were sold from the Province of Quebec. And he asks can we go on ? And I am bound to say—I do not wish to be offensive, but when a man is speaking from a pessimistic point of view, it is a great advantage to him to have been furnished by nature with a certain dolefulness of personality—and, I am bound to say that personality added tremendously to the effect, when the hon. gentleman said : Can we go on—the McKinley tariff causes a diminution of 25 per cent. in value ? Then the hon. gentleman brings forward this veracious witness whom he put into the box and who says that he could have got, before the McKinley Bill became law, $120 for the horse for which he could only now get $90. Under the McKinley tariff, horses up to $150 are charged $30 per head, so that when you take off $30 from $120, that leaves $90. But before the McKinley Bill, there was a duty of 20 per cent. charged. That would be $24. The difference between $24 and $30 is $6, so what you would have to take off the $120 is $6, and that would give you $114, and not the $90 that this witness, after the pattern that O'Connell has immortalized, was imposing on my friend or some other counsel. My hon. friend, no doubt, is a very good lawyer, but he does not understand much political economy, and it is as true in statesmanship as it is in regard to lawyers and others—*ne*

sutor. With your permission, I will ask the House to bear with me while I look at this resolution. It has been read several times, so I will not read it again, but there are two parts to it. There is the first part which says it is necessary to reduce the duty on all the prime necessaries of life, and the next part is that we should have the most extended trade relations in manufactures as well as in natural products with the United States. I am not going to be a carping critic about words, but I may say that a man with the great experience of the hon. member for South Oxford might, I think, have used more scientific phraseology than "the most extended trade relations." Why, in one phrase he could have given us the statement that what we want is absolute free trade with the United States. Remember, the most extended trade relations—however, that is mere hypercriticism, and I never descend to that. To begin with I object, as I believe others before have objected in this debate, that that language is vague. He says we should reduce the duties. How far? By 1 per cent.? By $\frac{5}{6}$ of 1 per cent.? By 20 per cent.? By how much? Surely in a resolution of this kind, which is to go before the country, which is intended to influence the people and to be a text on platform after platform, you should have given the people something definite? But the main necessaries of life—what are these? Why not mention them? They cannot be many. But it is the main necessaries of life for the farmer, the artizan, the fisherman and the miner. Visions of fish-hooks, of iron, of agricultural implements, of bread, cheese, bacon, a whole lot of things come before you. On what does the hon. gentleman want the reduction? Is it on bread? He cannot suppose that we want cheap bread in this country when we export so much wheat? Is it iron? My hon. friend from Addington (Mr. Dawson) spoke of iron. It sat upon the hon. gentleman's soul that the duty on iron was not reduced, or that it was not let in absolutely free. Suppose we take iron. Are you going to reduce the duty on that? Very well. Then we come to the second part. You want to reduce the duty on iron, and then you vote on the resolution that you want the most extended trade relations with the United States? What does that mean? Will anyone dare to say that you will not have to build up a wall against the importation of iron on the seaboard side exactly equal to that which they have in the United States? They want unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But the leaders in that country have declared: "Do you suppose we are fools to allow you Canucks, and the Britishers, through you Canucks, to deluge our country with goods from Birmingham and Sheffield? No; you must have a tariff like our own." Then, what does the hon. member for Addington and what do all the rest of them want? We have now a duty of $4 a ton. What will they have to pay when this wall is raised? They will have to pay a duty of $6 a ton. That reasoning applies to other articles *pro tanto*. I ask under which king? I interrupted last night, I think not offensively, the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) by asking him, how can you do this and have unrestricted reciprocity? One after the other has spoken on that side, but not one has explained how you are going to have these duties reduced and then go into a trade partnership with the United States—for that is what it amounts to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. No? I see that some hon. gentlemen can make a cucko cry over those benches, but not one of them, when challenged, can dare to show how they are going to do it. The leader of the Opposition is there. He is an experienced politician, he is a distinguished lawyer, he is a man of subtle intellect. I defy him to show us how he is going to do it, and I say to him that, if he can show how it can be done, I will vote for his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I told you you were boasting a few minutes ago.

Mr. DAVIN. You are not boasting now, because you are evading the challenge. Show me how you can have unrestricted reciprocity with the states without affecting your tariff on the seaboard. You ought to have shown it, and the member for South Oxford ought to have shown it when he tabled that resolution. But when we challenged him, what did he say? He said, in his peculiarly effective manner: I have not been called in as a physician, but when I am called in, then I will prescribe. The hon. gentleman is not in that position. A physician who is not called in is a physician who does not speak about the case of the patient; the physician who is not called in has nothing to do with it. But what has the hon. gentleman done? He has thrust himself into the patient's room, he has declared that he knew the disease, and he has prescribed. But I will come to the difference, if there is any, between what he has exactly done and what he has not done. I will tell you what he has done. He has done precisely what is done by any doctor who, when asked what are the ingredients of his pills against earthquakes, refuses to tell, and for the best reason in the world—that he does not know. But these doctors are usually quack doctors. In fact the hon. gentleman reminds me of a doctor we have up somewhere near Regina. He has a very peculiar notion about persons suffering from various diseases. Well, there was a young lady who was supposed to be suffering a little from constipation, and he prescribed that she should swallow a living frog. Well, it was impossible to get over the aversion of the patient, and equally impossible—supposing that aversion could be got over—that she could swallow the frog, because her larynx is not extraordinarily large, and the doctor never explained how that could be done. But he went about saying that she must swallow a live frog or she would die. The young lady trips round, and the freshness of her complexion, the brightness of her eye, and the quickness of her step, show that she has a good appetite, is well fed, has a good digestion, &c., &c., and her name is Miss Canada. What does the member for South Oxford say further? He gives you an array of duty paid on this duty, of duty paid on the other, and all coming out of the pockets of the tax-payers, every penny of it, he says. I admit, he says, I have never denied it, that these taxes are paid by the consumer; but, he says, they are paid by the producer too. So that we have here a series of taxes, and you have this peculiar phenomenon in political economy——

Mr. McMULLEN. Finish your frog story.

Mr. DAVIN. Don't you croak too much. In 1882, when I was sitting next to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and the hon. member

for South Oxford who was replying to Sir Charles Tupper, said: "I have never denied, and I admit it and declare it, that the consumer pays the duty just as often as the earth goes round the sun, and the producer pays the duty just as often as the sun goes round the earth." But now he has advanced in his astronomy. He was a disciple of Gallileo when he declared that, but now he declares that not only does the earth go round the sun, but that the sun goes round the earth, that is to say, that the consumer pays the duty and the producer pays the duty too, which, in the colloquial language I used to hear in other days, is "consumedly" absurd. Now, I will not go into the question of how much the farmer would be affected, supposing it possible——

Mr. McMULLEN. Tell us the frog story again.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend wants me to finish the frog story; but you see, Mr. Speaker, that not only has the hon. member for South Oxford, in the process of evolution, gone from the astronomical theory that the earth goes round the sun, but he now has got so far as to say that the sun goes round the earth as well, but my hon. friend from North Wellington is also in a process of evolution. The other night he was a tadpole; a few minutes ago you heard from his peculiar croak that he was just on the bridge between the tadpole stage and the frog stage, and now we find from the sound of the last croak that the full grown toad stage has been reached. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford makes the same statement again and again about the North-West. It has been made by others, I do not think it has ever yet been properly answered. He says in his speech that in one way and another we have spent at least a hundred millions of public money in the North-West.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that there is so able and distinguished a supporter of the member for South Oxford here, when I am about to arraign his calculation. The member for South Oxford makes the statement, but he never gives us the least proof. He goes about the country in the same way; he comes here and he never gives us the least proof. He comes out with bundles of papers, he hovers around the question, he pumps up the most violent epithets he can possibly find in the deep recesses of his abysmal hatred of everything Tory. He goes on in that style, then he pours out lamentations about the safety of the country, and he does not give you the least proof. The most delightful thing about it is this, that his followers take him *au sérieux*, think him a great statesman (!) and he himself has not the least suspicion of the thoroughly ridiculous character of his position. Now, Sir, what did the Canadian Pacific Railway cost us? Some $55,000,000, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) very properly pointed out yesterday. How does the hon. gentleman get $100,000,000, then for the North-West alone? It must be by adding on the land, the land, that is to say, that has come wholly from the North-West. Suppose I concede to him, for argument's sake, that he has a right to say that $100,000,000 have been spent in the North-West, then I will show him that he has not one inch of ground to stand upon in saying that the North-West has been a burden to Canada. This sum is arrived at by treating the land subsidies and railways as money spent, but this sum of a hundred millions, if it is to be admitted as correct, has given us a return. From Red River to the foot of the Rockies, that is in the North-West proper, the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost to construct $15,767,419, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) pointed out very properly yesterday. The land subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway was 18,206,986 acres, which at $2 per acre would amount to $36,413,972. Deduct the $15,767,419 it cost in construction, and you will find a balance of $20,646,553, which is what the North-West gave towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the older provinces, as was yesterday correctly pointed out by the hon. member for Lisgar. The value of the new towns and villages in the North-West brought into existence by the Canadian Pacific Railway, may be safely placed at $80,000,000. It is more than that, but I put it at $80,000,000. I am in a position to prove by actuarial estimates that that is correct. A railway is said to affect land 20 miles on each side. The railway mileage of the North-West is 2,318 miles. Take $1 per acre as the value added to the land affected by this mileage, and we have an additional value of $59,340,800. Admitting the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford, what do we have? The accounts stand: To public money sunk in North-West, according to the hon. member for South Oxford, $100,000,000. By balance of land subsidy given by the North-West Territories towards construction of Canadian Pacific Railway in older provinces $20,646,553. Value of new towns created by Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-West, $80,000,000. Additional value of $1 per acre, to lands affected by railways in the North-West, $59,340,800, or a total of $159,986,353. To this must be added the new wealth created by railroads in the North-West, other than the Canadian Pacific Railway, the increase in the value of property in the older provinces, caused by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the benefits direct, and indirect, of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the whole Dominion, none of which can be put into figures, but it is safe to say that for the outlay of $100,000,000, the country has received a return of over 200 per cent. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) goes on to say:

> "Have we not got our own North-West census returns taken 4 or 5 years ago, which show that we have succeeded in placing perhaps 9,000 families in the North-West and Manitoba in five years?"

I look at the North-West census, and what do I find? That our North-West census returns show that there was an increase of 72,600 souls, or, at 5 to a family, 14,520 families. However, 5 to a family is too large a proportion for a new country, and the number of families was certainly much larger. Besides that, we have to deplore, and I deplore I have not tried to mend it by example, a large bachelor immigration. But I remember, at the hospitable board of Mr. Manning, of Toronto, some years ago, telling a witty young lady of the poet Goethe, how in his old age, when on the verge of the grave, he was as attractive to the fair sex as in his youth, and I said to her: "The flowers of love sometimes bloom on the brink of the grave." "Ah," she said, "Mr. Davin, the frost, I think, would go hard with those flowers." The frost goes

hard with life in the North-West, as I can testify from observation, where lovely woman is not found. I have been in many homes, sometimes in bachelors' homes, sometimes in homes where there are families and where woman is, and you can have no idea of the difference. But women are now coming. Men are going east and bringing back wives, and the North-West, in defiance of the breeze and blizzards, when lovely woman once appears, homes happy, contented and prosperous, spring up as beautiful and bright as are to be found in the world. Then the hon. member for South Oxford claims an annual expenditure—and again I call the attention of the House to this—of $7,000,000 on the North-West, of which $4,000,000 is interest on the alleged outlay of $100,000,000. It has been shown that that outlay has returned $200,000,000, in which case the $4,000,000 becomes interest received instead of paid. Now, let me read some tables I have prepared to show the annual revenue and expenditure for 11 years for the North-West. The postal revenue and expenditure I place in a separate table, as no sane man would expect the one to cover the other, or to return anything. Now, Sir, here is the revenue derived from Manitoba and the North-West Territories from 1880 to 1890 inclusive:

Year.	Customs.	Excise.	Dominion Lands.	Total.
	$	$	$	$
1880.....	322,268	66,328	202,165	590,761
1881.....	473,230	97,875	201,952	773,057
1882.....	1,108,679	157,412	1,795,047	3,061,138
1883.....	1,833,656	185,367	1,042,658	3,061,681
1884.....	735,548	157,216	992,556	1,885,320
1885.....	589,208	148,178	439,494	1,176,880
1886.....	488,144	172,239	394,585	1,054,968
1887.....	523,131	211,070	568,990	1,303,191
1888.....	469,886	187,910	563,709	1,221,505
1889.....	574,536	227,289	588,862	1,390,687
1890.....	674,000	254,109	454,327	1,382,436
Totals....	7,792,286	1,864,993	7,244,345	16,901,624

That is not bad from a country which was without any railway communication with the outer world until the close of 1878, when the corduroy railway of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) went bumping into Winnipeg. What was the expenditure in Manitoba and the North-West during the ten years from 1880 to 1890? I will not go into details, but I will give it in a lump sum. You had an expenditure for Indians of $10,467,634; and you may remember that we are not chargeable with that, for these Indians are the wards of the whole Dominion of Canada, and if you never got a cent return for that expenditure, you could not treat these people with neglect. For Mounted Police we spent $6,776,007 in these ten years, and for the Dominion Lands $1,696,394, a total of $18,940,035. If we deduct the revenue from that, we have $2,038,511 left as a loss—if the hon. gentleman wishes to call it so—but, as I have shown, it is amply met by other considerations. Now, Sir, with such a showing as that, what are you to think of the hon. gentleman who perpetually talks of Manitoba and the North-West as if it were a dead loss upon the hands of the Dominion, and in fact, when we first came down here we used to be told: "We bought you; you are our possession, we purchased you." As a matter of fact, Sir, if you could get all the statistics of the value that the North-West is to Canada, you would find that at the present moment we are paying our way pretty well. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the manner in which he deals with the North-West is like an exacting father who has a prosperous and successful son, and who yet is never content with the way things go on. Now, Sir, the total postal revenue in the North-West and Manitoba for these ten years I have referred to, was $1,212,000, and the total postal expenditure was $2,241,202; leaving a loss in that respect of $828,980. Nobody supposes that that is a serious matter in dealing with the postal service, for I believe there are parts of Canada long settled, where the postal service does not pay; and we must remember that the postal service in any part of Canada cannot be properly considered a mere local service. In order to have the postal service complete you must reach every civilized part of the country, or otherwise your postal service in the more thickly settled part of the country would not be effective. Therefore, you can never take a profit and loss estimate of this service in any given part of the country. That is a point which I particularly wish to impress upon the attention of the House. I do not think that I have had an opportunity before of showing how absurd were the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but the least analysis of the situation shows that his figures and his calculations are utterly absurd. Mr. Speaker, I do hope that when gentlemen come to speak of that great country in the North-West, which is bound up with the future of Canada more than any other part of the whole Dominion, because it has put back-bone into this Dominion; I do hope that they will escape their sense of despair, that they will forget their feelings of gloom, and that they will separate themselves from those pessimistic views they have been accustomed to; that they will allow the light of hope and of confidence to break in upon them. It is not in the partizan manner in which this discussion has been conducted, that we should talk at this hour, when we stand on a height of prosperity that thirty years ago could never have been anticipated, a height of prosperity, from which we can see farther heights, peak rising above peak, on which the light of suns that we may not enjoy are already beaming. I say, Sir, that the proper way would be to approach the great problems that are before us, as brethren engaged in the great task of building up this young nation. That is the proper feeling to have. We should remember that after all, we tread a land that has been trodden from the very first by heroes. This is a young country, but it has an historic past. The men who first explored it were as truly heroes as any men who ever lived in any country, and from Jacques Cartier down, there has been no age in which we have not had men worthy of historical position. When you come to the time when there was a contest as to what race would predominate heroes fought and fell on each side. When you come to the war of 1812, you have for so small a war a larger number of distinguished figures than has ever graced the history of a similar epoch; and when you come to our last little

struggle on the banks of the Saskatchewan, it was not merely the fight, but it was that in the depths of winter our young men, mere youths, men unused to arms, marched there in the face of great difficulties over hundreds of miles of ice and snow, because they wanted to build up a nation. Would to Heaven that we might discuss the issues in this House in the same spirit, as I hope any of us would go, taking our lives in our hands, into battle for the country in which we live. I remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1870, when I went to Paris to go to the front with McMahon. Just before the last regiments left for the front, there was exhibited in one of the windows a splendid painting representing on the right the armies of the Empire crossing the Rhine at Ehrenbreitztein, and on the left of the canvas you saw, rising before them from their bloody repose, the ghosts of the triumphant republicans of the Napoleonic era, beckoning their descendants to cross that river, and to advance to battle-fields, and to win victories where they had won them. But, Sir, that army did not win victories, and why? It was not because they were not of the same heroic race. No; they had become luxurious; they had lost their faith; and therefore they were beaten. I hope that here in Canada, amongst our politicians, there will be the same faith that was shown amongst the young soldiers of our country to whom I have referred. If we have faith in the future of Canada, we can advance with confidence against any difficulty that may be before us, and there is no blessing of a free country; no art in which any people ever excelled, and no height of excellence to which any nation ever climbed, that we may not ambition, and without the least presumption or boastfulness aspire to, and with certainty attain.

Mr. SEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of satisfaction to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who is always very jovial, and who speaks in a manner to command attention, and I might say also, that when he does speak he always speaks in favour of something for Manitoba and the North-West. However, I have never heard any of these gentlemen coming from that country return thanks for what they have received. I would just mention three items of Manitoba and North-West expenditure—the $62,000,000 expended in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Mounted Police looking after the Indians and keeping them from being troublesome, interest would be $2,400,000 a year; $1,000,000 for Indians, and $750,000 for Mounted Police for keeping Indians under control, which together added make something over $4,000,000 spent annually on that country besides other favours they received. My hon. friend very ingeniously endeavours to show the growth of the towns and villages in the North-West Territories, as if they were assets and could be disposed of or turned into cash by the Dominion Government. That is not the case. All we shall derive from them is simply the revenue derived from what duties may be collected on the goods they consume, or from Inland Revenue. The land was sold to these individuals, they made their improvements, and if their lands have increased in value, so much the better for them; but although that is the fact the Dominion of Canada has nothing to do with that. In Ontario we know from sad experience that the increase in the value of lands in Manitoba and the North-West, the great debt we have incurred in making up the prosperity of that country, has resulted in a great reduction in the value of property in the province of Ontario; so that while Manitoba and the North-West has gained, the farmers we in Ontario have lost money through the operation. We wish the North-West well, but we hope the members from the new and distant provinces will not make such large applications in future. Immense sums have been spent on immigration, and last season a bonus was given to get people to settle in the North-West, so that I do not know what more they can want, inasmuch as everything has been done for them. They have no need to talk about blue ruin in that country, because some at least, such as fortunate speculators and journalists knew where towns were going to be built, became rich in consequence of their influence with the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway and securing land in desirable localities, but all the people out there are not rich. I know one gentleman who went there and sold a carload of horses, and all he received in cash was $70, the balance of the horses were sold on credit. So that all are not well off, but I do not say that by way of disparagement. My hon. friend has also said that there might be a remote probability of his voting on this question as the Opposition members of this House would wish he should. Well, I think it is very remote, because I remember on one occasion in this House he wrote out a resolution as well as it could be done in the English language, for he is a thorough master of the English language, and I was prepared to vote for that resolution, but I found my hon. friend himself voting against it. Now, I will also say a few words in regard to some remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman, although practising for the most part the healing art, is also engaged in farming; and as he is now the chairman of the Committee of Agriculture and Colonization, it may be justly supposed that he can speak with authority from the farmers' standpoint. He has told you that before the time the National Policy was introduced, there was a market in Canada for the produce raised by Canadian farmers; and we have been told very often that there was no market until after the National Policy was introduced, because the manufacturers were then given a start and made the market for what farmers had to sell. It is therefore apparent the one statement contradicts the other. At all events, in 1881, our population was something like 4,300,000, and we know that at that time the country raised a large amount of wheat, which was then a staple article and was exported largely. Now, Sir, I contend that, suppose the Dominion had a surplus of five or six million bushels of wheat to export after having sufficient for home consumption, and suppose 100,000,000 bushels were imported into this country and exported afterwards to another country, the effect on this country would only be the gain or loss in handling that large quantity of grain; it would not, as contended, flood or destroy the Canadian market. The same principle applies to barley, oats or any other grain or produce raised and sold in this country. It has been stated that we have our own market, because oats do not come into this country. I know this is not correct, because in the village where I live there is an oat-

meal mill, and I know that the proprietors of that mill buy oats in the United States, and grind them in bond and ship them out again; and this does not injure the Canadian farmer because these oats come in early from Detroit, St. Louis and Chicago, and affords labour to the men employed and does not injure the Canadian market. I never knew oats to be as low in price as 25 cents a bushel before the National Policy came into force. I remember that wheat was $1.50 per bushel oftentimes, both during the period we had reciprocity and afterwards, but I have never known that price or near it paid during the 12 years of the National Policy; and the late leader of the Government, Sir John Macdonald, after the reciprocity had been in force six years, when speaking at Caledonia, in 1860, said that if there was one thing that benefited the farmers of this country more than another it was the reciprocity treaty of 1854, and in saying that he spoke correctly. Now, in regard to what has been said about the hon. Finance Minister taking the duty off sugar, I certainly agree with that step, and that is what the Liberal party has always been contending for, and is just what the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford asks for. We contend for a reduction of the duties on the articles of prime necessity used by the people; therefore we are satisfied with that reduction on raw sugar, and I give the Finance Minister credit as far as he goes. But it is different with the Conservative party. They have told us repeatedly that by putting duties on articles which are consumed by the people, does not raise the price, and now they tell us that taking the duty off sugar reduces the price. They must have experienced a change of heart in this matter. I venture to say that if any of them goes to buy a dollar's worth of sugar and gets five or six pounds more for a dollar than he did before, he will see that our view is correct. They are coming to our way of thinking, and I am very glad to know that that is the case. Now, Sir, it was not very long ago that a committee was appointed at the instance of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to investigate the combines, monopolies and trusts, and that committee found that these evils did exist in the country to a very large extent. They found that every article, from that used by the infant in the cradle to the time when man came to the last scene in life and the undertaker had to perform the last sad rite, were taxed, and sold at exorbitant prices by the combines which the National Policy fostered. It is the high duties which give these combines life, vigour and power; and without these duties they could not exist, or if so for a short time and to a limited extent, one year was sufficient for the oatmeal combine to exist. It is no wonder then that the Bill was a dead letter. It was said that the Senate had, by changing a few words, destroyed its usefulness; but that was not the case. It was the National Policy that killed it, and the hon. gentleman who was the parent of the Bill and also a supporter of the National Policy, was one of the executioners who helped to strangle the measure for the restraint of trade. We have heard of many whom the National Policy has benefited. No doubt, some people have made themselves rich by its operations, and are put forward as examples of its good influence. I remember an instance of a gentleman who had been so well treated by the National Policy that he could afford to speak very favourably of it at a meeting which he was addressing, but, after he had finished, a farmer, who was an intelligent man, who had been battling with life for a number of years and had got the worst of it, the high duties he had to pay having gradually reduced his means until he had very little left, came on the platform; and his appearance, voice and surrounding seemed to indicate that what he said would spring from the bottom of his heart. He said to the audience: "Behold an example of the National Policy." There was another incident of which I was informed, during the late election, when, close to some of the cartoons of Government supporters, illustrating the old flag, the old policy and the old leader, was a bill advertising a bailiff's sale, showing that some poor farmer had gone under and was helped down under the operations of the National Policy. The farming interest is the largest in the Dominion, and, therefore, should receive the best consideration. As far as we know from the returns, the value of farm lands in Ontario amounts to $640,480,801; the value of farm buildings amounts to $188,293,226; the value of farm implements amounts to $49,754,832, and of live stock $102,839,235, making a total of $961,367,094. This is the value according to the return of Mr. Blue. It is hard to say what the actual value is, but this is the most reliable that can be had. However, it is more like the asking than the selling price, for it is only when a farm comes to be sold that the real value can be obtained. When people are asked the value of their land for the purpose of statistics, they do not care to say that its value is low, and it is only when there is a forced sale that it is known the value is 25 to 30 per cent. less than it was twelve years ago, There is another matter to which I wish to call attention, and that is the unjust and impartial expenditure of public money, caused by the National Policy. A return was brought down showing how much money has been expended by the Dominion Government in each province since Confederation in subsidies and railways built, other than the main line of the Intercolonial Railway. In 1881, Nova Scotia, with a population of 440,572, had received subsidies to the extent of $26,138, and railways built by the Dominion to the value of $7,821,070, making a total of $7,847,208. New Brunswick, with a population of 321,233, received in subsidies $888,731, and railways were built in that province by the Dominion costing $3,371,854, making a total of $4,259,585. Then the Province of Quebec, with a population of 1,359,027, has received subsidies to the amount of $2,428,344, and railways built by the Dominion to the extent of $5,520,323; total $7,948,667. The population of the Province of Ontario in 1881 was 1,923,228. There were no railways built by the Dominion, but subsidies were received from the Dominion amounting to $3,061,901. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with a population of 761,905, received $12,106,793, while Ontario with a population of 1,923,228 received only $3,061,901. So, Sir, you see there has been a great discrimination, and I am told that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there have been favoured spots, and that there are some constituencies which have not received any consideration whatever, simply because they do not support the Government; and when we see the large amounts given to these provinces, we understand the reasons why they sent so many members

to support the present Government. There is unfair and unjust discrimination against Ontario, and we remember very well the large and influential deputation which came to this House, on the 21st May, to interview the Minister of Railways and Canals who was at the head of the Government. The deputation consisted of representatives chosen from 150 municipalities. The delegates said: We have spent our money, and taxed ourselves to a large extent in granting bonuses to railways in the counties where we live and represent and have received nothing from the Dominion Government, and now that the Dominion Government is entering on a policy of subsidizing railways in different parts of the Dominion, we want to receive remuneration to a certain extent, and it would only be just and fair these railways should receive $3,000 per mile and that amount should be returned to the municipalities that have received nothing from the Dominion Government in order to put them on an equal footing with other portions of the Dominion that have received so much in the past notwithstanding the large amount we have expended. It was said to them: We do not know whether the members of the other provinces will be willing to give you anything or not. But what, Sir, do we see this session, $80,000 voted yearly for twenty years to a wild-cat scheme in Hudson's Bay, and the just rights of the people in Wellington Grey, Perth, Bruce and Simcoe are disregarded. And I believe the representatives of Ontario, if they would stand true to their own interests, would not be treated in this way; but I am sorry to say that partyism is so strong that they will not look after their own interests. We saw that the other day when the question came up to take the duty off binding twine. Although only a few of the manufacturers are interested in keeping on the duty the large body of the farmers are interested in having it taken off, and many of them have been discussing whether it would not be better to bind as formerly with the hand and use the old reaper rather than pay the extra cost of twine. So we know there was no relief given to them; it is the manufacturers' interests that are looked after. The farmers' small request was refused. It has been said that the United States is no market for us and that Great Britain is the only market. It is true that what the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) said, the United States was the market for our horses, barley, eggs and some other articles, but I shall show positively that that is the case by referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns. The produce which has been most beneficial to us in the past has found a market in the United States. It has been pointed out that some of the farmers in the United States are poor and do not get along as well as we do, and I do not doubt that is true, we do not expect to sell our grain and produce to those poor farmers. It is sufficient for us to know that there is a market there which we have had in the past and which we might have now. In regard to horses, according to the last return, which is only up to the 30th June, 1890, we shipped horses to Great Britain as follows:—Ontario, 24 horses, value $3,400; Quebec, 99 horses, value $14,275; Nova Scotia, 2 horses, value $250; making in all 125 horses from the Dominion, at a total value of $17,925. Turning to the United States, we find that Ontario shipped 7,373 horses, and received $1,007,985; Quebec, 7,691 horses, and received $745,140; Nova Scotia, 71, and received $7,817; New Brunswick, 724, and received $84,147; Manitoba, 88, and received $22,811; British Columbia, 4, and received $575; Prince Edward Island, 167, and received $19,420; so that, while there were sold from the whole Dominion of Canada 125 horses to Great Britain, for which we received $17,925, we shipped to the United States 16,118 horses, and received a total of $1,887,895, and that was $225,875 less than the value of what was shipped the previous year. That settles the contention that the United States is the market for horses. Before passing from that subject, I might show in an intelligent, common-sense way, who pays the duty on those horses. We know that there were three markets for our horses. First, there was the market in Canada where the seller could sell to a neighbour or in cities, towns and villages for use in this country. There was short freight and no duty to pay. Then, there was the market in Great Britain. There was a long carriage and the cost of freight was high, but no duty to pay. Then, there was the market in the United States, where there was 20 per cent. to pay, or $20 on each horse worth $100. If the buyer purchased a horse in this country, he calculated upon the 20 per cent. being paid before he got to the United States market, and paid the farmer so much less for the horse than if there was no toll or duty in reaching that market; and returns show that the United States is the only place worthy to be called a market for horses. We have been told that free and unrestricted trade would injure the price of wheat. Ten years ago, wheat was a commodity which we exported to a large extent, but now it is of secondary importance to the farmer, who makes his calculations on other articles of produce. Undoubtedly most of our wheat goes to Great Britain. The amount of wheat shipped to Great Britain, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, was 410,796 bushels, and the cash received for that was $379,893. The wheat which we shipped to the United States was 6,723 bushels, of the value of $6,589. Thus, all the wheat we shipped to the United States and Great Britain amounted to 417,519 bushels, of the value of $386,482. Consequently, you will see that wheat is of comparatively small importance. Pease is also a crop upon which we do not calculate much in shipping to the United States, but it is worth while to see the difference in the price of pease exported to Great Britain and the United States. We sent to Great Britain 1,857,970 bushels of pease, and received therefor $1,190,836. To the United States, we sent 437,775 bushels, and received $371,332. While the pease which were shipped to Great Britain realized 64 cents a bushel, those which were sent to the United States, after paying 10 cents a bushel duty, brought 84 cents to the seller in this country. In fact he received 20 cents a bushel more than he would have received if he had been forced to send those pease with the other pease that were sent to Great Britain. Another article which is very beneficial to the farmer to produce is barley. Of barley, we sent to Great Britain from Ontario 11,096 bushels and received $4,493, and from Quebec 16,036 and received $7,524, or a total from the Dominion sent to Great Britain of 27,132 bushels, realizing $12,017. To the United States, we sent from Ontario 9,908,367 bushels, for which we received $4,566,702, and from Quebec

31,378 bushels, which realized $15,860. The Dominion shipped to the United States a total of 9,939,745 bushels of barley and realized $4,582,562. That table shows you conclusively where the barley is exported to and that the only profitable market is in the United States. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to tell us to try the two-rowed barley, that it will fill the place of the six-rowed. I think it will not suit this country. I sowed a small portion of the two-rowed barley last season along with the six-rowed barley, giving both the same treatment—sown at the same time, in the same field, under the same conditions. The two-rowed barley was about three weeks later in ripening, and I think, from the appearance, so far as I could judge by the eye, that there was twice as large a crop of the common variety grown in this country as of the two-rowed barley, and we know the common variety of barley has been profitable to the farmers in the past; at best the two-rowed English barley is only an experiment. Now, I will explain the opinions and actions of the people of this country about the time the McKinley Bill came into effect. That Bill went into force on the 6th day of October last year, and Conservatives and Reformers all through the country were trying to get threshing machines to thresh out their barley as early as possible in order that they might get it across the line, and the buyers were urging them on so that they might get it shipped before the duty was put on. So much was this the case that I was informed that over 4,000,000 bushels were shipped to the United States before the 6th of October, when the McKinley tariff went into effect. They knew full well it would reduce the price, and before I get through I shall read a quotation from the Toronto *Empire* to show that the price of barley was reduced to the full extent of the 20 cents a bushel additional imposed by the McKinley tariff. I consider that barley is one of the most profitable crops we raise in this country, but so far as I can see in the region of country I travel through in going home, a very small quantity was sown this year; the people believe it will not be profitable and that this additional duty will shut it out of the United States market, which is our only market. Now, it has been mentioned that last spring barley went up. What was the cause of it? The cause was the scarcity of grain. I remember well that last year people were using barley as a substitute for oats, which were selling for 50 cents per bushel, and pease went up to 75 and 80 cents a bushel, and that is the only reason barley went up in the spring of last year, as barley was used as a substitute for pease and oats. Now, there is another article that goes largely into the United States, that is eggs. I will read from the Trade and Navigation Returns to show where the eggs are marketed that we produce in this country. I find that in the return I quoted from, there were only 3,600 dozen went from this country to Great Britain, realizing the sum of $820. But Ontario shipped the same year to the United States 9,328,182 dozen, realizing $1,322,986; Quebec shipped 721,119 dozen, realizing $121,422; Nova Scotia sold 488,654 dozen, realizing $58,042; New Brunswick sold 450,443 dozen, realizing $54,598; Manitoba sold 30 dozen, realizing $4; Prince Edward Island sold 1,834,307 dozen, realizing $236,052. Altogether Canada exported 12,825,735 dozen to the United States, realizing $1,793,104. That was a decrease from the previous year of $363,000, and there can be no other cause for this except the fact that when the McKinley Bill was before Congress the people were expecting its effect and were getting ready for it. The spring before the McKinley Bill came into force, a large dealer in the village of Fergus, Mr. Wilson, who always buys a large quantity of eggs, and his agent informed me: We are paying 8 cents per dozen for eggs because we expect the McKinley tariff in force in the fall, and a year ago we paid 13 cents per dozen. That may be the reason there was $363,621 less realized from eggs this year than last year. I will read you the remarks of Professor Shaw in regard to this matter. He touches on the barley and egg business. He is one of the professors of the Guelph Agricultural College, and knows whereof he speaks: he understands his business very well, and he speaks with authority. This is what Professor Shaw says:

"To any man who is free to think candidly and clearly, and to any man who wishes to do himself the justice of knowing the truth, there can be no room for doubt as to the immense damage done to the agricultural interests of this country by the McKinley Bill. Next year will see the poultry and egg trade of Canada almost annihilated. We managed to forestall the closing of the American market by shipping our eggs and barley across the border earlier than usual last season, but we cannot do that next year. With regard to the possibility of the European or British trade, Prof. Shaw said the prices there are purely problematical. If the old country market for eggs should prove better than or equal to that of the United States, private traders would soon discover that fact without any special board of commissioners finding it out for them. The wonder was that the egg merchants had not learned that they could make money in the transatlantic trade before this late day. The simple truth Prof. Shaw has ascertained to be, that Canada will lose by the McKinley Bill $500,000 in the egg business alone; that is, if our farmers continue to produce as many eggs at the greatly reduced prices of the future as they have produced in the past. But the chances are that the falling off in the production will occasion enormously greater loss. The great decline, however, will be in the barley trade. About 9,000,000 bushels of this grain has been annually exported, and if this volume of trade is kept up next year, the loss will be pretty nearly $1,800,000, or the full extent of the duty. When asked about the prospect of two-rowed barley coming into general cultivation and thus compensating for the increased duties, Prof. Shaw replied that there was nothing to indicate such a change."

This is no doubt correct. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) tried hard to show the McKinley tariff had not and would not injure the barley market. I bought a certain quantity last season at 42½ cents a bushel, and I was told by the farmer I bought it from he could have got 65 cents per bushel for it before the McKinley tariff came into force. This is only one instance in many I could name where the farmers lost 20 cents per bushel, being the difference between the old duty and the McKinley tariff, and I think the figures I have here will corroborate that statement. This report was taken from the *Empire* of 30th January, 1891, two or three months after the McKinley tariff had come into force. It shows the difference of the prices in Toronto and Buffalo, the highest price in Toronto was $1 per bushel for wheat as against $1.10 in Buffalo. With respect to barley the following is the report of the Toronto market:—

"Barley was unsettled, the weaker outside markets making buyers less anxious to take hold; at the same time sellers steadily maintained former quotations, offerings were rather larger. A sale of 13,000 bushels by sample was made at equal to 48 cents Port Perry, but the quality going hardly a No. 3 Extra. A lot of No. 3 was offered on the Northern at 45 cents."

The following is the report of prices in Buffalo the same day :—

"Barley—3 offerings; maltsters are figuring on large trade, but hold back for a break to meet their views. Quotations: No. 2 Canada, at 88 to 90 cents; No. 3 Extra, 85 cents; No. 3, 82 to 83 cents."

These prices are not for the first class barley we raise in Canada, but for barley like American barley, and while that barley was sold for 45 cents in Canada it realized 83 cents in Buffalo on the same day according to the report of the *Empire*. I was also informed, because I obtained the railway freight, that in my section where barley at that time was selling at from 45 to 48 cents per bushel, it could be taken to Buffalo for 5 cents per bushel; also that the freight to Buffalo was only one cent more than to Toronto. The freight to Montreal, however, was 9 cents more than to Buffalo. With respect to oats the following report appears on the same date :—

"Toronto—Market dull and easy to-day on spot, there being three sellers at 45 cents on track. In the west a few cars changed hands at 41 cents for white and 40 and 40½ cents for mixed."

"Buffalo—Oats scarce; higher. No. 1 white, 51 cents per bushel of 32 lbs., or 54 cents per bushel of 34 lbs., being 10 cents per bushel higher in Buffalo than in Toronto after freight is paid."

So there is a difference of 10 cents per bushel on oats. An hon. gentleman opposite has spoken about our potatoes being sold for about 30 cents per bushel. In the quotations appearing in this newspaper, potatoes appear as selling at $1 per bushel in Buffalo. The highest price paid in my section was $1 per bag, or less than 70 cents per bushel. From these quotations appearing in the *Empire*, which no doubt told the truth on this occasion, the Canadian farmer did lose the duty on those potatoes and would have received that much more if there had been no duty. Knowing this fact, it is no wonder that the farming community are very anxious to have free trade with the United States. I estimate that, on an ordinary 100-acre farm, the gain to the farmer, if we had free trade with the United States, would be about $200 a year as follows :—10 acres, 250 bushels barley, at 30 cents duty, $75; 10 acres, 300 bushels oats, at 10 cents duty, $30; 7 acres, 150 bushels pease, at 10 cents more per bushel, $15; 20 lambs, $15; one horse, $30; one acre, 100 bushels potatoes, $25; egg duty, $10. That is a reasonable calculation, without exaggeration. The people have not felt the effect of the McKinley tariff up to the present time, but when they find it will bear so heavily upon them, they will think all the worse of it. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that we cannot prevent the McKinley tariff being imposed by the United States. But if the Government have the opportunity of making a reciprocal treaty in natural and manufactured products and fail to do so, the people will hold hon. gentlemen opposite guilty for having failed to do their duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite when they dissolved the last Parliament declared they did so because they wished the question of reciprocity to be discussed by the people, and a new Parliament to be elected to deal with it. I doubt whether it is ground for satisfaction to hon. gentlemen opposite that the majority of the members returned by the two large provinces of Ontario and Quebec are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Hon. gentlemen do nothing but ask what we are going to do and find fault generally. It is easy to do so, and indeed it is the business of lawyers to find fault. But with all their ingenuity they cannot deceive the people, who are thoroughly alive to the great advantages to be derived from unrestricted reciprocity and are prepared to carry out that policy. Many quotations have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite from American journals at different times, and I will follow their example and read a few extracts. The New York *Tribune* of 6th March, said :

"If the Liberal party lose they can but be obstructed, not permanently put down, for their cause as far as Canada is concerned is the cause of progress, safety and wealth. The Government on the other hand winning, can enjoy but a brief and inglorious triumph; its success can be construed only as a declaration of industrial war against the United States, its leaders with droll audacity have left us no option but to shut our doors against and to hold them hostile if not dangerous neighbours, there can only be one result of methods so self hurtful. The resources of Canada, vast and rich as they are, can only postpone the destruction of a Government wedded to profligacy, monopoly, debt and disorder."

On 6th March, Secretary Blaine, speaking of the Canadian elections, said :

"As a matter of fact the Administration is utterly indifferent as to the result, none of the members of the Cabinet took any interest in the matter and cared less about it than Canadians usually do about our elections."

An American from Rochester told me a similar story. He said that one would imagine from the reports of Canadian politicians that the people of the United States felt a warm interest in the country, and wanted to gobble up Canada; but really the American people care less about the Dominion elections than about the return of a trustee in a school section. I will now quote some article, from American newspapers to show what the people of the United States think of the assertion frequently made in this House and in the country that there is a combination to bring about annexation. Let me remark that the journalists of the United States keep themselves well informed on what transpires here; they are not in the dark as to what we do, and I shall read this to show what their view is. It says :

"Not much that is new has been added to what was already known concerning the progress of the trade negotiations between our Government and that of the Dominion by the despatches given out yesterday at Ottawa. They show simply that cordial relations were established at Washington by the Canadian Commissioners, and that the negotiations will be resumed in October in a spirit that indicates a desire on both sides to come to an agreement. All the correspondence in Canada's possession that has a real value to the public was withheld from yesterday's publication. The missing papers undoubtedly were those wherein Secretary Blaine expressed the terms on which the negotiation must be based. We can well understand the indisposition of the Dominion Government to give out these letters just now. They would show, we suspect, that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper have already committed themselves to a measure of reciprocity much larger and broader than they defined as their policy during the late electoral campaign. That they would be obliged to do this if they really desired to perfect a treaty was plainly put in Mr. Blaine's published letter to Congressman Baker, and when the time comes they will learn that the length to which they must go is about as far as the commercial unionists have all along prescribed. This is an appropriate opportunity for some plain speaking to our Canadian friends. They know, or ought to know, that the American people without party distinctions earnestly desire to be on the friendliest terms with them. Their character as a highly moral, intelligent, industrious, law-respecting, progressive and enterprising people is perfectly well known to us, and by us much esteemed."

Another article from the New York *Tribune* says :

"It is a mild characterisation of Sir Charles Tupper's recent speeches to call them silly. They are worse than that—silly because they expressly accuse the American

people as a whole of scheming with the Canadian Liberals to bring about the annexation of the Dominion; worse, because their inevitable effect, coming from so prominent a politician, is to create a harmful prejudice against the United States in the minds of vast numbers of Canadians. Good reputation, to nations as to individuals, is a right, and for the responsible and representative official of one nation to speak slanders of another is to commit an offensive act. Mr. Tupper ought to be ashamed of himself. It is given out that he is to be one of the commissioners whom Sir John Macdonald intends to send to Washington presently, a fact, if it be a fact, which renders his talk the more indecent. Indeed, it is only fair to say that his appointment, in view of these speeches and others made during the campaign, would create a disagreeable impression in this country, if it did not raise a painful question at the White House."

At a recent meeting in Cleveland (Ohio) the platform adopted by the State Democratic Convention contains the following plank:—

"We favour closer commercial relations with Canada and the removal of the embarrassing and annoying restrictions which only vex our people without yielding any substantial revenue to the Government. Speaking before the convention upon reciprocity Mr. Thurman said the time is near when the people will express their belief in complete and not restricted reciprocity. If reciprocity, which has always been a Democratic, not a Republican doctrine, is a good thing with South America, why would it not be a better thing in Canada and Europe, with which our trade is a hundredfold greater than it is with South America? The time has also come when the people will say to the powers that be, that the honest workingman shall no longer be compelled by law to contribute a part of his hard-earned savings to help maintain those who, under the forms of law, have robbed him for over a quarter of a century; when they will no longer sustain any party which levies and collects one dollar of taxes over and above that which is required to wisely and economically administer the affairs of the Government; when they will give due notice that infant industries that have been nursed for 100 years have arrived at the age when they must take care of themselves; when they will brand a protective tariff as stealing, its advocates as beggars, and demand that we must have a tariff for revenue only."

Another meeting was held in the same state, and they made the following deliverance:—

"We demand the reduction of tariff taxes, and will continue the battle for tariff reform until the cause of the people is triumphant. All money taken by law from the people shall go into the public treasury. Tariff taxes shall be for revenue only. All so-called protective tariff taxes are dishonest, wasteful and corrupting. They plunder the masses to enrich the few. They have crippled agriculture, retarded manufacturing, created trusts, destroyed commerce and corrupted our law-makers. Therefore we are opposed to the McKinley Tariff Bill now pending in Congress."

The State of Michigan also spoke on this subject, and they said:

"We denounce and condemn the high tariff policy of the present Administration, and demand that our tariff and internal revenue taxes shall not be higher than to maintain the Government economically administered. We especially condemn the McKinley Tariff Bill, which still further restricts the market for American products, while it increases the burden of taxation. We denounce it, because it has not a section or a line that will open a new market for a single bushel of wheat or a single barrel of pork, and also because it still further restricts our market and limits our trade with the world—a policy that must more and more depress American agriculture, lessen the value of American farms, and increase the cost of living to the American people."

That is the fact. They view things in the United States just in the same light as we view them here. It is a thought worthy for the people of Ontario to contemplate that the value of farm lands in Ontario is $640,000,000 in round numbers. The net debt of this country is $237,000,000, and when we consider the fact that if a farmer starts at Windsor and comes down by Ottawa to the County of Soulanges; then starts from Toronto and goes back to Owen Sound or Southampton, and starts at Hamilton and goes to Hog's Bay, Barrie and Collingwood, that the national debt is a good deal higher than one-third of the value of all that land he has travelled over or can contemplate in the journey. When we hear gentlemen on the other side of the House talk about the prosperity of the country, we must remember that there are about ten or eleven million dollars a year of the money of this country which goes to the English capitalists to pay the interest on our debt, and for which we never receive any return. That is one of the reasons of the reduced value of farms and property; because there is no doubt that if you put high taxes on farms or villages or upon anything else, in all cases the taxes reduce the value of that property. I hope that the Government will now call a halt, and consider the situation of the country. They talk about the country being prosperous, but we know that when people are borrowing money on a farm from a loan company they are happy because they can put their hand on a five dollar bill, but by-and-bye, their money leaves them and they have to pay interest for the money which they receive. In a short time they borrow a little more; then a little later the farm is gone; and although we do not believe that this country will go this way, it is putting the country in a position that we do not like to see. However, there is a confiscation of the property of farmers gradually, but surely going on caused by the indebtedness of this country after the expenditure of over $100,000,000. Farmers cannot realize any more for the expenditure but less. We remember very well that in the early settlement of Canada people who came had very little and they denied themselves the necessaries of life in order that they might become independent and have a home in their old age. And now we see that there is a debt of $48 on each person comprising the population of this country, and that it is increasing; and what the end will be it is hard to say. Many men with fat government offices and men with large contracts have hope in the country, and they have reason for it; and we have hope in the country, that have neither government positions nor contracts that, while it enriches the individual, impoverishes the country to a certain extent. But we want a change, and I have no doubt that if we could have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, it would increase the value of farm property 25 per cent., which on $640,000,000 would mean an increase of $160,000,000. I hope this policy will be carried out. I hope that the good sense of the people in this country and in the United States will result in the negotiation of a treaty that will bring wealth and prosperity to this country and be beneficial to the United States and honourable to Great Britain. We know very well that the rulers of Great Britain wants nothing more or better than to see people in this country contented, happy and prosperous. We have heard about Farrer being in league with people across the line. This is only because they have nothing better to say. They cannot show a single sentence in the *Globe*, and it is assumed Farrer is a writer for that journal, which is disloyal to Canada or Great Britain. But another journal, once the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and Farrer, the chief writer, made the remark that if the tariff interferes with British connection, so much the worse for British connection. But I believe we can make a common-

sense bargain with the United States that will be acceptable to all parties and be greatly beneficial to the farmers of the whole Dominion.

Mr. ADAMS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That the accounts, vouchers and cheques for the payment of $145.83 to F. Hayter, and $145.83 to J. Gorman, as set forth in the report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the years ending 30th June, 1883 and 1884, be produced and filed for the use of the Select Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the sixth report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. ADAMS. In claiming the indulgence of this House, I assure you, Sir, that I shall be as concise as possible in dealing with some of the points raised by the various speakers who have taken part in this debate. We have had, during this discussion on the resolution of the hon. Finance Minister and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), all sorts of questions raised. All the matters in connection with reciprocity, and in connection with the National Policy, and in connection with the administration of the country by this Government, have been discussed in detail from every point of view. Each speaker has treated the subject in his own peculiar way, some dealing with it as it suited their own localities and their own provinces, while others have taken broad and general ground and discussed it from the national standpoint. In view of the various manners in which the different speakers from the east to the west have dealt with the subject under discussion, I desire to submit to the House, as best I can, matters which, to my mind, demand most the attention and consideration of this Parliament. We hear to-day the same old cries hurled against this side of the House, that the Government have been negligent in their administration of our public affairs, and that they have neglected public business to such an extent that a vote of condemnation should be passed upon them. Hon. gentlemen opposite urge that the Government of to-day is just as responsible as was the Government between 1867 and 1873, and ought to be similarly dealt with. The same policy, the same cries, the same crude criticism are used by the Opposition against the Government to-day as were used between 1867 and 1873. When we come to consider the questions of the past, when we come to give to them that fair and honest consideration and criticism which the importance of the questions then before Parliament demanded, it is only just and right that we should bring to bear, in our criticisms and judgment upon the acts of the Administration, that fair-play and honest dealing to which the Government are entitled, recognizing the great responsibilities that rest upon them, either in case of failure or success. Why, is it possible to-day that we sitting here should be told that the old Government, from 1867 to 1873, were negligent in their conduct of the affairs of the country? We are told that if they had acted prudently and wisely, the Treaty of 1854 which continued to 1866 would have been renewed. What is the use of talking such nonsense as that, and bringing up these old issues, when those same men who sat on the other side from 1867 to 1873 hurled the same denunciations against the Treasury benches of that time which they are now hurling against the Government? They said then as they say now that if they were to occupy the Treasury benches they would solve the problem, that indefinite problem and that uncertain policy which they initiated at the last election. When they got into power before, with all their promises of what they would accomplish they ignominiously failed in obtaining a renewal of that reciprocity treaty. I propose to quote utterances from some of the best men in the Liberal party on this subject, men who governed and controlled the country at that time; and to show that they were unable to succeed in this matter as well as the Administration that they followed. Let me cite an authority which will, no doubt, carry weight, though it may have been quoted before in this House, the testimony of the late Hon. George Brown in reference to this question. He says:

"But be this as it might, it was not for the people of Canada to be influenced by any such anticipation. They had shown their ability to open new markets for themselves when the American market was closed against them, and the clear path for them was to follow with redoubled energy and perseverance the policy on which they had entered, * * * Let them seek to develop their great natural industries, and especially the agricultural, shipping, fishing and lumber industries. Let them open up new markets adapted to their traffic, and let the Canadian flag be found floating on every sea."

These are the words of wisdom that fell from the lips of the Hon. George Brown, and this was the legacy he left to his Liberal friends. He was unable and his party were unable to succeed in what they desired, and this brought to the mind of Mr. Brown the fact that Canada must do something for herself, that she no longer could depend with any hope upon a renewal of that treaty, and he advised that the policy he mapped out should be adopted, that the views he submitted for their guidance should be followed, and then that success would come. Within the boundaries of this little nation of ours, we are able, if we have fair-play, to compete with the rest of the world. Only give us the chance, let us avail ourselves of what we have, and we will secure success. Reading between the lines of the words I have quoted from the late Hon. George Brown, it appears that he marked out to the Liberal party, that the only security for Canada was to adopt a national policy. He laid the foundation and gave the advice that the time was not far distant when they must adopt a trade policy for themselves as against the United States. My hon. friends on the other side do not see fit to follow the advice tendered by their late leader, but it is evident, looking

backward and observing the words which were uttered then, the people were told to look to the development of our own country and to develop its resources, and that in that way only would we meet with success. As another illustration, let me quote the words of wisdom which fell from another hon. gentleman who occupies a seat in this House to-day—I refer to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, late Premier of Canada. He said :

"I deprecate the idea of cringing to the Americans."

Is that the policy of the Liberal party to-day? Do they demand that we shall not cringe to the United States? Is it not their policy that we shall try to negotiate with the United States in such a way that the control of our fiscal policy will be taken from Canadians and placed in the hands of the United States? Later on I will prove that their policy of unrestricted reciprocity must mean political union—there is no other solution. Mr. Mackenzie says :

"I deprecate the idea of cringing to the Americans. I fully appreciate the benefits of reciprocity, but I do not think it becomes us, under present circumstances, to make any efforts for its renewal. I believe that we should pursue our trade policy without regard to reciprocity."

What words of encouragement do we need more than those? There should be no cringing to the Americans, he believes, but that we should pursue our own trade policy without regard to reciprocity. He tells us to depend upon ourselves, to test our own strength, and that the country can provide for its own wants, and, if the old member would speak again, I believe he would repeat the same words : "Let us not cringe to the Americans but have hope in ourselves." And it must be remembered that these are words coming from hon. gentlemen of the opposite party, who differ from us, who oppose us, and who charge the Administration of to-day with gross mismanagement of public business. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another authority, the authority of the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment to the resolution, the member for South Oxford. If I take him as an authority, hon. gentlemen opposite must consider him a good one. Now, surely the words that have fallen from his lips must have some influence with the men of this country. The hon. gentleman, in 1878, spoke in the constituency of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and speaking with all the responsibility of a Cabinet Minister, when addressing the people of that place in reference to the question of reciprocity with the United States and the failure on the part of his Government and of the preceding Government to obtain a further continuation of it, what advice did he give to the people of the Island? He said :

"If you say you are going to frighten the United States into reciprocity by imposing certain duties on articles now coming in from that country, all I have to say is this, that the men who tell you that reciprocity with the United States is essential to your existence are, in my opinion, playing a most unwise and unpatriotic part."

I wonder if that is the advice he would give to-day to the people of Charlottetown in addressing them. Will he tell them to-day that by that course they are pursuing a most unwise and unpatriotic line of conduct? He goes on to say :

"I don't deny the advantages of a free and fair exchange with the United States, but I say that Canada is not so dependent as these men would have us suppose, on the markets of the United States; that we are able to hold our own with the United States in any market that is equally open to the competition of us both."

What better policy do the Conservative party of this country want than that? What other platform does the Conservative party of this country want than that which was submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford to the people of Charlottetown in 1878? To what better policy need the Conservative party nail their flag than the policy propounded by the hon. gentleman for South Oxford, when he says that we are "able to compete and hold our own with the United States in any market that is equally open to the competition of us both." Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have a right to assume that the result of that speech, the result of that policy as propounded, the result of that doctrine as submitted by him, the result of that discussion on the Island in 1878, when he was so ably assisted by the pearl from Queen's County, the hon. gentleman who represents the Island, had its effect in bringing to the Parliament of Canada a united Liberal deputation from that Island. And, Sir, when we come to think of it to-day, we find that the Conservative party are denounced from one end to the other of this Dominion : they are attacked on every platform ; they are taunted here as being too independent of the United States. If we sit down and take statement after statement that has been made here to that effect, we find that the very policy, the very advice which were so tendered to us, came from such men as I have quoted here for the consideration of this Parliament. Let me say further in this connection that if there was one thing in the world that would influence any person, if there was one problem submitted to the consideration of the people more than another likely to influence them, it was such statements coming from such gentlemen of world-wide reputation, known all over the Dominion from one end to the other, and that caused the Conservative party to consider what they said, to give their words due consideration, and I believe it was by their influence that the National Policy was submitted to the people for their judgment in 1878. When we come to consider that in the wisdom of our late leader, after looking at the history of the country from 1873 to 1878, after giving careful consideration to the statements made by these hon. gentlemen while in opposition, after looking at the history of their Administration for the five years they had governed and controlled the country, and that he found it absolutely necessary, he found it an imperative duty to submit to the Dominion Parliament in 1878 a resolution embodying all previous resolutions that had been moved by him and supported by the Conservative party. Now, Sir, let us turn for a moment to this tariff, and in addressing myself to this subject I am free to confess that I have listened with a great deal more than ordinary attention to the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to the results of the National Policy. I have observed that on the other side hon. gentlemen say National Policy means ruin, National Policy means no wages, National Policy means dear goods, National Policy means bankruptcy ; and on this side of the House I hear from my friends that the National Policy has created trade, the National Policy has given labour, the National Policy or protection has opened up new industries, the National Policy or protection has given to our manufacturers that which they did not enjoy between 1873 and 1878. Between these two parties,

then, I have looked for means of forming a judgment, and I felt I would like to get an opinion from some person entirely independent of both sides of the House. Now, in view of this, I turn to an authority, a gentleman who occupied a very prominent position in this Parliament, who for years and years guided the Liberal party, who for years and years was recognized as an authority on all matters, on all subjects, which came before this Parliament for decision. Now, I know that his words have been cited before by hon. gentlemen, and I can understand that the reading of them again is not likely to prove interesting, yet I will venture to quote once more the words of Mr. Blake, when he says:

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of free trade for Canada he may be, has yet suggested—no man, I believe, can suggest—a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make, or can make, within our bounds, or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free-trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada, I have not believed it soluble in my day; and any chance of its solubility, if chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

Well, Sir, if this did not mean that the National Policy was approved by the Liberal party, if it did not mean that the National Policy had received the baptism of the whole people of the country and would be adopted by them in the future, then I know not what is the meaning of these words. I find that that is the policy they had been fighting against in the past, and I find that the criticisms and animadversions passed upon their conduct by the people of this country, have convinced the Liberal party that they were mistaken, and I tell the Liberal party throughout the Dominion that no party can be successful in the future, no party can hope to obtain the confidence of the people, no party can win success, no party has any chance of obtaining success, while the National Policy stands and by which we have found that the people are in accord with us otherwise than by supporting it. Well, Sir, the National Policy has been confirmed at no less than three elections, in 1878, 1882 and 1887, and yet, during the last two or three weeks, members of this House have been engaged in discussing this issue, as well as other dead issues. Time has been occupied in discussing this question that has already been settled by the great jury of the land, in discussing a policy that has come to stay, a policy upon which the people pronounced with no uncertain sound; and, in their cooler moments and on their solemn responsibility, the electors justified the acts of the Administration and sanctioned the policy of the Government as enunciated, and established the Conservative party in office, by virtue of their ballots, in order to carry out that policy, to carefully guard and direct the interests of the country, and to fulfil and carry on successfully this great policy. This decision has been affirmed time and time again at the elections, time and time again the people have spoken, when this policy has been the subject of discussion and criticism. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), the other evening, took occasion to state to the House that if we had to run again in New Brunswick, if we had to ask again a declaration of public opinion, and if we were compelled to return to the people, who in March last elected us, sweeping, practically, the province from one end to the other, practically sweeping away every vestige of the Liberal party from the St. Croix to the Restigouche, if we were to return again to the people asking for a verdict, that, in view of the change that has taken place in public opinion since March last, the Liberal party would win along the whole line in that province. Is it possible that the hon. member for Queen's can believe in such a dream as that? Is it possible for him to believe that public opinion in New Brunswick is so quickly changed? Is it possible for that hon. gentleman to believe in an approaching change, when permanence is one of the principal attributes of the National Policy? Not only did the hon. gentleman make that declaration but he challenged the supporters of the Government to meet and dispute his proposition that a protective tariff means increased prices to the consumers of the country. If that be so, then the whole policy of protection is gone. I have not in my philosophy the view that a protective tariff means increased prices to the consumer. I hold the very reverse to be the case. Protection rests upon the producers in the land. Give us the producers and we will find the consumers. That is the correct principle governing protection or the National Policy. Look out for the producers, for that is the true essence and meaning of the National Policy. If that be the true test of the National Policy, if the National Policy rests upon the interests of the producers, then I guarantee the difficulty is solved; immediately the wages are assured to the people and the consumers get cheaper goods. I will submit to my hon. friend from Queen's for his consideration, four propositions, which I have taken from the works of an eminent writer, against the hon. gentleman's position. This writer, Professor Sheldon, speaking on "What protection rests upon," says:

"But protection as known to our policy rests not upon the shifting, temporary, evanescent interests of political managers, however gifted and astute, but upon the most solid foundation. It has most excellent reasons for existing and it will not be soon or lightly abandoned in its essential principles."

The whole philosophy of protection is embodied in these points: let abundance be produced, little wasted in the profits of middlemen and transportation, and trust to home competition for cheapness. Cobden, in advocating free trade, said: "Take care of your customers; your producers will take care of themselves." Free trade is for the traders. Protection is for the producers and workers. The imposition of a duty upon goods imported into this country always means an advantage and helps the producer and worker at home. I now submit the first proposition of this writer:

"1. By inducing persons producing goods elsewhere to come and produce them here, to employ persons who would otherwise find employment with difficulty, and make two employers seek for one workman and bid up wages to get him, rather than leave two workmen to seek one job, and so bid down wages against each other to get employment."

This is the first proposition which the writer lays down. The producers of goods are invited to come here and produce them; and we are thus inviting capitalists from foreign countries to invest here. The second proposition deals with the benefits arising from protection. It is:

"2. It tends to develop through the rise of wages and prices, general intelligence, inventiveness in people who already invent with some facility, and in so large a way and in an endless variety it tends to substitute the powers of nature for the powers of man in production and distribution, and thus reaches ultimate cheapness through temporary and evanescent dearness. It seeks cheapness of things by ennobling and developing man."

This is the second proposition submitted by this writer for the consideration of free traders and of those who argue that protection is an evil instead of a benefit to the great consuming population. His third proposition is this:

"3. It tends to keep money the very tool of trade—what has been aptly called the instrument of human association—in the country for other uses, so that even temporary absence of it may not illegitimately and unjustly increase the burden of time contracts and debts, and so break down, by temporary stress, manufacturing and other establishments, and so again illegitimately reduce wages and prices."

This is the third proposition submitted by the writer for the consideration of all free traders, for the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite who desire to wipe out this National Policy and adopt a free trade system, which we believe will be injurious to our people. He then says in the fourth proposition:

"4. It tends to prevent merchants and manufacturers abroad from breaking down our establishments, by the advantage of that cheapness which they gain by the quantity of goods made and sold."

If this be the character of the results which follow protection, as laid down in the four propositions of this writer which I have read, then I think we are justified in saying that we have ample security. We are safe in saying that labour is sufficiently guaranteed to the working people of the country, and that we have a better means of obtaining the investment of capital, by which we can give employment and produce goods for the market. I cite the opinions of this writer, in view of the discussions which have been going on in this House and in the country, and if his contentions be correct, as I believe they are, then I claim that protection is necessary and essential to the manufacture of goods cheaply, and that it confers equal benefits on the labourer and on the employer. It secures the labourer employment at good wages, and it gives to the employer of labour a fair and just return for his capital. By protection we become strong within ourselves, we become courageous to go on and work; we are filled with hope and not with despair; we feel confident that every dollar we put in this and that enterprise will give us some return, and that our surplus cash will find an investment which will redound to the benefit of our own people. Under protection we become known as competitors for the trade of the world, it gives us a national name and makes our country independent. This writer sums up his conclusions in the following words:

"Protection, then, does not exclude but does include such regulations of trade as are truly reciprocal; trade not in too flagrantly unequal conditions; trade not too outrageously detrimental to those not immediately concerned in it. It makes as the first great condition of trade equality as against inequality; peace, absolute and abiding; peace, as against war and the preparations and threats of war."

This is the general summing up of this writer in reference to the effect of protection. In view of the twelve years which we have had, and during which we have enjoyed the benefits of the National Policy, surely hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot truly state that the people of the country are dissatisfied with the protective policy inaugurated in 1878, and successfully adopted and approved of from that time down to the present hour. Now, when the Liberal party had found it was useless to oppose further the National Policy, they turned quickly around and pronounced for commercial union with the United States. They abandoned their own platform and their own policy as laid down by Messrs. Brown, Cartwright and Blake, and they felt it necessary to introduce to the people some new fad by which they thought they could obtain their votes and confidence. They created a new policy of commercial union, and for a time the people were treated to speeches all over the country as to the benefits of commercial union, but they soon shrunk from popular discussion on that question, and they again sought a policy upon which to appeal to the people, introducing it under a new name—unrestricted reciprocity. I am doubtful as to whether commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity are not one and the same thing, and that is not a doubt peculiar to my own mind, but it is a doubt which has been shared in by the whole electorate of Canada. I rather believe, indeed, that the members of the Liberal party themselves do not know whether there is any difference or not between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. At one place you will hear a Liberal speaker give one version of it, and at another place you will hear another version. One man claims that commercial union is not unrestricted reciprocity, and another claims that unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union are practically the same. When we come to look into the opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, we find that they have grave doubts amongst themselves as to what their policy really means. I hold in my hand a speech delivered by Mr. Davies, the member for Queen's, before the Board of Trade at Charlottetown. He is the "pearl" of the Island, a gentleman whose opinions are entitled to weight and consideration; he is known as the leader of the Liberal party in the Lower Provinces, and he commands more personal influence as an individual than any other public man in the Lower Provinces belonging to his party. Speaking before the Board of Trade at Charlottetown the hon. gentleman said:

"Judging by what he read in the newspapers, he had no communication with the projectors of commercial union."

Oh, no; my friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) had no communication with the projectors of commercial union. So innocent was the hon. gentleman when discussing this question before the Board of Trade, that indeed he did not know what his friends of his own party had in view, and he was not called into the councils of the party. He treated the Board of Trade in this innocent way, and he told them: Oh no; I am speaking to you as a representative of the Island, independent and outside of the party with which I am associated. You can trust me and have confidence in what I say, when I speak in that way. It is the individual opinion of the member for Queen's that I submit to your consideration; and then the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"We assumed that under commercial union trade would flow freely between this country and the United States, as it now flows between the several states, while, as against the rest of the world, there would be a uniform

tariff to be mutually agreed upon by the two countries comprised in the union. 'Unrestricted reciprocity' would differ from commercial union in this respect, that while under it there would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would retain the right to frame its own tariff as against the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent. tariff, while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent."

That was the doctrine that my hon. friend from Queen's laid down—unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union inasmuch as that under commercial union we would have a uniform tariff, but under unrestricted reciprocity we would have our own tariff. Then he said :

"The immediate consequence would be, that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the States by way of Montreal."

He objected to that, and he went on to say :

"To this the States, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent, and unrestricted reciprocity—although it would suit us as well as commercial union—was, therefore, impracticable. In discussing commercial union we should, he thought, regard it from both the Canadian and provincial point of view, and in a broad and generous spirit. Its importance was the more pressing from the fact that if the relations of the two countries are not improved, if some settlement is not arrived at the Americans may, before twelve months have elapsed, put into operation the Retaliation Bill, under which our trade with the United States will be interdicted, and we might suffer a stagnation of trade. We are not in favour of selling our fisheries, as before, for a lump of money, neither are the Americans in favour of buying the use of them for money. The one sensible thing to do is to settle the difficulty, and to make the fisheries the basis of our negotiations for improved commercial relations."

This was the policy of the hon. gentleman at Charlottetown. The declaration he made to the Board of Trade then was: That unrestricted reciprocity was impracticable ; and that the only solution of the difficulty was, to make the fisheries the basis of a treaty between the Dominion and the United States, and, as a matter of fact, addressing himself to his own people, and moving them as he knows how to do on the platform, he was careful to avoid discussing the very question that he submitted to the people in March, 1891. In this discussion, the member for Queen's reminds me of my countryman Sheridan's description of Dundas, when he said that "he employed his fancy for his narrative and keeps his recollections for his wit." When we call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to tell the country what they meant by unrestricted reciprocity, when from every platform in the land one universal voice went out to the leaders of the Liberal party, saying to them : Explain to us what you mean ; if you men possess the secrets of reciprocity—if you possess the terms which you say you do by virtue of the negotiations which you say you had with influential and responsible representatives of the United States—then your bounden duty is to submit to the people every detail of the agreement you have made. When we say to them here on the hustings : No secrecy ; take the people into your confidence as to what arrangement you have made, the parties with whom you had the negotiations, the time and place, all the conditions and details, so that an honest and fair verdict may be given by the people of the country upon what you have done they are silent. Then, Sir, when we asked our friends on the other side, how they would make up the loss of revenue, resulting from their policy, the answer on the platform was : We will determine that when we get into power ; we will not give you any information as to the manner or mode or way in which we shall provide for such a contingency ; we refuse to give you the secret—had they or have they any ?—but we will make up the revenue in such a way as may suit our party should we come into power. That was not fair treatment ; that was not fair-play ; that was not the course that should be pursued by a responsible party. Every word that falls from the lips of the hon. gentlemen opposite as leaders of a great party, carries the weight of responsibility as much as the words which fall from the lips of the First Minister of the Crown when he announces the policy of his Government. They are as much bound by every obligation—bound by fealty to their party, bound by every principle that governs and controls and moves a party, bound by what they owe to the rank and file of their party, the men who fight the battles and deposit their votes—to state their policy clearly and distinctly, so that the people may vote intelligently upon it. Where is the policy of the Liberal party to-day—the policy that any man can place his hand upon, outside of the general term unrestricted reciprocity ? Ask them what it means ? Does it mean that we shall jump from a 30 per cent. tariff to a 60 per cent. tariff, adopting that of the United States ? Does it mean that we shall have the right to frame our own tariff as against the Americans—that we shall have ours and they shall have theirs ? Does it mean discrimination against the mother land ? If so, the people should know it. Then the people will be able to discuss it intelligently, and deal with it in such a manner as to guarantee their safety and security. Then the people will be able to judge in an intelligent way just what unrestricted reciprocity means. It is indefinite now ; it is uncertain. I admit that for the last two or three years, while hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were discussing this question in a general way, our people to a certain extent were caught by it. Our people fancied that with it they would pick up gold in the street ; they understood that they would have to work no longer ; they believed that once unrestricted reciprocity were obtained, they could practically live in idleness. All this time the Opposition, in almost every portion of the Dominion, had things pretty much their own way ; they were not met by the Conservative party ; they were allowed to go on with their discussion without being met and opposed ; and the result was, that in 1891, when we appealed to the people, unrestricted reciprocity had an advanced position in the minds of the people, and, therefore, harder and more earnest work was demanded from the Liberal-Conservative party to explain the meaning of that policy to the people. Why, Sir, it was only within the last two or three weeks of that great battle that the people were aroused from their mystical sleep, and became alarmed that there was something wrong in this question. It was only then that they discovered that the leaders on the other side had not taken them into their confidence—had not treated them in as frank and fair a way as the Liberal Conservative party did and always have done. The Liberal-Conservative party with boldness declared their principles; they issued their manifesto to the electors of the country ; and, Sir, when the people did become fully awakened in the last two or three weeks of the election, while the Opposition were successful to a certain extent, while they felt sure that on

the 5th of March the Government of the country would be defeated and they would take the Treasury benches—although they had two years' start upon the Conservative party in the discussion of the question, during which they met with little or no opposition, yet, when the people were awakened to a realization that there was danger ahead—danger to the institutions of the country and to their business interests—the result was that when the smoke of battle cleared away on the night of the 5th of March the Government were found to have been sustained by a majority of between twenty and twenty-five. So that, after all, the people spoke well. After all, the people recognized that they had a party who were not afraid to announce their policy, as against a party who were afraid to give them any indication of what the details of their policy were. The Government of the country were frank with the electorate; and an essential distinction between the two parties has always been that the hon. gentlemen who occupy the seats on the other side of the House have imagined that they and they alone are the possessors of a policy; whereas the Conservative party are in close touch with the people; they are in sympathy with the bread-winners of the land, and are willing to trust their case to them, and each appeal the Conservatives have made to the people has resulted in the approval of the Administration to-day in power. The voice of the people, on the 5th March last, decided against hon. gentlemen opposite. We are asked to-day by this amendment to reverse the vote the people then gave, and we are told by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the amendment means unrestricted reciprocity and nothing else:

"The amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, he said, is unrestricted reciprocity in its truest sense."

Either the statement of the hon. gentleman is true or it is not; and if this amendment means unrestricted reciprocity, let us see what unrestricted reciprocity means. The only way we can determine that is by reference to the views of the Administration in the neighbouring republic and of the organs which support that Administration. In an article on Canadian reciprocity, published in the *New Englander and Yale Review*, the Hon. Joseph Sheldon says:

"We are ready, and the Canadians know it, to grant them trade at any time on terms honourable and just, on terms of absolute equality and reciprocity, the same that New York enjoys with Massachusetts, the same that the late Confederate States now enjoy with the States never in rebellion."

If that does not mean political union, I would like to know what else can it mean? If unrestricted reciprocity means a union between Canada and the United States as close as that which exists between New York and Massachusetts, and between the late Confederate States and the States of the North, then the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite can only mean political union with the United States, and the stand which the Conservative party took at the last elections is fully justified. But we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the opinion of one of their leaders, expressed in addressing the people at any particular place, does not govern the whole Liberal party; we are told that the Liberal party is not bound down to the statements made in this House by the hon. member for North Norfolk; and we are told that the opportune time to discover what the policy of the Liberal party really means will be when they will have reached the Treasury benches. They wish to secure a verdict in advance by deluding the people with vague and indefinite proposals. But, not being agreed as to what their policy means, not having a fixed policy, or not daring to reveal its true purpose, I am confident that the people will continue, as they have done in the past, to leave these gentlemen where they are—in Opposition. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite, day in and day out, that the record of this Government, in its administration of public affairs, is not of such a character as to entitle them to the confidence of the people in the future.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ADAMS. "Hear, hear," says my hon. friend on the other side. I would ask the hon. gentleman to make a comparison between the history of the present Government and that of the Mackenzie Administration from 1873 to 1878. Was the record of the Mackenzie Administration of such a character as to entitle it to the future confidence of the country? I think not. Looking over the record, I find that under Conservative rule, from 1869 to 1873, the income of the Dominion was $90,755,241 and the expenditure $80,770,789, leaving a surplus of $9,984,452 for that period. Surely that is not a record any one can honestly condemn. But look to the record between 1873 and 1878, and it will be found that that period was the era of deficits. Hon. gentlemen opposite had a deficit of $6,426,958, and added $40,513,617 to the public debt during the short time they held power. What further? Shortly after the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) took office, his first act was to impose an additional tax of something like $3,000,000. In imposing this tax, he said:

"As far as it it possible to form a calculation, I am in hopes, if a sufficient amount of taxation is now laid on, we may be able not only to meet the requirements of the current year, with a small margin over, but to dispense with the necessity for additional taxation for a considerable period."

That statement was not only misleading but deceiving; and when the hon. gentleman who uttered it, and whose prediction was so utterly falsified, charges this Government with going from bad to worse, he must imagine that our people have a very short memory indeed. It does not come with very good grace from that hon. gentleman to make such statements. I find that the revenue between 1873 and 1878, instead of being only $18,000,000 per year, as it was under the Conservative Government, had increased to $23,000,000 a year, or an excess of $5,000,000 yearly. My hon. friends opposite had the benefit of the great savings which they say were effected between 1873 and 1878, and also of the broad and wide policy which they submitted, a policy the results of which only the future could determine, and yet they increased the expenditure by $6,000,000 over revenue. Why was it that the country was alarmed? During those five years, not only in reference to their general policy, but also in regard to the non-fulfilment of their promises, the people became aroused. The people demanded that the Government should fulfil their promises which they had made when they were in Opposition, and the result was that in the absence of such fulfilment they became dissatisfied with their do-nothing policy, and became alarmed when deficit

after deficit was rolled up, and came to the conclusion that the Liberals were unable to make revenue and expenditure meet, when they had a deficit of practically $1,600,000 a year for every year they were in power. No one can seriously be surprised that our friends on the other side of the House held office for such a short time, and that the member for South Oxford, when, in 1878, he delivered his Budget speech, had to declare that he was disappointed in his hopes, and had to declare—using his own words—that the trade and commerce of Canada had been reduced by nearly $50,000,000; that the revenue in Customs alone showed a decrease of $3,000,000, and our trade and commerce collectively had been reduced from $218,000,000 to $168,000,000. We need not discuss now how the $40,000,000 of debt was made up, but the books show that in 1874 there was an increase over 1873 of $8,476,503; in 1875 over 1874, $7,683,413; 1876 over 1875, $8,543,136; 1877 over 1876, $8,683,795; and in 1878 over 1877, $7,126,760, a grand total of $40,513,617 which was added to the public debt in the five years of Liberal rule. We are told that, in view of this, we should again entrust the Government of the country to the hands of those hon. gentlemen. We are told that the Liberal-Conservative party having been in power since 1878, the country should again give an opportunity to those hon. gentlemen opposite to administer executive affairs. Can the people trust you and place confidence in your ability, judging by your record between 1873 and 1878? I need not go much further in showing the House what the Conservative party has achieved in the interests of this Dominion. Every reader knows it. Great railways have been built, the country has generally prospered, and recognizes the benefit of the present policy of the Government, and is willing to leave their future interests in their hands. Our revenue to-day is running up to $38,000,000, but we need not touch that question, nor treat of the expansion of our exports and imports—showing an increase of $87,000,000 over 1868—or the large amount of railway construction which has taken place, or the passenger and freight earnings which are increasing every year, or the other matters which have occurred throughout this period to the credit of the Government of the day. Notwithstanding the advanced position we have in these matters, we have only added to the national debt a gross amount of $190,000,000, or a net addition of $150,000,000. We are told that Canada is not progressing, that there is more poverty existing in this land to-day than there was between 1873 and 1878, that the legislation of this Parliament has done nothing to advance the interest of the people or to increase the wealth of the country, that the taxes are higher than they were, and that the lands are mortgaged to such an extent that the people are unable to pay the interest thereon, and that, instead of the National Policy being of the character we claim it is, it has placed the country in a much worse position than it was in before its adoption. I will read you a few words from a volume, "Wiman on Canada," which is the first work he issued in reference to Canada, and that will give you an idea of his opinion in regard to this country then. I admit that he has changed that opinion since. His second volume, I admit, differs from his first, but I assume, when he was speaking in 1887, recognizing as we do that he is a man of ability, a keen, sharp critic and writer, possessed of great information, that what he then said in reference to this country, which is now being held up by hon. gentlemen opposite as a country which is not fit to live in, is worthy of consideration. We are told that we ought to go across the boundary line, that that is the promised land; and in regard to our own country we hear wails of despair, and *miserere*s are sung by those gentlemen over our decayed position, and that Canada is of no use to its population, that you cannot get this and you cannot get that in this Dominion: but here you have the statement of Mr. Wiman, who says that:

"In the splendour of her cities, in the magnitude of her public works, in the perfection of her means of communication, in the completeness of her educational institutions, in the intelligence of her people, and, indeed, in all that goes to make up the greatness of a nation, Canada to-day occupies a position of proud pre-eminence."

That is the authority of the gentleman they cite to-day in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. That was his opinion at a time when he was not actuated by selfish and unpatriotic motives, as he is to-day. That was his opinion given in cold blood. What a grand name he gave to this Canada of ours. What further have we? Mr. Wiman is in close communication with the newspaper which is closest to the ears of the Washington Administration, and announces its policy, that is, the New York *Tribune* Let us see what it says:

"Canada to-day is a great country. In its judicial system, its military organization, its superior ocean carrying trade, its excellent civil service, its municipal home rule, its efficient post office, its admirable election laws, and its beneficent system of public charities, Canada is second to no community in the civilized world."

That is the opinion of the New York *Tribune*, that is the opinion of an American writer as against the opinion of our own Canadian statesman—the opinion from a foreign land by one of the most prominent papers of the United States to-day; and when we can obtain such opinions as the foregoing from our American neighbours, does it not come with the worst possible grace from one of our own statesmen to use disparaging language? Should our people not be indignant at our Liberal friends, who are seeking to shape our legislation, trying to mould the policy of this country, to control public opinion, and instead of holding such an exalted notion of this Canada of ours, they leave it to Mr. Wiman to appreciate our interests and to the American press to testify to our national greatness and our national wealth. And, passing from that subject, I need not go through the increased produce of our mines, and of our forests, of our fisheries, the increase in export of animals and agricultural products, to prove that in Canada there is no such gloom as our friends opposite declare to exist. We find, on the contrary, that there is a spirit of universal confidence, buoyancy, hope and faith in the young men who love this Canada of ours, and if we possess more of such confidence than hon. gentlemen opposite it is simply because the party with which we are associated have been great factors in mapping out this great work that has been performed, it is because our policy has been in close sympathy and union with the leaders, the men of thought—not the dreamers, not the men who denounce this and denounce that, who have pronounced against every important question that has been submitted to Parliament from 1878 to the present hour, every important question that has

involved the life of this Dominion and which practically meant life or death to our people from end to end of it. We find that hon. gentlemen opposite have been beaten and battered and driven from one position to another position, they have receded from one point to another, and I am glad to believe that the people will demand from them that they turn their attention to the improvement of Canada instead of belittling her; they will demand of them to devote their ability to working out the glorious destiny of this country; they will demand of them their hearty co-operation and assistance in working shoulder to shoulder with the Conservative party, instead of raising the cry of alarm; they will demand of them to give a helping hand to the men who are struggling to advance the country's interests. Instead of despair, let us have hope; instead of disparaging words concerning the future of this country, let us have words of wisdom, words of cheer, words of comfort, words of advice with the true words of loyalty and the ring of love for Canada. I need go no further into this subject, except to refer to one statement that I was amazed to hear made by the hon. member for South Oxford in discussing the trade relations of this country with foreign powers. He, standing as the representative of a great party, a man of great ability and distinction, responsible, as I hold him responsible, for every word he utters—because he is in a great measure associated closely with the leader of the Opposition—I find that that hon. gentleman, when reading from the Trade and Navigation Returns and making a comparison between the export trade of this country in 1873 and our trade in 1890, only read the figures giving the trade of seven countries, instead of reading the trade of fourteen countries that were to be found on the same page of the returns; and comparing our trade figures of 1873 with those of 1890, he omitted the enormous diminution in our export trade under his own régime. Why, Sir, it cannot be supposed for a moment that we who sit here desirous to listen to the hon. gentleman, having an anxiety to pay that attention to him which his ability and his position demand—we cannot feel otherwise than astonished when we see him take up the records of the country and use the books submitted to Parliament, from which we cull our information and obtain our knowledge, and giving from those books a statement which is not true. I claim that it is practically wicked on the part of the hon. gentleman, it is wilful wickedness for the hon. member for South Oxford to make such a statement as that, and allow it to go abroad from his lips, the people accepting it as true, when the very record itself stamped it as being a dishonest culling from the records, when, if the truth had been stated, our export had increased by over $11,000,000 between 1873 and 1890. Now, Sir, in this connection I will turn to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I have mentioned before. We have him telling the leader of the Opposition that he has the utmost confidence in him; that that amendment suits him and his party; that they are united, and he bears testimony to the character, to the uprightness of the leader of the Opposition, for whom I, sitting in this Parliament for the first time, have as warm and deep admiration as that of any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I say the hon. member for North Norfolk states that he has the utmost confidence in the leader of the Opposition. He gives him unlimited confidence; with hands outstretched he seeks his friendship; yet it strikes me that the hon. gentleman ought to have remembered that it was not a very long time ago that he hurled words through this country that were not so complimentary to that leader. If his character, if his ability, if his leadership, if his wisdom, if his prudence in debate, if his firmness in contesting point after point with the Government, call for admiration on this side of the House, surely the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk, who had recognized his abilities in the past, should never have made the statement he did make, that he could see no hope in the future for the success of his party because a Frenchman and a Catholic happened to be leader. I thought to myself that I would like to say to the leader of the Opposition: "Don't let him embrace you too closely, because underneath his vest there is a breast-plate of ice that will freeze you to death." Let the hon. gentleman also beware of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, only the other day, was particular to brand him throughout the country as a man unfit to lead a great party on account of his nationality and religious belief. In regard to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), what does the New York *Tribune* say? I call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the *Tribune* has been watching our public affairs in view of the negotiations that are to be proceeded with on 12th of October next. The welfare of the country would have been promoted, in my opinion, if the Government had been left free and untrammelled to enter into negotiations respecting trade matters, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had said to the Government: "In regard to your general policy, we will attack you as severely as we know how, we will fight you in every legitimate and honourable way; but as regards the negotiations with the United States, as we might do something to injure or embarrass you, no resolution or amendment will be moved in Parliament which you can possibly say will trammel you." The *Tribune* says:

"Sir Richard Cartwright now comes forward with a proposition demanding the reduction 'of all duties on articles of prime necessity, and particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers.' The obvious answer to this is, that the Government has already sacrificed 12 per cent. of its revenues, and in such a way as to lessen the burdens of life to every class in every province. To do more would imperil administration. The Government can say, in other words, that it has voluntarily and already adopted Sir Richard's resolution, and he will find himself hard pushed for an answer."

While the American people can see that the reduction of $3,000,000 of the burdens on the people in regard to the sugar duties will be advantageous to our people, yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, day in and day out, that our sugar is not any cheaper than it was prior to the removal of the duties. The *Tribune* goes on to say:

"The concluding clause of Sir Richard Cartwright's motion calls for the conduct of the reciprocity negotiations with the American Government 'upon a basis of the most extended freedom of trade in manufactured as well as in natural products.' Every Canadian who knows anything of public affairs knows that the reciprocity Sir Richard demands is the only kind that can possibly be obtained. The American Government has already declared that it will not even discuss a scheme of reciprocity limited to natural products. Sir Richard's motion is nothing more, then, than a proposal that the American view be acquiesced in; and if he had made this his only issue, and the Government had then opposed it, the President and Mr. Blaine would have been justified in

assuming that further discussion at Washington was a waste of time. But in connecting this demand with a general call for the reduction of duties the Liberals will drive away from their support all Canadian protectionists who favour the National Policy, but who still want a wide reciprocity treaty."

This proves that hon. gentlemen opposite would, in the opinion of the press, have acted more wisely had they, in view of the early period at which our representatives will meet the representatives of the United States, not moved the amendment submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford. Coming as I do from the lower provinces, I was sorry to hear the hon. member for South Oxford declare that Ontario is to-day practically bankrupt, that real estate is mortgaged to such an amount that that province is poorer to-day than it was ten or twenty years ago. I was amazed to think that Ontario, of which I have heard so much, and which has been spoken of in such warm terms as the garden of the Dominion, is mortgaged so completely that it is impossible for the citizens to pay the interest on the same. The hon. gentleman has failed again, lacked that element which is necessary to success, and in consequence of the absence of which men will always feel that confidence cannot be placed in his words, and which we would like to give them. Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he urged the House to adopt his motion and endeavour to secure a market of 63,000,000 people, mention that there stood to-day registered in the United States nine million mortgages on the properties of the people. Then the hon. gentleman argued that the abolition of the sugar duty was practically of no benefit. That, however, should be left to the people to determine. Why need we argue out the question. Let that be left to the people themselves, and let them determine what the reduction amounts to. I guarantee that when the bread-winners of this country consider the question with their clear and sober thoughts they will determine exactly the benefit of the action of the Minister of Finance, whether 12 pounds or 20 pounds of sugar are obtained for $1, and whether more is obtained now for the same money than was obtained a couple of months ago. If a housekeeper finds she is able to get 6 pounds more, the question may fairly be considered settled. In regard to the hon. member for North Norfolk, I would be doing an injustice to my province if I allowed a statement made by him the other day to go unchallenged. In speaking of the Intercolonial Railway he said :

"The Intercolonial Railway, which was run last year at a loss of $553,000, and the Prince Edward Island Railway, which was run at a loss of $105,000. We can either make those roads pay their running expenses or we can shut them up altogether."

That is the policy of the Liberal party. That is the policy that one of its leaders announces to its supporters in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. He says, in effect : If I have power, weight and influence enough in the party to which I belong, should I be fortunate enough to become a member of the Administration when we do get into power, no matter when that time may be, I announce now that a part of the platform and policy of the Liberal party is, and the first action during my tenure of office as a Minister will be, the closing up of the Intercolonial Railway, which was given us by virtue of a compact and solemn agreement entered into by the people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of Canada at the time of Confederation. Let me ask, Is that honest dealing with the people of the Lower Provinces? Let me ask, Will we allow any Government to violate such a solemn agreement? I had thought that we would receive fair consideration from the hon. gentleman, and that he would be anxious to aid and assist us, as a part of the Dominion : but instead of that he demands that, notwithstanding all that the Maritime Provinces have done in the past, notwithstanding our self-denial and sacrifices, notwithstanding that we have supported a policy in many cases for the general benefit of Canada, which did not help us in the Lower Provinces, notwithstanding all that, we are told by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that when his party gets into power they will close up this highway given to us by the terms of Confederation. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in dealing with that deficit of $553,000 on the Intercolonial Railway and $105,000 on the Prince Edward Island Railway, told us that the loss sustained by the Intercolonial Railway is a "brilliant proof of aiding cut-throat lines to injure the Intercolonial Railway." That is the doctrine of the hon. gentleman from Oxford. Speaking on behalf of the Liberal party, he says that no more subsidies for provincial roads shall be given by the Federal Government. Are we to give our adhesion to that doctrine? Are we to support that policy of cutting off all subsidies from provincial railways in the Lower Provinces? The hon. gentleman tells us that this deficit is only a brilliant proof of aiding cut-throat roads. When I heard the hon. gentleman state that, I wondered if he had any recollection of his record when he was a Minister in the Government from 1873 to 1878. I wondered to myself if he was anxious to keep the eye of public criticism from the official acts of the various Ministers in the Mackenzie Government, of which he was one. He had no cut-throat roads to subsidize between 1873 and 1878. Their policy was not to subsidize local lines throughout the Dominion when they were in power. The Intercolonial Railway had then no competitor; and let us see what the deficit on that railway was between 1874 and 1879. In 1874 the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway was $598,091.78. To-day that road is competing with the Short Line Railway, which takes a portion of the carrying trade away from it; and yet, Sir, the deficit last year was not equal to the deficit in 1874, when there was no competitor with the Intercolonial Railway. In 1875 the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway was $281,563.99 ; in 1876 the deficit was $243,912.87 : in 1877 the deficit rolled up to $507,228.20 ; in 1878 the deficit was $432,326.78 ; and in 1879, so anxious were the hon. gentlemen opposite to increase on the previous years' showings, so that a man with closed eyes would have to tumble over it, the deficit of the Intercolonial was rolled up to $716,088.53. That is the record of the Liberal party when they managed the Intercolonial Railway ; that is their record from 1873 to 1879, when they did not subsidize any other railways, and when they had no competitor with the Intercolonial Railway. Last year the deficiency on the Intercolonial Railway was $553,000, and notwithstanding that, it was less than when they

were in power. We are told by the hon. gentleman opposite: That the question should be taken into consideration as to what we should do with this line of railway. I know it is said, in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, that a proposal is made that this railway should go into the hands of a commission, while others suggest that it should be taken over by a company; but, Sir, speaking for myself and the county which I represent, and by virtue of the solemn agreement entered into between the Lower Provinces and the rest of Canada at Confederation, I hope that no policy in regard to that road shall be adopted unless the people have a full and frank knowledge of every matter in connection with any transfer of that road which may be made. If the Intercolonial Railway is handed over to a commission, or to a company, it must be stipulated and provided that we shall not have an inferior road to what we have to-day, and that we shall not have an inferior train accommodation. We cannot submit to any proposition which would not leave us in at least the same position with regard to that road. Let me ask, in view of the statements made in this House by leaders of the Liberal party, what party can we turn to with such confidence and such hope as the Conservative party, who have fought the battles of life and death in the interest of this country? I will read an extract from the London *Quarterly Review* of April, 1891, because it contains statements which every member of this Parliament and every man in this country should take to heart. This article says:

"The two political parties in Canada since 1867, the year of Confederation, have been avowedly in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and the differences of opinion which have grown up between these parties since 1879, when the present Government adopted a so-called National Policy or system of protection, have been as to the extent to which a new treaty with the United States should go—whether it should be, generally speaking, on the basis of the Treaty of 1854, or a complete measure of unrestricted reciprocity, or, in other words, free trade in the manufactured as well as in the natural products of the two countries. This issue was formally raised at the general election which took place on the 5th of March last. The result of the contest, after some weeks of heated controversy, has been, so far as we can judge from the data before us, to give Sir John Macdonald's Ministry a majority over the whole Dominion of over thirty, in a House of two hundred and fifteen members, against an average majority of fifty in the last Parliament."

They knew the result of the election then and they took a deep interest therein. It is important that the Conservative party shall not be negligent; but that they must be industrious, they must keep moving forward, they must push ahead their work and their policy to a successful end. The reviewer says further:

"The gravity of the political situation for some time to come must be intensified by the fact that, while the party of unrestricted reciprocity has been defeated in the Dominion as a whole, it has developed strength in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where the total representation of one hundred and fifty-seven is nearly divided between the Government and the Opposition, and it is obvious that the contest between the two commercial policies has just commenced. Looking at the question from the point of view of an impartial observer, we can see that Canada is entering upon a very critical period in her history. She has reached that stage when all the antagonistic elements, arising from those differences of nationality, geographical situation and commercial interests, that exist in a dominion stretching for three thousand five hundred miles between the oceans, must complicate its questions of government and require a careful, sagacious and steady hand at the helm. Canadians are now practically the masters of their own destiny. From this time forward they have to face political, financial and commercial problems, which will require extraordinary statesmanship to solve wisely, and which must test to the very utmost their patriotism, their fidelity to an old and cherished connection, and their ability to preserve their political autonomy on the continent, and build up a great and prosperous nation, always in close alliance, we trust, with England."

That, Sir, is the opinion of this writer in the London *Quarterly Review*—that the present time demands from the people of Canada that they should be thoughtful, careful and prudent. We have, then, as I claim, in the Conservative party, a party that does not trifle with the sacred interests of Canada. We have the party that has proved true to her interests; we have the party whose policy has been broad, generous and liberal, as against a narrow and uncertain policy set up by the other side. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, be deterred by the threats and epithets which have been hurled at us from the other side of the House on account of scandals of which we have heard so much. An hon. gentleman the other evening told us that because these scandals have been revealed, therefore the whole Conservative party must abandon the ship and the flag. Such is not the policy of the Conservative party. But our policy is to go forward with a firm and steady hand, true to the great principles to which we are attached, and strong in the faith that in future—as we have a right to be, from the popular confidence we have enjoyed in the past—that party will continue to carry on and conduct the affairs of the country ably and well. Though we may be shocked now and then at some scandal arising here and there——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ADAMS. Have you not had scandals on the other side? You love scandals; you live on scandals. They are the breath of your nostrils. The only time you gained the public confidence was by a scandal. The only time you occupied the Treasury benches was by virtue of such.

An hon. MEMBER. We will do it again by another scandal.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, my hon. friend is probably congratulating himself. Hon. gentlemen opposite would probably have preferred that these scandals should not be probed to the very bottom. They doubtless imagined that the Government would retard the investigation. They hugged to themselves the hope that the Administration would not act against the officers who are employed in the departments, because such was their own history. But this Government are different. They are determined to probe the scandals to the bottom—no withholding of anything; no whitewashing. Why, Sir, when hon. gentlemen opposite talk of scandals and their hope of success following them, they have time and again deceived the people and led them astray; the blizzard has struck them in every election and torn their principles and their policy up by the roots, and laid them and their leaders on the "cold marble of the morgue." On the great public question before the country they have been uncertain and unsuccessful. They have had doubts, where we have had no fears. You gentlemen of the Opposition have held back with minds filled with dread, where we walked along with buoyant heart, with confidence and hope in the future, and called upon you to come and join and help us. But, Sir, if the scandals are great, as our friends opposite seem to imagine they are, and who gloat over the same, be patient yet awhile. Sir, the

power that is to-day carrying on and controlling the investigation, to examine and condemn, has the power to purify. If the Government in what they are doing are in earnest, as I believe they are, and if they can find wrong-doing, they will punish the offenders, and then the true principles of the Conservative party must live, and will not be buried by small sins. As Tennyson says:

"That man's the best Conservative
Who lops the mouldering branch away."

That is the position of the great Conservative party as it exists in this Parliament to-day: it will lop the mouldering branch away, but the old tree will stand. Although hon. gentlemen opposite think that the wisdom of the country is centered within the golden band of their line, yet outside of that there are thinking people who will tell you that the great principles which the Conservative party have advocated and fought for, in which they live and in which they will die, as against some little scandal or other, that these are the great things which the people watch and value, and about which the great interests of the country revolve. And having that confidence in the Conservative party in this House, I believe they will vote down the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not hope to add much to the fund of information and explanation which has been given to the House on the subject under discussion. But perhaps I shall be permitted to express my gratification at the reduction of taxation on an important article of consumption, the only inconvenience of which found so far has been that by being made cheaper sugar has been made sweeter. I may be permitted also to express my sincere regret that a larger portion of the high wall was not torn down, and that the breach was not made sufficiently wide to show our neighbours living in the great country to the south of us that on this side of the line there exists an earnest determination to open the door of international trade and friendship. In the course of the few remarks I propose to make I will deal with some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, and I intend endeavouring to justify the vote I propose giving in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), an amendment which, in my opinion, contains a principle fully in accord with the best interests of the country, an amendment embodying the policy which will certainly meet the most pressing needs and remove the serious difficulties with which we are face to face to-day, embodying a policy, which, if carried out, will place on a firm basis the harmony that should exist between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, and develop our trade in a manner mutually satisfactory and advantageous. With regard to the speech made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), much of what he said was true, especially that portion repeated by my hon. friend who has just sat down, namely, that we should conduct our discussion calmly and quietly. Beyond that, as well as I can remember, the hon. member for West Assiniboia spoke eloquently and brilliantly on the subject of tadpoles, expiring frogs, and milk and water. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams) quoted an article from the New York *Tribune* in order to show that the opinions of the Opposition in this House do not hold good in certain quarters, and tried to make capital against us; but if he had taken up the same journal of a few days ago he would have found another article which—if the hon. gentleman pins his faith to it, as he has done to the article quoted by my hon. friend—would surely strike terror into his patriotic soul. In the New York *Tribune* of 21st July I find the following article:—

"It cannot be expected that our Government will not take these facts into consideration in determining whether it is desirable to open trade negotiations next October. What possible profit can come from such discussions with a discredited Government, existing under conditions that momentarily betoken its fall?"

Whatever comfort the hon. gentleman may find in the columns of the New York *Daily Tribune*, I would strongly commend to his careful consideration the article from which I have taken this extract. I have listened patiently to the present debate, and I am forced to admit that it has displayed one unfortunate feature, and that is the tone adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in their references to the people of the United States. Fortunately, no law of man or nature, no law, supernatural or written, compels us to place confidence in the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite or in the conclusions at which, by peculiar methods, they have arrived. If we are to believe them, the farmers of the United States are in a most deplorable condition; if we are to believe them, it is the duty of every loyal Canadian to belittle the American people, their institutions and customs, and everything they hold dear. Upon what grounds can such attacks be justified? What is the cause of such misrepresentation? Is it the policy of the Government to try and destroy all prospect of ever obtaining a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, or has there been an understanding between the Government and their masters of supplies that this method will be adopted in order, if possible, to court refusal at Washington and thus prevent further negotiations tending to reciprocal trade? It looks like it. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember the result of his mission to Washington in March last. Can he to-day, armed with the utterances of his followers, say that he is in a better position to meet the representatives of the American Government in October next than he was before the elections? If he is perfectly sincere in his professions with regard to his mission in October next, then, Sir, no man can have greater reason to exclaim: Save me from my friends. Throughout the debate, particularly during the course of the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) last evening, and that delivered by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams), the Liberal party has been subjected to insults. Yet we are not discouraged, and have still reason to cherish and cling to our convictions. Yet our policy is growing largely in favour and popularity, and, to use a sentence well known: Its sun is rising when theirs is about to set." Our enthusiasm has in no way been chilled by the attacks and even reverses to which we have been subjected for some years. We have at our head a leader in whom we have the fullest confidence and whom we regard with the greatest respect, esteem and veneration. We have a policy which is certainly a sound one—the policy of unrestricted reci-

procity—and which is about to triumph over the ignoble attacks and assaults of the army of sham loyalists. It may indeed be a disagreable admission to make, but nevertheless it is true that the cry of loyalty, backed by that pernicious system so well known to our hon. friends on the other side, of a lavish distribution of royalty, is among the most powerful factors of the elements employed by them to retain power. We know that they have found this cry of loyalty a good one, and one with which they are slow to part. Even during this debate they have been profuse in their expressions of loyal attachment to England; they have proclaimed it to the four corners of the country, and the climax was only reached the other day when the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), in a moment of frantic delight, and verily jumping in his seat, exclaimed that he was a British subject, that he was born a British subject and that he hoped to die a British subject. I hope he will not die just yet; I hope he will live many a long day, and that, unlike many of his brother Conservatives, he will not, after indulging in such strong expressions of loyalty, emigrate to the United States. But does the hon. gentleman occupy an exceptional position in having been born a British subject? Why, this House, gallery, city and country are full of British subjects; and if the hon. gentleman will only take the trouble to go down the street he will find the poor labourer, with a pick in hand, earning a pittance of a dollar a day as the reward of his labour, under a burning sun, is just as good, perhaps a better British subject; because if an insult be ever cast upon the ensign of proud Britain it is the blood of that poor labourer which will be shed on the battle-field to wipe out the insult, while our declaimers on the opposite side will be found in their Cabinet quietly and fearlessly writing learned essays on the subject of loyalty, and proclaiming that they were born British subjects and British subjects they were bound to die. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman, who has an excellent memory, forgot to tell us whether he was prepared to accept all the conclusions and statements made in the very eloquent speech of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague). I wonder if he agreed with all that hon. gentleman said with regard to the policy of his party. I wonder, for instance, if he places any faith in the policy of Imperial federation. They claim to be a united family on the other side, and I am simply pointing out that there may be some divisions in that united family. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) spoke in favour of Imperial federation. I challenge the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) to say now whether he is in favour of Imperial federation, as his brother member for Haldimand is, or whether he is not. By keeping his seat he admits that disunion is in the heart of their family. I wonder is it creeping into the bosom of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), or is it consuming the breast of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). When the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), in his inimitable style, drew attention to the lack of harmony on the other side, he might have gone into the reading room and found from the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite how the lack of harmony exists in that party up to the present day. He might have quoted the opinions expressed by the ex-President of the Council, Mr. Colby, and by the Secretary of State, and he would not have found that there was any great similarity between the two speeches on the question of reciprocity, but, perhaps, that was so small a matter that it was a "loyal delusion." Doubtless he could have pointed to the warfare which has been going on between the organs of the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State; but, perhaps, they are merely "loyal delusions." He might have gone further, and might have quoted from the *Evening Journal*, which demands the head of one of the Ministers opposite. Or he might have read *Le Canada*, and the severe denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite which are contained in that paper. He might even have gone further, and referred to the dispute in reference to the portfolio of Railways and Canals; but, perhaps, we should not mention these cases, because they may be only "loyal delusions." He might have gone further, and referred to the divisions which exist on his side of the House, but we must not mention them, because a cloak of loyalty is thrown over those hon. gentlemen; and because they have always been loyal to No. 1, all must be forgotten and forgiven. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in order to justify his position and the position of his party—and he did not deny that there were scandals in existence—went back to the Government which had charge of the affairs of the country from 1873 to 1878. Let us travel back with him. The Premier who was then at the head of affairs still occupies a seat in this House, and, further, he occupies a warm place in the affections of his party and the country. His stainless record—and can we say the same of those who have been in possession of the Government benches since?—commands the admiration of all Canadians to-day. I will take up the comparison, and I say that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) assumed the reins of office, he closed the door against political corruption and against scandals; and when his successors, the heroes of the Pacific scandal, to which the hon. gentleman opposite, unfortunately for himself and his party, made a reference to-day, entered again into the possession of power, we soon found that they were at their old work, so that to-day we can hardly form committees enough to investigate the mischief, the scandals, and the maladministration that have been going on, and that to such an extent that the country stands shocked and appalled by the revelations which have already been made. When the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in office he kept the expenditure within $24,000,000, while his successors have brought it up to about $40,000,000. When he was in office peace prevailed throughout the whole of this country; but hardly had his successors come into power when the country was plunged into the horrors of civil war, in consequence of the cruel and callous neglect of which we have heard that it cost the country 200 lives, $10,000,000 and incalculable misery. Will hon. gentlemen point to that record with pride? Some portion of it is daily coming to light in a committee room not far from where we are sitting. From day to day it is being given to the country. I will refer to another portion of that record. In 1878 hon. gentlemen were returned to power, and again in 1882, on the strength of certain well-defined pledges, when they claimed that the expenditure should not exceed the

sum of $22,000,000, and yet they have brought it up to over $40,000,000. They promised to reduce the national debt, and how have they kept that pledge? They have reduced the national debt by increasing it by more than $100,000,000. They promised that they would not have any deficits. They said we had more than $6,000,000 of deficits, and yet in one year they piled up more than that amount. Further than that: they said they would build the Canadian Pacific Railway without its costing a dollar to the people of this country, and how have they kept that pledge? They have impoverished the country in building that line. They promised economy in the public service, and we have only to travel upstairs and call the civil servants to find how they carried out that promise.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But still they are loyal.

Mr. DEVLIN. They are loyal, but it is another loyal delusion. They promised retrenchment in printing and in immigration, and in both they have nearly doubled the expenditure. They promised a reduction in the ranks of the Civil Service. No doubt there is a rapid reduction going on now, and we may have the gratification of seeing before long that those gentlemen who ought to go will have gone, in addition to those whom they have sent away. I was very much amused, while listening to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams), when he made some statement in which the word "catholic" was used. On that ground he referred to the hon. member for North Norfolk. Well, he is in bad company over there anyway, but the company, it appears, has disappeared. Of course, they spoke of side issues. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) was very eloquent the other day on the subject of side issues. He was candid enough to admit that side issues were used during the last campaign. Well, I certainly thought at the time that they were used by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not think that I can present them in a better light than by quoting from an address which was issued to the electors of the Eastern Townships by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), a gentleman who stands, or rather sits, on the very verge of the Cabinet, a position in which he can conveniently draw inspiration. I hope the hon. gentleman will pardon me if I make some mistakes in translating this address, because it was published in French for the French electors. The address is: "To the electors of the Eastern Townships," and it is signed—I do not think we can mistake the gentleman—"W. B. Ives, President of the Conservative Association of the Eastern Townships." He begins:

"Gentlemen, Electors, you will be invited to pronounce upon certain questions of the highest importance at the coming general election. Animated with the desire"——

The hon. gentleman was "aninated."—

—"Animated with the desire of being useful to you, I come most respectfully to submit certain important points for your consideration. (1.) Unrestricted reciprocity is the policy of the Liberals."

That is about the only truthful point in the whole address—

"Mr. Laurier, speaking in Toronto in the month of October last, said that there should be a uniformity of tariff between the two countries. In 1889 he preached the doctrine of entire and unlimited reciprocity. Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Charlton and other chieftains of the Liberal party, have a hundred times over declared themselves friendly towards unlimited reciprocity."

Now, these were the words of the address—and you will see some curious conclusions drawn—

"What does unrestricted reciprocity mean but annexation?"

He speaks of Mr. Butterworth and several others. He also refers in this address to an eminent prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, Mgr. O'Brien, of Halifax. Now, just imagine the hon. member for Sherbrooke coming along with his address, just imagine this new defender of the faith rising to quote a pastoral from the Archbishop of Halifax. Still he quotes it at length, and he goes on to say:

"Annexation signifies for the French Canadians several things. The abolition of the French language."

Is not that a side issue?—

"Louisiana was at one time a French colony."

He did not speak of Texas.—

"It was sold by the Emperor Napoleon I to the United States. Despite all the efforts made, they could not secure the preservation of the French language. The policy of the United States from that time to this has always had the tendency of destroying the French language in that State. Its use is not even permitted in the Legislature. Annexation also signifies the education of the children by the state."

That is not a side issue.—

"The education of your children could no longer be confided to your Church."

Just imagine. Isn't this rich, coming from the hon. member for Sherbrooke? Why, he ought to be canonized at once—

—"even in cases where the Church would wish to do the work of its own accord and gratuitously. The whole system of separate schools would disappear for ever."

But that is not a side isssue. Was not the hon. member for L'Islet very unfortunate in referring to side issues?

"Annexation also signifies the wiping out of all the constitutional laws guaranteed to the French Canadians"——

This is for the French-Canadians.—

—"the use of their laws and their customs."

And he goes on—at all events, he winds up by saying:

"The policy of the Liberals is, Canada for the Yankees."

I would strongly advise the Minister of Finance to take this document with him when he goes to make his treaty of reciprocity next October and send it in as his card.

"Canada for the Yankees."

That is the expression.—

"A discriminating tariff against all other countries, a direct tax of $40 per year on every family of ten persons. The right accorded to the Congress of the United States to impose whatever burdens they may please upon the back of Canada without Canada being permitted to say one word in the matter. The monopoly of the business of Canada to fall into the hands of the people of Boston and New York. That is what Sir Richard Cartwright himself stated to the citizens of Boston fifteen days ago. The destruction of all the guarantees given by Great Britain for the preservation of French customs; and finally, the wiping out of Canada.—W. B. Ives."

There was another side issue, and I would not have referred to it were it not for the remarks addressed to the hon. member for North Norfolk by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams), who quoted some of that gentleman's accusations against the leader of the Opposition. But he forgot to tell us about a little bit of a side issue that was used up in Toronto only a week ago; and this will give you, Mr. Speaker, an indication of the broad

spirit, the kindly spirit, of the party opposite. The hon. member for one of the divisions of York, who, I believe, is grand sovereign of an order to which he belongs, was speaking in the city of Toronto on the 12th of July, or the day afterwards —at all events, it was the celebration of the 12th. Now, this gentleman is a member of the Canadian House of Commons; this gentleman knows the responsibility which attaches to his utterances; this gentleman also occupies a seat directly on the brink or the verge of the Cabinet, and, consequently, ought to be very careful with regard to what he may say, because he is supposed to be one of the mouthpieces of the Conservative party. This gentleman, speaking in the city of Toronto on this date, only a week ago, said: "He hoped that never would a Catholic occupy the position of mayor of the city of Toronto." I saw the remarks quoted in a French paper of Montreal. I was afraid that, perhaps, he had been misreported, so I took up a newspaper of the city of Toronto, the *Mail*, and I found there exactly the same remarks. That is the party of loyalty, of course; that is the party which does not use side issues; that is the party which travels straight upon the trade question. Again, another bit of side issue gives an illustration of their loyalty. It was only the other evening that a dinner was given in the basement of this House. I was not invited to it, and I cannot tell all that transpired there, but I believe that another important member of the order to which the hon. member from West York (Mr. Wallace) belongs was being dined by that hon. gentleman. I believe, furthermore, he is grand sovereign of the universe, and came all the way from Ballykillbeg, and that this gentleman was treated right royally downstairs. But were they loyal in doing so? I believe it was the same gentleman who a short time ago, on an important occasion in Ireland, exclaimed: "We will kick the Queen's Crown into the Boyne." No doubt they were celebrating that. Bad as I am, I do not entertain any such sentiments, and I would feel more disposed to kick that gentleman who would undertake to kick the Queen's Crown into the Boyne; and Canadians despise such sentiments. No reference is necessary, of course, to the side issue we have heard on all occasions, "Support the Government and share the spoils." No reference is necessary to that famous side issue, "Now is the golden opportunity of the Maritime Provinces." I have merely presented the side issues of abuse of the American people, misrepresentation of the policy and intentions of the Liberal party. But, notwithstanding all that, I think we have reason to think those hon. gentlemen are shameless when they come here and talk of side issues. We are opposed to the National Policy for many reasons. I will quote an extract which will give a pretty good idea of the opposition we offer to it, in the words of an eminent Canadian:

"I claim that the policy of Sir John Macdonald is a policy of creating interprovincial trade and sustaining a national sentiment in Canada. That is the true meaning of the National Policy. It means more than mere protection of commercial interests, but a national sentiment as well. That policy would be sound, and ought to be supported by all parties, if our geographical position was such that it was possible. But, unfortunately, the configuration of Canada is such that there can be no healthy interprovincial trade. After twenty years' experience in Confederation, with absolute freedom of trade between the several provinces, with enormous expenditures on railroads, specially designed to promote this trade, there is practically to-day no healthy interprovincial trade. The Maritime Provinces are compelled, under the existing arrangements, to purchase very largely their manufactured goods from Montreal and other cities of the other provinces, but they are compelled to pay for them in cash. Scarcely a single product of the soil, the forest or the sea from the Maritime Provinces ever seeks or finds a market in the Upper Provinces. Some articles are sent from Nova Scotia to these provinces. Some coal is sent to Montreal (only about 240,000 tons), which is but a small factor in the coal industry of Nova Scotia. It is true that we send some manufactured cotton and refined sugar to the Upper Provinces, but this would scarcely involve the labour of 500 citizens. The products of the great natural industries of the provinces are compelled to seek a market elsewhere. This is the chief cause of the widespread feeling of discontent which prevails. The same principles are applicable to all the provinces. Ontario's trade is not with the Maritime Provinces, but with New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and Illinois. Manitoba's trade is not with Ontario and Quebec, but with St. Paul and Minneapolis, and the railway problem which is now agitating Manitoba is simply the outcome of a universal want on the part of the people of that province of trade with the United States. The trade of British Columbia is almost entirely with California. Montreal, while gaining certain advantages from her present trade with the Maritime Provinces, would, from her position, secure a hundred-fold greater advantages by obtaining a share of the enormous trade of the States surrounding her."

Again, it will be well to call the attention of the House to a resolution passed by a very important body, the interprovincial conference at Quebec, at which Conservative delegates were present. The resolution to which I refer reads as follows:—

"That having reference to the agitation on the subject of the trade relations between the Dominion and the United States, this interprovincial conference, consisting of representatives of all political parties, desires to record its opinion that unrestricted reciprocity would be of advantage to all the provinces of the Dominion; that this conference and the people it represents cherish fervent loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and warm attachment to British connection; that this conference is of opinion that a fair measure, providing, under proper conditions, for unrestricted reciprocal trade relations between the Dominion and the United States, would not lessen these sentiments on the part of our people, and, on the contrary, may even serve to increase them, and would at the same time, in connection with an adjustment of the fishery dispute, tend to happily settle grave difficulties which have from time to time arisen between the mother country and the United States."

It has been stated that, so far as we are concerned, the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty which existed from 1854 to 1865 was a good thing for Canada. If I mistake not, that is the contention of the Minister of Finance in 1891. It may not be uninteresting to quote the opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald on the same subject. He said:

"It would be impossible to express in figures, with any approach to accuracy, the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the reciprocity treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities."

He went on to say:

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government, which the latter policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the reciprocity treaty, of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbours in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes have ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has wholly disappeared."

He also points to this as one of the reasons for putting an end to the political discontent which existed in view of the troubles which had taken place some time before, and which had taken the form of an annexation movement. I believe the movement referred to is the one with which our

present Prime Minister was connected; but the cloak of loyalty is thrown over his shoulders, and his sentiments must be forgotten. With respect to the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other day, that all the treaties of reciprocity had been obtained by Conservative Administrations, it might be well to remind that hon. gentleman that such was not the case; that the treaty of reciprocity we enjoyed was obtained by the Hincks Administration, and if he considers that a Conservative Administration I only trust that he himself will become one of the same. While referring to that hon. gentleman, I may say that he also spoke of the great confidence which the farmers possess in the policy advocated by the Government. He forgot, however, to tell the House that he escaped at the last election by the skin of his teeth; that at a previous election he was elected by a majority of 545, whereas at the last election, notwithstanding the fact that he had election lists suitable and all the advantages of Government support, his large majority was reduced to 19 votes. I am afraid that next time he will bid us good-bye altogether. There are many other quotations I could offer in support of the policy advocated by the Liberal party. I do not desire to detain the House longer, as many other speakers will follow; but I think the most severe denunciation ever uttered against the present policy of the Dominion Government is to be found in an article which appeared in the Toronto *Empire* of 30th June. This article was an editorial utterance, and was never intended as a reflection on the policy of the Government, but it was intended rather to denounce one of the great railways of the country, a railway which has not received justice from the Government. It was in pursuance of that policy adopted by the present Government, that they should run down the Grand Trunk Railway, decry this magnificent road, and make little of its management. The *Empire*—and remember the *Empire* is a loyal paper, which finds fault with everything American, and of course finds everything English good—goes on to say, that the policies of the two roads are very different; that the Grand Trunk Railway pursued an English policy, and the Canadian Pacific Railway pursued an entirely different policy, and one that almost invariably obtains in American railways. I wonder if that is loyal? Now, what fault does the *Empire* find with the Grand Trunk? The fault is, that the Grand Trunk Railway is a large manufacturing company, that it has established extensive factories to build their own cars, to make their own wheels, and to manufacture everything required for the road. The *Empire* condemns the Grand Trunk Railway while it upholds the Canadian Pacific Railway, which adopts the American policy, which is different. These gentlemen on the other side of the House talk about us calling out blue ruin; but what have they done during the last election? They have been decrying this great company; they have been running it down; they say its receipts are small; they make little of the road in every possible way, and they give us an example of how they can cry out blue ruin. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, out of their own mouth comes their own condemnation. Another question which remains to be settled in connection with the discussion before us is this: Are all the manufacturers

of the country opposed to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity? We know, Sir, and we have evidence, that many manufacturers carrying on business of great importance in this country are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, and they have given us very good reasons to show that they are as well able to compete with the Americans as the manufacturers of any other nation. We believe that they are able to hold their own, and that they are not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Sir, the question remains, and it is a question easily settled, for we have only got to look around to find how true it is; Is the country really as prosperous as hon. gentlemen opposite make out that it is? They have told us, for instance, to look at the tall chimneys and to listen to the busy hum of industry. Well, we can look around and we will certainly see tall chimneys, but do you observe the fire of life in them, and where is the busy hum of industry, and why is it silent? Cross the river to the manufacturing city of Hull; that is a manufacturing city which has wonderful opportunities, and which has great advantages. Ask the manufacturers of that city if they enjoy to-day the degree of prosperity to which they are entitled, by reason of the magnificent advantages which are placed within their reach. Why, Sir, we know that not only in Hull, but here in this city of Ottawa, and in the city of Toronto, and in every other city of this country, there are to-day hundreds and thousands of unemployed men seeking for employment. Yet, we are told that there is a great deal of prosperity in the country. Prosperity, indeed! Is the presence of over a million Canadians in the United States evidence of prosperity? Why have they been exiled from their country? Is it because their Canadian home is no longer dear to them; because of an unnatural desire to sever the ties which should bind them to the soil which is theirs: or are they driven out of this country by necessity, the very first cause of which is the high tariff existing between the two countries? Now, Sir, what is the result of the evidence which has been placed before this House during this debate, and before the country during the last few years, if it is not that the pulse of the commercial artery, while depending for its life-giving power upon the National Policy, beats feebly and irregularly; indebted at times to happy and extraordinary circumstances it may possess some tone, but that is soon followed by a period of lengthened and prolonged depression. And, Sir, it is sad to be obliged to admit, and to the Canadian anxious to see his country take its place among the nations, it is humilitating to be forced to confess that the future is not bright. This is due to the unpatriotic manner in which the people of Canada have been deceived by those, the responsibility of whose office, and the elevation of whose position ought to have made them candid; and because they were blinded by those who should have led in the path of light and of honesty. We have been told that the National Policy has been a success, but it has been a huge national fraud, and that cannot be denied. It has been a fraud in the full sense of the word: it is lifeless, dispossessed of its million limbs, and unfit for use, unfit to be looked upon, patched up in a hundred ways—in fact, yawning for the very grave which awaits it. It is a policy which may have made some rich, but it has made the masses of our people

poor. It is a policy in which the speculator, the briber and the jobber may find a fortune, but it is every day impoverishing the farmer, and the lumberman and the miner. Let it be removed now; let it not be said that, in its name, the intelligence of this country shall continue to be insulted, and that for its unnecessary sustenance the life-blood of the nation shall continue to be drawn.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). Mr. Speaker, I suppose I shall be believed if I tell you that I am anxious to be as short as possible at this late period of the debate. My object in rising now is not to go over ground which has been already well covered, but only to answer a few points, which I think require an answer, regarding some interests which have been discussed yesterday and to-day. First, I should like to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend the member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), although I suppose I shall not be expected to follow him through his whole speech. That hon. member has spoken much of side issues brought into the debate, and he would evidently wish people to believe that all the side issues have been raised on our side. But looking at what is now going on, I ask any candid man to say which party are raising the side issues. While we are now engaged in this Chamber in such an important debate we see hon. gentlemen opposite and their press trying if possible to drown the arguments and to weaken the strength of the speeches which have been made on our side by occupying public attention with small, petty scandals, in order to prevent the people, who have already pronounced on the financial issue, from taking the stand they wish to take, and in order to bring back the old time when, by means of side issues, the Liberal party were able to reach the Ministerial benches. Well, Sir, even on the question of side issues, and of scandals, we are not afraid to meet them; and it ill-becomes the Quebec members sitting on the left side of the Speaker to speak of scandals here, and to accuse our party of being corrupt, if they look upon their own record in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec. We may well compare our position here with their sat Quebec, where they have been brought face to face with their own scandals and corruption. We remember very well that during last session, when we were obliged to vote against one of our friends, not one member of our side of the House refused to do what he believed the interests of justice required. But what has taken place at Quebec in the case of the scandals there? A committee was appointed to investigate one of those scandals—the Pacaud-Whelan scandal, if I remember rightly—and what happened? Witnesses were called before that committee, but they refused to answer the questions that were put to them; and the chairman of the committee, who was an honest man, voted with the minority, and forced a report to be made to the House denouncing the witnesses who refused to answer. But what was the position taken by those who now denounce us as countenancing scandals and corruption? Mr. Mercier, now His Excellency the Count Mercier, who is being serenaded and promenaded and drummed and fifed to-night, rose in his seat and said to the majority: No; you must not order these witnesses to answer the committee, but protect them against its authority. In consequence of this, one member of the Opposition, answering the accusations brought against the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec, was able to say on the hustings: Well, the difference between us and you is, that when people on our side are convicted of corruption we condemn them and force them out, while you conceal them, when you do not share the spoils with them. So much for the question of side issues raised by my hon. friend from Ottawa County. Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to refer to the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). That hon. member had a very doleful story to relate to the House. If we were to believe him, everything is desolation, poverty and failure in our province—so much so, that even creditors who have been cautious enough to lend their money on mortgage only to the extent of 50 per cent. of the value of the properties do not dare to take action against those who are in arrears for fear that the properties upon which mortgages have been created fall into their possession; and we are told that the authority to sustain that statement is that scarcely any suits are to be found in the courts to show that the Crédit Foncier, for instance, has taken action against its debtors. There is good reason, Mr. Speaker, why suits have not been entered, and that is, that every obligation has been fulfilled according to the terms. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) gave some figures on this point yesterday, but I think it is very important that I, also, should put on record some figures to show how groundless was the statement made by my hon. friend from Arthabaska about the poverty and desolation existing among the farming classes in our province. I happen to have the report of that same Crédit Foncier institution for the year ending December last, and what do I find? I find that its loans in the Province of Quebec amount to nearly $5,000,000, and that its aggregate loans in the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, amount to $6,668,000; and the whole of the properties in the hands of the company held by execution of judgments at the end of last year amounted to $49,000. Further, I find that although the poor, poverty-stricken borrowers of whom the hon. member has spoken had to meet for interest and sinking fund for the last six months $445,971, they were in arrear only to the amount of $88,000. Almost immediately that amount was reduced to $67,000, and by April last, that is to say, during the winter, which is the worst time for people to raise money and pay their obligations, it was further reduced to $27,000. And that is the position of these poor people who the hon. member would have us believe are in a condition of such distress. Of course, his object is to decry the policy of the Government; that is natural. Of course, if the hon. gentleman could prove that our people are in such a reduced position that they cannot meet their obligations, that their creditors are afraid to close on them lest the properties they hold as security would remain in their hands, that would go in support of his case; but what is the position? The hon. member knows very well that there are banking institutions in his district; he knows very well that there are

industries and trade in agricultural products in his district; and I could show him reports which would inform him that, strange to say, amongst all those failures, amongst all that poverty that he has seen—dreamed of, rather—the deposits in our banks, the savings of his own people out of their earnings, have been increasing, instead of decreasing, during the last three years. Whilst commerce has been depressed, according to the hon. gentleman in those localities, the reports show that the number of notes under protest have been less; thus, no loss has been made on the operations of last year by those banking institutions; yet this gentleman is so well informed and takes so much interest in his district that he comes here and weeps over the poverty and failures and the exodus of our co-citizens. I should like to know by what process he could show us that, whilst the deposits in our banks are increasing the population is decreasing, and everybody is leaving home because he cannot find enough on his land to provide for the wants of his family. That is the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite try to deceive public opinion as to the actual position of the country. They seek, by discrediting their own friends and neighbours, to prove that the McKinley Bill, with which this Government have nothing to do, has reduced us to a miserable state of affairs, that our Government are the guilty and responsible parties, so long as they do not consent to throw us into the arms of those who have concocted that policy against us, and that so long as they are on the left side of the Speaker famine and exodus must prevail. I had much pleasure in listening to another speech yesterday, one which gave me more pleasure, I must say, than that of my hon. friend from Arthabaska. I refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). That hon. gentleman is a staunch friend of the Opposition and a faithful follower of the leader of the Opposition, but his old principles and the strength of the position of the Government compelled him to make yesterday one of the most powerful speeches in favour of the National Policy. I was glad to hear, especially from my hon. friend, the old principles and arguments used by him when we stood together and fought the same battles. We were then protectionists; we were then anxious to see the policy of protection prevail in the councils of the Dominion. Well, when I heard my hon. friend talk in the way he did, when I heard him advocate so eloquently and forcibly a policy which is but the logical consequence of the policy the Government has maintained for the past twelve years, I thought he might be expected to become another advocate, and one of the most powerful advocates we shall have during the next fight before the people; because his arguments will bear in our favour, not only in the special points he has taken, but in all the points covered by the policy as upheld by my hon. friend the Finance Minister. What does the hon. member for Berthier say? He said, speaking of the beet-root sugar industry:

"Qu'en présence de la difficulté de créer une si vaste industrie, difficulté qui est encore augmentée par la législation des pays qui viennent en concurrence avec notre agriculture, c'est le devoir du gouvernement d'intervenir et de placer nos producteurs sur un pied d'égalité avec leurs concurrents."

In this sentence we find the whole gist of the National Policy, and I am not surprised to find that, on a point which is most interesting to our farmers, the hon. member for Berthier, with his reminiscences of what he has written on protection, has found such a strong point, and an argument which will cover, not only the ground I want to cover with him, but the whole National Policy. His words, translated into English, are as follows:—

"In the face of the difficulty of creating so vast an industry, a difficulty which is increased by the legislation of countries which compete with us in agriculture, it is the duty of the Government to interfere and put our producers on a footing of equality with their competitors."

That is our policy. That is what we have always contended for; and without which we would be at the mercy of our neighbours, without recourse, and would be compelled to close our manufactories and become mere dependents on the United States. Now, I am glad to believe with him in the importance of that industry the hon. gentleman wants to protect. I am very happy to be able to endorse the principle he laid down with regard to that special industry, which is in thorough accord with the National Policy. As the hon. the Minister of Finance has shown in his *exposé* of the financial position of the country when he was giving us the welcome news that he had decided to remove the duty from raw sugar, and thus to grant to the consumers the boon of the reduced price on that staple article, he was aware at the same time that by doing so he was striking at its roots an industry which, though not successful so far financially, has been the object of great studies, great anxiety and great sacrifices in our Province—I allude to the beet-root industry. Taking away 2 cents from the raw sugar was taking away the incidental protection which had been given so far to the beet sugar industry. The promotors of that industry, and with them both the Federal and Local Governments, had felt that unless we could secure to the farmers that protection we had already secured to the manufacturers by the National Policy we might at any moment, by the caprice of the party exigencies or some other interest amongst our American neighbours, see the makets of their country closed to us, and our farmers left without any sufficient market to which to sends their goods. In prevision of that, we were anxious to build up alongside of those manufactures which were being created by the National Policy another market, where the farmers would be sure to obtain fair prices and ready prices for other produce from their farms. We have succeeded to a certain extent in creating good markets in large centres like Montreal, St. Hyacinthe, and other places in the Dominion, by encouraging such industries, for instance, as the refining industry, which my hon. friend thought fit to denounce yesterday, such industries which have secured work for thousands of labouring men, have given a ready market for thousands of tons of coal from our own mines, and have aided the shipping and other transport interest to a large extent by the amount of freight brought to and delivered from those refineries. We say that, if we could join with that the production of our own sugar we would have all the benefit of the immense consumption of that article amongst ourselves, and that would be in the interest of the producers in this country. The importation for three years has been over 100,000,000 pounds a year, and it has cost the country over $5,000,000. In 1889 it amounted to $5,500,000. If we add to that the amount of $3,-

500,000 which was collected by the Government in the Customs duty, it would show that the amount expended and going out of the pockets of the consumers was nearly $9,000,000 a year. Through the liberality of the policy proposed by the Government this year we are being saved $3,500,000 a year, but we have still to face the amount of over $5,000,000 which goes out of the country every year for that amount of raw sugar which is imported. If we could introduce that industry, which would benefit the farmers, the labourers and the people who would be called upon to produce that raw article, we could save to the country the large amount of $5,000,000, which would thus promote the well-being of our people. I think that is a question which demands full consideration, and I am glad to see that it has not entirely escaped the attention of the Government; because, while they have taken off the 2 cents duty which was considered the necessary protection to help that new industry to become a national industry, they have provided for the protection for one year of the beet root which will be produced. But my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) was right though in saying that this was not going far enough. The United States, having in view the important results obtained in Europe by the protection given to the industry in Germany, France, Russia, Austria and other countries, where the beet has been cultivated, have by the McKinley Bill given 2 cents a pound for all produce from the soil in the United States up to a certain degree polariscope, and that for the term of 15 years. I know, and the information derived from all the papers in the United States which take an interest in the sugar industry will show, that the people there have taken all the steps necessary to take advantage of that bonus—so much so, that in Louisiana alone the reports already sent in show that the Government of the United States will be called upon to pay the enormous sum of $9,000,000 to cover the bonus of 2 cents a pound on sugar which the farmers there will produce from the cane or the beet-root. The United States have not been afraid to follow in the steps of the European countries. And so we should do likewise, when we consider the great benefits that have been derived from the encouragement given in those countries to the beet-root industry. The reports show that previous to 1860 the cultivation of the beet-root in France, Germany and Russia produced scarcely enough sugar to meet the wants of the consumers within those countries; but since the system of giving a bounty has been inaugurated, we find the result has been that in Austria, while in 1861 only 54,000 tons were produced, in 1879-80 the farmers had increased their production to the amount of 498,000 tons, which amount has gradually risen, until last year it was 750,000 tons. In Germany, which in this respect heads all the countries of Europe, we find that in 1861 the farmers only produced 125,000 tons, whereas in 1875, when the bounty had just been given upon exportations—because they already had put an excise duty on the raw produce, so as to secure an income for the Government—in 1875 they increased their production to 390,000 tons; and at the present moment it exceeds 1,200,000 tons. We see the same result in France. In 1875 France produced 462,000 tons; under the reduced bounties this production, in 1880, reached only 500,000 tons; but now, owing to a change in the policy of the French Government, the production amounts to 750,000 tons. In Russia, in 1885, they could not produce enough for their own consumption; but under a bounty system they are not only able to supply the wants of the population of Russia, but they are now exporting a large amount. In Germany, I know for a fact that they are actually coming to this country and selling raw sugar from the beet-root and competing with the cane sugar of the United States, despite the distance and the rates of insurance and shipping that they have to pay. I have seen thousands of tons imported from that country and refined in our Montreal refineries. These facts show that after a certain time, when a reasonable protection has been given to that industry, when the farmers have been educated to cultivate the beet in such a way as to obtain from the soil the greatest possible crop, they will produce such a quantity of beets as will ensure the manufacturer a fair return for his outlay. With a proper soil, with a favourable climate, a climate as well adapted to that industry here as in the countries which I have mentioned, I see every reason for hoping that that industry will ultimately succeed in Canada, as it has already in some part of the United States, and has obtained in countries which were considered less favourable with respect to soil and climate than our own. On this point we have the testimony of men who ought to be believed, because they have paid for their experience, they have invested money in the enterprise, without having so far obtained any return; and yet they are so well satisfied that they are willing to risk their money again if they are only put in the same position as they were before that duty on raw sugar was taken off the tariff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What has been the rate of production per acre in Canada?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). In our province the experience has been that when the crop has been properly put in and well attended to, the yield has been from 10 to 12 and 15 tons per acre. When you remember that the manufacturers are willing to pay $4.50 a ton, that the Local Government has offered 50 cents a ton so as to raise the price to $5 a ton, we see that a very fair profit may be realized. Past experiments show that when the beet is properly cultivated it contains from 10 to 12, and even 15 per cent. of sugar. At that rate, when the general average of cultivation has reached such a point there is no doubt that it would become a self-sustaining industry. It is for that reason that we are anxious to see the Government extending some assistance—if you do not wish to call it a bounty, call it an indemnity—and grant 2 cents for this year, and keep it on. There is another reason for taking this course, if they want the indemnity offered to be of any value to the farmers. This year the farmers, if I am truly informed, have consented to grow beets to a larger extent. Last year was another year of experiment. New men had come into the field; being aware of the faults and deficiencies of the past, they wanted to engage in the cultivation of the beet on a scientific basis, on a better-reasoned plan. Well, they have gone to work, and the result has been considered by them satisfactory, as regards the amount of beet obtained from the crop as well as the percentage of sugar obtained from the beet; but they have not obtained enough to cover the expenses of their

enterprise, so they want to try another year, just as soon as the tariff will warrant them in going on. But if the Government insist on refusing to grant further aid the result will be that the manufacturers will not run any risk this year, because they are not sure that the earnings derivable from that campaign would still cover their expenses. They want to make more experiments, and while they are producting the sugar, and before it has reached the market, when they will be able then to realize their loss or their gain, the time for making new contracts with the farmers will have arrived, and unless they have a guarantee that the Government is ready to give them another year they will refuse to renew their contracts with the farmers for another year. They are sure that if they are not protected by this Government, if the 2 cents which were granted to them incidentally are not maintained, they must find themselves in presence of an actual loss for next year, thus rendering useless the purchase from the farmers of the crop of this year. So the grant that is being made now under the resolution proposed by the Minister of Finance would be illusory ; it could not be made use of. Under these circumstances, I think the Government would do well to reconsider the matter, and see what they can do in the way of extending the grant—let them call it an indemnity if they like, if they do not want to admit that it is a bounty. But I think we should face the question immediately. We should be able to do here what has been done in the United States, France, Germany and Russia, and encourage that industry which, if it should prove successful, would became one of the main industries of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Not only have experiments been made in the Province of Quebec, but experiments have been carried out in Ontario, and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Dryden, stated in the Local Legislature that the beet crop in that province produced 10 to 12 tons and, in some instances, 15 and 18 tons to the acre, and that the percentage obtained was from 12 to 14 per cent. of saccharine matter in the beet, the average being over 13 per cent. That is a result which should satisfy a new country, for it would satisfy growers in the old countries, where the cultivation of the beet is better known. This goes to show that the industry when successfully carried on in that province, as well as in Quebec, would furnish an immediate market for the farmers and add to their wealth. It would prove important, not only from a local standpoint, but in the general interest of the whole. We must not forget that the economic position of the older provinces has changed since the opening of the North-West Territories, that we have very powerful competitors there in the growing of grain, and unless we find new markets for the products from our farms, and new markets that will furnish a ready demand, our position may remain as critical as it has been described to have been during the last three or four years. The position of the farmers has been carefully considered by the United States authorities. Their condition is not better than the position of our own farmers. According to official reports, and not merely from hearsay, it appears that many states show an exodus of agriculturists, that farms are being abandoned, that rural properties have depreciated in value. It was undoubtedly one of the reasons why the Congress at Washington adopted the McKinley tariff, which gives protection to the beet-root industry and offers inducements to the farmers as well as to manufacturers to establish beet-root industries. The figures adduced here in connection with this subject are very eloquent. The Minister of Finance told us that our importations of raw sugar were 223,000,000 lbs. in 1889, which means it would have required at least 1,100,000 tons of beet root to produce it, and 50 to 60 beet-root factories required to convert that quantity into sugar, and from that estimate it is easy to see the large amount of work that must be given to the people.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the actual cost of producing a pound of sugar from the beet?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The difficulty has been this, that the quantity here produced has not been sufficient to cover the necessary expenses outside of the actual cost of the beet and its fabrications. It is expected when 10,000 tons can be obtained for each establishment it will afford a sufficient percentage to cover the expenses, and more. But you must produce at first the beet-root of the required quality, and then you have to work it. Take, for instance, the beet as it is purchased from the farmer. It is paid for at the rate of $4.50 per ton, and it is supposed to produce 200, 250, or 300 lbs. of sugar, according to quality. The richer it is the cheaper it will be. This material is next taken to the factory and worked. The sugar may cost 4 cents or 5 cents per pound now, but the cost might be reduced. Experience has shown that the beet sugar produced in the factories at Berthier and Farnham has averaged about 90 per cent., and has reached 95. It is thus evident that the cost of refining is not very great, and I am satisfied that not many years would elapse before this industry will be able to sustain itself; and then, if it should attain the success achieved in France and Germany, it would become, not only a source of wealth to the farmers, but a source of revenue to the Government. Under any circumstances, the Government would not run great risk in assisting this industry. Capitalists outside this Dominion are desirous of risking their own money in the enterprise, and the least the Government should do would be to grant them such help as would encourage them to work two, three or four years more. If they did not succeed, the undertaking would not have cost much to the Government. If they do succeed, I think it will be money well invested, and, as my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) said, it will be sure to bring in a return to the treasury in some other form. I have dealt at greater length on this question than I intended to, but I thought it necessary to insist on the question at issue, when we saw that, although we had not to face that kind of a blockade which Napoleon created during the war against the introduction into continental Europe of the produce from England and the colonies, yet we have another kind of an attempt to blockade, in the shape of the McKinley Bill. Let me point out, though, that the McKinley Bill has not succeeded in preventing us from selling our hay, and I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), who complained about the hay question, that that produce, which was sold at such a low price last fall, has now reached such a fair price on the market of Toronto as to

be quoted to-day as selling at $12.50 per ton. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) had to give some solace to his friends while he advocated the National Policy, and he was obliged, of course, to make them feel that he had not abandoned them entirely. He wanted to show that he was still in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, and in order to justify that opinion he informs us that upon 18 articles of export, he had found that the United States was a better market than England for our farm produce; but I have gone through the Trade and Navigation returns and the hon. gentleman must have been obliged to make big jumps in order to avoid items there which would strike the eye of anyone, and which proved, to the contrary, that our better market was in England, not in the United States. The hon. gentleman, for instance, did not mention cheese. I think that is a product of the farm, and I find that we shipped to England to the extent of nearly $9,000,000 worth of cheese last year, as against $31,473 into the United States. Neither did the hon. gentleman mention cattle, which have been shipped to England to the extent of $4,992,161, as against $488,266 to the United States; butter, which was shipped from Canada to England to the extent of $174,000 worth, against $7,000 to the United States; meats have been shipped from Canada to England to the extent of $359,921 worth, as against $83 to the United States; and of canned meats we exported $28,841 to England, as against $756 worth to the United States. Apples, the produce of Canada, were shipped to England to the value of $1,277,577, as against $233,000 worth sent to the United States; and when we come to see the total value of the exports shipped from Canada to England, as compared with the total value shipped to the United States, we will see that my hon. friend did not do justice to the English market. Instead of exporting only $2,000,000 worth to England and $12,000,000 to the United States, as my hon. friend said, we find that our actual exports to England amounted to $41,499,149, as against $33,291,207 worth to the United States. I am sure that all the arguments of my hon. friend in favour of unrestricted reciprocity were made to try and induce his friends to forgive him, to support the National Policy, and to induce them to support the Government in giving the necessary help and relief to an industry which is now in danger. I shall not detain the House further than to mention that I have received a letter from a gentleman who has taken a great deal of interest in the beet sugar industry, and he says that it will require five years of the continuation of the policy announced by the Finance Minister to secure a full opportunity to the manufacturers of that commodity to test the possibilities of Canada as a field for that enterprise. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the kindness with which you have listened to my remarks.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, as regards the Budget speech of the hon. Finance Minister, there has been a good deal of discussion on both sides of the House, and I shall not weary hon. gentlemen with any extensive remarks on this subject. I am pleased that the Government has thought it wise to lighten the burdens of the people, by removing from one of the necessities of life the heavy taxation to which it was subject; but I would have been much more pleased had they left us in a position whereby a combination of the sugar manufacturers could not have deprived us of much of the benefits that might accrue to us from this reduction in the sugar duties. As the Government were following the steps of the United States in this matter, if they had placed the duty on refined sugar at five-tenths of a cent per pound, as in the neighbouring Republic, instead of at eight-tenths of a cent, it would have left our people in a more favourable position—and not only that, but the Government would have received a considerable amount of revenue from the importation of the better qualities of West Indian sugar. It would also have placed our West Indian importers more on a par with the sugar manufacturers, and would allow some pecuniary profits to those who are engaged in that business. Many consumers prefer the higher grades of Porto Rico, Barbadoes, and other West Indian sugars, to the refined yellows, as they deem, whether rightly or not, that they contain more saccharine matter. Why should not the ship-owners of Halifax, St. John, Lunenburg, Yarmouth, and other sea-ports, have an opportunity, under this revision of the tariff, to supply the people of Canada with a good article of sugar at a cheap rate, instead of, as at present, having all the benefits that can be derived from the trade placed in the hands of the manufacturers? The hon. Finance Minister may say that he has placed sugar No. 14 Dutch standard and under on the free list, and that this is good enough for his table; but while I should not like to doubt the veracity of the hon. gentleman, I would venture to remark that when he comes to put that sugar on his table his better half will have something to say on the subject. Under the present arrangement in the tariff the importation of sugar will undoubtedly lead to litigation and trouble, and the genial and smiling countenance of the hon. Minister of Customs will, I am sure, be clouded, in trying to render an impartial decision in cases where, if the decision is against the importer, it simply means ruin to him. As regards the adding of 5 cents per pound to the Excise duty on tobacco, it is a doubtful factor towards procuring a larger amount of revenue. The Excise duty in the United States, if I understand aright, is 6 cents per pound, and the enormous difference between their Excise and ours will contribute, I fear, to a large amount of smuggling along our border. Customs and Excise duties, it is generally conceded, if carried beyond a certain limit, cease to produce additional revenue. Importation is almost prohibited on the one hand, and production curtailed on the other. I would also ask the hon. Minister of Finance why, in increasing his taxes, he did not increase those on the rich man's cigars as well as on the tobacco used by the labouring man. I was also in hope that the article of cornmeal, which is used so largely by the farmers in the Maritime Provinces for their cattle, would attract the attention of the Government this session. Many farmers in our province use annually from ten to thirty barrels for feeding purposes. As the duty is a direct tax upon them, and the article of corn is one which does not need much protection, owing to our soil and climate not being peculiarly adapted to its growth, I am sure that there is no article the removal of the duty from which would have given more satisfaction. I would like also to call the attention of the Government to the

article of manila cordage for the use of the fisheries. For many years we were allowed to import this article free of duty, but after the inception of the National Policy, of obstructing trade, it was deemed best, in the interests of the manufacturers of Halifax, Montreal and St. John, to tax the many thousands of fishermen all over the Dominion in order that the owners of these factories might become wealthy. This, it was claimed, would so build up these industries that in a short time they would, in competing for trade, be able to sell cordage at a lower rate than we could purchase it from abroad. Therefore the Government placed a duty on all cordage of about 2½ cents a pound, when, lo! instead of competing with one another they entered into a combination, and kept prices at a figure far beyond a reasonable profit on production. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if I am rightly informed, the agents of the factory at Halifax actually sold manila yarns and cordage last season to the fishermen of St. Pierre, Miquelon and Newfoundland for 2 cents per pound less than they disposed of it to the people of our own province. For my own part, I purchase mostly American cordage, as it is better in quality and can be obtained at a price not much greater than the inferior home article, notwithstanding the duty and freight of nearly 3 cents a pound. But I suppose they will all be American factories after this, as I understand that American capitalists have purchased all such industries throughout the Dominion. The following which I have copied from a New York paper exhibits the whole thing :—

"The despatch from St. John, N.B., to the effect that the National Cordage Company of New York has purchased all the cordage companies in Canada that were some time ago organized under the general designation of the Canadian Cordage Company conveys information that has been quietly current in Wall street for some weeks. The price paid is said to have been $2,000,000, and it was paid straight out of the treasury of the New York company. The statement is made that it will add $500,000 to the company's annual receipts. The acquirement of the Canadian companies removes a formidable competitor for the purchase of hemp from the markets of the world and enables the New York people to control the price of the raw material more successfully than heretofore."

This, Mr. Speaker, simply means that every consumer of cordage in the Dominion of Canada must pay the exorbitant prices demanded by this combination, and also, that this combination is sustained by the Canadian tariff, which prevents outside competition. But as these factories will hereafter be worked by foreign capital, the Government, having no further incentive to protect these industries, will, I suppose, take steps to enable our fishermen in the near future to import their cordage free of duty. As I notice the hon. junior member for Halifax in his seat, I would like to ask him what the wholesale price of manila cordage at the Halifax factory is at the present time.

Mr. STAIRS. I cannot say.

Mr. BOWERS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhere in the vicinity of 12 cents a pound, and American cordage can be purchased for 9¼ cents, with 1¼ cents discount, 30 days. Hon. gentlemen opposite may prate of their loyalty, and of the advantages of the old policy; but when I travel through my own county, and witness the vacant houses and abandoned farms to be found there, I cannot but perceive that a policy that brings such a blight upon our people and forces them to emigrate to a foreign land to gain a livelihood must be an absurd and a bad one. There are districts which, within the last ten years, have lost by emigration from 10 to 15 per cent. of their population. I have in my mind a district within twenty miles of my own home that only a few years ago had shipyards, where vessels were built, whose white sails were to be seen sailing to West India ports, to the ports of Boston and St. John, and to many other foreign countries. That was not more than twelve or fifteen years ago. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, you may judge of how much trade there is when I tell you that, a Customs officer dying at that port since I came to this meeting of Parliament, I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact, and asked him to appoint a successor, when he informed me that the receipts at that office in 1889 were only $10, and in 1890 only $1.50; and you can also have some idea of what has taken place in that district when I tell you that from 50 to 75 families have moved from there to the United States within the last ten years. A policy, Mr. Speaker, which hampers trade, and which, like a two-edged sword, cuts both ways, must be a vicious one. As the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) the other night gave us an example of how this policy affected the farmer, I will give you an example of how the fishermen thrive upon it. "B" sent to Boston 200 quintals of codfish, 200 quintals of pollock and 100 barrels of mackerel. He sent for a return cargo as follows :—100 barrels cornmeal, 25 barrels clear pork, 25 barrels kerosene oil, 8 dozen pairs men's rubber boots, 1 ton of manila cordage, 500 pounds of lard, $200 worth of furniture, and $150 worth of hardware. On the return of the vessel the captain renders him an account as follows :—

Sold 200 quintals of codfish at $4.84 per quintal		$ 968 00
do 200 do pollock at 3.00 do		600 00
do 100 barrels of mackerel at $10 per barrel		1,000 00
		$ 2,568 00
Deduct the amount paid for duty on 400 quintals to the United States Government, at 84c. per quintal	$ 336 00	
100 barrels mackerel, $2 per barrel	200 00	
		536 00
Leaving a balance to purchase goods of		$ 2,032 00
Purchased 100 brls. of cornmeal at $3 per brl	$ 300 00	
Duty on meal	40 00	
25 brls. of clear pork at 12c	300 00	
Duty on pork at $6	150 00	
do brls. at 20c	5 00	
1 ton of cordage at 10c. per lb	200 00	
Duty on cordage	45 00	
500 lbs. lard at 6½c	32 50	
Duty on lard at 2c. per lb	10 00	
do 10 packages	0 40	
8 doz. pairs rubber boots at $25 per doz.	200 00	
Duty on boots	50 00	
$200 worth of furniture and duty	270 00	
$150 do hardware do	202 50	
25 brls. kerosene oil, containing 48 galls. each, at 8c	96 00	
25 brls. at $1.50	37 50	
Duty on oil	72 00	
Testing oil, $7.50; duty on brls., $7.50	15 00	
Being a total of		2,025 90
And leaving a balance coming to the shipper on the transaction of		$ 6 10

Now, if we had reciprocal trade what would be the result? It would be as follows :—

200 qtls. of codfish at $2.84 per qtl.	$ 968 00	
200 qtls. of pollock at $3 per qtl.	6 0 00	
100 brls of mackerel at $10	1,000 00	
		$2,568 00
"B." debtor to 100 brls. of cornmeal	$ 300 00	
25 brls. of clear pork	300 00	
1 ton of cordage	200 00	
500 lbs. of lard, 6½ cts	32 50	
8 doz. rubber boots, $25	200 00	
Furniture	200 00	
Hardware	150 00	
25 brls. kerosene oil	96 00	
25 oil barrels	37 50	
		1,516 00
Leaving a balance to the shipper of		$1,052 00

Thus, Sir, you see at the present time, under our glorious old policy, the shipper has coming to him $6.10, while under extended reciprocal trade he would only realize $1,052. Still you will find people, even among our labouring classes, supporting a policy so inimical to their own interests. The policy that supports one class of the community at the expense of another is a bad one, and should not receive the sympathy and support of our traders, farmers, labourers, mechanics or fishermen. Now, that is not the worst showing I can make on the subject. I will just give you another little calculation to show how prejudicially to our interests the National Policy works. In the fishing settlements we also manufacture heavy salted pollock, and I will show you how this industry is injured by the National Policy. C sent to Boston 1,250 quintals of salt pollock, which were sold, clear of freight, at $2 per quintal, or a total of $2,500. After paying the American duty of 84 cents per quintal, amounting to $672, he had $1,828 left, which amount was invested in kerosene oil, as follows:—

207 barrels of kerosene oil, containing each 48 gallons, or 9,936 gallons at 8 cents per gallon amounting to	$ 794 88
Duty on the same	596 16
207 barrels at $1.50 each	310 50
Testing at 30 cents each	62 10
Duty on barrels	62 10
Total	$1,825 74

Leaving a balance of $2.26 to the shipper.

Under reciprocal trade he would have 1,250 quintals of fish at $2.00, equal to $2,500, from which he would have to deduct:

207 barrels of oil at 8 cents per gallon	$ 794 88
207 barrels at $1.50	310 50
Testing	62 10
Total	$1,167 48

Which, taken from $2,500, would leave him the magnificent sum of $1,332.52. Thus, you see he pays to the two Governments over 53 per cent. of the whole amount. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) admits that blankets are 40 per cent. cheaper here than in the United States. He also says that the price of tweeds in Canada are from 20 to 25 per cent. less than in the United States. He adds:

"If he wants proof of that let him go to any seaboard town and watch seamen landing from a vessel. What do the crews do when they come ashore? Immediately each man buys a suit of tweed, some underwear and coarse boots, for they know where they can buy them the cheapest."

If that is so why should the hon. gentleman and his compatriots not require free trade with the United States? Why can we not send in those goods and others and make money out of the Americans? I cannot see why our manufacturers cannot compete with the people of the United States. Again he goes on to take a line somewhat different. He says:

"The best we can hope to do by the National Policy is to keep the price relatively high and that is all we have ever promised to do, and that promise we have absolutely fulfilled."

I grant this without contradiction. That is the trouble, and we wish on this side of the House a policy that, instead of keeping the price high, will lower the price of his living to the workingman of this country. One of the other hon. gentlemen who spoke, I think the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) said, in speaking of pork, that our farmers would not get so good a price for their pork under reciprocity as they do now. Yet, at the same time we keep out corn lest American corn would come in and take the place of Canadian pease. But if corn can be brought in and sold to our farmers for feeding hogs, why should they not be able to raise as cheap pork as the United States' farmers. The hon. gentleman also forgets that when pork is high the lumbermen, and the fishermen, and the people in the Maritime Provinces have to suffer. We are interested in having cheap pork and beef as well as the farmers are interested in obtaining high prices for these articles. Allow corn to come in free of duty and our farmers will be able to raise pork and beef and sell just as cheap as the Americans. But the aim of the National Policy as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) says:

"The best we can hope to do by the National Policy is to keep the price relatively high, and that is all we have ever promised to do, and that promise we have absolutely fulfilled."

Now, is that something to take credit for? Can any hon. gentleman on the other side take credit for a policy which keeps everything high? If so, they can have all the credit they wish. I am in sympathy with all means that will give us more extended reciprocal trade with all nations. I believe in doing away with all obstacles that will hinder a man from purchasing in the cheapest market, and from selling in that market where he can obtain the best results of his labour. In short I am averse to forcing any individual by the means of restrictive legislation to purchase goods whereby his hard earnings are only levers to advance the interests of pap-fed cormorants whom like the daughters of the Horse Leech of Scripture, as told us by the Wise Teacher, are continually crying: "Give, give." If people wish to call me a free trader I shall not quarrel with them, but, as a Canadian, loyal to his country and to whatever I think will conduce to its benefit, I shall take pride in pointing across the water, where the greatest nation on earth has built up its immense commerce by simply allowing the natural laws of supply and demand to prevail in unrestricted trade. True happiness and prosperity will come to the nations of the earth, when, instead of building up walls to coerce and irritate each other, they shall reach out and grasp each hands in free and friendly trade, striking off the shackles that now encumber commerce and trying to do all in their power to promote goodwill and peace toward men. Therefore, I shall

have to vote for the amended motion as read by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I think, Sir, judging by the way the speeches are gradually becoming shorter, that we are coming within a measurable distance of the end of this debate; and I shall not trouble the House at any length with the remarks I have to make, but shall confine myself to the charge of inconsistency made by hon. gentlemen opposite against hon. members supporting the Government. If those hon. gentlemen who have made this charge had read the speeches of some of their hon. friends who preceded them on their own side, they would have found a complete answer to the arguments they made. I find that the hon. member for Huron has completely, to his own satisfaction, proved that the duties upon wheat and flour have not increased the prices of these articles, and he occupied two or three pages of *Hansard* in showing that since these duties were imposed, the prices ruling in Toronto were 10 and 12 and sometimes 16 cents lower than those ruling in Buffalo and other cities of the United States at the same time. In a great many articles you will find that, when the charges are made by one who does not represent an agricultural district, a member for an agricultural district reverses that statement, and proves that the duty put on agricultural products is keeping the prices down in Canada. If any argument were needed to convince the people in the Maritime Provinces that the duties on wheat and flour are keeping down the prices, I have no better evidence to use than those of the hon. member for Huron. I find that the hon. gentleman who proposed this resolution has been in this House for some time. On the 13th December, 1867, Hon. Mr. Fisher, who was then representing the County of York, N.B., when the House was about to concur in the tariff brought in for the first time in that year, moved in amendment:

"That the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, for the purpose of reducing the duty proposed to be put on molasses, tea and several other articles which enter into the consumption of the whole people of the Dominion, and of admitting flour, meal and corn free."

Amongst those who voted against that motion I find the name of Cartwright, who, I presume, is the hon. member for South Oxford. I find that on the 18th May, 1868, Mr. Blake moved:

"That the said amendment be not now concurred in, but that the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with an instruction to strike rice out of the 15 per cent. list and to insert it in the free list."

And I find preceding the name of Carling, in opposition to that motion, the name of Cartwright. Also, on the 18th May, 1868, Mr. Oliver moved a similar resolution:

"That the amendment be not now read a second time, but that the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following animals to the special exemption list:—Horses, horned cattle, swine and sheep, when imported for agricultural purposes by agricultural societies."

And again I find the name of Cartwright amongst those who voted against it. In 1869 or 1870, I am not sure which, Mr. Dorion moved a resolution similar in effect to the second part of the resolution we have now before us, and I also find the name of Mr. Cartwright amongst those who voted against that resolution. So that, when hon. gentlemen opposite charge us on this side of the House with inconsistency or difference of opinion, I think they will find quite as much, if not more, on their side of the House. In regard to this resolution, I propose first to deal with that part of it which refers to reciprocity. I do not think that hon. gentlemen on the other side are so much in favour of reciprocity as they would lead us to believe, because, if they were in favour of reciprocity, they would not attempt at this stage to weaken the hands of the Government when they are proposing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. In 1874, when the Liberal party were in power, Sir John Macdonald said that they should have the most extended relations with the United States, and, if they could not get as good a treaty as they desired, and could not include as many articles in the free list as were included in 1854, they should take as much as they could get. Mr. George Brown, who was then the representative at Washington, declared that that was weakening their hands and was brought up against them when they went to Washington to negotiate a treaty. I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot charge the Conservative party with being opposed to a fair reciprocity with the United States. It is true that the negotiations for the old reciprocity treaty of 1854 were commenced by the Liberal Government, but they were completed by the Conservative Government which came into power before the negotiations were ended. When these negotiations were about expiring, a Conservative Government was in power in Nova Scotia and it sent a representative to Washington. A Conservative Government was in power in Upper Canada and it also sent a representative to Washington, and endeavoured to renew the treaty of 1854. In 1869, the same thing was done, and the Government tried to negotiate a new treaty. In 1872 the Government negotiated the Treaty of Washington. Then the Liberals came into power and tried to negotiate a treaty in 1874. The Conservatives came again into power, and, in 1888, they tried to negotiate a treaty on the basis of the treaty of 1854. In this they failed. In 1866, as Mr. Brown stated in the Senate on his return from Washington in 1874, the Conservative Government went so far in giving away everything we had here, according to his views, that he himself refused to be any longer a member of that Government. Sir Alexander Galt, who was the plenipotentiary of the Government at Washington in 1865, also stated in this House that they offered every inducement to the United States to negotiate a treaty in 1865 or 1866, and that they declined to do so. In fact, he said the only thing they would admit into the United States from Canada free of duty was grindstones, but they proposed so high a duty on other products that it was impossible to negotiate a treaty with them, and he believed it was their object to embarrass the British Government on this continent, and not that they thought the treaty would be disadvantageous to them. In 1874, Mr. Brown was sent to Washington, and, in a paper which he prepared with his coplenipotentiary at that time, he made out his case as strong as it possibly could be made, showing that the treaty of 1854 was more advantageous to the United States than it was to Canada. He went back to 1821 and showed that between 1821 and 1832, during thirteen

years, the United States sent to the British North American Provinces $30,997,417 of home products and $403,909 of foreign products, or a total of $31,401,326, while the entire imports of the United States in the same period from the provinces, including Newfoundland, only amounted to $7,684,559, leaving a balance of trade in favour of the United States of no less than $23,716,767. Again, from 1833 to 1845 the United States sent to the British provinces $54,082,537 of home products, and of foreign products $4,640,332; and all that we sent there was $23,356,275, leaving a balance in favour of the United States in those 12 years of $35,366,594. Then taking the next period of eight years, which is more remarkable still, he shows that the United States sent us $55,072,260 of home products, and $22,020,254 of foreign products, and all we sent them was $36,753,592, leaving a balance in favour of the United States of $40,338,822. In addition to that they had a large portion of our carrying trade which is not shown here at all. Then under the treaty of 1854 he says that in 13 years, according to the United States returns, they sent us $346,180,264 and they took from the provinces $325,726,520, leaving a balance in favour of the United States of $20,454,246. He shows that during the time of this treaty the balance was largely in favour of the United States, that they had also the carrying trade of the country from one province to another, along their canals and railways, which must have amounted to a considerable further sum, as in very heavy articles the cost of transit is about 100 per cent., and in the finest merchandise it amounts to two or three, and some times as high as eight per cent. During the treaty, in addition to the advantage they had in the way of trade, they also had the use of our fisheries free. Now, at that time Mr. Brown made various offers to the United States. He proposed that they should have a treaty based on the same terms as the treaty of 1854; this the Americans declined. He also agreed that manufactures should be added, and asked them to say what they really did want; the Americans declined. In fact he proposed a treaty, a draft of which was drawn out, in which he proposed to give away everything we had, and I am sure that any Canadian reading the treaty must be thankful to the Americans that it was not accepted. He was giving away our fisheries, allowing them to bring in manufactured articles, while their products and everything they had, were admitted free, except for one or two years. They proposed that the clause in the Fishery Treaty, by which the value of the fisheries were to be arbitrated upon, should be wiped out also, and these fisheries were valued at $5,000,000 for the eleven years during which the Americans had enjoyed them. Now, if the Government at the present time are negotiating with the United States, what would be the use for us to cut off all the duties from articles coming in from the United States to-day? What would we have to offer in return? Why, we would have nothing; the Americans would simply tell us that they had everything now and they wanted nothing further. But the Liberal party a few years ago were not so strongly in favour of reciprocity as they are to-day. I find that Mr. Dorion, in moving his resolution, very similar to the one we have now, except that it was somewhat longer, set forth at some length the advantages of trade with the United States. The resolution was opposed by Mr. Mackenzie, who declared that he would not cringe to the Americans, that the Americans were not in favour of a treaty, as the party of protection had got hold of the politics across the border, and he deprecated any cringing to the Americans at that time. Mr. Joly also positively declared that however willing the Americans might be to come forward, he was only prepared to go half way to meet them. Mr. Blake also voted against it, and declared that it was of no use, that we had made several propositions, and that it was cringing to them now to ask for reciprocity again. When the Treaty of Washington was nogotiated it was of some benefit, our fishermen found it to be of some benefit to them, and the country found it also to be of some benefit, particularly in the receipt of the $5,000,000. We find that the Liberal party, then, were opposed to that treaty. They took very strong grounds against it, and perhaps there was no person who took stronger ground against the treaty than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Here is what he said in 1872:

"This treaty proposes that at one fell swoop we should blight and perhaps destroy the prospects of this country. A hundred years ago, after the assassination of John Duke of Burgundy, a Carthusian monk held up to the King of France the skull of the murdered nobleman, and showing the hole made by the battle axe of the assassin, said: This is the hole through which the English entered France and took Paris.' * * * He (Mr. Mills) then holding up the treaty in his hands, said: 'Gentlemen, here is the hole which the American people will use to gain possession of Canada.' (Hear, hear, from the Opposition). 'This is the hole through which they are to be admitted into this country to destroy our union with the British Empire."

A few years afterwards a motion was made in this House by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., looking to a renewal of this treaty. Perhaps there was no person more severe upon this treaty than the then hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron); he said:

"The Premier did not oppose this; he might have given the matter away altogether in order to please Great Britain. Reciprocal coasting regulations were proposed by the British Commissioners. The American Commissioners declined the proposition. The British Commissioners proposed reciprocal negotiations in vessels, a most important interest in which Canada was deeply interested, but the Americans respectfully declined it, and nothing further was heard of it. The British Commissioners proposed to settle the Fenian raid, but this did not commend itself to the Americans. Then the British Commissioners proposed a modification of the reciprocity treaty, but the Americans respectfully declined. The British Commissioners proposed a modification of the tariff with our canals and the St. Lawrence River, but the Americans most respectfully declined.

"He believed that if we gave up the fisheries now we gave them up forever. Because it was a mistake to suppose (as had been stated) that the Imperial Government had promised to give notice of a termination of that treaty in ten years. The hon. gentlemen who thought that the treaty would terminate in twelve years were deluding themselves into a belief that the British Government had promised to give the notice.

"He looked upon the treaty so defective that he thought it better to wipe it out and begin *de novo*.

"The hon. gentlemen declare that the whole press of Canada was first against it and the whole press of America for it. He cited the New York *Tribune* as saying that Canada had surrendered the fisheries which were more valuable than the whole of the rest of Canada.

"Why, says he, what was true of the Americans fifty-eight years ago is true of them to-day. Concession only whets their appetites.

"All the American papers looked upon the treaty as a step towards annexation.

"The only thing now to do was to summon the British flag off the continent. The early victories over Baden were nothing compare do the diplomatic victories. The reading of the treaty was to take place 17th June. The

anniversary of Bunker Hill and the ratification on the 4th July, Independence Day."

So far as the second part of this resolution is concerned, I propose to vote against it, upon the ground that the Government are now in negotiation with the Government of the United States in respect to a treaty; and even if they were not, I do not believe a resolution of this House would in any way facilitate the obtaining of a reciprocity treaty with the American people. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is certainly a free trader. He objects to a duty upon anything. He blames this Government for the duties that Americans place on articles which go into their country. I should like to know how hon. gentlemen can accuse this Government for any duties the Americans are pleased to place on articles entering the United States. The hon. gentleman contends that the people of this country are paying the duties which the Americans place upon their articles and are also paying the duties which this Government places upon articles coming from the States. If the balance of trade has been so largely in favour of the United States it would appear I think that the United States ought to be looking more for a market in this country than we should be looking for a market in the United States. A great deal has been said with regard to the debt of Canada and the large amount collected as revenue, and we are constantly referred to Great Britain. But, I find that in the United Kingdom they collect as revenue $11.32 per head; Gibraltar, $16.62 per head; Malta, $7.09, and in Canada we collect $6.54. If we turn to the Australian colonies we find the following:—New South Wales, $39.18; Victoria, $33.94; South Australia, $41.23; Western Australia, $41.23; Queensland, $39.91; New Zealand, $32.93. I know some hon. gentleman may point out that a large amount of revenue in Australia is derived from public works, but this is altogether aside from public works. Our debt in this Dominion has largely been contracted by the admission of the various provinces, our debt at the time of Confederation being about $80,000,000. No less than $115,000,000 have been expended on railways and $32,000,000 on canals. We have also assumed a large amount in the shape of debts belonging to the various provinces, and in that way the debt has increased. Has not this Government been doing all that is possible to reduce the taxes on the necessaries of life? If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was enforced to-day, we would be paying on tea alone over $1,000,000 and on coffee a very large amount and yet a proposition is now before the House that the taxes should be reduced further than the $3,000,000 that have just been remitted, and I consider this is not a proper time to pass a resolution to further reduce the taxes. In the counties with which I am acquainted the Government is constantly found fault with because it does not expend more money in subsidizing railways and constructing public works. I should like to know how much money the Government of Nova Scotia would have to expend on roads and bridges if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite were now in vogue. I will now take the coal trade and show how the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite affected it. In 1873 the sales of coal in Nova Scotia amounted to 811,106 tons, in 1878, 693,511 tons, in 1890, 1,786,111 tons, in 1889, 1,555,107 tons. The output is at present almost three times that of 1878-79, the last year in which hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. When we consider that 8 or 9 cents of royalty is levied on every ton of coal sold in the province, making the total amount received by the Local Government equal to about $160,000, I think that the Liberals who come from that province, who know the value of the amount of revenue received by the Local Government in assisting them to secure their seats here, should not strike a blow at that great industry of the province. This is the fifth session I have been a member of this House. I have heard the same arguments, the same facts, the same figures given, and the same epithets applied to this side of the House; but the people of the country have weighed the matter, and they have decided to send a majority to sustain this Government. When, for the fourth time, hon. gentlemen opposite find the voice and sentiment of the people against them, they will adopt some new policy. Up to 1886 their policy was in regard to taxation, but that year the policy was changed, and commercial union, or free trade, or reciprocity with the United States, has been their policy since.

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, at this advanced period of the debate, and after the long and elaborate speeches which have been delivered by hon. members on both sides of the House, I presume we all realize with a certain degree of satisfaction that the time has come for short speeches, which may receive as fair a hearing, and are about as efficient as orations of two or three hours duration, to complete the conversion of our hon. friends on the opposite side of the House, to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. Being an old stager, of nearly 20 years upon the Opposition benches, I am not supposed to shower congratulations upon the Government, and especially upon the head of the Finance Minister, for the policy which he has announced in making his financial statement. It is, on the whole, Sir, the same old policy which was inaugurated in 1878, and which after having been modified about as often as an old maid, determined upon pleasing some fellow, modifies her dress, has become the mother of two illegitimate children, bearing the names of "Combine" and "Monopoly." But I do not propose to discuss the principle, and the details of that policy, upon this occasion; it is a work which I have already done in previous sessions, and it has been done again by some of my hon. friends during this debate. I want, Sir, to refer to the statement made by the Finance Minister when he said, that he determined to give to the workingman, what he has called, a free breakfast table, by allowing him to get his sugar free, as he can already get his tea and coffee free of duty. When the Finance Minister gave that information to the House, I regretted that he did not find it proper to give to the workingman, in addition to free sugar, free tea and free coffee, also free bread. If it is thought that no duty should be levied upon sugar, tea and coffee, because they are considered as necessaries of life, I think that there are still greater reasons to allow flour to be admitted duty free, because bread ought to be regarded as one of the most important articles among the necessaries of life. Sir, in my humble judgment, bread occupies a higher rank than tea, or coffee, or sugar, among those articles of food which contribute to the sustenance of human life,

and must of necessity supply the table of not only the workingman, but of every man. I do not know what is exactly the state of public opinion throughout other parts of the Dominion respecting this question, but let the Finance Minister visit the great Province of Quebec, and I venture to say that he will meet there thousands and tens of thousands of people, farmers, artizans, and workingmen of all descriptions, who will tell him that, in their opinion, bread is a far more important article than tea or coffee. They will tell him that it would be better for them, and more profitable for the Government, if duty was imposed upon tea, which is cheap, and flour admitted free of duty. They will tell him that they would prefer to pay a duty of four, or even five, cents per pound on tea than the 75 cents duty which, under the present tariff, they are compelled to pay upon every barrel of flour which they consume. We import a considerable quantity of flour into this country. I see by the Trade and Navigation Returns that last year we imported for home consumption 169,869 barrels of flour, for which we paid $612,953, and upon which a Customs duty was paid of $89,771.23. But, Sir, there is no doubt that a much larger sum has been extracted from the pockets of the consumers to go into the pockets of the mill owners, because of the advanced price of the home manufactured flour, resulting from the duty imposed on the imported article. Last night my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said that we paid no taxation upon flour, because we exported a large quantity of it. I do not share his opinion. His assertion is based upon a principle which, as a general rule, is a correct one, but there are exceptions to some rules, and this case is an exception. If we pay no taxation on flour, why the duty? This duty on flour has been placed there, either to protect some people, or otherwise it has been placed there to blind and deceive some people. It is one or other of the two. We do not import flour into this country because of the scarcity of the article, but there is no doubt whatever that the flour imported into Canada, is purchased at a lower price than the home manufactured flour, or otherwise there would be no reason for the importation. Mr. Speaker, this duty upon flour weighs heavily upon the people of the Province of Quebec. And I see by the official returns that the people of the Province of Quebec consume about one-third of the whole importation of flour into this country. As has been truly asserted by my hon. friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) last night the farmers of the Province of Quebec are not largely producers of wheat. There is a very small number of them who sow wheat, and that only to the extent of a few bushels a year, because they know it is a very uncertain crop; they prefer to sow other grain and buy their flour. I repeat that this duty on flour is regarded as oppressive by the people of the Province of Quebec, because it is levied upon an article of food which in their opinion holds the most important place among the necessities of life. I tell the Finance Minister that so long as he has not removed that odious duty on flour, he has no justification for claiming that he has given the workingman a free breakfast table. Now, Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends opposite have received with enthusiastic cheers the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that he would relieve the burdens of the people of the country to the amount of $2,000,000 a year. I frankly and willingly admit that that is a sound policy. It is a policy which has been praised and recommended by all statesmen who have been regarded as great financiers. It is easy indeed for anyone to conceive that a Minister of Finance, having in his possession a surplus of nearly $4,000,000, has nothing better to do, at least under ordinary circumstances, than to reduce the burden of taxation. But, Sir, if the hon. gentlemen opposite think that they may feel enthusiastic over this change, we on this side of the House have no reason to complain of it. On the contrary, we rejoice over the event, because this change is in accordance with the policy of the Liberal party; and there is not a Liberal in the country, I am sure, who is not satisfied with this change, and does not regard it as a triumph of the policy of the Liberals in this respect. I have noticed, Sir, during this session, as well as in previous sessions, that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they discuss the fiscal question, never miss the opportunity of attacking the Mackenzie Administration. Prominent among those who have done so on this occasion was the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), who I am sorry is not at present in his seat. That hon. member, after perambulating over a vast field of figures, concluded by telling us an old story, which had been already repeated more than a thousand times in this House, that the Liberals had increased the taxation, that they had spent too much money, that their administration had been characterized by deficits. Well, Sir, it is true that the Mackenzie Administration did raise the taxation, but everyone knows that they were compelled to do so by the actions of their predecessors. When they assumed office, they soon found that they had accepted a mortgaged estate, and they saw that with the revenues in hand it was impossible for them to meet the obligations imposed on the country by those who had preceded them in office. So they were compelled to raise the tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent. But, Sir, can this increase of 2½ per cent. be denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as oppressive or onerous, when we know that on reassuming power they increased the tariff from 17½ per cent. to 35 per cent.? Can they denounce as extravagant the annual expenditure of the Mackenzie Administration, which averaged $23,500,000, when they have carried it to $36,000,000 and even $37,000,000 a year? They speak of deficits under the Mackenzie Administration. Well, Sir, there were deficits. The Liberal Administration had only one surplus, that was in their first year. In the other years they were met by deficits; but everyone knows, and every fair-minded man to-day admits, that those deficits were not the result of extravagance in the expenditure of public money, but that they were caused by a great commercial crisis which lasted for years, not only in this country, but in the United States, in England, and all over the civilized world. Owing to that crisis our imports decreased, and there was consequently a diminution in the Customs revenue alone of $3,000,000. That revenue, which was $15,000,000, in 1875-76 fell to $12,000,000. There is the reason for these deficits, and bear in mind that not a single one of those deficits equalled the diminution of Customs revenue alone. But, Sir, the cause of those deficits was beyond

the control of the Government, and there was no remedy for them. I am mistaken, Sir, there was a remedy, and that remedy would have been an increase of taxation. But, Sir, the Government thought, and properly thought, that an increase of taxation in the circumstances of distress which then prevailed would only increase the sufferings of the people. They knew that all classes of our community were suffering from the stagnation of business consequent on the continuation of the crisis, and they thought that the adoption of such a policy as an increase of taxation at such a time would be cruel and inhuman—would be only adding general oppression to general depression. They preferred to wait for the return of better times, fully persuaded that the surpluses of future years would be more than sufficient to cover the deficits of past years. Hon. gentlemen on the other side know all these facts as well as we know them; but when they speak of these deficits, they carefully avoid to mention the circumstances which caused them. Sir, let me say without offence to anybody that in this respect they place themselves in the position of witnesses who tell the truth, but not the whole truth. Before these hon. gentlemen indulge in any repetition of their attacks upon the Mackenzie Administration, it may perhaps be good for them to look at the Public Accounts, where they would find something that should edify them. The Public Accounts show that hon. gentlemen opposite, since they assumed power, although they have collected an immense revenue compared with that of the Mackenzie Administration, have suffered more from deficits. They show that in 1884-85 they had a deficit of $2,240,058.90, that in 1885-86 they had a deficit of $5,834,571.85, and that in 1887-88 they had another deficit of $810,031.16. Sir, these hon. gentlemen have not to justify or excuse these deficits the same reasons which could excuse the deficits which occurred under the Mackenzie Government, because they have occurred in years of prosperity and when these hon. gentlemen commanded a very large revenue. But, Sir, the people of the country know to-day what degree of consideration they must give to these continuous charges against the Mackenzie Administration. Sir, as one who gave that Government his humble support, I am happy to be able to say that I conscientiously believe that the Mackenzie Administration was the most honest and economical Government that ever administered the affairs of this Dominion. Thank God, Sir, to the eternal honour of that Government, under their rule the ears of the people were not soiled. The public mind was not disturbed and the public conscience was not saddened or shocked by reports and evidences that had taken place in any of the public departments of corrupt and scandalous transactions. Let me add here, that it affords deep gratification to his friends in this House and to the people of this country, to see the venerable statesman who was then at the head of the Government, though crippled and disabled by cruel sickness, still occupying his seat in this House—this House, which has witnessed his hard labours, his great efforts, his warm patriotism, where he has worn out the best years of his life and completely ruined his health in the service of his country, with no other reward than the personal satisfaction of having left behind him a political record which will ever be, in the estimation of his friends at least, a model of honesty, patriotism and honour. We have been told, Sir, in the course of this debate, that we are a happy people—a very happy people. Well, I am sure that our condition is better than that of the Indians or of the negroes of Africa. We would not change it for that of the Chinese or even that of the most civilized but oppressed people of some of the European states. But there is a law of nature which constantly impels men to go forward and seek to improve their actual condition. It is a law of progress, which can be successfully stopped in its course by the power of no mortal man. Although we may be a happy people, as compared with others who are placed in a condition inferior to ours, it does not follow that we should fold our arms and remain satisfied with the present and neglect the future. As a whole, we may be a happy people, but there is no doubt that there are, in the midst of that happy people, a large number of persons whose wants cannot be met and whose hopes cannot be encouraged by the actual condition of the country. We are a happy people, but from the midst of this happy people you can see every year thousands of persons leaving their native land to cross the frontier and live with the foreigner. What inducement attracts them hither? They do not leave their own home to satisfy a fanciful taste for travelling. No, it is a sacrifice for every man to leave his country, his relatives and friends: those people go, pressed by necessity and because they hope to find in the neighbouring republic a prosperity which cannot be found in Canada. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said last night that he would not speak of the exodus, and judging from his tone, he appeared to consider that subject not worth while discussing. Perhaps he shares the opinion of those, who in the course of this debate, have stated that there was nothing strange in the exodus, because people in England and Scotland leave the rural districts to go to the great centres, and because people from the Eastern States of America leave them to go to the Western States. But those people, in leaving one place in their country go to another place within their own country. The American goes from the east to the west, but keeps within the United States. That is not the case with our people. They leave Canada for the United States, true, with the hope of returning home, but experience has proved that the greater part of them never return. But the hon. Finance Minister, it appears, has found a remedy to cure the evil of emigration. He proposes to increase our trade with Great Britain, and make that country a very accessible market for the sale of our poultry and eggs. He proposes to develop our trade with the West Indies. This is, if I remember aright, the second time he has made that promise. He made the same promise during last session, and, from all appearances, his journey to those countries, last fall, does not seem to have been crowned with much success. Sir, the hon. gentleman will develop our trade with the West Indies, which, according to his own statement, have the enormous aggregate trade of $4,000,000 a year. He will develop our trade with South America, Australia, China and Japan, in fact with every country he can imagine, except that great country, which, according to the laws of nature, it is most beneficial for us to trade with—the United States. Did we not hear that hon.

gentleman, when he made his budget speech, tell this House that the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 had been a boon to Canada? Did we not hear, during last session, another hon. gentleman, then a Minister of the Crown, tell this House that reciprocity in agricultural products between the United States and Canada would be ruinous to the Canadian farmers. Sir, in view of those disclosures, emanating from two gentlemen, both Ministers of the Crown, and one of them the Finance Minister, I ask how can our people be hopeful or confident that these hon. gentlemen seriously desire to negotiate any reciprocity treaty at all with the United States. As a general rule, when a man wants something, when a representative of the people wants to see a certain policy adopted, he alleges all the reasons he can find and all the arguments he can make in support of that policy. But, on the other hand, when he wants to prevent the adoption of any doctrine, he utters all the reasons and makes all the arguments he can think of which militate against it. But we have been witnesses to a strange spectacle in this House. We have seen hon. gentlemen opposite attempting to reverse that rule; we have heard them, while professing to be in favour of reciprocity—of what kind we do not know—argue all the time against it. Take all their speeches, and one after the other, from beginning to end, was an argument against reciprocity. They took the trouble to tell us that this kind of grain and that other kind of grain was selling at higher prices in Canada than in the United States, that agricultural products in the United States are similar to ours, that the markets of the United States are overstocked with their own products, of which the Americans are compelled to ship a large surplus to foreign markets; and they exclaimed if our markets were thrown open to American products they would be deluged by those products. What is the logical inference to be drawn from such statements? No other than the following:—If the condition of things is such as represented by those hon. gentlemen, reciprocity, under any form, would not be desirable or profitable, but, on the contrary, would be detrimental to Canadian interests. If hon. gentlemen opposite want some kind of reciprocity, why do they not say openly what they want? They tell us they want a fair and just treaty, and that is all; but let me say that a policy defined in such vague terms does not mean much. It does not mean as much as reciprocity in natural products. In my humble judgment it means nothing. After the declaration of the Finance Minister and the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am at a loss to know what has induced the Finance Minister and his colleagues to go to Washington last spring, and to intend to return there next fall to negotiate commercial reciprocity with the United States. But they made promises to the people during the last election. They told the people that they had dissolved Parliament for the purpose of consulting them on this great question of reciprocity, and the fact is that they are now compelled to go to Washington by the pressure of public opinion. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) told us that the Liberals had brought side issues into the election, and that, if we had discussed this question of reciprocity alone, we would not have returned to this House with a corporal's guard. I do not know what was the topic of discussion in the County of L'Islet at the last election, but I do know that in almost every constituency throughout the country the question of reciprocity was the great topic of discussion. The Liberals preached unrestricted reciprocity as they had done before, and the Conservative candidates professed also to be in favour of reciprocity, but of a limited reciprocity confined to natural products. They told the people that, if the present Government remained in power, they would negotiate a treaty which would benefit the farming interest, the mining interest, the lumbering interest and the fishing interest, and permit them to continue protection to the manufacturing interest. If they had not preached that doctrine, I do not say, like my hon. friend, they would not have been returned with a corporal's guard, but I sincerely believe they would have been defeated. They preached a policy which saved them at the last election, and I must admit that, if they could succeed in negotiating a treaty which would satisfy the farming interest, the mining interest, the lumbering interest and the fishing interest, the country would be satisfied. But here the question arises, can they succeed? When we look at the experience of past years, the prospect in not encouraging. We all know that the Canadian Government after the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, made attempts on different occasions to have that treaty renewed or to obtain a treaty on the same basis. They never could succeed. A treaty was negotiated by the Mackenzie Administration through the agency of the late George Brown, but the American Senate rejected that treaty as being too favourable to Canadian interests. We have before us the recent declarations of American statesmen, of Mr. Blaine, Mr. Carlisle, and other leaders of the two great parties who divide public opinion in that country, and they all state that no kind of reciprocity will be entertained except on the basis of the freest commercial intercourse between the two countries. Surely this does not mean reciprocity limited to natural products, but it means unrestricted reciprocity such as is preached by the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen opposite may call it commercial union if they please, but any such measure would have to be such a measure of reciprocity as would be acceptable to the Canadian people. The lessons of the past are not lost for the Liberals. In presence of the numerous but vain attempts which have been made by our Governments to obtain reciprocity limited to natural products, and in presence of the recent declarations of American statesmen, the Liberal party have thought that no reciprocity could be obtained between Canada and the United States unless it comprises the free admission on both sides reciprocally of all products being the respective produce of the two countries. The Liberal party have adopted that policy and have preached it to the people, being convinced that it would promote the interests of our country by a rapid development of its great natural resources, by securing a market for the farming, the lumbering, the fishing and the mining interests and such other interests as might be created by the development of our resources and the expansion of our trade. We believe that all those interests would be satisfied by the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. But there is an element of our people who is ardently wishing for the American markets: that is the

farming class. Our farmers want reciprocity, and they are bound to have it. They form the most populous class in our community; they are the backbone of the country, and they have the power to impose their will. It is that vigorous class which at the last election nearly succeeded in upsetting the Government of this country, and it is that class that will change the Government if satisfaction is not given to it when another occasion arises. Our farmers know the importance of our trade with the United States. They know that from year to year that trade has been increasing and that within the last few years it has exceeded our trade with Great Britain. To-day our trade with the United States is nearly 50 per cent. of our trade with the whole world, notwithstanding the obstacles in the way by the existence of a tariff wall on both sides of the frontier. Our farmers know well that, when they want to sell their surplus of horses, they depend entirely on the American market, and there is no other foreign market for them. They know that when they want to sell their surplus of sheep and of wool they have there their best market. They know that, when they want to sell their surplus of barley, poultry and eggs, there is the only market in which they can sell with profit. They know that, when they want to sell their surplus of hay, there is no other foreign market of any consequence than the American market. That is a commodity of the greatest importance to the farmers of the Province of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen opposite have insinuated that the farmers of that province are wrong in raising so much hay, that they would do much better if they fattened cattle and raised stock with that hay. Let me tell those hon. gentlemen that the farmers of the Province of Quebec are not prepared to receive their lesson. They know what they are about: they know what is to their interest; they know what is best for them as well as they know when they are losing money in an enterprise of any kind, and they are as intelligent as any group of population living, no matter where, on the continent of America. They are the owners of lands which are well fitted for the production of hay, and the cost of that crop is almost nothing. They have raised hay in large quantities since they have found a market in the United States, and they have realized large sums of money by that trade. They know that the New England States are separated from us by only a short distance, that they are within a few hours of us, and that all our products can reach them to-day sooner than can the products of the Western States. By the geographical position of the New England States, they constitute for us one of the best markets which is to be found for a very large portion of the products of the Canadian farmer. Now, Sir, let me add that our farmers have been educated, not by theories respecting this question, but by facts. The facts are there, obvious, staring them in the face, and they speak louder and more eloquently than the fanciful calculations and vain declamations of politicians who do not want to heed them. Sir, I will take the liberty to tell my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), that he may read for the benefit of our farmers as many quotations as he pleases from dreamers and builders of theories, whether they bear the name of Goldwin Smith, or any other name, but he will never succeed in persuading our farmers that by adopting free trade with the United States, by discriminating against England in favour of a country that in return would discriminate in our favour against the rest of the world, he will never succeed in persuading them that they would be guilty of disloyalty against the mother country. They hold that every country has a natural right to entertain with other countries just such commercial relations as can best agree with its own interests. They are a loyal people, but they are not prepared to sacrifice their own interests and the future prosperity of their families to uphold a very respectable but merely sentimental interest. They are a loyal people, Sir, and while they would not raise their arms to strike a parricidal blow at the mother country, they yet feel in their souls, that their intelligence and their hearts, their devotedness and their lives, are due first, second and all the time, to Canada, the home of themselves and their children. Sir, in upholding those sentiments they play the part of good Canadians and true patriots. My hon. friend from L'Islet has told us that the Liberals are prepared, in order to secure reciprocity with the Americans, to concede to them everything without compensation. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that we are prepared to concede to the Americans just as much as they would be prepared to concede to us, nothing more and nothing less. It has not been the practice of the Liberal party to make concessions to the Americans for nothing. When I remember the career of the Conservative party, I find that by the Washington Treaty they have conceded in the past to the Americans, without any compensation whatever, the navigation of the St. Lawrence River, and the use of our fishing grounds. My hon. friend from L'Islet also told us that when we speak of reciprocity, we speak of it in such terms as if our entire prosperity depended upon the adoption of that policy, and believing that he had found an irresistible argument, he exclaimed: "Why, look at the continental nations of Europe. They do not speak of reciprocity between neighbouring nations, and if it is such a good policy as is represented by the Liberals of Canada, why do not the European nations adopt it?" Sir, I shall not undertake to repeat all the reasons which may prevent reciprocity or free trade being adopted among the continental nations of Europe. But I will tell my hon. friend he ought to know that the continental nations of Europe send their surplus to the great British market, which is free to the whole world, and that if England chose to adopt a policy of protection such as they have themselves, they would, perhaps, soon find it to be necessary to make a modification of their protective policy in the interest of their subjects. We know, moreover, that some of those countries are ruled by monarchs who constantly dream of extending the limits of their empires, while other countries are busy in preparing the means of defence against foreign invasion. They must raise immense revenue in order to maintain those enormous standing armies which seem to have made of Europe, during the last twenty years, nothing but an immense barracks filled with soldiers. Sir, they must have immense revenues, and under such circumstances it is likely difficult for those European governments to agree to any measure of free trade among themselves. But if those nations were situated as we are in Canada, with only a few volunteer troops and without a military navy, if they were situated as are the

United States with an army of only 25,000 men supported and paid by the contributions of 65,000,000 of people, then the rulers of those European States might find it beneficial to adopt a policy more in accordance with the principles of free trade between neighbours, knowing that it would promote the prosperity of their much depressed tax-payers. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite, as one of their chief objections to unrestricted reciprocity, that the adoption of such a scheme would cause a loss of revenue and would lead to direct taxation. I have stated in this House on a previous occasion, while speaking on this subject, that if I were convinced that direct taxation would be the consequence of the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, I would repudiate the scheme. But, Sir, I am convinced that this country has resources of many kinds by which we could compensate ourselves for the partial loss of revenue which would follow the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, without being obliged to resort to such an extreme measure as direct taxation. There are many articles which are not taxed to-day, and upon which a tax could be imposed without being onerous to the people. The total amount of taxes would not exceed the amount that is raised to-day; our tariff could be readjusted in such a way as to impose taxes upon such articles as would involve the least degree of burden upon the people. I am sure it would be very much preferable to the tariff of to-day, which weighs down the people with taxes which are not only onerous but oppressive, more particularly on the farmers. Sir, I have no fear of direct taxation. I look upon it as an impossibility in this country. We know men, and political parties are composed of men, when they are in power they desire to remain there, and they cling to power as a drowning man clings to life. I hold that no political party in this country would dare to impose direct taxation on the people, for they know very well that so soon as the scheme was promulgated and adopted, that party would be repudiated *en masse* by the people, that party would be killed and buried under popular maledictions, and buried with no hope of resurrection. I do not fear direct taxation. Even in the ambition of politicians, the people would find this country a guarantee that direct taxation will never be resorted to. A few words in regard to the references to annexation, and I will close. I do not speak often, as hon. gentlemen know, and I refrain especially from my difficulty in expressing myself in the English language, I speak in that language from a sense of courtesy to the great majority of the House who do not understand French. Sir, it is said that the adoption of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, would lead to annexation. I have always thought that no convention could be made between two parties without the express consent of both. When a commercial treaty is entered upon between this and another power, it is necessary to its adoption that it should obtain the consent of the two parties. Sir, this is a principle applicable to political union. No political union can take place between the two powers without the free consent of both, save in the case of conquest by force of arms. I do not know that there is existing in this country any annexation feeling. I do not believe it. But there is one way in which such a feeling could be created, and that is by the maintenance too long of a policy hostile to better commercial relations with the United States. I was a young man when the annexation agitation occurred in 1849. Those who took part in that movement were not impelled to do so by political motives. They did not seek for more liberty than we possessed, but the movement was suggested by economical reasons. Those who shared in the movement sought nothing more than freer commercial relations, and as soon as the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, as soon as it had been put into operation, the annexation feeling which had previously existed, vanished, and vanished I hope forever. It is said that history repeats itself. Why should it not repeat itself in this case. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, give the people reciprocity with the United States and you need not fear that you will ever see an annexation agitation in this country. But, before I resume my seat, let me turn to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Pesiardins), to whom I once again must pay my respects. That hon. gentleman said that the Liberals during the last election campaign had appealed to prejudice. He charged notably the leader of the Opposition with having appealed to popular prejudice on the hustings, by referring to the sad events which occurred in the North-West in 1885. I will not say that the statement is untrue, but I will tell him that I cannot believe it. The hon. gentleman must have been mistaken. I heard the leader of the Opposition several times during the campaign, and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he did not make the least reference to those sad events which we all know are issues gone by. He did not appeal to any of those sentiments which may be considered prejudices. I had the good fortune to hear him on several occasions when he made addresses on the hustings, and I may say that I never heard a more unprejudiced man. But my hon. friend has been known for many years to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who have been in a position to estimate his character, and I am sure that every one of them would feel reluctant to believe that he, the leader of a great party, would not disclaim to appeal to popular prejudices. Sir, my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, speaks on the hustings, as he speaks in the House of Commons, with the same deference towards his opponents, with the same frankness, the same high tone, with the same polite, courteous and dignified language.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to apologise to the House for attempting, disabled as I am, to take part in any discussion of this kind, but I will endeavour at all events to make my fault as small as possible by making it as short as possible. In order that I may do so, I will endeavour as far as possible to confine myself to one aspect of the question. Before, however, I deal with that, I wish to make one general observation in the line which has been followed by one or two hon. members on this side of the House. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the course that has been pursued by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in refusing to disclose his policy before the House is, to say the least of it, most unhappy. The hon. gentleman asks us to do something remarkable. Lord Salisbury only last month from his place in Parliament, speaking of Canada, referred to "the marvellous progress which above all the dominions of the British Crown,

Canada has exhibited in recent years." This progress, which Lord Salisbury described as a marvellous, and greater than the progress of any other dominion of the British Crown, has been achieved under the National Policy. The hon. gentleman asks us to tear up the National Policy by the roots, and he admits, as he is forced to admit, that that implies the loss of many millions of our revenue; and in fact an entire reconstruction of our fiscal policy. In other words, the hon. gentleman asks the people of this country, at a time of marvellous prosperity, to go in for a fiscal and commercial revolution of an enormous kind, and he asks the people to do so, on the strength of an alternative policy which he says he advocates. But he refuses to disclose to the people what that alternative policy is. The hon. gentleman was asked by my hon. friend, the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who I venture to think made one of the finest speeches which have ever been made in this House on this question; in the course of his remarks he asked the hon. gentleman to say, whether the policy which he advocated, implied commercial union with the United States if the people of the United States refused to accept the so-called unrestricted reciprocity, that we are supposed to be discussing in this House; though no one seriously supposes that we are discussing any such question. The hon. gentleman was asked to state whether or not he would accept commercial union if the people of the United States refused his unrestricted reciprocity, and what did the hon. gentleman answer? He said: When I get on that side of the House I will tell you and tell the people what I will do. In other words, the hon. gentleman said: I appeal to the people of Canada to support my policy; I have a policy which I maintain will bring greater prosperity to this country than the policy under which she is now prospering; but do you suppose I am such a fool as to state to the people what that policy is. Let me into such a position that I can work my own sweet will for a while in spite of the people, and then I will let you know, and I will let the people know, what I will do; but until then they shall not know from me. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great many rather masterful utterances from the hon. gentleman since I have had the pleasure and honour of a seat in this House, but I must say, that I never yet heard an utterance from him, which in good, solid, sturdy—well, I was almost going to say insolence to the people of this country—exceeded that. At all events, it was as studied an affront to the people of this country as the hon. gentleman even could very well have managed to offer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What kind of reciprocity was put in issue before the country by the Government at the last election? We are all anxious to know that.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood that the policy put before the country by the Government, was a policy as nearly as possible on the lines of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. That is what I have always understood. I do not know whether that is what the hon. gentleman understood, but I thought there never was any misunderstanding with regard to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As by Mr. Colby, their authorized exponent, for example.

Mr. McNEILL. Here was a simple question asked the hon. gentleman, as to whether he was in favour of commercial union or not, as to whether he was prepared to accept commercial union or not, and he refused to answer that simple question, and he in fact told the people of the country, that they would find it out, if they were foolish enough to put him in power, but not until then. That is the position in which we stand with regard to that matter. I must say, that so far as my judgment goes, the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued in that matter is utterly indefensible. If the hon. gentleman had been asked to give a statement as to the details of this policy, he would have been perfectly justified in refusing to do so; but when the hon. gentleman is asked to state what are the fundamental principles which underlie his policy, and he refuses to do so, then I say that his course is perfectly indefensible. It is of the utmost importance that the people of this country, who are asked to cast their votes upon this question, a question which is fraught with the most serious possible results to them, should know exactly, and squarely, and distinctly, what the policy is which the hon. gentleman pretends to advocate. I say that if the hon. gentleman still refuses to state what his policy is—I can hardly conceive that he will refuse to do so—but if he does refuse, he must consent to be written down in the pages of Canadian history, as no better than a political bandit, or political wrecker, who regardless of consequences, regardless of the suffering and the loss and the misery that it will entail, is prepared to obstruct the triumphal car of his country's progress, and to overset it if he can, in the hope that he may be able perhaps, to snatch some paltry benefit to himself out of the destruction that he has succeeded in bringing about. That is the position in which the hon. gentleman stands in my eyes; it may not be so in the eyes of those who sit on the same side of the House with the hon. gentleman himself. I am quite satisfied that the course he has adopted is not the course his leader would have adopted, had he been allowed to follow his own wishes and instincts. But, Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us that the Conservative party were altogether regardless of British interests when they introduced the National Policy, and that the National Policy has discriminated against British sales in Canadian markets. Now, I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his facts and figures, but I think they will not bear much investigation. I happened to be present on the occasion when the National Policy was introduced into this House. I had not the honour of a seat in this House at that time, but I happened to be present on the floor, and I remember very well that Sir Leonard Tilley on that occasion stated distinctly that the Government, in framing that policy, had been specially regardful of the interests of England, and that they believed that, comparatively speaking, that policy would be beneficial to English trade in Canada. That statement was received with tempests of applause from this side of the House, and yet the hon. member for South Oxford states that the Conservative party had no regard for British interests in that matter. He says that the National Policy discriminated against British sales in Canadian markets. I say that the statement the

hon. gentleman makes is utterly void of foundation, and I can demonstrate that to the satisfaction of every hon. member in this House in three minutes by that clock.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do it.

Mr. McNEILL. I will do it, just to please the hon. gentleman who asks me to do it. I say that British sales in Canadian markets, when the hon. gentlemen came into power in 1873, amounted to $18,000,000; the hon. gentlemen operated for five years, and at the expiration of that time British sales in Canada had fallen to the almost incredible amount of $37,000,000. If the hon. gentlemen had had an opportunity for five or six years more and had been equally successful, I do not know but the name of Great Britain would have disappeared from our financial returns altogether. But it may be said that the cause of this was that there was a depression of trade at that time, and that if we look to the sales of the United States in our markets we shall find a similar falling away. Well, what are the facts? The facts are that the American sales in our markets during the same time did not fall away at all; but on the contrary they slightly but appreciably increased to the extent of $1,000,000 at the same time that the hon. gentleman had reduced British sales by $31,000,000. Now, Sir, what was the case under the National Policy?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). You have failed to tell us how he reduced the British sales.

Mr. McNEILL. I will allow the hon. gentleman to explain that, it is not for me to explain. The year 1879 I leave out of consideration, because the greater part of that year was under the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The National Policy did not come into operation until almost the close of the fiscal year. If I counted the year 1879 against the hon. gentlemen, as I ought to do, it would show an additional falling away of $7,000,000 in British sales. But now let us look at the operation of the National Policy, which the hon. gentleman says discriminated against British sales in Canadian markets, as compared with his own policy. The National Policy began to make itself felt in 1880, and what do we find? Do we find that British sales had fallen away still more? No, Sir; we find that British sales had increased in that year from $30,000,000 to $34,000,000, and never again during the whole course of the time that the National policy has been in force have British sales come within $2,000,000 of the low figure to which they were reduced under the operation of the hon. gentlemen. The year before last they had increased to $42,000,000 and last year to $43,000,000. In other words under the operation of the National Policy British sales had increased 40 per cent., while United States sales increased at the same time only 20 per cent. And yet the hon. gentleman says that the National Policy has discriminated against British sales in Canadian markets. Why, Sir, when I came into the House, the other night, and heard the hon. gentleman, in his stentorian tones, with those figures in his possession, inveighing against discrimination against Great Britain under the National Policy, I could not help being forcibly reminded of the herbivorous champion of another arena, who, we are told, invariably tightly shuts his eyes before he makes his assault. The hon. gentleman, Sir, goes through the country, telling the people of Canada that the United States market is the only market in which they ought to sell their goods. He says that, for almost every article the farmer has to sell, his best market is in the United States. He tells us that it is the great market for the products of our mines, the products of our forests and the products of our fisheries. Well, I join issue with the hon. gentleman. It is true that it is the best market for the products of our mines. It is not true that it is the best market for the products of our fisheries. It is true that last year we sold in the United States $2,850,000 worth of fish, and in the English market, $2,700,000 worth, showing a slight advantage in favour of the American market, but we find that, while the United States were buying from us nearly $3,000,000 worth of fish, they were cutting us out of the English market to the extent of over $4,000,000—acting as our middlemen, and pocketing the profits which our people ought to have. In the products of our forests it is absolutely incorrect to say that the United States are the best customers we have, because last year, while they bought $10,500,000 worth of the products of our forests, we sold in England $14,000,000 worth, and what do we find by a little investigation of these figures? Just as we found in regard to the fisheries, that while they are taking from us these $10,500,000 worth of our lumber, they are cutting us out again in the English market to the extent of exactly $10,000,000; they are selling there almost exactly the same amount of lumber that we sell to them—square and sawn fir and hardwoods, just the same kind of timber that we sell. They either sold the timber that they got from us or they sold an equivalent amount of their own timber, and thus got the benefit of handling our timber and the freight upon it. And while I am speaking of freight I wish to call attention to a point of very great importance which I owe to the kindness of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), who called my attention to it, that is, that in selling that $14,000,000 worth of timber to Great Britain last year, we earned in Canadian vessels alone $7,000,000; so that you must add that $7,000,000 worth of freight to the $14,000,000 worth of lumber that we sold to Great Britain in order to at all appreciate the value of the market we have in England as compared with the market in the United States. And yet the hon. gentleman tells us that the United States is the best market for the products of our forests. I must confess that for my own part I do not greatly regret the fact that we gained that additional $7,000,000 by selling our $14,000,000 worth of lumber to our friends in England, who rejoice in of our prosperity and who glory in our national development, rather than selling our timber to people on the other side of the line who are jealous of and envy our prosperity, even if they are not, as Mr. Mowat says they are, positively hostile to this country. Further, I do not very greatly regret that this $7,000,000 went to the sailors of the Maritime Provinces, the men who enable us to make the proud boast that this young Dominion of ours is already the fourth or fifth maritime nation on the face of the earth. And I do not at all regret, and my constituents will not at all regret, that those who most directly benefit by this $7,000,000 were the

seamen on our Atlantic seaboard, even though they do happen to reside in that portion of the Dominion which has been described by the hon. gentleman, with gracious generosity, as the shreds and patches of the Dominion. I think the North-West Territories is rather a big patch; but we are not here to consider size, but worth, and, for my part, I venture to say that if we are to judge the Maritime Provinces by the intellectual stature of the men they send forth, they are the peers, if not the superiors, of any other province in the Dominion, and Prince Edward Island, though it may be small, is past expression rich and beautiful, glowing, as it does, like a costly jewel in the fair bosom of the Dominion. But Sir, I say that there is here no question of size, or worth, or patches or parts at all, but we are here, in Parliament assembled, to deal with one whole indivisible Dominion, bound together by bands of steel and iron, and by loving, kindred hearts, and by considerations of mutual material benefits. And I say further that any member of this House who expresses himself in this regard, as the hon. gentleman has done, is not only unworthy of the support of the people of this country, but is deserving of the censure of the Canadian House of Commons. Now, as I have said, the hon. gentleman tells the farmers that the Yankee market is the best market for his products. I cannot go into this question as I would like to do, for the House is sufficiently weary of the debate, and no doubt sufficiently weary of my remarks, but this I will say, that while the Americans took from us of farm products last year $13,000,000 worth, the people of England took from us $22,000,000 worth; and before you can fairly compare that $13,000,000 worth, which we sold to the Americans, with the $22,000,000 we sold the people of the mother country, you must apply to it the same principle we have applied to the fish and lumber. You must substract from that $13,000,000 worth, the $5,500,000 worth by which our Canadian farmers were deprived of their own markets by Americans. In other words, while the Americans bought from us $13,000,000 worth of farm products, they sold to us, over the heads of our own farmers, in pork and other products, $5,500,000 worth. If you deduct that $5,500,000 from the $13,000,000, you will find you have $7,500,000 worth left to be compared with the $22,000,000 worth that the people of England bought from us. In other words the farmers of Canada sold to Great Britain $3 worth of products for $1 worth they sold to the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would it not be an advantage to stop this trade with the United States altogether?

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend knows perfectly well the value of the argument I am addressing at this moment to this House, and he knows perfectly well that the remark he is making is a little wide of the mark.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this was an evil.

Mr. McNEILL. What was?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Our trade with the United States.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry my hon. friend has become suddenly so dense. I cannot say of him as Dryden said of Shadwell:

> "The midwife laid her hand on his thick skull,
> With this prophetic blessing be thou dull."

The hon. gentleman knows very well what the value of the argument is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that $13,000,000 was sold by us to the United States, but that we must not estimate that as a basis on which to form any conclusion as to the value of our trade, because we must deduct from that the $5,000,000 which we bought from them, thus reducing the trade down to $8,000,000.

Mr. McNEILL. I have said that before you can fairly compare the value to the Canadian farmer of the market for $13,000,000 worth, which he has in the United States, with the value of the English market, you must deduct the $5,500,000 worth of American produce which exclude his goods from his own market.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad the hon. gentleman understands that now. As I have said, our farmers, for every dollar's worth that they sold in the United States, have practically sold $3 worth in the markets of England. I do not think it would be fair to leave the argument there, because it is true that there are certain products of the farm for which we have a large market in the United States, and for which we had no other outlet in the past. They are very important products of the farm, and it was very valuable to the farmers of Canada to have had this outlet, but I say that for every one of these products, with the exception perhaps of hay and lambs, we have reason to believe that we have a better market in the mother country.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do you not use it?

Mr. McNEILL. We are using it. We are rapidly opening up that market. We have been rapidly opening up a market for our stockers in the mother country within the last few years. The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that the whole market for live stock and Canadian beef in the mother country was opened up by the enterprise of one man, who got some quarters of beef from Slattery, of Ottawa, and took them to Liverpool. He then invited some people to a dinner at an hotel, and circulated through England, by means of the press, the fact that we could produce good beef in Canada, and from that small beginning this $7,000,000 of trade has grown up in a few years. Yet the hon. gentleman talks as if it were not possible to open up markets for our other products in the mother country. Perhaps he has heard that the other day we shipped forty horses to England. We have heard from that side of the House that we could not find a market for our horses in England. Yet the shipment I have mentioned averaged £72 or $360 per horse in the English market. Among them was one which had been offered to a Yankee dealer for $175 and refused, but was sold in the English market for £100 sterling, in round figures $500. Therefore, I think we have some reason to believe that we have a market in England for our horses, and I tell you, Sir, that the market for sheep, which has been falling away in the United States during the last three years to the

extent of 25 per cent., has been increased in England to the extent of 150 per cent. during the same period. The hon. gentleman is drawing me into a discussion which I did not intend to enter upon, but, I may say, that the most important of the products we have sold to the United States in the past was barley. The year before last that export amounted to $6,500,000 out of a total of $13,000,000, or one-half of the whole. Now, we have every reason to believe, unfortunately, that we are going to lose that market for our barley. Last year, the export was only $4,500,000, as compared with $6,500,000 the year before, and this year it will be much less. Not owing merely to the operation of the McKinley Bill, but by reason of natural causes, by reason of the greater production of barley in the Western States, and also from the fact that the brewers are using corn instead of barley in the manufacture of beer, we are going to lose our market for barley there. I have in my possession a letter which was written to the director of the Experimental Farm by one of the principal barley experts in the Province of Ontario, in which he points out how uncertain the United States market is for our barley, and how important it is that we should grow two-rowed barley for the English market, and we have the best reason to know that Canada can grow the best two-rowed barley in the world, and we have an unlimited market for that in England. Mr. Saunders reports that the experiments have resulted in showing 3½ bushels an acre more from that two-rowed barley than from the six-rowed barley. I ask my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) if he does not think that, in view of these facts, there is reasonable ground to think that we shall have a good market in England for our two-rowed barley?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know that we sell to the United States 4,000 horses a year more than they buy from all the rest of the world?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not mistaken.

Mr. McNEILL. How many do they buy from the rest of the world?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). About 13,000.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentlemen is wrong. Our principal competitor is Ireland, and instead of buying 13,000 horses for England last year, they bought 40,000 horses. The hon. gentleman has not got the return from Ireland at all. Our principal competitor is Ireland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. McNEILL. I will ask the hon. gentleman to read the returns from Ireland, and I will sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You had better not cheer an inaccurate statement

Mr. McNEILL. Read the return from Ireland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have the return from the United Kingdom.

Mr. McNEILL. That does not show the number imported from Ireland at all. I told the hon. gentleman that our principal competitor would be Ireland, and he said "not at all." However, the hon. gentleman has drawn me very wide afield, and has taken me away on ground that I did not intend to occupy to-night. But now that I am on this subject, I may point out to the hon. gentleman that even in the matter of potatoes, if he takes the returns he has there, he will find that the people of England paid 90 cents a bushel for potatoes last year; and if he takes our own trade and navigation returns for the year ending June, 1890, he will find that we only got 30 cents a bushel for potatoes in the United States. There is a good margin for an enterprising man to work upon, and yet the hon. gentleman says that, because this trade has not been opened up in the past, it cannot be opened up at all, which is a strange argument for a philosopher.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do you not go in and make a fortune by shipping potatoes to England?

Mr. McNEILL. I may. I have not said I would not. I only made the discovery the other day. Now, this United States market is the market to gain which we are asked to make all the sacrifices which are demanded of us. I will not reiterate what has already been said, and what I said myself here three or four years ago, as to the effect of such policy upon the agriculturists of Canada, that they would be flooded with American coarse grains, with their scrub cattle from Texas, with their oleomargarine and butterine which hon. gentlemen opposite were assisting us a short time ago to keep out of Canadian markets. That branch of the subject has been pretty well threshed out, but I will make one remark further. In addition to the destruction one by one of our manufacturers by the unfair competition of rings which would be made for the purpose of crushing them out, in addition to the loss of $16,000,000 of revenue which would have to be made up by direct taxation (which the hon. member for South Oxford said was a good thing on the whole, but which the hon. member who spoke last said he would never support), this policy which the hon. member for South Huron asks us to adopt calls upon us to discriminate against British goods in our markets. The hon. gentleman told us when he addressed us first on the subject that this was of the essence of his policy. There certainly has been some misunderstanding on that subject in the Province of Ontario. A good many gentlemen on the other side denied that it was the intention to discriminate against British goods, and I know that in my own riding it was stoutly denied that such was the intention, but the other day the hon. gentleman told us this was involved in his policy. Lord Lansdowne said on the last occasion he addressed a public assembly in Canada, that such a policy would be a moral affront to England. Mr. Chamberlain says that this would absolve England from any obligation to come to our assistance in case of necessity. Mr. Wiman says it would probably involve what he calls another Boston tea party, and the kicking the British Crown out of Canada. We need no one to tell us that this would mean peril to our connection with the empire of which we form a part. For the sake of the American market, we are asked to go in for this policy. Hon. gentlemen know that they cannot stop there. They know that the so-called unrestricted reciprocity which we are discussing will not be entertained on the other side of the line, and that the only reciprocity which will be entertained there is one which the hon. member for

North Norfolk was, I believe, quietly advocating during the last campaign, and which the hon. member for South Oxford has refused to repudiate and that is commercial union. That means that we are to place ourselves at the mercy of a nation which regards us with envy if not with enmity. We are asked to forego all we have gained in order to arrive at that result ; we are asked, as I said, to cast ourselves utterly at the mercy of that country —not to cast ourselves into their arms, but to cast ourselves under her feet, and to discriminate in our markets against the country by whose support alone we have been able to maintain ourselves as an independent people on this continent. We are asked to discriminate against her in our markets, we are asked to offer her what we have been told by one of her leading statesmen would be a moral affront, and we are asked to cast ourselves under the feet of the country which has endeavoured to deprive us of our fishing privileges on the Atlantic, and which has not scrupled, on the Pacific, to seize our peaceful shipping on the high seas, to confiscate them, to pillage them, and to carry them off captives into American ports. This is what we are asked to do, and I want to ask if there is one sensible man, or any man with one generous impulse in his breast, who will consent to accept such a policy as that when it is understood ? I say it is a policy that is unworthy of any country which has one particle of self-respect. But there is a policy which we might adopt with advantage, and that is a policy, not of going on our knees for the eleventh or twelfth time to the United States, and begging for something which they tell us they will not give us, but it is to offer to the mother country discrimination in our markets in favour of her goods and asking her to give us discrimination in her markets in favour of our goods. That is the true policy for Canada to pursue at the present time, and, Sir, I say that that policy is one which, if we only addressed ourselves to it with one-half the energy that has been employed to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, or whatever else you choose to call it, with the United States, we could obtain and carry into effect. There has been such a change in English public opinion during the last few years in reference to this question and kindred questions, as is simply marvellous to any one who knows, as I know from a residence in England of some thirty years, what the feeling in England was some years ago. Why, Sir, a few years ago any man who ventured to get up upon a public platform and advocate preferential duties in the English markets for colonial goods, would have been regarded as poor Malvolio was, a man tainted in his wits. But what do we find to-day ? We find to-day that that policy is advocated on platform after platform all through England ; we find that it is advocated in Sheffield, in Birmingham, in London in Leeds, in Liverpool, in Manchester, in every other centre of British industry, and it is not received with derision, but it is received with tempests of applause. And, Sir, not only so, but we find that the press are beginning to support that policy, we find many of the leading organs of public opinion in England, notably the London *Times*, endorsing that policy, and we find that within the last few days almost, within the last few weeks at least, a society has actually been organized in England, comprising among its members one hundred members of the British House of Commons, I believe at the present time—it had some 60 or 70 members of the House of Commons the last time I heard of it, but the number has since increased, I believe, to 100 members of the British House of Commons who are advocating that policy. I see further that this society appears to have been formed in consequence of a statement made in the House of Commons by no less an authority than the Imperial Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. MULOCK. What did Lord Salisbury say upon the question ?

Mr. McNEILL. I will tell you in a few moments what he said. But what did Mr. Goschen say which induced those gentlemen to set about forming this society to advocate this policy ? Mr. Goschen said :

"He protested against the view that under no circumstances could we make fiscal arrangements with our colonies without endangering other portions of the trade,"

And he added :

"What chance or hope have the colonies held out to us that they are ready to move in this direction ?"

Now, I think that is an invitation to the colonies that is plain enough, and that invitation is endorsed by a subsequent invitation made in the columns of the London *Times*, in which, I think, that journal says that the Canadians have time and again offered better trade relations to the United States, but never once to England, and they invite us to do so. Now, Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to argue the point that this would be a good policy for Canada to adopt. That, I think, will be admitted by every gentleman in this House, and I think it is sufficient to say that there is good reason to believe that if we only made a strenuous demand for such a policy, we would get it. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) asked me what Lord Salisbury said. Lord Salisbury received the deputation in such a manner that they were so thoroughly encouraged by what he said that they set about at once starting an agitation in England.

Mr. MULOCK. They are very easily encouraged.

Mr. McNEILL. Have you read what Lord Salisbury said ?

Mr. MULOCK. I have read the report of it that appeared in the papers.

Mr. McNEILL. How did you get your report ? By cable, I suppose.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, I suppose it was the cable report.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, that is the Yankee version of it. Read what Lord Salisbury said, as reported in full in the London *Times*.

Mr. MULOCK. The report I read was published in the *Empire*.

Mr. McNEILL. I believe it came by cable through American sources. I consider Lord Salisbury's views most favourable, at least as favourable as any Minister in Lord Salisbury's position could possibly be expected to express them under the circumstances. Now, in my opinion what we ought to do is to say plainly that we will give Great Britain an advantage of 10 per cent. in our markets, we will reduce our tariff to that extent as against the foreign goods, if she will give us an advantage of 10 per cent. in her markets. I venture to think that if such a policy as that were adopted, even hon. gentlemen opposite would

have to admit that Canada had become a prosperous country; I think there would be such an increase of prosperity in all the channels of trade in this country, that we would all be astonished at the result in a very short time. For my part I cannot understand how any man who is a British subject can refuse to apply to Great Britain to grant us such terms as those we have asked from the United States, not half a dozen times, but a dozen times, in order to get access to their markets. Why should we not ask the United Kingdom once to give us better terms in her markets? We have been told that she will never do it because the volume of colonial trade is so very small as compared with the volume of Britain's trade the world over. I will conclude my remarks by reading, in reply to that argument, what Lord Salisbury himself said on the 10th of November, last year:

"We know that every bit of the world's surface that is not under the English flag is a country which may be and probably will be closed to us by a hostile tariff, and therefore it is that we are anxious above all things to conserve, to unify, to strengthen the empire of the Queen, because it is to the trade that is carried on within the empire of the Queen that we look for the vital force of the commerce of this country."

That is a sufficient answer to those who say that this will never be granted because the people of England regard colonial trade as a matter of comparatively small importance.

Mr. EDWARDS. We have listened to such a speech as we might expect to hear from an Imperial Federationist.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to speak for a moment. We do not seem to be within measurable distance of the end of this debate, if that measurable distance is to be found within the small hours of the present morning. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), if he thinks it possible for his side to close the debate by 3 o'clock; if it is not possible for him to do that, whether we cannot come to an arrangement by which the debate may be closed on Tuesday, at an early hour.

Mr. LAURIER. I can say to the hon. gentleman that it is not possible to close the debate by 3 o'clock, or at any reasonable hour during the present sitting. Several hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared and anxious to speak on this question, which is a very important one, as hon. gentlemen know, and we have not yet given up the hope of converting hon. gentlemen opposite, or at least some of them. I think, however, we can agree to take a division on Tuesday, at as early an hour as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think the hon. gentleman had better move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will not detain the House very long. I began my remarks by saying that we had just listened to such a speech as we might expect to hear from an Imperial Federationist. Some years ago, before Confederation, I believe, the Province of New Brunswick in its tariff arrangements discriminated against the United States, and passed a Bill to that effect. I understand that Bill was disallowed by the Home Government. The same principle that prevailed in England then, prevails to-day. England purchases from the nations of the world the food for her people as cheaply as possible, in order that her manufacturers may prosper, and in order that she may compete with and send her manufactured products to even such highly protected countries as the United States. I do not believe at all in this Imperial federation fad——

Mr. DENISON. You do not understand it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Perhaps I do not understand it, but I think I do understand it; and I will show that the hon. gentleman that has just spoken does not understand the interests of the farmers of this country or of the great producers of the natural resources of this country. In the course of his remarks the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) referred to the question of horses, and I will settle that question just here. He said that England imported more horses than we sold to the United States. What is the fact? We sold last year to the United States 16,000 horses, while the total number imported by Great Britain was 12,000. In the course of the hon. gentleman's remarks he also stated that we had introduced the sale of our beef "stockers" into the English market. Before I close my remarks I will show that it is to the interest of the farmers of Canada to feed their cattle here and then send them to England, instead of sending cattle over there and sending over the material to fatten them, the English farmer not only having the profit on the fattening of the animal but also the manure. The hon. gentleman began his remarks by referring to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The ministerial side of the House seem to have a special delight in abusing that hon. gentleman. They seem to have but one policy—the retention of office at all cost, and the abuse of the hon. member for South Oxford. I heard the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) speak the other day, and I understood him to ask: How will you raise the revenue? I do not remember him saying anything about commercial union; perhaps he did so. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said: I will show you when we get there. I do not think it is his business to tell hon. gentlemen opposite how he will manage public affairs, but I am satisfied he will manage them in such a way as to promote the best interests of the country. He will aid in giving this country honest government, and he will act in such a manner that we will not have such disclosures as we are now having every day. We have always maintained that this country has been corruptly governed, governed by purchase, and the facts are now coming to the surface. The party now in office will soon go out of power in a far more ignominious way than they did at the time of the Pacific scandal. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) next referred to the sale of British goods in this country during the time of the Mackenzie Administration. If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite would have averted the commercial depression that then existed, then if there is one thing for which the Tory party should be held responsible more than another it is that they did not introduce their great National Policy four years sooner and have saved the country from the great depression which prevailed. I understand that previous to the time when the Mackenzie Administration went out of power great pressure was brought to bear on them to raise the tariff. I under-

stand that hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then sitting on this side of the House, watched very carefully the course of events, and it was their intention, if the tariff had been raised, to adopt the policy we are now advocating, and leading speeches were prepared for delivery; and if they had been delivered, and if that policy had been adopted, the very hon. gentleman who has just spoken would be here to-day advocating the policy we now present. Above all things, however, that a Tory member knows is to have no mind of his own but to follow his leader. The hon. gentleman next referred to our forest products, and said our exports to Great Britain last year were of the value of $14,000,000, while the receipts from our vessels for the carrying of same were $7,000,000. That would make the cost of exporting our goods to England one-half of the total value. Such is not the case, and I may say that a very small portion indeed of the products of our forests go from Quebec or the St. Lawrence in Canadian vessels. I am sorry to say so, but it is the truth. The hon. gentleman also stated that the English market was the best market for the products of our forest. I happen to know something about this particular question, and I say that the American is a far more reliable market for the product of our forests than is the English market. In the English market the products of almost the entire world centre. It is a flickle market, while the United States is a far more uniform market for our products, and in a general way it is a far more satisfactory market. The hon. gentleman said it was true that we had in the United States a better market for our hay and lambs; but for no other article of farm produce. I think, before I get through, that I will prove conclusively that there are other products of the Canadian farmer which find a better market in the United States than in England. I am a lumberman, but I represent a farming constituency; there was a time when a great deal of lumbering was carried on in that constituency, but to-day there is very little lumbering, and while I feel it my duty to advocate the interests of all our industries which are natural to the country, I feel it my duty, above all, to advocate the interest of the great farming industry. Every hon. gentleman in the House knows that we require only to look at the table of our exports, in order to ascertain that the farming industry is the most extensive which we have in this country. The exports of the farming industry are more than double that of the lumber industry, and the remarks which I will address to the House will be more in advocacy of the farming industry than of our other industries. While I admit at once that England is the largest market for our farm products, at the same time I contend very strongly that the United States is also a very important market in this respect, and that the United States buy from us products of the farm, which England buys to a very limited extent indeed. I will begin by taking that very product of the farm to which my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) referred. We exported last year to the United States, 16,118 horses, and only 125 horses to England. I have not the returns for last year, but in 1889, the total import of horses from all countries into Great Britain, was 12,456. This proves conclusively that the United States is the market for the surplus horses of Canada. Now, the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby), in the course of his remarks the other night, said that he would make the Canadian lumberman eat Canadian pork, and on the same principle I presume he would make the Canadian farmer sell all his horses to Canadian lumbermen. I think, however, there is a good deal better market for our horses than that. In Canada, we always have a large surplus of horses for sale. The United States is our only market outside of the home market; and the United States market being debarred from the Canadian farmer he has simply to sell his horses at such a price in this country as the purchaser is willing to pay for them, for the reason that there is no competition. Situated as we are on the northern portion of this continent, we will always be large producers of horses, because we produce the cereals which are best adapted for feeding and growing horses. Such is not the case in the country to the south of us. As the southern states of the union develop, the demand for horses in the United States must increase. The corn raised in the United States, on which they feed their horses, is a fat producing material, while the oats and other cereals which we grow in Canada produce bone and muscle, and therefore we will always have the best horses on this continent. These are evidences that, in the American market, we have the very best market for our surplus horses. My hon. friend admitted that the United States market was the best market for our lambs. He could not very well deny it, from the fact that we sold last year, to the American market, some 251,640 sheep, while we sold in the English market only 57,000. It may be argued that the United States also sends sheep and horses to Great Britain, but that argument will hardly hold to any extent, when the statistics are enquired into. Last year the United States sold only 236 horses, and 6,464 sheep to Great Britain. Let me ask why is this? It is for the reason I have given before; that a large portion of the American union has a warm climate in which sheep and horse raising will never be profitable, while in this northern clime we can grow them profitably. As that country fills up, and as we develop, as I hope we shall develop, that demand will increase, and naturally we will always have a demand for our sheep in the American market. Now, let us take the question of barley. I am dealing chiefly with the articles which we sell largely to the United States, and which we do not sell largely to England. We sold last year 9,939,745 bushels of barley to the United States, and we sold 27,132 bushels to England, while the United States sold only 987,000 bushels of barley to Great Britain. Here is another article which we produce, and for which the United States is our only market. It may be said: Oh, we we can grow barley that will be used in England. An attempt is being made to do that, and so far as I am aware, up to the present it is a failure. The particular barley we raise in this country, is the kind the United States require; and England does not require and does not buy it. I understand that there is a very small portion of the United States in which that particular kind of barley is grown. Here, then, is an article for which the United States must continue to be our customer. Now, take the article of hay. Last year we sold 101,713 tons of hay to the United States and 10,408 tons to England. Now, I will admit at once that I regret that so much of our hay is being sold out of the country. I think it is desirable that our hay should be used in the country; but, Mr. Speaker, as you are very

well aware, there are many new portions of this country where the farmer has nothing to sell but his hay. The settler, in the early period of his settlement, when he clears up the land, finds that hay is the easiest crop he can raise, and the crop from which he can most directly realize ; and under the condition of things that exists to-day he has either to content himself with such a price as he can obtain in this country, or pay $4 a ton of duty for the privilege of shipping his hay to the United States. Take potatoes. We sold last year to the United States 1,053,230 bushels, and to England only 724 bushels. A very considerable portion of this country, right about us here, sells largely of its potatoes ; and if hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe that it is in the interest of the farmers of this country to have a free market in the United States in which to sell their potatoes, there is one thing certain, that the farmers themselves thoroughly believe it, because last autumn they suffered very considerably for they had a large quantity to export, and they severely felt the enhanced duty upon them. Now, it is argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that England is the great market for all our products. I think I have shown that there is at least a large list of agricultural products which we sell in the United States and do not sell in Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen who refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns will see that our large exports to Great Britain are in cheese and in beef. In those articles the United States is also a large exporter to Great Britain—in beef many times larger than we are, in cheese not quite so large. Those articles I do not claim very much for ; they do not come into the argument to the extent the other articles do, for the United States is a competitor with us in those articles in the English market. But, Sir, I want now to show you how the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat desires to encourage the Canadian farmer. He referred to the fact that we sold our stockers to Great Britain, that is, the animals to be fattened, and he seemed to glory in the fact. We on this side of House advocate free corn, and why ? We advocate free corn because the English buyer buys corn in Chicago, freights it to Liverpool, and lays it down there at a lower price than we can get it for in this country, paying the duty on it. The result is that he is able to fatten the lean animals he gets from Canada with corn purchased from the American producer, and in that way entirely beats the Canadian farmer. Is that justice to the Canadian farmer ? The Canadian farmer who understands the subject best will say no. It is argued on the other side of this House that if the condition of things we desire to bring about is introduced, the productions of American farmers will pour into this country, and the Canadian farmer will be swamped. I deny the statement. Last year we sold to the Americans $11,219,000 worth of agricultural products, while we imported, all told, $5,343,000 worth. If the United States market is made a free market to us for those materials that we already sell to them, we shall sell them manifold more, and our trade in that direction will be very largely increased instead of diminished. The argument regarding the beef applies in exactly the same way to our dairy products. We are to-day proud of the fact, that we are larger exporters of cheese to Great Britain than is the United States. We desire to increase our butter export in the same ratio ; and if we are to accomplish that end, on the same ground we desire to have American corn free—why ? Because it is one of the best materials on which to feed dairy stock. But the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby), I suppose, would force the Canadian farmer to raise corn in this country, whether he can or not. I suppose he would make the farmers in some of the northern parts of the Province of Quebec grow corn. He would force us to raise cotton in this country, and I suppose he would force the south to grow icebergs. There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, we cannot get over; we cannot get over geographical conditions or climatic conditions. We on this North American continent have a variety of climates, and also a variety of products. The south produces materials which we require, and we produce materials which the south requires. Commerce is nothing more nor less than the interchange of the surplus products of labour. It is against reason and against nature that the producer of materials in the north and the producer of materials in the south should meet at a certain line and be told that past that you shall not go to exchange the surplus products of your labour. Mr. Speaker, I am in principle an out-and-out free trader. I look upon a protective tariff as nothing more nor less than a robber's tariff. I say that under a protective tariff the labourer does not enjoy the fruits of his labour. Under a protective tariff, a large portion of the earnings of the labouring man goes into the pockets of the monopolists and those for whom this tariff was framed. We are told that if we entered into such an arrangement as will enable the producer of natural products to exchange his products for the materials he desires from the more southern portion of the continent, such an act would be disloyal. Well, I have yet to learn that a fair exchange of the surplus products of the labour of one country for the surplus products of the labour of another is disloyal, but I am very glad to say that we who, for the last four years, have been described as a lot of disloyal men, now find that hon. gentlemen opposite can only discover one disloyal man in our midst ; and in a few days too he will no doubt be proclaimed a perfectly loyal man. In my estimation he is a perfectly loyal man, because he desires to legislate for the masses and not for the classes of this country. A comparison is made between the trade of this country with the United States and its trade with Great Britain, but the cases are very dissimilar. We border nearly four thousand miles on the American union, while Great Britain is three thousand miles away ; and while every true Canadian desires to develop trade with Great Britain to as great an extent as possible, he also desires to develop trade with the United States. The great difficulties of the tariff as between the two countries are these : The products of the different portions of the country east and west, are different. The requirements of the people are different, and a tariff that suits British Columbia does not suit the lower provinces. This country, ever since the introduction of this policy, has been governed with great difficulty, because it is perfectly impossible to frame a tariff satisfactory to the whole, and while we all earnestly desire to remain a portion of the great British Empire, we are far more likely to ensure the continuance of that connection by having such arrangements between ourselves and the United States as will not lead to friction and diffi-

culties between the two countries. If we are to make this country the country we all desire it shall be, we must have a contented people. We must not have in the west a people who are discontented because of conditions that suit the people in the east, and *vice versa*. Under reciprocity, such as we desire to bring about, no such difficulties can exist. But we are told that if we introduce this policy, if we obtain reciprocity with the United States, the result will be political union with that country. I do not believe any such statement. I believe, as I stated before, that the way we can best avoid that contingency is to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the United States. The last speaker referred to the question of commercial union. I will say at once that, so far as I am individually concerned, much as I desire and much as I believe it is in the interests of this country to have reciprocal trade relations with the United States, if such can only be obtained on the basis of commercial union, I am opposed to it, and I will tell you why. Because if we should have a commercial treaty with the United States whereby we would be obliged to adopt their tariff, and if their tariff is maintained as high as it is to-day, I claim the farmer, the lumberman, the fisherman and the miner would be placed in a very detrimental position indeed. I would be opposed to any such scheme, but the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford is exactly in accordance with my views. This question of reciprocity is one question but we have another great question. The people of this country have been burdened for years by an unjust and infamous tariff, a tariff opposed to the producing masses of the country and in favour of a few manufacturers. We have manufacturers in this country who do not require any such protection, and there is no manufactory existing that ought to exist where any such protection is necessary; and I say it is in the highest interests of the country that those burdens should be removed, and that we should return to a revenue instead of a protective tariff. We are asked on the other side: how we are going to raise a revenue? I reply that the present tariff is not a revenue-producing tariff. It produces a revenue for a few manufacturers, but not the revenue it should for the treasury of this country. The best policy we can adopt is a policy which will enable the people of this country to purchase in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. The population of any country, and the population of every country, are best employed in producing those resources which are natural to the country, and exchanging their surplus products for the surplus products of other countries which are natural to them. That is the natural course of trade, and any artificial means which hinders that condition of things is a policy which is detrimental to the best interests of any country. What is the condition of the United States to-day? Are not the people there waking up to the fact that they have been living under a system of tyranny for many years? Are they not now shaking off that system? Yes, they are shaking it off, and they will shake it off; and, when that becomes a low tariff country instead of a high tariff country, it will take a place among the commercial nations of the world. What is that country to-day? It is simply a country with an inter-state trade. It has no foreign commerce. It pays its foreign debts with raw produce because it cannot compete with Great Britain in the markets of the world in manufactured goods. If this country is to be the great country we hope it will be, we must not continue a similar policy. We are told time and again that we cannot get reciprocal trade relations with the United States. If we cannot obtain reciprocal trade relations, there is one thing which we can do. We can skake off the fetters which to-day are crushing to the earth our farmers and others, and afterwards we can endeavour to obtain the next greatest boon, and that is the free interchange of products with the great American nation to the south of us. In speaking strongly as I do about my own desire to remain a British subject, I do not for a moment reflect upon the country to the south. I have the greatest admiration for the people of the United States and for their grand country, but I believe and have always believed, since I have been able to think upon such subjects, that it is desirable in the interests of both countries that the two systems of government should continue to exist upon this continent. That is a very large and populous country. There can be no doubt that within a few years the United States will have difficulties to encounter. They have a great diversity of climate. They have the great north and the great south. In this country we have only the great north. We are a homogeneous people. For my part, I do not desire political union with that country, and I do not think it is involved in any discussions that have taken place on this side of the House, but give us the conditions we desire, that is, remove this high and infamous protective tariff which we have, and, if then we can get a fair treaty with the United States, we, a vigorous people, as we are—and the people of the north are always more vigorous than the people of the south—will compete in the markets of the world with any country in existence. I for one believe that, if we had been a little more favourably geographically constructed, it would have been better for us. We have a very great length and we have not very much breadth. That is against us in some respects. But, even with those disadvantages, give us a fair field and no favour, and we are afraid of nobody. I do not think I will take up the time of the House much longer. I have been dealing with the agricultural industry, and I will refer for a short time to the lumber industry. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) say that the National Policy had been helpful to the lumberman of this country. If taxing everything that a man buys, everything that a producer uses in the course of his business is helpful, then it is helpful. What is the position of the Canadian lumberman?

Mr. MASSON. Wealthy.

Mr. EDWARDS. If it were possible for you, Mr. Speaker, to take part in this discussion, I am sure you would tell the House that of all the men who have embarked in the lumber trade in the Ottawa Valley, not more than 10 per cent. have succeeded. You would also tell the House that at the present time the lumber trade is not in a very prosperous condition, when

half the lumber mills in the Ottawa district are not running. There is a large mill that produced about 50,000,000 feet a year, that shut down last fall and is not running now, and I do not know if it ever will run again. Then a large mill was burned down last winter and is not going to be rebuilt, so I understand. The lumber trade is in this position in Canada: It has to compete in England with all the producers of the world, and in the American Union it has to compete with the products of that country. The use of the American southern pine has been gradually marching northward until some of it is now used even in Canada. If there is one industry, next to the agricultural industry, in whose interests reciprocity would be beneficial, it certainly is the lumber trade. The member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in discussing the lumber trade a few days ago, pointed out some of the difficulties that in his opinion existed, but he did not point out any remedy, but left that to the Ministry. That is the question of the export duty on logs. This question of the export duty on logs is thoroughly well understood. The duty on lumber going into the United States used to be $2 a thousand. When the export duty on logs was taken off, the duty on pine lumber was reduced to $1 a thousand. Should the export duty on logs be reimposed, the duty on lumber going into the United States would be raised to $3 a thousand. Of course, the member for Muskoka is a protectionist and I am a free trader. In my opinion the export duty on logs should never have existed and should not be reinstated. In his view, being a protectionist, I have no doubt he thinks that it should be; but what will be the consequence if it is? I will simply say this to the Government—as I may not have another opportunity of saying it—that the conditions of the lumber trade are such that if the duty were reimposed, and if the $3 duty were charged on lumber going into the United States, every single saw mill, at least on the Ottawa River, would have to be shut down. I sincerely hope that the Government will not reinstate that duty; I do not believe they will. If it was in the interest of this country, if it would benefit the whole people to reimpose that duty, then I would say: Put it on. But I do not believe it would be beneficial. An hon. gentleman opposite said the other day that the lumbermen were all rich. I will tell you how rich they are. They are rich to this extent, that they have gone to the public sales of the different provinces and bought limits at very high prices; they have constructed dams and slides and river improvements, that have cost large amounts of money; they have constructed mills that have cost large amounts of money, and their total wealth, if they have any, consists in those materials. What are the conditions now? The trade is taxed, as I say, on every article of import that is used by the lumbermen. The Provincial Governments are taxing them highly, both on the direct product and in the way of an annual rental on their holdings. There is another great enemy to the interests of the lumbermen, and it is a great enemy indeed. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me in the statement that three times as much lumber has been destroyed by fire this very year as has been produced in one year by the lumber trade. That is a matter of very great consequence. If the forests could be preserved, as many believe they can be preserved, I would go in heartily for any means necessary to that end. But if the pine timber of this country is not cut by the lumberman, it will, in a very few years, be destroyed by fire. If the Government re-enact the export duty on logs, the effect would be that the lumber would not be cut and sold as it is now, bringing in, as the House is aware, a large revenue to this country, but the timber would be destroyed by fire. I think it is the duty of the Provincial Governments to do everything they can to preserve the lumber of our forests, and it is the duty of the lumbermen who have the licenses to do everything they can in the same direction. But if the trade is hampered, as it would be hampered under the conditions that the hon. member for Muskoka desires to exist, the result would be a very serious loss indeed to this country.

Mr. KENNY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, the 23rd ultimo, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in joining with many hon. members who have preceded me in this debate in offering my congratulations to my friend, the hon. Minister of Finance, upon the eminently satisfactory statement of the financial condition of the country which he placed before Parliament in his Budget speech. I have still greater pleasure in joining with many hon. gentlemen who preceded me also, in the statement that the announcement which he then made of the financial condition of Canada and the removal of the duties on raw sugar, amounting to $3,500,000 annually, which he then accomplished, not only gratified, but satisfied the great mass of the people of Canada. From my native province down by the sea, the fairest of the fair provinces of our glorious Dominion, from the sister Maritime Provinces of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, from the great Province of Quebec, and from the large and wealthy Province of Ontario of which we are all so proud, and in whose prosperity we believe, notwithstanding the lugubrious utterances of disappointed politicians, to the contrary, from the great Province of Manitoba and from the North-West Territories, from our great prairie lands which we hope may soon become the happy home of millions of prosperous Canadians, from our Pacific province which has just begun to feel the impelling force of the development

of its great resources and the stimulation of a trans-Atlantic system of railways, from all Canada have gone out loud and long, cheerful and triumphant congratulations to the Government upon the financial condition of the country and the fiscal policy which has been initiated in this Budget speech. The shouts of exultation by which the speech was greeted by the supporters of the Government in this House found a responsive echo in the hearts of the people of Canada. The refrain was taken up in every province and found a welcome in every home. The Budget speech of 1891 was delivered under the shadow of the great loss which Canada had suffered in the death of her most distinguished son, who had been for so many years the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party of this country, the party which is in this Legislature and in this country to-day the dominant party. The Budget speech of 1891 is the most positive and satisfactory evidence that can be given that the Liberal-Conservative party of this Dominion to-day, as in the past, is ever true to its policy, that policy which always seeks the greatest good of the greatest number of the Canadian people. The policy of the Liberal-Conservative party is primarily, essentially and continuously a Canadian policy. It is a policy progressive, comprehensive and enduring. It ignores all narrow and sectional issues. The Liberal-Conservative party of this country is ceaseless in its efforts to secure the general well-being of the people of Canada, the development of the resources of Canada, the increase of the productive forces of Canada and the extension of the commerce of Canada. The Liberal-Conservative party desires the laws which Canadians have made for the Government of Canada, and will never consent to the surrender of Canada's right to regulate her fiscal policy, as may best suit her own people, free from all foreign influences. The Liberal-Conservative party desires to strengthen that tie which binds us, as in a love-knot, to the mother country, and to retain our place in the greatest empire the world has ever seen. In marked contrast to this cheerful, this hopeful policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, is the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite—a policy of dreary, doleful, melancholy pessimism, a policy anti-Canadian and anti-British, which is incorporated in this resolution for commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity or whatever you like to call it, which is foreign in its conception and hostile to Canada in its intention. I may repeat here what I have said before, that the masses of the people of Canada are loyal to the institutions of their country. And, therefore, I say that the squalid and loathsome history of the treasonable intrigue and conspiracy which, it has been made public, existed between Mr. Farrer, of the Toronto *Globe*, and prominent American politicians, some of whom have been named here by hon. gentlemen opposite as representing their views and wishes, is painful to every true-minded Canadian. I was glad to hear from the Minister of Finance, early in his speech, a reference to our improvement of the trans-Atlantic mail service. We heard from the hon. Minister that the delay which had unfortunately occurred in this matter was due in part to the very sad and unexpected death of the presiding genius of the Barrow Company, the gentleman who had visited Canada for the purpose of conferring with the Government, in the expectation that he would be able to make satisfactory arrangements to carry out the improved service which we have so long desired. The Minister of Finance explained that the sudden death of Mr. Bryce Douglas had interrupted those arrangements, and also that the condition of the London money market was so unsatisfactory at that date that a company contemplating such an enterprise would have found it very difficult to then place its stock on the London market. Sir, as regards the London money market, we all know that there is a very decided improvement, and that to-day money is lower in London than it has ruled for many months: and while the condition of that market is exceedingly sensitive, and although money is cheap it is not easily borrowed unless most satisfactory credentials accompany the loan, at the same time that difficulty of the high price of money is very largely removed. It has been recognized that to secure for Canada a mail service to Australia and Eastern Asia, it was absolutely necessary that we should have an efficient service on both oceans. The service of the Pacific Ocean has been most satisfactorily established, and it is very much to be regretted that to-day, after the generous vote of Parliament, we have not been able to establish an equally satisfactory trans-Atlantic mail service. I hope that the matter will be earnestly taken up by the Government during recess. I may here repeat what I said before in this Parliament, that I think it should be our object to establish as good a service as there is on the north Atlantic, and that to accomplish that it would be eminently desirable, in my judgment, if the port of departure on the other side of the Atlantic was not a tidal port. I hold the opinion that it would be better if the service was started from some port in the Bristol Channel; but that is a matter in which I quite recognize that the contractors, whoever they may be, will have much to say. But this I do say, that looking to the Canadian terminus of this service, I hold strongly to the opinion that we should go to one port all the year round. At present it is contemplated that we should go for six months of the year to Quebec and six months to Halifax. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are great disadvantages in this arrangement; regularity of departure and arrival is essential to the success of the route, and this cannot be obtained with two disconnected terminal ports; and, therefore, I offer the suggestion to this House, that it would be eminently desirable if these steamers went all the year round to Halifax. The voyage to Halifax could be accomplished in 30 to 40 hours hours less than to New York. Passengers *viâ* Halifax could be landed in Montreal or in Ottawa before a steamer of like speed leaving Liverpool, or leaving the same port of departure in Great Britain, could reach New York. I know that there will be objections from the cities on the St. Lawrence to these suggestions of mine. The idea is not entirely original; I have heard it from gentlemen who have given this matter very great attention, and who are not identified with the Parliament of the country, but who are much interested in seeing an efficient service carried out. I think it would be wise for us in Canada to utilize that port which nature has placed at our disposal, and which is eminently fitted for such a service. I was also glad to hear from the Minister of Finance that he intended making ample provision for our West India service. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) during the course of his

speech, stated that our West India trade had fallen off to the extent of $1,000,000 between 1873 and 1890. I think that is due, to a great extent, to the fact that some of the goods which we then shipped by sailing vessels have since gone by way of New York, Boston and other ports, by steamers, and that the diminution of our West India trade is largely due to the fact that we have not had sufficient steam service between Canada and the West India Islands; and I am, therefore, glad to hear that provisions have been made for carrying on that service efficiently. It is gratifying to notice, Mr. Speaker, that in the matter of land transportation great progress has been made in Canada during the past ten or twelve years. It is stated that in 1878 the number of miles of railway in operation in Canada was 6,143, and that in 1890 the number had increased to 12,998. Now, at the risk of being accused of advocating a cut-throat railway policy, I must express my opinion that I think it would be in the interest of Canada if the Grand Trunk Railway system was extended to the Maritime Provinces. I know very well that I shall lay myself open to attacks from hon. gentlemen opposite, for making this bold assertion, but I would say to the Government to disregard the announcement which had been made from the other side of this House that those hon. gentlemen are entirely opposed to subsidizing railways. I hold that it is in the interest of Canada that the Government should aid the extension of our railways to such an extent as the varying condition of our finances may warrant. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite, in their attempts to induce the people of Canada to believe that their country is retrograding and is retrogressive, are constantly referring to the public debt, and making what they suppose to be, and what they hope will be, alarming statements upon the condition of our country in that respect. I have taken the trouble to examine myself into the condition of the debt of Canada from Confederation down to the present day, and I have sub-divided it into three periods. I find that in 1867 we commenced with a net debt of $75,728,641, and that in 1873 it had increased to $99,848,461, or an increase of $24,119,820, being an average increase under the Conservative Government of $4,019,803. In 1873 the debt was $99,848,461, and in 1878 it was $140,362,069, or an increase under the administration of the hon. member for South Oxford of $40,513,607, showing an annual increase of $8,102,721. Now, Sir, in 1878 the net debt was $140,362,069, and in 1890 it was $237,533,211, or an increase of $97,171,142 under the Conservative Government, or an average annual increase of $8,097,595. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this statement shows conclusively that the average increase of the debt under the Liberal Government, when the hon. member for South Oxford—who is always so very eloquent in attacking the Government for the large increase in the debt—when that gentleman administered the finances of this country, the average annual increase was greater than it has been under any Conservative Administration. That was under the Radical Government, or if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will allow me to use a term which is a favourite expression of his, that was under a "radically corrupt" Radical Government. I find also that since 1878 the expenditure on capital account has been as follows:—On the Canadian Pacific Railway, $51,736,629; canals, $19,906,594; debts allowed to provinces, $10,291,252; Dominion lands, $3,123,294; Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways, $17,735,038; other public works and public buildings, $4,094,634; North-West Territories, $870,069; these different expenditures on capital account from 1878 to 1890 amounted to $107,757,312. Therefore, whilst the net debt has only increased $97,000,000, we have actually expended on capital account during the same period $107,000,000. I find also that the net rate of interest in 1889-90 was $2.99 lower than it ever reached, and that the *per capita* increase of interest since 1879 was only 6 cents on the dollar. But, Mr. Speaker, in order to institute a comparison between the increase of debt under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite and under the present Government, let us examine the increase of debt from 1875 to 1878 and compare it with the increase during the past four years. It will be found, on referring to the Public Accounts, that the increase from 1875 to 1878 was $32,037,033, and from 1887 to 1890, $14,373,108. But it must not be forgotten that this increase of the debt of Canada from 1875 to 1878 had been largely incurred to make up the deficit between the income and expenditure from 1876 to 1879. During those years there were deficits to the extent of $6,500,000; in fact, so miserably was the financial business of this country conducted, so inaccurately were estimates made as to the expenditure of the country, that in each of the years 1876-77-78 and 1879 there was a growing deficit. Is it any wonder that in those days the credit of Canada fell lower on the English market than ever it was before, or that we were obliged to make loans on most unfavourable terms? Call that policy the "fly on the wheel" policy, or as my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) epigrammatically expressed it, "the slumbering fly on the halted wheel;" that is a most unfair description of the hon. member for South Oxford, for as regards staying the car of progress, he was a perfect giant, and his administration of this country was so eminently unsatisfactory that I think the people of Canada will be very loath to reinstate him in that position. Let us look for one moment at the relative increase of the debt of other important colonies of the Empire, because it is not fair to institute a comparison between the expenditure of a young and growing country like Canada and that of older countries. It will be found that in 1880 the Australasian debt was $431,095,099, and in 1890 it had increased to over $858,000,000, or had positively doubled. I think that, considering the expenditure on capital account we made during the past 12 years, the outlay which we have made on canals, on railways and other important services, we have nothing to deplore or regret or to be alarmed at with respect to the increase of the net debt of Canada. In order to make a point against the Dominion Government, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when replying to the Minister of Finance, pointed out that the balance of trade is this year $25,000,000 against us. Hearing that statement from a financial critic, I took the trouble to investigate as to the condition of trade when that hon. gentleman was guiding the finances of the Dominion, and I found that from 1874 to 1878 the gross balance of trade against Canada was $133,469,558, or an annual balance of trade against

us during those five years of $26,693,911; or actually for every year in which that hon. gentleman administered the finances, the average balance of trade was $1,583,911 more than during last year, showing that the balance of trade against Canada was actually greater under his administration than it is to-day. After all, if we are going to institute a comparison between the conditions of trade from 1874 to 1879, as the hon. member for South Oxford undertook to do, we must examine the whole trade of the country, because every business man knows that at one period there may be a depression in one province or locality, and that, to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to the condition of trade generally it is absolutely necessary to examine into the aggregate trade of the country. I was sorry to hear from the hon. member for South Oxford that our commerce with certain countries which he named was less than it was some years ago. I was particularly sorry to hear that such was the case with the Island of Newfoundland; but I am disposed to believe that many of the exports of Canada to that country find their way *viâ* Boston and New York, and are not, therefore, recorded in the exports of Canada, and that to a great extent will explain away the disparity which exists. I hold strongly to the opinion that we should make every effort to retain our hold of the trade of the sister colony. But, Sir, I find that the aggregate trade of Canada from 1874 to 1878 was $940,000,000, and from 1886 to 1890 it was $1,016,000,000; and I am happy to say, that for the past year the aggregate trade of Canada was $218,607,390, or the largest for any year since the provinces have been confederated. I think that this is a more satisfactory way of coming at a fair conclusion than by jumping at the balance of trade which happens to exist last year. These hon. gentlemen opposite, one would infer from their arguments, endeavour to show that our trade with the United States has decreased; whereas, as a matter of fact, an examination of the Trade and Navigation Returns will show that our aggregate trade with the United States amounted to, from 1874 to 1878, $400,209,706, and from 1886 to 1890 it had increased to $442,113,613; showing a very satisfactory increase. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are never so happy as when they are trying to explain to Parliament and to the country the unsatisfactory condition of the trade of the country generally. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that the bulk of the people of Canada were poorer to-day than at any other period in the history of Canada. Sir, I must question the accuracy of that statement. I think that the hon. gentleman was suffering from a special attack of pessimism when he made that statement. I find that one of the most prominent bankers in Canada, —a gentleman who, I believe, is not a supporter of the present Dominion Government—Mr. Cox, the resident manager of the Bank of Commerce, at the annual meeting of his shareholders, announced that the condition of the trade of Canada generally, and of the farming population of the Province of Ontario, was satisfactory. I find that Mr. Hague, general manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada, the second largest monetary institution in our Dominion, made the following statement at the annual meeting of the shareholders of that bank. Mr. Hague said:

"And, as men are concerned just now about the position of the country, I may say that it is thirty-five years since I first entered a Canadian bank. Thirty-five years is not a long time in the history of a country, but during this short period I have seen the deposits of Canada grow from fifteen millions to two hundred and twenty millions. This fact speaks volumes. In view of such a result in so short a time, one would be pessimistic, indeed, to have any doubts about the future."

Mr. Speaker, I consider Mr. Hague a better authority on this question, and I say it with all due respect, than the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Let us look at the one item of deposits in the banks of the country, and compare these figures now with the condition of the country in this respect in 1878. If the bulk of the people of Canada are poorer to-day than they were in 1878, will the hon. member for South Oxford have the goodness to explain to us how it is that the deposits of our people in the banks of Canada have increased by $108,900,000 since 1878? A reference has been made also to the general commercial conditions of the country, and the effect which this depression, which the hon. gentlemen opposite allege to exist so universally, has had upon the commerce of Canada. As late as 11th July, I find the following in the Toronto *Globe*:—

"The feeling throughout the country reported by travellers who have returned to the city this week is one of hopefulness. Country merchants, encouraged by the prospect of a good average harvest of grain in this province, anticipate a prosperous autumn trade, and with a realization of these hopes the cities—the basis of supplies—will of course benefit from any improvement in the situation. The recent showers greatly benefited the crops."

Now, this, taken from the *Globe*, I accept as a better authority upon the condition of the commerce of the Province of Ontario than the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); and it must be remembered that this is from a paper which is edited by Mr. Edward Farrer, who has been known and is recognized as the *fidus Achates* of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am very much afraid that this cheerful announcement made by the Toronto *Globe* on the condition of the commerce of the country will be a great disappointment to the hon. gentlemen opposite; but I accept it as the truth, because these hon. gentlemen apparently were relying upon the depression which they contend exists in this country to help them in the by-elections; and if they rely solely upon that they will, I believe, be doomed to very bitter disappointment. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the conditions of the trade of the country, let me draw the attention of the House to just a few important items. I find that the raw material imported into Canada in 1879 amounted to $5,000,000, and in 1890 it had increased to $16,000,000; but I must not forget that hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that they have no faith in the manufacturing future of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in Parliament, I think it was in the session of 1889, that he thought it was impossible for Canada to ever become a manufacturing country on a large scale. Well, Sir, certainly nothing could be more unfortunate for the manufacturers of Canada than that, by any accident, the financial affairs of this country should drift under his management; for I have no doubt that, if such an accident should happen, he will, as

he did before, do all that is in his power to destroy the manufactures of Canada. Take the article of sugar alone. I find that in 1878 we imported only 108,000,000 lbs. of sugar, while in 1889 we imported 222,000,000 lbs.; and I have no doubt that, under the removal of those duties which has recently taken place, the amount of our importations will be still further increased. This increase in our importation of sugar is also largely due to the fact that the people of this country are better off to-day than they were in 1878, and, instead of following the advice which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) then tendered the people of Canada, which was, that they should work harder and eat less, the fact is, that to-day the people of Canada are eating more and are much better off, and, consequently, there is an increase in the importations of sugar. Mr. Speaker, there is no man in this House who is at all familiar with the condition of the people of Canada, who will believe for one moment that the mass of the people are not infinitely better off than they were in 1878. I say, speaking of my own province and of the eastern section of this Dominion, that the people are to-day better housed, better clothed and better fed, that their children are better educated than ever they were before, and that Canadians who have taken the trouble to examine into these affairs, have a perfect horror of the days of 1878 and the wretched policy which was then in force in this country. Take, for instance, the article of raw cotton. In 1878 we only imported 7,000,000 lbs.; in 1889 we imported 35,000,000 lbs. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour occasionally to show, from a decrease in the imports of Canada, that the general trade of our country in retrograding. In cotton and cotton manufactured goods, you will find, by referring to the Trade Returns, that in 1878 we imported manufactured, bleached and unbleached, cotton sheeting to the value of $12,700,000, and in 1889 we imported only $1,300,000 worth of these goods. These goods are now manufactured in the Dominion of Canada; and even if those who have their capital invested in the various joint stock companies producing these goods received little or no return from their investment, at all events Canadian labour got the full benefit accruing from their manufacture in the country; and that is a strong point in favour of the National Policy. But, Mr. Speaker, the National Policy requires no defenders in this House. In 1879 it was adopted by the Parliament of Canada; in fact, it was the issue before the people of Canada at the general election in 1878; again in 1882 and also in 1887, and in 1891; the people showed their appreciation of the National Policy; and whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say about the blessings of free trade, I contend that the adoption of a protective tariff whereby we were enabled to start and develop manufacturing industries within our own country has been eminently beneficial to the people of Canada. Let us look at a few of our exports; and I know that these figures are uninteresting, and I almost ought to apologize to the House for taking up its time in referring to them. But if one is to arrive at a correct idea of the condition of the trade of the country, it is essential that we should examine into these figures, because, unfortunately, we cannot accept those placed before us by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, just one word about the examination of those blue-books. I recommend hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to examine for themselves the Public Accounts and the Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada; and I know no better way of confirming one's belief in the policy which guides the present Government than to compare our condition, as shown by the Trade Returns of 1878, and those unfortunate years for Canada when hon. gentlemen opposite governed this country, with our condition to-day. I find that there has been a great increase in our exports of cheese, cattle, sheep and coal products, in the note circulation and bank deposits, and in all the other items which point to an improvement in the condition of the general population. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the condition of the rural population: in fact, they seem to lay great stress upon the farmer's vote. Nearly every appeal which I have heard has been directed to the farmers, and they endeavour to show the farmers of Canada that their condition is not as good as it was, and that the change is owing to the National Policy. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite really know better. They know, for various reasons, which it is not necessary to delay the House to explain, and which have been thrashed out during the course of this debate, that in the neighbouring republic the condition of the rural population is eminently unsatisfactory. For example, let us take that which most concerns us living at the eastern end of the Dominion, we find that among our neighbours in the State of Maine there are 3,300 abandoned farms; in the State of New Hampshire, 1,400; in the State of Vermont, 1,500; and in the State of Massachusetts, 1,400. I am happy to say that no such condition of things exists in the eastern end of the Dominion; and judging from what I have heard from hon. gentlemen from the Province of Ontario, I know very well that no such condition of things exists in that wealthy province. That is the condition of the farming population in those states, which is in full possession of what hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to call the 65,000,000 market. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, how the farming population of Ontario are to be benefited by being placed in competition with this impoverished farming population of the neighbouring republic. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated that he does not wish to institute a comparison—that is, if I understood him correctly—between the farming population of these Northern States and that of the Dominion of Canada; but what he desires is to secure for the farming population of Canada the market of 65,000,000 people in the cities of the United States. Sir, surely the people who reside in the states which I have named are just as near those cities as our farming population would be; so that I cannot see any force in that argument, and I am surprised that a gentleman of his ability and knowledge should use it; because there is no one who understands this question better than that hon. gentleman. He is the only one of the Canadian statesmen who has ever been quoted in the Congress of the United States, and my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) made a mistake when he said that the hon. gentleman had not been mentioned in the Congress of the United States. I think it is only fair to the hon. member for North Norfolk that I should cor-

rect that error and say that the hon. member for North Norfolk has been mentioned in the *Congressional Record* of the United States.

Mr. BORDEN. I said that Mr. McKinley did not quote from the hon. member for North Norfolk in the speech with which he introduced his Bill.

Mr. KENNY. I think the hon. member for King's was referring to the hon. member for Westmoreland.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. KENNY. With all due deference to my hon. friend, I must admit I have not taken the trouble to examine into the matter myself, but I am informed that he is mistaken. But be that as it may, the name of the hon. member for North Norfolk does figure in the *Congressional Record* of the United States, and I do not see why it should not, for we have heard in this House the leader of the opposition referring to Mr. Sherman and to Mr. Hitt as exponents of their views; and if the hon. member for South Oxford, when leading the Liberal party in a certain debate, tells the Legislature of Canada that if we want to find out what the views of hon. gentlemen opposite are we will see them reflected in Mr. Hitt's resolution, if these hon. gentlemen are so fond of naming American statesmen, why should not American statesmen be privileged to name Canadian statesmen? I must say, after my experience of the past four years, having listened to the annual panegyric of the United States delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), although I have attended Fourth of July celebrations and listened to Fourth of July spread eagle speakers, I have never listened to greater eulogies of the United States than these I have heard in this House from the hon. gentleman. There is evidently a division of labour among hon. gentlemen opposite which reminds me of a sketch in *Punch*. The older members of this House and the hon. member for North Norfolk himself can remember the time when John Leach was the favourite caricaturist of *Punch*, and one of his famous sketches depicted a dinner at a regimental mess table. One could recognize, at a glance, that the ordinary resources of the mess had been very much overtaxed by a large influx of guests, and that several waiters had been called in who were new to the work. One of them, who, like my progenitors, evidently came from the Emerald Isle, was in the act of serving a gentleman with some vegetables, when one of the military entertainers said to the impromptu servant: "Hand this gentleman the potatoes." But Pat, with that strong sense of duty which is characteristic of our race, immediately replied, "Please, sir, I am told off to the cabbage." Having listened, as we have been condemned to do in this House, for the past four or five years I have had the honour of a seat here, to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), belittling and disparaging his own country, and to the hon. member for North Norfolk always following with a panegyric upon the United States, I am always reminded of this picture in *Punch*, because evidently one of these gentlemen is told off to the potatoes and another to the cabbage. I will say in justice to the hon. member for North Norfolk, that if, by any unfortunate combination of circumstances, it should ever be my lot to fill the role of either of these hon. gentlemen, I would much sooner stand up in this Legislature and praise the country in which I was born, than, like the hon. member for South Oxford, traduce my native land. But to come back for a minute to the condition of the rural population in the neighbouring republic, I find that in the great State of New York, which is so near the 65,000,000 population, so much nearer than any portion of the Dominion, the farm land in fourteen counties visited by the officials of the Government had depreciated in value. State Assessor Wood said that in a few decades there will be few or none but tenant farmers in the state, and year by year the value of farm land is depreciating. Will not the farmers of Canada, the farmers of Ontario, when the speeches we have had in this Legislature from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are scattered among them, realize the benefit of a home market? And when it is explained to the farmers of Ontario that what hon. gentlemen opposite desire to accomplish can only be obtained by the destruction of the distributing trade of the cities of Canada—Toronto, Hamilton, Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Winnipeg—and all the other distributing points throughout the country, do you not think they will understand that the market which these growing cities offer to the farmers of our different provinces will be of more value to them than the distant markets of New York and other States? I will not now refer to the condition of the farmers in the Western States: but I was rather amused at the hon. member for South Oxford, who is very bold in assertion but seems to have great difficulty in finding any accurate case to place before Parliament to verify his traducement of the farming population of Canada, appealing to one of the hon. members of Prince Edward Island to substantiate the statement that a decent man who had emigrated to the Western States from Prince Edward Island wrote to friends there that he would return if he could get a decent farm at a decent price and if there was a decent chance of obtaining unrestricted reciprocity. That is really the only case he was able to submit to Parliament to substantiate his very remarkable theory. As regards the farming population of our country, I fear very much that, owing to the same causes which exist in the United States and which also prevail on this side of the border, that population may also decrease; but let us glance for one minute at the condition of the farming population of the British Empire, because hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of telling us that this unfortunate condition of affairs of the farming population of the United States is solely due to the fact that in that country they have a protective system. I have in my hand the final report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the depression of trade and industry, and I will read a few extracts with reference to the rural population of Great Britain. The report says:

"And first of agriculture. This primary industry, the most important in the kingdom, not only on account of its nature but by reason also of the numbers engaged in it and dependent upon it for subsistence, has reached a state approaching something like collapse. The loss in the value of crops alone is estimated by Sir J. Caird at nearly £10,000,000 a year for the last ten years. The percentage of the population employed in agriculture has diminished during the last thirty years by more than 7 per cent. in Ireland and more than 8 per cent. in Scotland, and more than 9 per cent. in England. * * * It was stated to us by a competent witness that, speaking

generally, there is scarcely a farmer in this country who, by reason of the reduction in the value of animals and stock in general, is not, taking his capital into account, 40 per cent. poorer than he was twelve years ago. At present, as we are told, the tenants are not making anything but are losing. The capital of the farmer is gradually going from him, his stock, cattle, and horses diminishing and the cultivation of the land deteriorating. * * * But in Ireland the state of things is even worse; for in that country where agriculture is the only great industry, the whole community being in fact dependent upon it, the depression of agriculture is specially severe. And as the majority of the small farmers in Ireland cannot be said to farm for profit, but only for bare subsistence, the depression is far more keenly felt among that class than in the corresponding class in Great Britain."

It is with very sincere regret that I refer to this lamentable condition of the rural population of the mother country or in the United States of America: but I read these statements to show that the allegation of hon. gentlemen opposite that the depression which prevails among the rural population of Canada is exceptional, is not borne out, when we compare it with the condition of the rural population in the neighbouring republic or in the mother country. It is very well known that, since the protective policy was adopted in Canada, there has been a very great increase and development in our manufacturing industries. Those of us who are engaged in commerce must recognize the fact that, not only has there been a great increase numerically, but also a great improvement in all classes of goods which are produced in this country. Within my own recollection, and I have been engaged in the importing business for many years, many of us found it advantageous to have our business represented by resident partners or associates in the city of Manchester. At that day the cotton goods which went into common use in Canada came from Lancashire, and the woollen goods from the neighbouring County of Yorkshire, and we found it convenient to have our representatives in Manchester. Very soon after the change of Government in 1879 and the adoption of the policy of protecting our manufacturers, we discovered that we were manufacturing in Canada all these goods, and that it was not necessary to maintain a resident buyer or partner in Manchester, and, therefore, we moved our representatives to London. I mention this simply to show the entire change which has taken place in this respect within a few years. I am only surprised that the imports of this country have been sustained as well as they have been, considering the great displacement of imported goods by home manufactured goods which has taken place. This is a matter which is engaging the attention of merchants in the mother country, and it is known there under the name of "Fair Trade." When I was in England a few months ago, I went into the city of London and was shown the price of certain textiles, and how very cheap they were compared to the price at which they were sold ten or twenty years ago. I expressed my surprise that Yorkshire could produce anything so cheap. I was told that these were not produced in Yorkshire but in Switzerland. I asked what Customs duties these goods had paid on coming into England. I was told that they were free and there was no duty paid. I asked what would be the rate of duty if the Yorkshiremen retaliated and sent their goods into Switzerland, and I was informed that they would be met with a duty of 20 or 25 per cent. I said I thought that was very unfair to the Yorkshiremen. That is an instance of similar transactions which occurred in Canada before our duties were increased, when Canada was made a slaughter market by American manufacturers. At that time we had a duty of 17½ per cent., and yet we all know what took place. In looking over some back numbers of the *Hansard*, I think in 1876, I found that Mr. Thomas Workman, who then represented Montreal West in this Parliament, called the attention of the Government to the fact that their tariff was so regulated that the manufacturers of the United States used Canada as a slaughter market to the detriment of our own manufacturers. While Mr. Workman was supporting the Government of the day, in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Finance Minister, he told them that, if they did not change their policy and give a fair protection to the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian manufacturer could not live against the unfair competition he had to meet from the United States, because the Americans were selling their goods in Canada at lower prices than they were selling them in their own country. They were doing exactly what the Swiss merchant does in England. When he has a surplus at the end of the season, he sends it to London to be sold at a low price: and so it was here. The American manufacturers were sending their surplus products here and slaughtering them, just as the Swiss are doing in England. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that if we did away with the barriers that now protect the manufacturers in this country our trade would be enlarged, and we could compete with the American manufacturer. We are not yet in a position to compete with the manufacturers of the United States. We were much later in starting our manufactures, our capital is less, and, until we have our manufactures more developed, we will not be in a position to compete with them. It would not be fair competition. Every one who remembers the condition of Canadian manufactories in 1878, will understand that the slaughter market now would be infinitely worse if hon. gentlemen opposite had their way. Hon. gentlemen opposite are hostile to all manufacturing industries, and, therefore, the manufacturers of Canada cannot expect much sympathy or help from them. We had an instance of this when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance removed the duty from raw sugar. He was told, when he retained the duty of eight-tenths of a cent on refined sugar, that he was putting that amount into the pockets of the manufacturers. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) estimated it at $2,000,000, but that was simply a bold assertion without anything to prove it. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) dealt with the question more fairly. He made a calculation whereby he came to the conclusion that the refiner in Canada was receiving 30 cents per 100 lbs. more than the refiner in New York, which, he said, would make a difference of $600,000, so there was only a difference of $1,400,000 between the member for South Oxford and the member for South Brant. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), when he dealt with this question—and I admit that he did so frankly and fairly—told us that on the day on which he quoted the price, granulated sugar was $4.20 per 100 lbs. in New York. I have taken the trouble to find what

was the price in Halifax on that day, and it was $4.25. It is contended that the granulated sugar that we manufacture is some 10 cents per 100 lbs. better than that which is manufactured in the United States. On that I do not express any decided opinion, but it is evident that the difference in price was very trifling.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did the hon. gentleman look for the price in Montreal at that date?

Mr. KENNY. I did not, and for a reason which I will explain. I happen to be what hon. gentlemen opposite call a monopolist: I am interested in the refinery at Halifax, my relations are more intimate with it than with the refiners of Montreal, and I asked the question there. Now, one word as regards these unfortunate sugar monopolists. Our experience in Halifax, where we have two sugar refineries, has been that to be a shareholder in a sugar refinery is not a lucrative position. I may say of the two refineries that are now at Halifax, one on the eastern side and one on the western side of the harbour, that unfortunately the pioneers in these enterprises lost every dollar of capital they put into them, and, therefore, the position has not been a remunerative one. I applied to Halifax for the reason that I could obtain immediately the information which I required: but my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) must remember that the cost of transportation from Halifax to Montreal per 100 lbs., is 20 cents. I do not know what the cost of transportation may be from the city of New York; but if I understood the hon. member for Brant correctly, I think he laid down the axiom that he only objected to the system of protection when it largely exceeded the amount of Canadian labour required to produce the article. I say candidly that I have not read the hon. gentleman's speech: I always listen to him with a great deal of attention, and as the words fell from his lips I thought I took them down accurately. I desire to point out one fact to the hon. gentleman, who seems to be labouring under the impression that these sugar refiners have been making such enormous profits at the cost of the people of Canada. I do not know whether he really believes that as a business man or not, but I desire to place some figures before him. They have been used once before in the House, but I think that my hon. colleague made use of them when the hon. gentleman was not in his place. My hon. colleague took the trouble to ascertain from one of the sugar refiners in Halifax what the average cost of raw sugar had been during the past two years, and he found that in 1889 and in 1890 it averaged 5·14 cents, and that the average price at which refined sugar was sold was $5.74, or a difference of 60 cents per 100 lbs. for the manufacturer. When the hon. gentleman considers the cost of turning raw sugar into the refined sugar, I think he will recognize that there is not a great deal of profit in the transaction, not more than a fair and reasonable living profit. But, Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised when hon. gentlemen in this House sitting opposite rose in their places, one after another, and assailed the refining industry of Canada. It is the pet aversion of hon. gentlemen opposite. It must be remembered that Mr. Wiman, the inventor of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, in January last, went to Boston from New York. The hon. member for South Oxford also went to Boston from Toronto. It is true they did not meet, so far as I know; they were not at the same dinner party, and it is very remarkable that in all these numerous social gatherings the hon. member for South Oxford and Mr. Wiman do not chance to meet at public entertainments. But Mr. Wiman was at a dinner in Boston which took place about January 22 or January 23, 1891, one week before the hon. member for South Oxford was entertained there, and at that dinner Mr. Wiman went on to explain that formerly refined sugar was largely imported from Scotland into Canada, but under the protective system refineries had been established in Canada, and Mr. Wiman informed his American audience that by unrestricted reciprocity instead of buying all their sugar in Canada the Liberals proposed now to buy it in New York and in Boston. Those hon. gentlemen stand up here, one after another, and assail the refining industry of their own country in order that the words of Mr. Wiman may be verified, and that we may be compelled to buy our sugar in Boston and in New York. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen talk of subservieney to the Americans; have we ever noticed such an instance of subservieney as this? Mr. Wiman made no secret of it, Mr. Wiman spoke with confidence, Mr. Wiman was in intimate intercourse, no doubt, with some of these hon. gentlemen, and Mr. Wiman spoke with confidence on this question, because he knew that his friend from South Oxford, when he had the opportunity before, had closed the refining industry in Canada, and that he would do it again if ever he had the opportunity. Now, Sir, those hon. gentlemen are so much alarmed at the duty of ⅜ of a cent per pound on refined sugar, when they had an opportunity of benefiting the poor man, and the artizan, and the fisherman, and the miner of Canada, what did they do? Why, Sir, they put 5 and 6 cents a pound on his tea, and 2 cents a pound on his coffee, and 2½ cents a pound or thereabouts on his sugar, yet these are the hon. gentlemen who stand up in their place and endeavour to persuade the labouring classes of Canada that they are being imposed upon by this Government which has removed the entire duty from tea, the entire duty from coffee, and has left only a small duty on refined sugar, simply to preserve the Canadian market to Canadian labour. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather amused at a reference which was made early in this session by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, to Mr. Sherman and to Mr. Hitt. This hon. gentleman stated that the terms of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, for which they are contending, had met the approval of these two distinguished American statesmen. Sir, I have taken some trouble to inform myself as to what Mr. Sherman had stated and made public on this question. I desire to speak with all due respect of Mr. Sherman. I fancy Mr. Sherman would be accepted as an intelligent man, and an honest man, on both sides of the border, and in that respect he would be the *rara avis in terri* which the hon. member for South Oxford is looking for, because he seems anxious to find an honest and intelligent protectionist. Well, I would refer him to the Senator from the Province of Ontario—I beg pardon, from the State of Ohio; we are liable to get mixed up when we speak so often of the Senators and dinner parties across the border, that

we forget to distinguish those from this side of the line from those on the other side. But I mean the Senator from Ohio. Mr. Sherman is an exceedingly prominent member of the Congress of the United States, and his name has been introduced here by the leader of the Opposition. He is, therefore, what the member for South Oxford is looking for. But now it is said by the leader of the Opposition that Mr. Sherman represents their views. Let me state what Senator Sherman's views are. On 4th January, 1888, Senator Sherman made a speech in the Senate of the United States, in which he used this language:

"I prefer that policy which looks to the interest of our own people rather than those of foreign nations. I prefer the policy of reducing prices by home competition rather than by foreign competition, of cheapening raw materials, by increased production and the improvement of our rivers and harbours, and the competition of our railways. In other words, I prefer the development, increase and growth of the productions and employments of our own countrymen, by the aid of our revenue laws, without respect to the policy, or theories, or interests of other nations."

There are the views of the Hon. John Sherman; and what consolation or comfort can hon. gentlemen opposite draw from them? Later on, in the same speech, he said, referring to what protection has accomplished in the United States:

"It has so increased and diversified our domestic manufactures that they have grown to the enormous sum of $7,000,000,000, including every article of necessity or desire, and yet in every stage of its growth has reduced the cost to the consumer more and more."

Then he makes a reference to Great Britain and Canada. He says:

"Great Britain alone pursues the policy of free trade, only because by centuries of protection she has so established her manufactures that she can compete with all the nations of the world. Even now we can, if we will, by wise commercial regulations with Canada and Mexico, and the South American States, extend the market for our home manufactures over vast regions, exchanging tools and implements, cotton goods and furniture, for sugar and coffee and other tropical productions in the south, and lumber, timber and furs in the north."

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the consolation which hon. gentlemen opposite derive from a perusal of Senator Sherman's speech. He says he is anxious to extend the market—he does not use the words commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity—he is anxious to increase intercourse with Canada for American manufactures, and he says we can send them in return lumber, timber and furs. This is the authority quoted by the leader of the Opposition as representing their sentiments and ideas. But I find, further, that on 18th September, 1888, and it must be borne in mind that this was 5 or 6 months after the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had introduced his first resolution favouring commercial union: that subsequently, of course by arrangement and by a mutual understanding and an interchange of ideas, which has merited for Senator Sherman the references which the leader of the Opposition had made to him in this House, in fulfilment of all these arrangements Senator Sherman on that date introduced a resolution in the Senate of the United States, as follows:—

"Resolved, that the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to enquire into and report at the next session of Congress the state of the relations of the United States with Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada, with such measures as are expedient to promote friendly commercial and political intercourse between these two countries and the United States; and for that purpose to have leave to sit during recess of Congress.

Is that what hon. gentlemen opposite desire? Is that the reason the Senator for Ohio has been mentioned here by the leader of the Opposition, because he is an advocate of greater commercial and political intercourse between the two countries? But we cannot judge of those gentlemen by the resolutions, because they are willing to change a resolution at every session of Congress or every session of this Parliament. We must judge of them by their utterances, and I find that during the speech which Senator Sherman then delivered he made use of this language:

"With a firm conviction that this consummation, most devoutly to be wished, is within the womb of destiny, and believing that it is our duty to hasten its coming, I am not willing, for one, to vote for any measure not demanded by national honour, that will tend to postpone the good time coming, when the American flag will be the signal and sign of the union of all the English-speaking people of one continent, from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Ocean."

Was that the reason Senator Sherman is selected as an exponent of the views of the leader of the Opposition and his followers, because he desires that the American flag shall alone float over this continent from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Ocean? But it is somewhat singular that this speech, made in the Senate of the United States, should have been made subsequent to the resolution which was introduced here by the hon. member for South Oxford, and which clearly contemplated commercial union only. It is well known that in September, 1890, Senator Sherman changed his resolution and introduced another resolution in the Senate of the United States, in which the words commercial union are omitted. It was a very great departure on the part of Senator Sherman from all his previous declaration; and if I am correctly informed, and I have taken the trouble to examine the *Congressional Record*, he did not deliver a speech but simply introduced his resolution with very few remarks. He spoke pretty much to this effect:

"There can be no question that better trade relations ought to be had between Canada and the United States. While they produce largely the same articles and are competitors for the market, their trade with each other is larger than with any other nations. Canada consumes more of our food than we consume of theirs. The amendment I introduce looks to such a conference, and I believe will be productive of advantage, not only in cultivating friendly feeling, but in increasing trade and commerce."

What was the fate of this resolution? It was so coldly received by the other members of the Senate that Senator Sherman was afraid to divide the House upon it. It was opposed by Senators Evarts, Edmunds, Morgan, Fry and others, and I will read a quotation from Senator Spooner, who seems to have voiced the feelings and views of the other members of the Senate when he said:

"I hope to see the day when the American flag will fly over Canada and when the British flag will be gone. Commercial union will come with political union, and not until then."

Yet Senator Sherman has been quoted here by the leader of the Opposition, and his views have been commended for our serious consideration. Is it any wonder, when one is advised by the leader of a party to examine into what Senator Sherman had stated, and when another hon. gentleman told us that a reflection of the views of the party opposite can be found in the resolution introduced by Mr. Hitt, that one becomes alarmed at the position

of affairs in this country, especially when one finds a great political party urging their fellow countrymen to look to the Americans for the sign by which they will conquer, and when, on a closer examination, we find those gentlemen, no matter how much they may change their resolutions, evidently, from the first, never intending anything but commercial union and only advocating that because they believed it would result in annexation. Take Mr. Hitt's resolution; and we must not disassociate Mr. Hitt's resolution from his own utterances. Mr. Hitt, who has been quoted in the House this session by the leader of the Opposition, is on record as having over his own signature declared:

"It is better not to make two bites of a cherry but to go at once for annexation."

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a rest.

Mr. KENNY. You cannot hear it too often. We never tire of discussing this question in the Maritime Provinces. We believe that Canadian nationality and Canadian autonomy are imperilled in this question. We believe it is the most important question ever before the Parliament of Canada, and if the hon. gentleman wants an authority for that opinion, I will refer him to his friend Mr. Goldwin Smith and to the early pages of the introduction to the Manual on Commercial Union, and he will find it recorded there, that the question now under consideration by the people of Canada, and which is now being debated in this Legislature, is the most important they have ever had to consider since Confederation. I only dissent from that expression, to this extent, that, in my mind, this question is infinitely more important than the question of Confederation. I was not in the House when my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) made some reference to the trade of Halifax, and I desire now to refer in a very few words to the remarks which he made. I regret exceedingly that my hon. friend could not make his argument without referring to the state of the trade and commerce of Halifax in a manner which I think that city does not deserve at his hands. It seemed that the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), after he had indulged in a panegyric upon Dakota, attempted to decry the commerce of the cities of St. John and Halifax; but I must not forget that the hon. gentleman, when he did so, had previously expressed his approval of the utterances of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Boston, in which that gentleman stated that Boston was to become the entrepot for the commerce of Canada, and especially during the winter months. If these are the views of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), I am not surprised, that, in order to make a point against the condition of the country, he should even attempt to decry the commerce of the city of Halifax and of the city of St. John. The hon. gentleman was pleased to say, that, so far as the trade of Halifax was concerned, the only increase in that trade has been in the exports. Sir, I think I have shown during the remarks I have made this afternoon, that it is exceedingly difficult to arrive at the condition of the general commerce of any one port in Canada, by judging of the imports; and especially so of any port in the Maritime Provinces, for the reason that many of the goods which are consumed in the Maritime Provinces paid duties in the cities of Montreal, Toronto and other distributing points. Therefore, there has been a displacement of imports. I also desire to point out, as I mentioned earlier in my address, that in Canada to-day we are manufacturing our own cotton and woollen goods, as well as the goods into the manufacture of which iron enters, and numerous other articles; and which goods formerly paid duty. Therefore, it is difficult to estimate the trade of a port like Halifax or St. John solely by its imports. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) should also have remembered that in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia during the years from 1875 to 1878, wooden shipbuilding was exceedingly active, and during that period we put afloat from those Provinces, shipping to the value of some $20,000,000. The goods connected with the building of these vessels paid duty in St. John and in Halifax, but to a great extent that trade has left us, and I am afraid that wooden shipbuilding can hardly be again revived. We have attempted to find employment for many of the people who were formerly engaged in this industry by starting cotton and woollen manufactories; and even in the good city of Yarmouth—and I would be sorry to say one word to disparage Yarmouth, because I have passed many pleasant days there and have many warm friends in that city—in that good city, when wooden shipbuilding ceased to be remunerative, the people there, under the wise protection which is afforded by the National Policy, started, as I am informed, a woollen mill, and also a cotton mill where cotton duck is manufactured. Before I leave this subject, however, I also wish to point out to my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that in 1877 there was a very sad and serious loss of property in St. John, N.B., by fire, and that one consequence of that was to contribute very largely to the importations, in order to replace the goods which were consumed by the fire. Referring to the trade of Halifax, I desire to point out to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that while the sea-going tonnage of Halifax in 1878 was only 423,423 tons, and the coasting tonnage was only 185,314 tons, making a total of 608,737 tons, in 1890 the sea-going tonnage of Halifax had increased to 682,408 tons, and the coasting tonnage to 278,764 tons, total tonnage 961,172 tons, or nearly 60 per cent. of an increase over 1878. Let me do the city of Yarmouth the justice which the hon. gentleman himself did not do it, and let me point out to my hon. friend what the tonnage of Yarmouth was, in 1878, as compared with the tonnage in 1890. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the sea-going and coasting tonnage of Yarmouth in 1878 was only 40,000 tons; and that in 1890 it had increased to 168,693 tons, or something like 400 per cent. If the hon. gentleman had told us of the increase in the trade of Yarmouth, he would have been doing his cause more good than by trying to decry the trade of the cities of Halifax and St. John. These hon. gentlemen opposite contend that it would be eminently in the interest of Halifax and St. John that we should have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States of America, and the citizens of St. John and of Halifax, in order to test accurately what would likely be their fate under such a condition of things, have only to look at what goes on in the neighbouring city of Portland, Maine. Portland, Maine, is much nearer to

the market of 65,000,000 people which hon. gentlemen say is going to be such a boon to us than either Halifax or St. John; and I find that, from 1888 to 1890, the imports into Portland, in the State of Maine—which it must be borne in mind is much nearer to the 65,000,000 market than Halifax is—amounted to $2,808,957, while the imports of Halifax for the same period amounted to $17,710,850, or something like six times as great as the trade of Portland was. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to make the argument that we would be benefited by a change which would place us in a relatively worse position as regards the 65,000,000 market than Portland occupies. Let us look again at the population of the two cities. I find that in 1860 the population of Portland, Maine, was something like 26,342, and that in 1890 it had increased to 36,426. Now, in 1861 the population of Halifax was only 25,000, and in 1891 I am fairly entitled to assume it will be at least 40,000. Therefore, there cannot be much comfort to hon. gentlemen opposite in an investigation of these figures, and I regret exceedingly that my hon. friend from Yarmouth could not make good his case without making those disparaging remarks about the capital of his own province and about the city of St. John, with which good place his own town has so large a commerce. But I suppose it is only part of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to assail in this way the distributing centres of the Dominion. Now, if my hon. friend from Yarmouth had taken the trouble to look at the progress that Nova Scotia has made in her general trade and commerce, he would, I think, have found it to be satisfactory. He would have found, for instance, among other items, that under the National Policy the amount of sugar entered in Nova Scotia for home consumption in 1878 was only 7,000,000 lbs, whereas it has increased in 1889 to 50,000,000 lbs. He would have found also that in 1878 we only entered 5,000 lbs. of raw cotton, whereas in 1889 we entered 3,000,000 lbs.; and our labouring people had the benefit which accrued to them from converting these raw products into manufactured goods. He would also have found that in the article of wool in 1878 we only imported 8,440 lbs., whereas in 1889 we imported 37,000 lbs.; and of this wool, I have no doubt, unless I have been misinformed—for I have not been in Yarmouth for some years—that a considerable quantity has been manufactured into a very good class of goods in my hon. friend's own good town. As regards the resolution before the House, I am not going, at this late stage of this prolonged debate, to say more than that I was sent here by my constituents especially to vote against unrestricted reciprocity, and I owe the large majority which I received to the fact that I was opposed to that policy. Why, Sir, the majority in the city of Halifax could never have been increased to such an extent as it was on an ordinary party issue. Any one who remembers the complexion of the representation of Halifax in the last Parliament and sees what it is to-day, must recognize that some great change has come over that constituency. The hon. gentleman who represented Halifax on the other side of the House, and who was the senior member for that city in the last Parliament, was and is a man of undoubted ability and influence both here and in the community in which he resides; and the large majority which was recorded against him was due to the fact that the people of that community, as the people of the Province of Nova Scotia generally, are opposed to the policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, knowing as they do that in it is involved the annexation of Canada to the United States of America. It means a common tariff, in the framing of which Mr. Hitt has told us naturally 65,000,000 people would have more to say than 5,000,000. Mr. Hitt has plainly and candidly expressed that opinion to the people of Canada. It means, further, that in order to gratify hon. gentlemen opposite we must have direct taxation. An hon. gentleman opposite, I think it was the hon. member for South Oxford, spoke of a black flag. I assume that hon. gentlemen opposite are the black flaggers. They are very much in the habit of laughing at us as the old flaggers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would very much sooner be an old flagger than a black flagger; and I think if they would inscribe on their black flag in white the letters d.t., which might represent direct treason or direct taxation or *delirium tremens*, they would get such a fit of the d.t.'s before they would get through with this question, that they would be very glad to change their policy and their tactics. Mr. Speaker, I think that our record of twenty-four years of Canadian unity should rather inspire us with confidence in the future than alarm us as to the present condition of the country. There is no country in the world, as we all know and must admit, which has made the progress that Canada has made during the past twenty-four years; and one must regret to see a party in this country obliged to have recourse to a policy of belittling, vilifying and falsifying the condition of their own country in order to make political capital. Sir, if the lamp of faith in our country should be extinguished, dark and dreary would be the future of our people, for history tells us, that whenever a people have been untrue to the common dictates of patriotism, they have become mere vassals in the service of a foreign state—that their commerce and their husbandry have left them, and the very implements of their handicraft have fallen from the hands of their own people. Sir, I have said before, and I repeat, that we have reached a crisis in the history of Canada—that the question now before us is the most important one on which we have ever had to express an opinion; and I believe, Sir, that the increasing hostility which is evident in the public mind of Canada towards this policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity is simply evidence that it has come to be better understood, and that its concomitant, annexation, is repulsive to the people of Canada. I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada are loyal to their country and their Queen, and they proudly proclaim that "Canada is not for sale."

Mr. FRASER. One is somewhat surprised that it requires so much time and energy to make the people of this country understand how disloyal we are on this side of the House, and how well understood are the treasonable utterances and the treasonable conduct of gentlemen on this side; and that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down should have spent two hours in enlightening this House and through it this country, when he said that the country understood the matter so well. It

was, indeed, an edifying sight to see a gentleman, without any thought of himself—to see a monopolist as he called himself, a sugar refiner—getting up to teach this House and the people of this country, in his own bland manner, taking the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and all the other members of the Opposition under the shadow of his wing, patting them betimes before he stabbed them, to make them understand that he, with no motive except his heart-burning love for his country, with no stock in a sugar refinery, with nothing at all of that sort, could see a vision of a bright future for this country if it would continue to legislate as it has done in the past, in the interest of the few as against the many. Surely it was a spectacle to make the angels weep to see how little he had in himself to dictate the speech that he made. And then there was a crisis. Of course, there is a crisis. There is always a crisis with all these men who are engaged in manufacturing whenever you propose anything that is going to affect them. When the hon. gentleman spoke about the danger to this country, and when the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) spoke in the same way, I was reminded of a picture which appeared in *Punch* depicting a criminal in gaol holding a conversation with a drunken man outside the window. The hon. gentlemen opposite will, of course, understand that I make no reference to them. But they were talking of the danger to their country and of the violent character of the Opposition. "Our country is in danger," hiccupped the drunken man outside, and the prisoner, who was ready, perhaps, for execution, said: "Oh, dear me, our liberty is in danger." "I do not care so much," said the other, "for that, but what I am concerned about is our glorious religion." These hon. gentlemen opposite have about the same amount of reason and feel the same concern when they speak of the danger to this country from the Opposition policy. Whoever heard men, whom this country undertook to legislate into wealth, speak otherwise than in favour of the policy by which they benefited? The hon. gentleman said that the Opposition were speaking for the farmers. So we are; and because we are speaking for 60 per cent. of the population of this Dominion, while they are speaking for only a small fraction, are we to be charged with being disloyal? Is there anything dishonourable in that? Is it not more loyal and more honourable that we should speak in favour of the fisherman, the farmer and the artizan, who have been hoodwinked by hon. gentlemen opposite into thinking that protection would make them rich, than it is for hon. gentlemen who have come here and legislated to make themselves wealthy to charge those who raise their voices in behalf of a deceived and plundered people with being disloyal? The men who speak in favour of the farmers are speaking in favour of the men who need protectors in this Parliament. Too long has legislation been directed in the one groove. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has told us that he was sent here to vote against reciprocity. I tell the hon. gentleman that I know something about Nova Scotia, and if it was not that the Government adopted partial reciprocity as their platform in the last election, few of their supporters would have been returned from that province. Their whole argument in the city of Halifax and elsewhere, used by the supporters of the Government, was this: We are just as sound on the question of reciprocity as our opponents, and we have the Government and can get it for you much better than the Opposition. Had it not been for that prospect held out to the people, not even a corporal's guard would have been returned from Nova Scotia to support the Government. They were returned to power because they promised reciprocity. They told the people that the anxiety of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues for reciprocity, in the interests of Canada, was such, that they could not wait for the regular time to bring it about, but appealed to the people to strengthen them with their mandate at once. I tell the hon. gentleman now, who may be making, with many others, his plea to the people, that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, no man who is not in favour of the fullest reciprocity possible with the United States, consistent with our own dignity, consistent with everything that is good in our own country, can hope to obtain the suffrages of the people. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) found fault with my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), because he gave a true picture of the trade of Halifax. I notice, however, that the hon. gentleman did not attempt to answer the figures of my hon. friend, but said it is very difficult to find the facts. Whenever, Sir, we find a protectionist cornered, he will contrive to wriggle out in some other way. He will say there is prosperity here and there, and then he will leave prosperity for a moment to dilate on the glorious National Policy, and in another moment he will be away up in the clouds. The farmer, he will say, is getting more for his grain here than he could there; he will take the markets of one side and contrast it with a market somewhere else, and he will make out that the farmers are getting such high prices that it is a wonder every one of them does not become a capitalist. In listening to hon. gentlemen opposite, I am reminded of the story of a grocer, a coloured man, who himself delivered the eggs he sold, and had too keen an eye for business to be particular in giving the full number. One of his customers, a good wife, thought she would count the eggs herself, lest there might be some mistake on the part of the servant. The grocer began to count as he delivered the eggs, one, two, three, &c., and then stopped to ask where was her little boy. He is in school, replied the old lady. Why, said he, that small boy in school; he can't be seven. Oh, said she, he is thirteen. Well, said the other, he is the smartest little boy of his age I ever saw. I would not take him for thirteen; and then he resumed his counting, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, and so on. Then he asked about the age of the daughter and the old lady's age, whom he flattered by making her out to be much younger than she was, and in the end the old lady paid for four dozen of eggs when she only got two dozen, but she was so much flattered and pleased that she really had not the heart, afterwards, when she discovered how she had been swindled, to complain. Now, the difference between those who are in favour of better trade relations with the United States, those who are in favour of absolute free trade, which is bound to come some day, and those who support the National Policy, is this, that all the free traders have to do is to stand on principle, and they need not go round and point out this success or that, this prosperity or the other, which is built up at the expense of the people. I rejoice in every

man becoming prosperous, but I do not believe in any man becoming wealthy except on conditions that will enable every other man in the Dominion to become wealthy in the same way. No other law will do in this country or in any other country. I do wish those hon. gentlemen would buy a primer on political economy, for I have heard in this House more unadulterated ignorance given expression to on the question of political economy than I thought could exist in any representative body. It will be a matter of considerable surprise to the historian of the future, when he reads over these debates, to find that in this age, which boasted so much of its enlightenment, so many representative men at a loss—either through design or ignorance—to understand the first principles of political economy.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What are they?

Mr. FRASER. Let the hon. gentleman buy Henry George's work on political economy for ten cents, and let him read it, and he will not then stand up in this House and proclaim himself anything else than a free trader, unless he does violence to his conscience.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen may say "oh, oh" as much as they please; but let them mention any authorities of any repute who have written in favour of protection except Cary, who was a Southerner, and Horace Greeley, who was a journalist. Let these hon. gentlemen go to any college in the Dominion or in the United States, and find me a first-class man who is anything else but a free trader?

Mr. KENNY. Senator Sherman.

Mr. FRASER. Senator Sherman? Is he a professor in a college? It suits him to be a protectionist, as it suits the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) to be a protectionist, because he is making money out of it. I would like to know the name of a professor in a college who has ever given his opinion in favour of the system of protection?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The people of Canada have given their opinion.

Mr. FRASER. Part of the people of Canada have expressed their opinion, but the people in general are not protectionists. Do not those hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as we on this side know that there are numbers of people who have voted for the sake of their party who, in their heart of hearts, are aware that protection is a bad thing? If you meet hon. gentlemen opposite alone, if you meet them outside of this House, they will tell you quietly, I am a free trader in principle, as if a man can be a free trader in principle and a protectionist in practice. They can only be that when they are making money out of it. They say we must have protection because, if we do not, somebody else is going to get the better of us. I lay down the principle, and it is a primary principle of political economy, and I propound it here for the benefit of my hon. friend at the rear who asks for some information in regard to political economy, that if one man gets protection for the manufacture of hats, the man who make shoes for the man who makes hats has a right also to get protection, and the man who supplies him with meat has a right to protection, and the man who supplies him with clothes has also a right to protection, and every man who works or gives anything which enriches this country has a right to the same protection because he has to pay out of his own pocket for the benefit of the one man who is protected. When we go back to first principles, what do we find? We find the principles established by the Creator Himself, no protection to any one but a fair field and no favour. I ask if any man should get by law the right to receive one cent from his fellowman unless the money so received finds its way back to the pockets of the man who pays him. Is it right that any man who manufactures sugar should get anything from the people by law unless he pays it back to them in another way? The whole thing is a system of legalized robbery. The whole thing was begotten in America after if was forgotten in England, and it was begotten in America for selfish ends, but even in the United States, as in this country, the people are beginning to understand that those who cry most lustily for protection are those who make money out of it, and that protection has no other design than that a few should be enriched at the loss of the many. I am not in favour of aristocracy, but I very much prefer an aristocracy by birth to a plutocracy by wealth, because with an aristocracy by birth at all events we would have education. These men boast that the National Policy has enriched a few. They point to this industry and that industry and the other as having been greatly developed, and they say protection is a great thing. Not at all. You may take a town in a county prosperous by protection, but you do it at the expense of all the other parts of the county. I might go over to the other side of the House and might get assistance and might fasten the hands of those hon. gentlemen and take their money out of their pockets. If I do that, it is true that I am wealthier than I was before and I might say so, but is that of any benefit to those from whom I have taken the money? The same is true in regard to protection, when it lays a heavy burden on those who get no advantage from it. The only wealth which is good for us to have is the wealth which is free as the air and which shines like the sun, the wealth in which every man can participate, the wealth that gives every man, no matter what his standing is, the opportunity of entering into the markets of the world and testing his skill and brains in the markets of this country and of the whole world. That is true political economy. What is the system of hon. gentlemen opposite? Their system is that this country must be a manufacturing country, and they contend that, because neither the capital nor the brains of those who engage in manufacturing is sufficient to build up our manufacturers, the Government must lay a contribution on all the other people of the country in order to build up those manufactures. I like to see manufactures increase in this country, and I know that manufacturing will increase in Canada, but if it depends upon a contribution levied on all the people by law, then I say let us rather remain as we are than take money out of the pockets of the others in order to build up our manufactures, because you will find that where assistance is given the work is not so well done. Every hon. gentleman know that if a man is manufacturing hats or shoes and the Government give him aid in order to do that, he will not be so careful about the fabric that he manufactures as if he had to produce his work

unaided and compete with others. What is the reason why the goods of Great Britain are made better than in any other part of the world? It is simply because the Scotch and English and Irish artizans know that they go into competition with the rest of the world and that they have to make the best article they can, because they know that the only thing which succeeds in the markets of the world is good goods. That is the reason why English goods have made their name in every country in the world. If you go to the United States and ask for good clothing, will they show you American cloth? No; they will show you Scotch tweed or English goods. I was amused to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) state that when he was in London he found Swiss goods being sold there cheaper than English goods. He did not say what goods they were, but of course they were watches.

Mr. KENNY. No; they were not watches. They were textile goods.

Mr. FRASER. Every one knows that the Swiss produce very cheap watches, and they manufacture a small quantity of textile goods. But Switzerland is a small country. Can any one imagine that Switzerland was going to swamp the produce of Great Britain in textile goods? When the hon. gentleman goes to London next and walks along Piccadilly or any of the other streets of that metropolis, he had better keep his eyes open, because the merchants there will fool him every time if he imagines that the trade of Great Britain is going to be swamped by the production of a small country like Switzerland. The English artizans do not fear because they know that they can beat off any competition brought against them, and, as those who buy goods are in the majority always, it is a good thing always to get cheap goods. Is not plenty a good thing? Here is another principle in political economy for my hon. friend in the rear who asked for information and is learning something now that he did not know before. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that plenty is not a good thing, but that scarcity is a good thing. They say that we ought to manufacture a small number of articles, that we ought to shut ourselves up by a wall of protection, and manufacture only a small quantity of various articles. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) gave us an idea of protectection—a cross-eyed view of protection—and expressed the opinion that Great Britain would eventually become protectionist. In the cycles of the ages which are coming, I think I can see the offspring of the hon. gentleman holding the brush and the palette for the New Zealander sitting on the ruins of London bridge, and at that time, and then only, protection will be again adopted as the policy of Great Britain. There are only a few cranks in England who preach protection, and perhaps there are a few cranks who come from England or elsewhere to this country and preach it here. The hon. gentleman may be looking down from a higher sphere on his progeny, but not until London is in ruins will the people of Great Britain lay aside the policy which has made a history for them and put them above all others in their competition in the markets of the world; not until then will they go back to the dirty ragged shreds of an effete protectionism. You might as well expect that the member for Halifax could rise and by his might turn the sun backwards, as to expect that England would ever go back to protection. Yet this is the kind of thing that is told to the electorate of Canada, and their loyalty is called into doubt by saying that England is learning of us and she is going back to protection. Is it not surprising? But there is another thing that the hon. member for Halifax said which I will notice before I come to the general question. Speaking about the year mentioned by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) he says that the hon. gentleman should remember that 1875 was a great year in Halifax because shipbuilding was brisk. These were the doleful years the hon. gentleman referred to in this House. It is true our shipping at that time was on every sea, and the hon. gentleman had to get evidence from hon. gentlemen opposite that this was the year when the imports and exports of Halifax were great, because our ships were being built and sailed, and I thank him very much for unwittingly giving us this point of relief to the background which he says we are painting on this side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter fully into the remarks made by the hon. gentleman on the various subjects, because it would take hours to review them, and they have already been discussed. One cause of complaint against gentlemen on this side was, that a certain hon. gentleman on this side had been mentioned in the American Senate. Now, I do not think that is a disgrace. I am sure that when the Government, if they go to Washington, if they have any honest intention of going to Washington, they will find that the name of the member for Halifax is mentioned there; I am sure that his speech will be read to them there, and the commissioners will be asked: Are these the kind of supporters you have? Are these the people who want reciprocity? Hon. gentlemen opposite are divided into a number of classes. I want first to state that it seems to me that there is no argument in this case except that which we make, namely, that we want reciprocity with our neighbours across the border, and the only answer we get from hon. gentlemen opposite is that they want no reciprocity at all. I think Mr. Colby was the only man on that side of the House who had brains enough to see the issue at that time. He boldly said: I am not in favour of reciprocity, even in natural products, I am in favour of no reciprocity at all; and he is followed by no less distinguished a gentleman on the other side than the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who is not in favour of reciprocity of any kind, even in natural products.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Who is your authority?

Mr. FRASER. Yourself.

An hon. MEMBER. That is mighty poor authority.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) is in favour of reciprocity of a certain kind. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does appear to me that that is the proper ground for the hon. gentleman to take, namely: You are in favour of reciprocity; we are in favour of no reciprocity. I tell him that reciprocity with our neighbours across the border means so much free trade; and you might as well try to make oil and water mingle as try to unite reciprocity and protection. You cannot do it. They won't come together, and these hon. gentle-

men know that. What has been the whole burden of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite? Well, in the first place we had a glorification of the National Policy, and we had that *ad nauseam*. I never heard from any equal number of gentlemen so much glorification of the National Policy. Of course, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) was not in favour of reciprocity at all. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was *L'Allegro* of the debate; he tripped the light fantastic toe; he gathered up a little scrap here and a little scrap there, in favour of that policy. If the hon. member for Haldimand was *L'Allegro*, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) was *Il Penseroso* of the debate. He says he is in favour of a little of it; and we see that in the resolution that he attempted to bring into the House. That resolution was a kind of a double-barrel gun, part of it was in favour of the Government, where it told of all the glorious things that they had done, and the other part of it looked toward reciprocity. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, that those hon. gentlemen, to be consistent, must oppose reciprocity altogether. I can understand them saying that Canada is big enough for the Canadians, and all the people that can get into it, or, on the other hand, we can close out the whole world, and we can live within ourselves. That was the cry of protectionists in the United States, and it is the only consistent thing that they can say, namely, that this country is big enough, and we can make this country big enough without any outside help. In the United States they said: the United States for the Americans, while they say here, Canada for the Canadians, not Canada for any other nation, not Canada for any other people; no, they want Canada for the Canadians, and that alone. I can understand them saying: We can live within ourselves, and we will live within ourselves; we want no assistance from any other person outside; we want nothing to do with any other nation, but we want to live here alone. But if these hon. gentlemen believe all they have said in glorification of the National Policy, at the same time they themselves must admit that in many parts of the country, at least in the Province of Nova Scotia and in many parts of the Province of New Bruswick—as I have learned from people living there, if the evidence of some of the inhabitants of those provinces is to be taken as good—affairs in those parts of Canada are not of so bright a colour as hon. gentlemen pretend they are. The hon. member for Halifax had to depend on a little report in the *Globe*; he built up an argument upon it, because the *Globe* said that travellers coming home were encouraged by the prospects of a good harvest; and that there were good times coming for the country. Now, if the hon. gentleman had thought a moment about what he was reading, he would have seen that the report indicated that the times were not good now, and that the people depended on a good harvest to have good times. But the hon. gentleman, like those with whom he is surrounded, is one of the prisoners of hope, and they have to depend upon a good harvest or something else to tide them over the difficulty. And why? Because the very touchstone of the whole question is that this country could not exist only for the farmers. It is all very well for them to say we are taking the side of the farmers and they are taking the side of the manufacturers. I stand by the farmer, because his prosperity means the prosperity of every man in Canada, and if he does not prosper there will be no Canada. Talk about our prosperity, talk about our greatness, is it not all due to the farmers? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to look across the border where the farmers are poor; they can raise nothing, according to those hon. gentlemen. They want to make us believe that the United States are so poor that their farms are actually lying without owners; that there is no person living on them. Surely those people who have left those farms and are living in cities will want something to eat, and cannot we send them something to eat when their farms are so poor that they cannot raise their own food? In one breath they say the United States are so poor, that their farms are so run down, that we do not want to make any treaty with them; their farms are deserted and they are not able to buy anything from us. Well, hon. gentlemen opposite must take either one horn or the other of the dilemma. That state of affairs has been brought about in the United States by protection. I believe that state of affairs does exist to a certain extent in some of the older states, but I want to say that the same evil which exists in that country is manifesting itself in this country, and in both cases it is due to protection. I want to tell the hon. member for Halifax, who stated that England and Scotland and Ireland were in a distressed condition, that he forgot to tell the real cause of it, and that is, that they have no free farms there. I want to tell him that if the landlords in Ireland did not rack-rent the farmer, the land that he tills, the Irish farmer would be well off to-day. I tell him that if the tenants of England, the crofters of Scotland, were not subject to the landlords there, who use their power to impoverish them by rack-rent, just as the protectionists of Canada have the power of making the people of Canada support them, they would be wealthy and prosperous. He should have stated the conditions fairly. To compare farms in England, Scotland and Ireland with those in Canada is to compare things that differ. The hon. gentleman should have considered the underlying differences before bringing them into contrast. I say this: Given the condition that our farmer can buy what he wants as cheap as possible in Canada, given the condition that in the race of life he is not hampered to support bloated monopolies, given the condition that his position is such that not only can he buy everything as cheap as possible but he can sell his products on as favourable terms as possible, he cares not and fears not the competition of the American farmer or any other. Why? Because our land is, acre for acre, as good, and we can succeed. But surely, hon. gentlemen opposite forget that in 1878 we were promised that the National Policy would make our farmers rich, and even the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) had to admit before sitting down that the condition of the farmers in Nova Scotia and of Canada as a whole was not very prosperous. Then the hon. gentleman went on to show that the condition of the farmers was not satisfactory elsewhere. Truly, it is great consolation to know when you are poor that some one else is poor likewise. How happy the farmer here who is taxed on an average 20 or 30 per cent. on every thing he buys; how he must return thanks to the good Government that permits him to purchase

everything he requires at 20 or 30 per cent. duty, and at the same time to know that some farmer across the border is also poor. With what satisfaction he will sleep, and how he will love the Government that has brought about such a state of things, and to know that there is a farmer as poor as he across the border. It is something for which he should not only be gratified, but he should also give thanks. The next thing we had was a misstatement by hon. gentlemen opposite of the position of their opponents. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that running through all the speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite there is the same line of argument. No doubt it was agreed upon. No hon. gentleman seems to have made his speech without consulting some person. There was a misstatement of the position of the Opposition, a misstatement so far as their view of the laws of their country was concerned, there was a misstatement so far as the principles they were advocating were concerned. We say it is a good thing to exchange the products of the sea, the mine, the forest and the farm, which we can manufacture on the ground where they are produced, with our American friends across the border; the same privilege being given to them. But how are hon. gentlemen opposite going to proceed? They wait to obtain a statement from us of the whole case. But that will not do. From the first to the last of this debate there has not been a hint as to what they are going to do when they visit Washington. They are waiting to get information here, they want to find information here, and as they adopted in part the policy of the party on this side of the House, so now they want to adopt also the explanation of that policy in order that they may go there equipped, because they know that the people are at the back of the movement in favour of freer and better trade relations with the people across the border. Do they give us any light? Not the least. I submit that a free statement of the case as between the two parties ought to be given. I submit that the Government should engage to give a free statement, before they go to Washington, as to the conditions prevailing in this country. They will have strange views of the question if they go to Washington entertaining the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I see hon. gentlemen go, for example, to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and ask: What kind of a treaty would you make? If the speeches of hon. gentlemen afford any index of their feelings, and I think no hon. gentleman speaks his mind more freely, and I think there is no hon. gentleman in whom there exists more latent honesty than in the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien)——

Mr. O'BRIEN. "Latent" it is.

Mr. FRASER. Latent honesty.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Nothing but "latent honesty?"

Mr. FRASER. I judge latent honesty is there, for the hon. gentleman expresses his honesty, and I think back of the whole there must be a tremendous amount of latent energy and latent honesty. If hon. gentlemen opposite consult him he will say: No reciprocity in anything. If the Government go to the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) he will say: We must have reciprocity. What are they going to do with the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite? How are they going to reconcile these speeches, and how are they going to come back here, even if they make a treaty, with the expressions of opinion made by hon. gentlemen opposite standing on record? I think, if I judge the Government aright—I did think they wanted reciprocity, but I rather think, if the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite afford any information, the Government do not believe in reciprocity, and do not want a reciprocity treaty—they will not have reciprocity, and they will come back next winter, if the Government exists so long, and they will declare that their friends did not want reciprocity. What do they mean? Hon. gentlemen talk about disunion; but I never saw such disunion as is displayed by the party opposite, disunion among members from the various provinces as to what kind of reciprocity they want. Some, indeed, want reciprocity, and some want no reciprocity. Some want reciprocity in natural products, some want reciprocity in coal, and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that was one of the articles he wanted to see on the free list.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What I said was, that reciprocity was a misleading term, because exchange is made under the name of reciprocity when there is no reciprocity; but it does not prevent us from taking from the United States anything that it would be to our advantage to take. I mentioned coal, because coal is an article we both buy and sell, and, therefore, the term reciprocity could fairly be applied to it, but it cannot fairly be applied to articles we do not buy or sell.

Mr. FRASER. Quite so. I commend the hon. gentleman to the tender mercies of the hon. Minister of Marine, who stated in Pictou that there could be no reciprocity in regard to coal, and that the duty must be maintained. Then other hon. gentlemen opposite are in favour of reciprocity in a few articles, but there is no consensus of opinion among them to-day. We have some hon. gentlemen favouring the adoption of a partial reciprocity, if it can be obtained on our own terms. I was surprised when hon. gentlemen said they wished reciprocity, if they obtained what we wanted. Did you, Mr. Speaker, ever hear of such a bargain being made? Do hon. gentlemen think the Americans are fools, that all we have to do is to state what we want and they will give it to us? Not at all. When hon. gentlemen go over there they will have to enter into discussion with the Americans in seeking to negotiate a treaty, and in order to effect a bargain it must be one that is in the interests of both parties. We have a hope expressed to that effect, even by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), whose bowels of mercy for the Government were opened, and he hoped they would obtain a reciprocity treaty. It is strange that if reciprocity is not a good thing, hon. gentlemen opposite want it. Why do they not say at once: It is not a good thing and we do not desire it. Why should hon. gentlemen opposite in their speeches constantly denounce the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? He must possess a good nature in order to stand it. The whole burden of the song of hon. gentlemen opposite was centred on the actions of the hon. member for South Oxford. What a perfect fiend in human form he must be! The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) spent half his time in criticizing that hon. gentleman, and his criticism was of so severe a type I could scarcely

understand that an hon. gentleman of his geniality and good nature could become so bitter against the hon. member for South Oxford, and his example was followed by all the smaller speakers, until the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) fairly forced himself into a rage. The hon. gentleman looked over to the seat of the hon. member for South Oxford, but he was not present; he fairly foamed with rage, and he declared that the hon. gentleman was the darkest man on this side of the House and in the country. Why all this? Is not this the highest tribute that could be paid to the hon. member for South Oxford? Do they not in effect declare that the very man they seek to vilify, and who must be shot at by every cannon and every small gun on the other side, is a bright man, and are they not making him, if he is not great, great indeed? I can fancy the manner in which he accepts these attacks. I have seen on a stormy night on the Atlantic coast a lighthouse placed on a granite rock. The waves dash against it, the gulls scream over it, and the ocean threatens to engulf it; but the storm passes, the waves cease to beat against it, the gulls go to sleep, and the light still shines over the sea. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite deem it to be their duty to hurl all their epithets at the hon. member for South Oxford, for of all the destroyers of their pet schemes, he is indeed the chief.

Mr. DAVIN. Was there a revolving light?

Mr. FRASER. No. The prairie is the place for wandering light. I was going to say this: that if there was a man in this House or in Canada, that they felt ought to be killed, if they could do it, it was the hon member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He has been attempting to teach, and has succeeded in teaching, the people of this country what the true principles of political economy are for the last twenty years. It took Wilberforce more than twenty years to teach the Christian people of Great Britain that slavery was a bad thing, and it may take the hon. member for South Oxford and his friends on this side of the House more than twenty years to teach the half-civilized people of Canada that protection is a bad thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and no loyal men on the other side can say nay to it; because they are placing Great Britain all the time as an example to us, and I am only putting ourselves as being in the position of being not as cultured as Great Britain, and they, at least, cannot say a word to me. After the hon. member for South Oxford has been doing what I have said, for the last twenty years, no wonder that you on the other side would like to kill him. Yet, one of the strongest tributes I have ever heard paid to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was, when a member on the Conservative side said in this House, that if the hon. gentleman had adopted protection in 1878 he would be in power to-day. There could be no stronger tribute to the hon. gentleman than that; because the hon. gentleman, from conviction, and without regard to his retaining power, felt that in this country, as in all countries, the only thing that would make us great and good was free trade. Rather than throw aside his principles he clung to them, and I believe that the people of Canada to-day have infinitely more respect for him for so doing. I say, to use the rather doubtful term of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), the people of Canada have "infinitely" more respect for the hon. member for South Oxford to-day than if he had then changed his principles for any principle flying around in order to retain him in power, as the hon. gentlemen opposite will do and have been doing. The people of the country, I repeat, have more respect for him than if he changed his principles to suit whatever circumstances may arise, just as hon. gentlemen opposite do, who are in the habit of throwing their principles away as easily as a man casts off his garments. These hon. gentlemen opposite know that they have other methods of bringing their supporters to book:

> "They cast off their friends, as a hound would his pack.
> For they know, when they like, they can whistle them back."

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stood firmly by his principles in 1878; he stood by the sound principles of political economy, rather than cast them aside to suit the whim of the hour, and hence the rage of the Conservative party; hence the attempt to belittle him; while all honest men should admit that nothing could be more in his favour than his stern adhesion to the principles which he believed in. As the hon. gentleman sat there listening to all these remarks of members opposite, and impervious to their little shafts, I could not help but think that the very charges which they brought against the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were the very things which, in my opinion, constitute the reasons why he should be applauded. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of this House longer, for I shall conclude before you leave the Chair at six o'clock. I think that perhaps in this discussion we have had speeches which were nearly long enough, to say the least of them. I want to say, that so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, the condition of things down there is not all as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says. I happen to know something, in my practice, of our farming community, and I tell the hon. gentleman that in the Counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysborough, the farmers are not as well off to-day as they were fifteen years ago.

An hon. MEMBER. That is so.

Mr. FRASER. I tell the hon. gentleman that, and he himself says it is true.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I do not believe it.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says it is true, and yet you do not believe it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). In fact, I know it is not true.

Mr. FRASER. You have got your choice, but I will take the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax in preference to yours.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I can prove from the farmers themselves, from the reports of their agricultural societies, and other reliable information, that it is not true.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman cannot do it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I can do it.

Mr. FRASER. Yet, Mr. Speaker, not later than three days ago, the largest petition ever presented to the Canadian Parliament—a petition signed by fifteen thousand farmers, came into this Parliament asking that a reduction should be made on the prime necessities of life, and stating that farming was not in as good a position as it had been. Does the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) think that he knows as much about farming as these fifteen thousand farmers do? I have no doubt that he is as wise, in his own conceit, as these fifteen thousand farmers are; but notwithstanding that, I still believe that these fifteen thousand farmers know more than he does; and when they penned their names to this petition, I will take their opinion before his, be he ever so wise. I submit that the condition of the farmers of these three counties I have mentioned is not so good as it was, and I have got the assent of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) that it is not.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to make a personal explanation, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, further than to say that my opinion is that the rural population of Nova Scotia is amenable to the same influences which affect the rural population of the United States and other countries.

Mr. FRASER. Ah, that is his reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under protection.

Mr. KENNY. And in free trade England.

Mr. FRASER. I ventured to think that the hon. gentleman would not come back to that argument again, after I have shown that the question of high rents was the question which affected the farmers in England. Does he think that the farmer in Canada who owns his own farm, and who pays no rent, should be in as bad a position as the farmer in England who has to pay a high rent? If the hon. gentleman knows anything about the farmers in Great Britain and Ireland, he knows that the question of high rents is the very foundation of all the grievances they suffer under, and he must know very well that in Ireland there is very little left for the farmer when the rent is paid.

Mr. DENISON. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FRASER. I will answer whatever the hon. gentleman has to state.

Mr. DENISON. I wish to state that the rents in the County of York, where I live, are higher than they are in Ireland.

Mr. EDGAR. They are not higher in the part of the County of York that I represent.

An hon. MEMBER. You don't represent York.

Mr. FRASER. You see how very easy it is to show where the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) is wrong. He thought he had the whole thing to himself, but here comes an answer to the hon. gentleman's declaration. Mr. Speaker, another thing I will tell you is that the fishermen of the Province of Nova Scotia are not so well off as they were before. And here comes a point, and a point I wish to bring before the attention of this House, and that is, that of all the cruel things in this world the treatment of the farmers and the fishermen by this Government is the most cruel. The farmer has to take his chances on bad crops and bad weather and other conditions of nature, but this Government never took that into account, while they knew that the manufacturer has to take none of these chances. The farmer must be fed and clothed, whether it rains or shines, and his success or failure often depends upon the natural conditions I have referred to. It is the same way with the fisherman. He enters his tiny boat and sets out on his work, and, if a kind Providence does not send him fish, he has to come home and be at the loss; yet, notwithstanding this, you lay upon him the heavy burdens of buying every article he uses, and placing heavy taxes on these articles in order to swell the pockets of the monopolists who give him no advantage. I tell the Government that the only way to give a fair chance to those classes of our community, is to make the conditions of life so easy that even if they occasionally meet with losses, because nature has not been kind to their industry, they should at least not be burthened so badly as they are at present. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the country is very prosperous, but I know in a county in the Province of Nova Scotia a professional man, a great friend of the present party in power, a present member of Parliament, and the condition of things in his county were so bad that actually, poor fellow, he had to swear himself out of gaol for less than $200; and yet I am told that the conditions of life in Canada are all favourable.

An hon. MEMBER. He was a politician.

Mr. FRASER. He is a politician, but is every politician in that condition? I know certain men that are not in that position since they came to Parliament, and it is just because they are in Parliament. That remark might apply to a gentleman on this side of the House, but it certainly would not apply to a gentleman on the other side of the House, or else he is not in the secret of certain matters that are now being enquired about and explained before a committee of this House. Mr. Speaker, when I was coming to Ottawa, I came from Yarmouth to Boston on the steamer *Yarmouth*, and the captain of that steamer gave me this fact: That from the 11th day of March in this year, until the 11th April, by that steamer alone, 300 persons more than in the same month of the previous year, went to the United States. Remember that is in this year, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is no exodus. I am not going to blame the National Policy for all this. I would not do that; but I am going to say this, that the National Policy has much to do with it, and the fact that our people have to leave this country is the best proof that the conditions of life are not as favourable here as they ought to be. Need I tell you in this House, that any country where an honest man cannot get all the work he wants, is not in a prosperous condition. The proper condition of life is, that every man who is willing and able to work should be able to get work every day at a fair day's wages. That is not the case in this country, and I maintain, Sir, that until such a time as we have a change in our policy such will not be the case. In spite of this we are to a certain extent as prosperous as the Americans are. Why, Sir, there

is enough land and there are enough workingmen in this country to prevent even this vile system of protection making people poor. Do hon. gentlemen opposite take great glory to themselves because we are living—because we do not find ourselves all beggars? Is it a great thing that we live, and live so as to get enough to eat? We ought to live better, and we ought to be happier. I tell you that if the conditions of life were easier, if our people had not to bear all this heavy burden of taxation, things would be very different with our farmers and artizans and fishermen; and it is on behalf of these people that I want to raise my voice; and despite the fact that the hon. member for Halifax has proclaimed himself to be a monopolist, I wish to say that if you want to make this country great, you can only do it by improving the conditions of the poor—by making life easier for the men who toil in the shop, in the fields or on the seas. The rich can take care of themselves; they need no help from Parliament, because they have the help within themselves; but it is the men who have to work, who have to give blow after blow for every dollar they receive whom this House ought to legislate for, by breaking off the shackles, and giving them the best conditions possible under which to live. I believe that this amendment should pass, because I believe that our Government when they go to Washington to negotiate should go there with the knowledge that the farmers, the artizans, the fishermen and the labourers want to get their goods as cheaply as possible; they should go to teach the people across the border who have such incorrect ideas of political economy that we have truer ideas in Canada. I also support this resolution because it strengthens the hands of the Government to make a treaty, and I want to strengthen their hands.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. That is as true as the rest of it.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen may laugh; but it is because I want to assist the Government, it is because I want them to go there strengthened, it is because I want to help the labouring people of this country, that I support this resolution. I think it ought to pass first of all to relieve the persons mentioned in it. I think it ought to pass in the interest of Canada. I think it ought to pass in the interest of Great Britain, to show the United States that this colony, instead of following in their footsteps, is following in the footsteps of the mother country. You may say that there is no feeling in this country in favour of reciprocity. Why, Sir, I tell you that the woman with a mop trying to drive back the Atlantic waves, is no more ridiculous than hon. gentlemen opposite who say that they are going to drive back the sentiment in favour of reciprocity by proclaiming that there exists a prosperity which does not exist; and neither this country nor any other country can ever be made great by a system conceived in the interest of the rich and against the poor, a system for pilfering the poor for the benefit of the rich, and making this country a laughing-stock in the eyes of England and the world. We never can and never will. And it is in order to strengthen the hands of the Government when they go to negotiate a treaty, and in order that our people may receive the benefits of reciprocity, that I am going to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford.

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

After Recess.

INVERNESS RAILWAY AND MINING COMPANY.

Mr. WILMOT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations in reference to this Bill. During the last session of this Parliament, a Bill was introduced for the purpose of incorporating a railway company in the County of Inverness, which I vigorously opposed, on the ground that it was only multiplying railway charters on ground already occupied by three railway companies. That Bill embodied incorporators whose names were Messrs. Paint, Hyndman and Small. Considerable discussion occurred in the Railway Committee on that Bill, and it was rejected, as I assumed, on the ground that this Parliament should not interfere in a matter of rival local charters. But this Bill embodies the names of incorporators who have a local charter over the same ground, so that the main objection which applied to the Bill of last year does not apply to this Bill, because its passage will not multiply railway companies over that ground. It simply incorporates the charter for members of another company which has been incorporated by the Local Legislature by a Bill entitled an Act to incorporate the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. In the Railway Committee the promoters of this Bill consented to have the name changed to that of the local charter, and also to have the same persons incorporated as had been incorporated by the local charter, with other amendments. Therefore, I think that the situation will not be materially affected if this Bill is allowed to pass. I still hold the same objection to the incorporation of several companies over the same ground. I feel now, as I have always felt, that the granting of several charters over the same ground by the Dominion Parliament or the Local Legislature is the best course possible to pursue in order to destroy the prospects of building a railway. I regret that in the east of Nova Scotia as well as in the west, companies have been chartered by the Local Legislature to such an extent as to destroy the prospects of building railways in that province. There were four railway branches built in Nova Scotia since 1877, but in no one of these cases were there two companies chartered over the same ground. If there had been two or three railway companies chartered over either of the grounds on which these lines have been built, I am satisfied that there would not have been built the Cornwallis Valley, the Oxford and Pugwash, the Joggins, or the Stewiacke and Lansdowne Valley railway lines. They were successful, not because a subsidy amounting to $3,200 a mile was voted by this Parliament, and because of the lobster clause 5 of the Act of the Local Legislature of 1886, but it was due to the fact that the Local Government was friendly to these lines, and prevented more than one

charter being granted over either ground. The Hants Central Railway has not been so fortunate, because arivalry has been created onthat line by rival charters. The Queen's, Annapolis and Shelburne lines have also been unfortunate, because rival charters have been granted over these lines, with, I believe, a member of the Local Government as charter member, so that he can prevent at pleasure the construction of a line in that part of the province. And in Inverness, I am sorry to say, the prospect of building a railway has been blasted for years to come by the fact that three companies have been chartered for the construction of a railway over that very important ground which requires railway facilities for the development of the mineral resources on the north-west coast of the Island. In view of that fact, I do now, as I formerly did, express the hope that the Government will undertake the construction of branch lines to the Intercolonial Railway. This is the policy pursued by all railway corporations in their own interest. It is the policy pursued by the Canadian Pacific Railway and by the Grand Trunk Railway, and I do not see why a policy which is advantageous to these great corporations should not also prove beneficial to the Government, which practically is the corporation that runs the Intercolonial Railway. If the Intercolonial Railway does not pay, it is, in my opinion, simply because the Government have not pursued the same policy which the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have pursued. I withdraw my opposition to the Bill, simply on the ground that it does not multiply railway charters over a ground which is covered by three local charters, and because it only gives a Dominion charter to one of those companies. I have no hesitation in saying that this Dominion charter is not as advantageous to a company as a local charter. There are various reasons why that is so. One great reason is that, under a Dominion charter, a company must purchase the right of way, whereas, under a local charter, it can negotiate for the purpose of acquiring the right of way from the municipalities, and the municipalities are always willing to give that right. There are also various other reasons why a local charter is more advantageous to a company than a Dominion charter. It seems to me, however, there is no harm in this Bill. It will please the promoters, and though I firmly believe no company will ever be organized under the charter we are about to pass, yet, as it is a consolation to the promoters and will not likely hurt anybody else, I withdraw my objection.

Bill considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed, under the title: "An Act to incorporate the Inverness and Victoria Railway and Mining Company."

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Mr. Foster and amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

Mr. SKINNER. I must apologize, Sir, for venturing to address the House at this late stage of the debate. I shall endeavour to restrict myself as closely as possible to the resolution under discussion, but we have drifted in this discussion so far from the subjects covered by it, that it will be a difficult matter to keep strictly within the limits and avoid following the example set by hon. gentlemen opposite. The resolution as introduced to the House had a two-fold aspect. One was that duties should be taken off all goods used by artizans, farmers, fishermen and miners. I presume those four classes of people were introduced into the resolution with the view that the discussion might possibly affect them for election purposes rather than with any sincere desire to legislate for their benefit any more than for that of any other class in the country. I think it is unfortunate at any time, and especially in a discussion of this kind, that we should introduce any class distinctions in a country where all classes are equal before the law, and that we shall say that there shall be one style of legislation for one class and another style for another class. According to my knowledge, and I think it is the knowledge of other hon. gentlemen, the farmers, miners, fishermen and artizans are as well looked after as any other class in the community, and, when we are asked to take off the duties on these goods these persons use, what is the answer to be given when I ask if these people do not now get a large majority of their goods entirely free of duty? What would be the answer when I ask, do this class of people not get their goods as cheap in this country as in any other country of which we have any particular knowledge? Are not those goods cheaper to them here than they are in the United States?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SKINNER. Some hon. gentlemen say "no." If any hon. gentleman says "no," I do not think he can maintain the negative. If we had the same tariff as the United States, I think a louder complaint could be made in reference to the prices of those goods than that which was made by the gentleman who last addressed the House. Take the article of flour. Will any man say, except for the purposes of argument and in places where he cannot be contradicted, that flour is any higher in price in Canada on account of the duties than it would be if there were no duty upon it? All that the duty on flour does in this country is to keep our own market for our own people. If you look at the price of flour in the United States, you will see that the price here is no higher than it is there, and, if we had free trade with that country to-morrow, the price of flour would remain the same. Take meats, take everything that this country produces, and you will find that the farmer and the artizan have everything of that kind as cheaply as they would under a complete system of free trade. Take tea and coffee, which are used by these persons, and you will find that they are cheaper than they would be able to get them in the United States. Take sugar. Can it be said that free trade would make sugar cheaper than it is now?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. SKINNER. It would be the case if we had free trade, each country having its own tariff,

but, if we had free trade such as is now spoken of, the price must be the same in both countries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SKINNER. The argument might proceed in regard to all the classes of persons who are referred to in this resolution, and it could be shown that they would not get their goods any cheaper than they do now if this system were carried out. The second proposition is, that in the negotiations which may take place with the United States in October, the Government should press for free trade, or, in other words, unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. Having disposed of the first part of the resolution, I shall refer more particularly to the arguments of the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House (Mr. Fraser), and shall intertwine what I have to say generally on these propositions with what I have to say in reply to him. He started out by imputing to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) an interested motive, by saying that he would not be in favour of a protective policy if he were not a sugar refiner. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are too fond, while they are praising the farmer and some other portions of the community and think they can get votes from them by pursuing that kind of policy, of throwing out innuendoes and maligning the great manufacturing industries of the country. Every manufacturer is called a monopolist because they know the word "monopolist" has a bad sound in the country. If the manufacturers in Canada are entitled to be called monopolists, what are the manufacturers in the United States entitled to be called, and, if we had reciprocity with the United States, would not the same argument of those hon. gentlemen be thundered forth against the manufacturers in the United States with greater force than it is now against the manufacturers in Canada? But it is untrue—speaking in a parliamentary sense—that the manufacturers are monopolists. There is no country in the world where the manufacturing interest is being carried on with less monopoly than it is in Canada, no matter whether those countries are free trade countries or protectionist countries. The term "monopoly" will extend to England as well as to the United States or to Canada. Monopoly is as old as the history of commerce, and the most extensive trade monopolies have existed in the past in England and other European countries. When hon. gentlemen use the term "monopolists" as a term of abuse, they are maligning those to whom they refer when they imagine they are stating a proposition which has an element of truth. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is a sugar refiner, is that a disgrace? Should not Canada be proud to be able to refine its own sugar? Was it able to do that from 1873 to 1878, when the refining interest ceased in this country? Hon. gentlemen may say that it should cease, and I understand that is their ground, but, unless the sugar is refined here, competition cannot be maintained against the rest of the world, and during the five years I have referred to, the sugar refiners were not able to maintain themselves against the rest of the world. The protective policy has given Canada the refining of its own sugar. In doing that, industries are built up, and I hope money is made. But I think it will be found that the sugar refiners of the country have not made more money than any other class of men engaged in business with a similar amount of capital and a similar amount of risk. Therefore, instead of being a term of disgrace, it is a term of honour that was flung across the House at the hon. member for Halifax, along with the insinuation that he only spoke as he did because he was a sugar refiner. I say it is well that the manufacturing interests should be represented in this House. I say the manufacturing interests of Canada are a glory to the country: they tell the story of its progress, its development and its independence in the commercial arena. I say that all that has been done has not increased the cost of those productions, substantially, to the country. Take the great cotton interest of Canada. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that the cotton goods of this country cost any more now than they would cost under a free trade policy? Everything in the world the tariff has done for Canada, so far as that interest is concerned, is to give our own people the manufacturing of our own cotton, and instead of importing the manufactured material, we now import the raw material and then make into fabrics to be used by the people of the country. So one may go on with reference to that part of the hon. gentleman's speech in which he had flings at the manufacturers, but I will not enlarge upon that to any greater extent just now. No man, he said, is a protectionist unless from self-interest. Well, Sir, self-interest is a good thing in a sense. The man who does the best for himself is doing the best for the country in which he lives, because the country is composed of an aggregate of units, and if the units are making themselves prosperous, although from a motive of self-interest, the country is growing prosperous at the same time. But it is a mistake to put it in the sense in which the hon. gentleman did, because there are thousands and thousands of our people who are in favour of protection because they think it would build up the country generally, and if it were left only to the few that are directly interested, such as the manufacturers themselves, do you believe for a single moment that such a policy could be sustained in this country for the length of time it has? The hon. gentleman anticipated a thought of that kind when he said: But those outside of the manufacturing industries who sustain protection do so because they want to sustain their party, and, therefore, they vote against their consciences and against their ideas in reference to those propositions. We who know the opinions of the people of this country, and have heard the voice of the electors from time to time, know that that is not the case. The people of this country who sustain protection do so from a motive of patriotism, from an idea of wishing the country well and advancing its interest, and for no other view or motive in the world. Then the hon. gentleman laughed at the idea of England ever going back to protection. Perhaps it never will; he does not know. England has changed her policy many and many a time, and will probably change it many and many a time again. But a few words upon the history of English free trade. When England embraced free trade as a policy, her statesmen thought she was going to lead the trade of the world. They thought that other nations would see that the policy of free trade was so beneficial to her that they would follow in

her track and become free trade countries as well. But what is the result? The United States, one of the greatest of modern nations, has become the greatest protectionist country that the world has yet seen. Germany is a protectionist country, France is largely a protectionist country, Austria is a protectionist country, and so on. In very many of the nations we find that the protection idea is increasing in force, in intensity and in breadth, all the time, and it may very well be that in England after a while, if she finds herself shut out of the markets of the world, may turn her attention to this proposition, and ask herself what she had better do with reference to her trade. England is free trade now, but a large number of the people are taking up the idea that England should at least have a protectionist policy so far as the outlying portions of the British Empire are concerned. Hon. gentlemen opposite will sing out: Oh, that is the Imperial federation fad, or something of that kind. I am not rising here to-night to make any remarks about Imperial federation, but I will say that I believe a policy will grow up in these British countries of drawing more closely together, rather than of drawing apart. Whether you make it Imperial federation or give it another name, makes no matter: that will be the tendency in the years to come—mark what I say upon that point. On the question of whether England is becoming protectionist, we are not going to be guided by her policy, but we are going to do that which will be best for our own interests. But I do think, and I believe I speak the sentiments of a majority of the people of this country, when I say that if we would pay a little more attention to cultivating trade between us and the mother country, and talk less of trade between us and the United States, we would go ahead much faster than we do now. Mind you, I am in favour of freer trade relations with the United States, but I believe the way to get freer trade relations with the United States is to talk less about it. The United States will never give away one inch in our behalf for any love they have for us. The United States Government is the most selfish government in the world to-day: the personal element enters less into the United States Government than in any other Government on earth. I do not say that in any disparagement of the people of the United States, but because I believe that the form of government existing in the United States is a vast corporation, and a corporation, as it is said, has no soul; therefore the United States Government does not move by favour, or any sentiment of that kind, in its relations with foreign nations, but it moves along a line of abstract selfishness, doing the best it can for that people, utterly regardless of what the result may be to other countries, no matter how they are situated or what their circumstances may be. We know that it is the policy of the United States never to interfere in reference to other countries. If the nation to which we belong had adopted and carried out such a policy in the centuries that have passed, all civilization would have been swept from the world. It is because of what Great Britain has done outside of those three kingdoms that progress has visited all the nations of the earth. I say it is necessary to understand that feature of the United States Government, and then we shall understand that whatever is got from that country is given because they think it is best for their own interest, and for no other reason in the world. Well, then, if that be the case, and the United States Government thinks that Canada requires free trade with them in order to be prosperous, they will not give it to us: as I said, they will always follow their own interest. But I believe, as time goes on, the United States will see that it is to their interest to have freer trade relations with Canada, and I believe we will get them. But I do not think we will accomplish the purpose we have in view by continually making our policy turn upon what the United States are willing or are not willing to do for us. For one, whilst I would like to have freer trade relations with the United States, I believe that Canada can live and flourish and become a great country, and have an enormous trade, even under the policy of an absolutely prohibitory tariff between Canada and the United States. I believe our policy should be that of to-day, yet at the same time we should be ever ready to go on and meet the people of the United States as things develop, and increase our trade with them and do the best we can, and not make it appear all the time as if we were dependent upon them for our very existence. The hon. gentleman who last spoke referred to the decline in shipping. Surely he does not think that decline arose from any legislation of any nature or kind in Canada? Shipbuilding declined in this country, as we all know, because of the development of iron shipbuilding. And in this connection let me make reference to the place from which I come. Two hon. gentlemen who recently addressed the House, the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), spoke with respect to the decay of trade in New Brunswick, and, of course, incidentally, to the decline of shipping. The port of St. John before the decline of shipping was one of the largest ship owning ports in Canada, and, in addition to that, it was one of the principal ports for building and exporting ships, it exporting a great number of ships yearly. All that shipbuilding passed away, without reference to our legislation. In addition, St. John, as is well known, suffered greatly from the disastrous fire that occurred 12 or 13 years ago, and the line of trade altered to a great extent in certain other things. The development of the railway system for a certain time dispersed a portion of the trade that centred in St. John, and other conditions had to arise by which other trade should take its place. Therefore, if any hon. gentleman would honestly discuss the trade of St. John, he should not only look at the dry figures, which can be made to lie more than any man can lie if placed in certain positions, and if used for that diabolical purpose, but he should look at the environment and all the surrounding circumstances before he comes to a conclusion. The array of figures used by the hon. member for Yarmouth are of the class of figures that have been running through one of the Opposition papers of St. John for two or three years. The people down there almost know these figures by their ear-marks, and they have been trotted out to do duty as hacks in carrying the political car round the country. They know that these figures are entirely false, because they are placed in an entirely false position, and the whole story is not told. The commerce of St. John is greater to-day than it ever was.

The arrivals of vessels in port last year were more than four times as many as in the port of Montreal, greater in number, but not so much in tonnage. St. John does a very large business, and it is the distributing centre for quite a large section of country. We have to account for it in some way. In view of the changed condition of affairs we did well to sustain ourselves. I remember year after year, when pessimism was to some extent as strong as it is on the other side of the House now, that it was depicted when certain things took place in St. John the whole place would become desolate. Those things took place, but the angel of desolation did not come in their track. What was the reason? Because other trade developed. At the union of these provinces the interprovincial trade, so far as can be ascertained, amounted to about $3,000,000 yearly. Now, so far as can be ascertained, it amounts to over $80,000,000 a year. What has built up our internal trade? The financial and fiscal laws of the country, the development of the people and the operations of manufacturers and producers. St. John has obtained a fair, and even more than a fair, proportion of that trade, because the railways centre there now in such a way as to give her the advantage, and her proportion of that internal trade more than makes up for the other trade she may have lost under the statistics now before the House and country, submitted for the purpose for which they have been presented. I tell the hon. gentleman that his doleful story is not true, his conclusions are not correct, his premises are not within the lines they should be, and his figures should be used in a different way. The member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), also had his fling at the prosperity of St. John. I do not think the hon. member was glad of it. I think he has been looking through these smoked glasses so long that he thinks what he sees is the reality, but he is mistaken. He particularly referred to the lime business; and let me say a few words in regard to it. I believe the lime business will yet flourish in St. John, notwithstanding the McKinley tariff, and I do not understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can so long and so continuously charge upon us the McKinley tariff. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite know that the McKinley tariff would have passed, no matter what our legislation here was. The McKinley tariff was not particularly aimed at us, but it was aimed at Europe. It was a commercial defiance on the part of the United States to the rest of the world, it was a notice that they were going to manufacture all the articles referred to in it for themselves, and, therefore, to say we are responsible for it here, is just as sensible as for some hon. gentleman to rise in the English House of Commons and say that the tin trade in England, which has been to a certain extent paralyzed by the McKinley tariff, was paralyzed because of some action of the English Parliament or English statesmen with respect to the United States. Those are statements which are incorrect, for the United States passed the McKinley Bill because they thought it to be in their interest to do so, and that is all there is about it. But I believe the lime business at St. John will yet flourish, unless the United States goes still further. What are some of the facts in this connection? This is the worst year of the lime business for ten years, because of the hard times in the United States, and that is what has stopped a great deal of the exportation of lime during this year. The people around the Bay of Fundy have been in the habit, also, of supplying the lime-burners of Maine with large quantities of wood. What is the fact? Our vessels have been laid up in great numbers, I see recently, because the lime-burners do not need the wood. Why? Because, the lime market is so dull. And, therefore, the same arguments which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) advanced with reference to the lime business of St. John could be advanced with respect to the lime business at Rockland, Maine, the very home of the lime trade. I hold, therefore, that the isolated points do not prove anything, except that there was here or there some fact with respect to it. But you cannot deduct a general principle from any set of facts; you should get your general principle first and your deduction will come all right. The hon. gentleman who last spoke said that the Conservative party had no policy, not with regard to unrestricted reciprocity, but with regard to reciprocity generally. I suppose that is intended as sarcasm. Surely there was nothing more clearly defined between the two parties at the late election than their trade policies. The Liberal party said they were going for unrestricted reciprocity, or, in other words, for free trade with the United States. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to discuss for a few moments what the hon. gentleman said with respect to the abuse of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I fail to see where this side of the House has abused the hon. gentleman during this debate. I should think he would feel proud at the great prominence which has been given him in the discussion. To state facts is not to abuse. Has there been anything stated here with reference to what the hon. gentleman said, which is not true? Will any gentleman opposite state that we have attributed any remarks to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) which he did not state himself? Well, then, to repeat his utterances is simply to state a fact, and to state a fact is not abuse. The hon. gentleman for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) compares what he calls our abuse of the hon. member for South Oxford to the waves of the sea that are beating up against the lighthouse; and he says that the lighthouse stands there casting its resplendent rays the same as ever. He makes the hon. member for South Oxford the lighthouse of his party. Suppose we accept that statement; I ask the question, not only in this House but in this country: If during the last election Canada had steered her ship according to the light from that lighthouse, where would she have landed?

An hon. MEMBER. On reciprocity.

Another hon. MEMBER. In Washington.

Mr. SKINNER. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that he was going in for reciprocity, and that he was going in for discrimination against Great Britain. These were the two leading propositions in his policy, and if the country had adopted his policy then, we would be here legislating to-day to surround this country with a tariff wall against Great Britain, and to throw open the market between the United States and us. So far as I can understand, the policy announced by the hon. member for South

Oxford was clear enough, but, then, it is an anti-British policy. The hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden) said that the Conservative party, or some other party in Canada, had done a similar thing when they agreed to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; but there is a fallacy contained in that statement of a very great extent. Under that treaty, we were only providing for a few things that did not affect Great Britain at all; it was only with reference to the raw materials of these two countries. But what did the movement promoted by the Liberal party last winter show? It showed on the part of the party led by the hon. gentlemen opposite, a national movement in favour of carrying this country into a general proposition, of not only unrestricted reciprocity, but in favour of raising up a barrier tariff wall, and discriminating against the mother country. It was a notice—it will be an historical notice—it was a great public notice from this country to Great Britain, that we were taking the first step in Canada to recede from our connection with the mother country. I am not saying now whether that would be right or wrong; I merely ask what would be the result of the policy announced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? I could understand that there was some reason in it, if the resolution that we are discussing to-night was in favour of free trade generally. The hon. member who last spoke (Mr. Fraser) simply spoke as a disciple of Henry George. He gave out, so to speak, that he had imbibed and absorbed and assimilated the principles laid down by that writer, and these are the principles of absolute and utter free trade. It may be that these principles are better than the principles of protection, but I am not discussing that now. We might go on for weeks and weeks, either in the theoretical sense which he did, or in the practical sense in which business men would, discussing this question of protection and free trade. It cannot be that all the people that are in favour of protection, are what the hon. gentleman intimated they were, namely, cranks, and such things as that. I think when he comes to reflect that so many nations have adopted the principles of protection, he will see that his little pop-gun, shooting terms of that character against the statesmen of the influential nations which have decided on the policy of protection, will have very little effect upon the policy pursued by the empires to which he referred. Protection and free trade have been discussed, and will be discussed, and those who argue on either side need be neither fools nor cranks. There will be good and able men discussing both sides of that question, probably, for many years to come. I could understand if the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), being a disciple of Mr. George, had advocated free trade; but he did not. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution and the resolution itself, is not in favour of a general free trade. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to attack the National Policy, why do they not come out and attack it squarely, and say: We will have free trade instead of the National Policy. Then, if they did that, we could get in these goods from the United States which they speak about; then our fishermen and the other classes of the community which they speak of, would have all these goods coming into them free; but that is not the policy which they adopt. They say: We want to have free trade with the United States; and there they leave it. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, suppose we could get free trade with the United States as they advocate, and still have this enormously protective barrier against the United Kingdom, how powerful would be the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough, which I am attempting to reply to, with reference to the protection under the shadows of which he is now claiming to sit. The arguments which the hon. gentleman made this afternoon, have been made in Boston and New York a thousand times, and yet, notwithstanding, the United States is the greatest protective country in the world; and, if we were to have this tariff wall thrown around us, we would simply pass under the arms—or, as he would have it, under the curses—of protection to a greater extent than we are now. Therefore, so far as this position is concerned, I think the hon. gentleman has neither logic nor evidence to support his arguments. I think he has made his speech with the idea that these fallacies will reach a certain class of men who will be influenced by them, and that he imagines his statements will have the effect of misleading the country. However, that was the policy of the Liberal party in the contest. The contention of the Conservative party was this: We are in favour of freer trade relations, but in that connection we have two ideas before us and before the country. One is, to preserve, as far as may be, the National Policy, as it is called, and, at the same time, preserving the independence of Canada in a commercial sense, so that Canada should not lose the control of her own tariff, that she should not cease to be empowered to pass whatever laws she might please, in reference to revenue and matters of that kind. The result of that is, that, if the United States are willing to-day to meet us, and in the first place take up the question of an interchange of raw material, we will meet them. But, say the hon. gentlemen opposite, the United States will never do that. That is not our fault. Are we to be blamed for what the United States may do? But then, the hon. gentlemen opposite say: You can have something more. Well, we are willing to do that, and the question comes up: How much ought we to give them more than they give us, in order to get that. Now, we have our fisheries in the Maritime Provinces, and our fisheries on the inland waters as well, but I speak especially of the sea fisheries, and we are willing, and have been willing, and have said to the United States: Make a reciprocity treaty such as I am now referring to, and we will allow you to come in and fish with our fishermen within our own fishing limits, as freely as our people do. Would not that be a great thing to throw in, when we are making a treaty of this kind? The hon. gentleman opposite who last spoke said we wanted protection for the fishermen. I know, from having conversed with the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, that they are of opinion that they are better off now, with the fishermen of the United States kept out of their fisheries, than they would be under reciprocity, if the United States fishermen came in to fish with them. There never was a time in the history of Canada when our fish were as valuable in the markets of the world as they are to-day. At the present time our codfish are worth about a dollar a quintal more than they were at any time under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. All the more valuable fish of the Maritime

Provinces, such as the salmon and the mackerel, the United States have to take; and the United States consumers have to pay the duty on them. Therefore, there never was a time in the history of Canada when those very fisheries were more valuable to our fishermen than they are to-day. If there were any argument on that point, it would be with reference to the prices our fishermen have to pay for what they consume; but we know that the material which goes into the nets of the fishermen and other things which they use comes in entirely free. So that any hon. gentleman who gets up and propounds this argument about the fishermen of the country, is not doing it on a solid basis of fact. Then, this Government has expressed its willingness to enter into negotiations with the United States for the purpose of arranging a reciprocity treaty. That, surely, ought to be enough. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that that will not do it. If not, it is because the great party of hon. gentlemen opposite have said to the United States: Do not do it, and if you do not, we will give you more. When treaties are discussed between the nations of the earth, they are discussed in private; but hon. gentlemen opposite, as we say in law, are giving our whole case away by telling the United States that they ought to demand everything, and that if they do they will finally get everything. I say that is a bad policy. The Conservative party and those who have the best interests of Canada in view, will never consent to that, but will, I believe, say to the United States: We will negotiate with you a reciprocity treaty if you will do it on terms that will be just to our people, and along the lines which we have indicated; but we will never surrender the interests of our country to any foreign power. Then the exodus was referred to by the hon. gentleman. This exodus has played almost as great a part in the history of Canada as the ancient exodus played in the history of the Jews. We cannot have a Budget debate without hearing this question brought up. Why, there is nothing in this exodus to cause any fear to Canadians at all. We belong to a race of exotics. Our forefathers came across the sea and landed in this country. We have the spirit of enterprise, the spirit of pressing forward, the spirit of independence, the spirit of subduing the world. If the exodus feeling had never existed in Great Britain, this continent would never have been settled. If the exodus feeling had never existed in France, those valiant men who came up the valley of the St. Lawrence would never have done the great work they did for civilization. The exodus spirit belongs to humanity and the progress of the world, and therefore we have no fear of this exodus. I saw statistics some time ago showing that during the last twenty-five years over 1,600,000 people had gone out of the State of New York away to the far West—had exuded, so to speak, out of that great State. If the pessimistic argument had been applied in that case, the State of New York ought to be a most unprosperous country. But no matter whether you have tariff walls or a reciprocity treaty, you never can eliminate from the great people to which we belong that spirit of eternally pressing forward along the lines of the nations with which we are connected. But one thing we have done in connection with this great and magnificent union that we have established in Canada: we have first by purchase, and then by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, provided a western country to which our people can go, and have gone, and to which they will continue to go during the years to come, building up and developing this country. Therefore, when this question of the exodus is brought up, it is only as it were a scarecrow in a cornfield with which the crows have become acquainted, and it ceases to scare any longer. I have some sympathy for the hon. gentleman who last spoke, for that terrible intelligence which he received on that steamer going from Yarmouth to Boston, that 300 persons more had gone within a certain time to the United States—I suppose he meant more than had gone last year in the same length of time. He did not say how many returned. He could not see any returning; his glasses were so green, or his political eyesight so much blurred over, that if he saw any coming back, he would think they were only going backward and did not intend to come to Canada at all. Why, I saw it stated in a newspaper that something like 1,000 persons had returned to Yarmouth in those steamers in a short time. In the Maritime Provinces there is a continual flux or reflux of population during the year. It has so grown up that during the summer time quite a large number of our people go to the United States and man the fishing fleets and work there, and return to their homes again in the autumn. Whether it is for the good of the country or not I need not stop here to argue. But I can say this of the Maritime Provinces, taking the Island of Prince Edward, for instance, that notwithstanding the people who have gone from there to the United States, you will not find a country of equal size where there are more men of means, a greater proportion of happy homes or of successful people, than you will find there. It may be that because the country is small the people have an inclination to move. Then, in connection with this exodus, another thing must be taken into consideration. There is a great rising up among all the people of these countries. There is more education given to the masses now than was given to the few a century ago, and what is the effect of that education upon the young people of the farm? When they have become educated, they have caught as it were a glimpse of the world; a knowledge of history, geography and mathematics have been poured into them; a picture of the whole world, as it were, has been revealed to them; and their first impulse is to go abroad and see the world; and after a while when they have seen it, and found they are a portion of the whole rather than of a part, they will come back again and rehabilitate what they have left, and we will not lose our people at all. That has not been considered in connection with the exodus at all; and instead of it being regarded as an argument against the country, when it is considered in the historical and philosophical sense, it only shows the great prosperity of our country; it shows that we are able to throw off so many people as we do, and yet retain our position and prestige, and carry forward the great work we have undertaken, which ought to fill the souls of hon. gentlemen opposite with joy rather than to darken their dreams with grief. With reference to the exodus we need have no fear. I have attempted to answer the arguments of the hon. gentleman, and I do not propose to address the House further. Whether we are to have free trade or protection will remain for the

people of Canada to decide. I heard an hon. gentleman say last night that the Opposition expected to come into power on what he called scandals. I hope, if they should come into power, they will do so on some policy. It will be better for them and for the country that they should come into power on some well-defined policy, so that the country may know where they are. And that, I believe, is also the opinion of the electors. I do not believe that the electorate of this great country who are in favour of sustaining the dignity and the integrity of this country along the lines I have indicated, will, because a few scandals have arisen, drive the ship of Canada away from its true course along the waves of history. The people understand the whole question too thoroughly to be so led away. One reason why the people in the constituency I have the honour to represent changed their votes to such an enormous majority against unrestricted reciprocity was this: The history of the coast cities of North America was there spread before them. They saw how the city of New York had eaten up such a large proportion of the foreign trade of Boston; they saw how the cities of New York and Boston together had absorbed nearly the entire foreign trade of the city of Portland. That city, which used to have a large import business, last year imported very much less than $1,000,000 worth; and the people of St. John reason in this way. They said: If New York, under commercial union, has absorbed the foreign trade of Portland, what is going to become of the foreign trade of St. John; and like sensible men they voted against the policy which would ruin our cities. If the hon. gentleman who spoke last were here, he might say that, in so voting, he acted from a selfish standpoint, but I hold he acted from a patriotic standpoint. Men who had been opposed to the Conservative party all their lives, came by the hundreds and went to the ballot box, saying: We will support no such policy as that; we want to keep the trade of our country. What has Canada done? Canada has put $100,000,000 into her railroads and built up her commerce on the idea that it should flow through these great lines of railway; but hon. gentlemen opposite wish to come in with a policy which will put a stop to our internal commerce and ruin our railways. To that policy we are opposed. We have stood by the Union, we have made many sacrifices to build up the Union, and we are going to continue standing by it. We are going to do nothing that will prevent the trade of the West flowing down to the East and our trade going up to the West. To-day in the Maritime Provinces we substantially use no flour save Canadian flour, and are proud of it; and before the Union largely all the flour we used came from the United States. We are becoming Canadians, we are becoming cemented together more strongly every day; and our nationality has gained a strength in this short time we could hardly have anticipated twenty-five years ago when forming Confederation. Down by the sea, we look with hope to our trade with the western provinces. We know the history of the cheese development of Ontario, and that industry may be taken as an indication of the development we may expect with reference to our other productions. Will any gentleman opposite say that the United States will be the natural or any other kind of market for our cheese, or butter, or other products of this country? No; but the markets on the other side are ever open for those products. That is the view we take; it was on that ground we were elected; and we will stand by the Union and protection so long as our present development continues, and we will be prepared to enter into free trade relations with the United States as soon as the United States are willing to make a satisfactory treaty with us, always keeping in view the integrity of Canada and our connection with the great Empire to which we belong.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, although this debate has now lasted for several sittings, and there probably remains no one to be converted in this House, you will allow me to say a few words in the name of the County of Napierville, which, of the whole Dominion, is the only county where the opinion in favour of unrestricted reciprocity is so strong and universal that the two campaigns which lately took place in the county were both between supporters of that policy. There is not, that I know, one single protectionist in the whole County of Napierville. I am, therefore, sure that if my words do not meet the approval of the Conservative party in this House they will meet the views of the Conservative party in the County of Napierville. I believe that such a circumstance is so rare for a member that I must not lose the opportunity of giving this satisfaction to the Conservatives of the county which I have the honour to represent. Before dealing directly with this question of reciprocity I wish, Mr. Speaker, to give a moment of attention to an argument used by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) in answer to my hon. friend, the member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin). The hon. member for Ottawa complained last night that the present Administration was a little too noted by its scandals. The hon. member for Hochelaga thought he gave him a satisfactory answer in saying that we, the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, had no right to complain of scandals here, when in the Province of Quebec there was against us what we termed the Pacaud-Whelan scandal. The position of the hon. member is doubly false, Mr. Speaker. We do not sit here for the Province of Quebec, but for the whole Dominion, and we must merge our nationality with that of the other provinces, as we must confound the name of our province with those of the other provinces. We sit here with a spirit of justice, and it is as such that we enquire into all the scandals of the present Administration. It is with this spirit of justice, and not as members from Quebec, that we criticize your scandals when we have found them out. Well, Mr. Speaker, where would such reasoning lead the hon. member for Hochelaga? The Conservative party was not driven away from power for its good deeds. It was turned out of office for its scandals, I believe. We remember their scandals, from that of the North Shore Railway to that of their man Gale. Now, when we are in power, how will the hon. member for Hochelaga be able to criticize the Liberal Administration, for I hope we are soon to have a Liberal Administration in the country? How, do I say, will he be able to criticize the Liberal Administration, should any abuses then reveal themselves; he, a Conservative, and coming from Quebec, where so many Conservative scandals have taken place? The falsity of the argument is so evident that I need not answer it any further, and I hasten to come

back to the question of unrestricted reciprocity. I was much surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear in this House Government orators attacking with so much violence the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, when barely six months ago, in the County of Napierville, where I had the honour of being the Liberal candidate, the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), one of the most important members of the Cabinet, followed by the hon. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bergeron), and by four or five members of this House, as well as by a crowd of picked canvassers, came into the county to fight the battle of a free trader, who did not content himself to say on the hustings, in the very presence of the hon. Secretary of State, that he was in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, but declared himself even one of the warmest partisans of free trade. There naturally remained one answer to the Secretary of State to explain his course: it was to say to this House, and to his friends, that he had gone and carried on that campaign in favour of a personal friend; that as the fight was between two candidates who did not share his opinions, he could take part in this election as a personal friend of Mr. Paradis. But now, after his speech of Monday last, the hon. Secretary of State can no longer make this answer. For, in answer to my little bit of a speech, as the hon. Secretary of State was good enough to call it, on Monday last, he gave us the little bit of an answer which I am going to read. Here is what he said:

"He did not miss the opportunity of saying that the Government, which had been represented in this campaign by many of its friends and by one of its members, had answered requests which had been made in the county for a public work."

Then the hon. Secretary of State was representing the Government in this election campaign; then it is the Government which came into the County of Napierville to advocate the election of my opponent, Mr. Paradis, who was publicly declaring in favour of unrestricted reciprocity and even free trade. Have I not a right of concluding, Mr. Speaker, that unrestricted reciprocity cannot be as repugnant to the hon. members of the right as they wish it to be believed; that it cannot be such a detestable and disloyal scheme, when barely six months ago such a scheme was openly supported, as I have said, in the County of Napierville. Besides, Mr. Speaker, what are the real reasons given on the other side of the House against unrestricted reciprocity and in favour of protection? Your present programme, we are told, is in contradiction to your programme of the past. The American farmers are in a deplorable state, and why should we be initiated to this deplorable state of things by unrestricted reciprocity? Lastly, how are we to make up for Customs duties, which are to give way to unrestricted reciprocity, without recourse to direct taxation? Mr. Speaker, the first of these points was made by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who, in order to show that our present programme is in conflict with our past, read speeches of Liberal chiefs for the last fifteen years. I understand that on a husting the hon. member for Haldimand might have offered such an argument, which takes with electors of any county. But when he addressed the House of Commons he might have done us the honour of thinking that we reason a little more seriously. The question of unrestricted reciprocity and the question of protection are commercial questions, which affect in no way the immutable principles on which the Liberal party rests. It is a question the *pro* and *con* of which change with the different phases and the different circumstances through which a country passes. I may well have been in favour of protection ten years ago, and yet consistently be in favour of unrestricted reciprocity to-day. Human perfectibility is only possible on the condition of there being men intelligent enough to profit by the lessons of the past and to modify their opinions in accordance with the results of experience. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the hon. member for Haldimand, who has dwelt the most on this point, what he thinks of Sir Robert Peel, who, after having been the pillar of protection in England, became later on the champion of free trade. Surely, the hon. member will not undertake to pull down the statues which free trade has erected to this great man of England. And if he tells me that this example is not sufficient to prove that he is wrong, I will recall to his mind the contradictions of his friends in this House. Has the hon. Minister of Finance not been one of the strong advocates of the prohibition of intoxicating liquors, and is he not against prohibition to-day? And yet it seems to be that in these questions of morals the matter of principle is somewhat more important than in a commercial question, and I believe that it does not behoove one to change one's mind so soon when one wants to retain a little personal dignity. This example is surely as notable as the would-be inconsistencies mentioned by the hon. member for Haldimand, and I hope he will take note of this inconsistency of the hon. Minister of Finance along with the others. The second argument brought against unrestricted reciprocity is the deplorable condition of the American farmer. I remember that when the hon. member for Haldimand dealt with this question the hon. leader of the Opposition smiled. The hon. member for Haldimand, anxious to find evil even in the smile of a Liberal, immediately asked for an explanation from the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman answered him that he smiled because, while the speaker was depicting the deplorable condition of the American farmer, the Conservative party was trying to initiate us to that condition in wanting to give us agricultural reciprocity. The hon. member must have realized that it was an imprudent thing to question the smile of an intelligent man; for if he weighed the answer of the hon. leader of the Opposition he must have seen that it destroyed his laborious display in this respect. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, either the American farmers are prosperous or they are not. If they are not in a prosperous position, then why wish to assimilate us to them? Why say that agricultural reciprocity will be a remedy to the present evils from which the country is suffering? If they are in a condition of prosperity, why refuse giving us unrestricted reciprocity? It is because, do you say, we do not want to sacrifice the manufacturers' and combinesters' interest. I then understand that the only difference between you and us is this: You put in one of the basins of your balance the interests of the farming community, and in the other basin the interests of the manufacturers. And for the reason that the load of this second basin, that of the contractors and manufacturers, finds a way to melt into money available in election times, you give the preference

to this second basin, and not to the one which holds the interests of the farmers. I believe this is the only point on which we differ. We have in view the interest of the agricultural classes, andfor it we are ready to sacrifice even the interests of those influential manufacturers who make your strength in elections. We are ready to declare in favour of the agricultural community rather than in favour of the manufacturing class. You finally say: How will you make up for the lack of revenue which will follow the abolition of the tariff, without direct taxation? I, for one, am not in favour of direct taxation. But, I ask, what is the tax which the farmer does not pay to-day? What is the tax which the consumer does not pay? It is true we can drink tea, and even sweetened tea, without paying duty; but what do we eat, and what can we wear, upon which we do not pay a tax? The very flimsiest of flannels the farmer pays a tax on. He pays taxes even on his daily bread, and the light he uses at night. The present system of tariff seems, then, to my mind, the heaviest taxation which we could enact; and it would be better to have a direct tax, proportionate to the different classes of society, which every one would pay, according to his riches, rather than the present system. But I believe that we can sufficiently reduce our expenses to meet the wants of the country without direct taxation. It is my opinion, and it is that which my neighbour, the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) expessed the other day in this House. But you answer us: The country is very prosperous; why make a change? Every one of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen on the right side of the House gave us a striking picture of the prosperity of the country. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins)—and he is a consummate statistician—tells us that in the Province of Quebec the value of land has not diminished. Well, I do not know if there be one member coming from the Province of Quebec who would say in all sincerity that property has not diminished by at least 25 per cent. Is there one member, somewhat mindful of what is going on in his parish or in his county, who has not been struck by such a fact, that, as with us, there were last year more that 200 public sales at the church doors, while there used to be ten or fifteen per year? Farmers were obliged to sell at paltry figures their farming implements in order to emigrate to a foreign land. This is a state of things which the hon. member for L'Islet must have witnessed like others. For my part, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the country is as prosperous as we are told it is by the hon. gentlemen on the other side, unless by the people of the country we be to understand the Ministers who govern it, the manufacturers and the contractors, or the departmental heads, who know how to sow contracts and extras to reap jewels and diamonds. For me, the people of the country are not that. The people of the country is the agricultural community. And while you rejoice over the state of the country, the agricultural class bemoans. This class economizes on the heads of wheat to pay for your wild expenditures. It gave you a warning at the last elections; it will seal your fate at the next, which I hope will not be slow to come.

Mr. LEDUC. (Translation.) After the numerous and eloquent speeches which were delivered on both sides of the House since the beginning of this debate, I understand that it would be impossible for me at this stage of it to develop any new proposition. But, being here the representative of a county almost exclusively composed of farmers, it seems to me that I could not be justified, under the circumstances, were I to content myself with giving a silent vote. I believe it to be my duty on the contrary to impress my view on the great and important question of commercial reciprocity, a question which has been so much discussed since the last general elections. If I judge from the speeches which we have heard from the other side of the House, it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite have greatly modified their opinions since that time. We then met on the different hustings of the country, the Conservative candidates or their friends; we heard them declare with more or less force in favour of commercial reciprocity. According as the circumstances wanted, according as the audiences they addressed were more or less strongly in favour of commercial reciprocity, these gentlemen would more or less strongly advocate this measure. Some were even met with who went as far as championing unrestricted reciprocity. That is to say, that in a great number of counties, the programme of the Conservative candidates was so like that of the Liberal candidates, that a great number of electors, taking them to be sincere friends of reciprocity, allowed themselves to be deceived, and gave their votes for "the old chief and the old party." Evidently these candidates had been authorized to say nothing of "the old flag," for it was not the old flag they were upholding then. If at that time, Mr. Speaker, the same language had been used before the electors as is used since the beginning of this debate; if the friends and representatives of the Conservative party had argued that the condition of the United States farmers is inferior to that of our own; if, in short, all possible arguments against commercial reciprocity had then been arrayed by the Conservative party before the constituencies, I believe that it is not the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald that would have been returned, it is not the Government of Hon. Mr. Abbott that would to-day be at the head of affairs, but, on the contrary, we would to-day see the honourable and distinguished leader of the Opposition preside over the destinies of the country. However, Mr. Speaker, with an inconsistency not at all surprising with the hon. gentlemen opposite, after having depicted in such sombre colours the situation of the American farmers; after having represented by all means at their disposal that there is no advantage for us in a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, they turn and tell us: In the month of October next we shall be ready, and we will send delegates who will endeavour to establish commercial relations with the United States. This contradictory attitude on the part of our hon. friends of the right does not surprise us, for enough of them have committed themselves on the question of commercial reciprocity during the last election, that the Government should now think proper to make at least a show of wanting to conclude a treaty with the United States. They will send delegates to the United States in October next, but I fear their trip will not be much longer than that of the delegation of March last. After a few days passed in the American capital, they will come back, and tell the electors: We have done all that was

humanly possible to do, but how can we help it, the United States do not want to make a treaty of reciprocity with Canada? And they think the trick will be played. Well, I can tell these gentlemen that they will not be quits so easily. The Canadian people has been so often deceived that he has his eyes on you, he watches all your movements and you shall pay with your heads if you do not fulfil the promises which you made at the last elections; that is, if you do not obtain this treaty which was, according to you, to bring prosperity to the farmers. A certain number of members of the right spoke with much force on the prosperous situation of our country. They made a brilliant picture of it; they represented it under such attractive colours, that under the charm of their words we would for a moment have been tempted to believe that we were the most happy and the most prosperous people in the world, had we not unfortunately every day under our eyes the most evident proof to the contrary. If I thought that the hon. gentlemen who spoke so were sincere, I would ask them to come down from the heights they have climbed, and to visit the rural districts, to question the farmers; to ask them if they are better off to-day than they were ten years ago; if property has really more value than it had ten years ago; and they would be answered that the position is worse than ever; that real estate has decreased 30 or 40 per cent. If you are not satisfied with this answer, enter, on your way, the country store. Ask the merchant if the terms of credit are shorter, if he is better paid by his debtors. He will answer you that never were the terms of credit longer nor collections harder. If yet you have not evidence enough, go to the registrar's office, and when you have found how heavy are the mortgages which burden our farmers, I believe that you will agree with us in saying that the situation is not as brilliant as you have been pleased to represent it. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that one need go this length to find that we are really not in a very prosperous condition. We have only to refer to recent emigration reports, and if you admit, as you contended in 1878, that emigration is the thermometer by which the prosperity of nations can be gauged, I believe that you will acknowledge that there exists in the country a great uneasiness, that there exists a great fever which threatens to become an epidemic. It is useless then, Mr. Speaker, to delude ourselves, when, on all sides of us, hundreds and thousands of voices lament to us every day that their position is worse than ever, when real estate has lost about a-third of its value, and when emigration has taken such alarming proportions. Then it must be acknowledged that something is going wrong somewhere. It must be admitted that the evils which were complained of in 1878, far from having been remedied, far from having been removed, are, on the contrary, worse than ever. It must be admitted that the great remedy, that the policy which was to be the infallible panacea that was to cure all evils, did not produce the results that were expected from it. What remains then for us to do? Mr. Speaker, when a wise and prudent physician has used a remedy and finds that the same has not produced the effect he expected therefrom, what does he do? He studies his case more carefully, he goes back to the causes of the disease, and substitutes for the unsuccessful remedy a better one. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances we should urge upon the Government to do the same. We have the proof that the great remedy of protection which we have been treated with for the last twelve years or so has not produced the results which were expected from it. With protection, according to the hon. gentlemen of the right in 1878, all was to flourish in the country. Hundreds of manufactories were to rise in all parts of the country. There was to be work for all the hands. The farmer was to have a market at his door. In short we were to be a happy and prosperous nation. Unfortunately this result was not attained. I will, therefore, urge upon the Government to change its remedy. But what remedy is there to apply to the situation? This remedy, Mr. Speaker, we shall find it in the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends. We shall find it in commercial reciprocity with our neighbours. The speakers who preceded me and who spoke in favour of reciprocity, have shown us the immense advantages which would result therefrom to the Canadian people. They have shown us with official documents in hand that the United States were our natural market; that, notwithstanding the taxes which we are obliged to pay at the American frontier on our goods, we still export into that country about 50 per cent. of our total exports. They have shown us that with unrestricted reciprocity, while on one hand the Canadian buyer could realize a great saving on his imports, the Canadian farmer on the other hand would get more remunerative prices for his produce. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these two propositions are evident. It seems to me that if we abolish the taxes which we have to pay at the boundary line, on the American goods, these goods will cost us less. I believe that the hon. members on the other side of the House have had quite recently an example of this. When the hon. Minister of Finance abolished the tax on sugar we immediately saw the price of sugar drop 2 cents a pound all over the country. It would be the same thing I believe on other articles. If the 75 cents duty on flour were removed, the consumer would be that much the gainer. As to the improvement in the prices of the produce which our farmers have for sale, I believe the thing is equally evident. It has been established from the beginning of this debate, that about two-thirds of the produce from our farms has no other market than that of the United State. Therefore, the moment this market is closed to us, the farmers are forced to keep their produce in their barns, or in their houses, or else to sell it at low figures. Our farmers understand it perfectly well. They know that under the operation of the McKinley tariff, it is impossible for them to send their horses to the other side of the line, for they would have to pay a duty, half the value of each horse. They can no longer send their hay there, for it is taxed at the rate of $4 a ton. And so on for all the articles of export. The farmers understand that well, and the hon. members on the other side of the House understood it so well also, that at the last general elections—although we had a right to doubt their sincerity—they thought proper to adopt a flesh and fish policy in order to capture the vote. I shall not insist any longer on this point, by putting before the House long columns of figures, for this has been

done by others more able than I. But I cannot conclude without giving a little attention to certain objections that have been made to our policy of unrestricted reciprocity. With unrestricted reciprocity, the hon. gentlemen opposite say, we shall immediately lose the enormous revenue which we now derive from our Customs offices along the American line. How, they ask, are you going to make up this shrinkage? You have no other means than direct taxation. It is undeniable, Mr. Speaker, that with unrestricted reciprocity we shall lose seven or eight million dollars from that source a year, but I do not believe there is anything in that that should frighten us. The other day, Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the famous question of prohibition the hon. Minister of Finance stated, if I remember well, that, for the greatest good of the people, he would not be afraid of losing the revenue derived from liquors. Well, this revenue is almost equal to that which we derive from American goods. Besides, it seems to me, we could easily practise economy, which would help much towards making up the amount that we would lose. It seems to me that in certain departments—and this appears every day more and more evident—considerable savings could be realized. And if, after having realized all possible savings, we could not cover the deficiency, we could do then what the hon. gentlemen of the right do now, we could tax other articles. They boast to-day of having remitted a tax of three millions and a-half on sugar, but they found, nevertheless, means of taxing whiskey and other articles, instead. Well, if we had a deficiency we would also tax whiskey a little. Another objection which is made, Mr. Speaker, is that if we establish unrestricted reciprocity, we shall ruin our manufactures, and hundreds and thousands of workmen will find themselves in the street, without work and without bread. I think we have a perfect right to differ in opinion from the hon. gentlemen on this question, when the manufacturers themselves differ in opinion with each other. There is a certain class, among the manufacturers, who prefer a restricted market of which they are the masters. They prefer to quietly eat the good things which the Government serves them every year, oblivious of the sufferings which result to the poor. They remind me of the spoilt children for whom their parents can never make enough sacrifices. Their courage and energy never develop; as soon as they will be left to themselves they must necessarily fail. But by the side of this class, there are the true manufacturers. And, then, what do they ask? A market. Give us, they say, the great market of the neighbouring republic, and we will treble our establishments. That is what the true manufacturer says. He does not fear competition. On the contrary, he sees it come with pleasure. Besides, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the day we have a great market we will see foreign capital invested in our industries. It recurs to me, if my memory is not at fault, that not long ago great English capitalists invested immense capital in manufactures among our neighbours. Why? Because the United States had an immense market to offer. Therefore, if we had the advantage of an immense market we would equally have the advantage of capital. Far from ruining our manufacturers, reciprocity would be the means of giving them a new impulse, a new life. But there is another objection more dreadful still, which was hawked about on all the husting during the last campaign. It has also been held up to us from the beginning of this debate. We have heard the hon. gentlemen's doleful tones, in which—and I believe that had we been nearer them we would have seen tears drop from their eyes—in which, I say, they preferred that dreadful accusation of disloyalty which has been brought up against the Liberal party before the country and before the House. This accusation does not surprise us. It is as old as the world. And in the past, when our fathers, the Reformers, were doing all in their power to secure for us the free institutions which we now enjoy, there were, as there are to-day, a certain class of people who had not the courage of imitating them, and who entrenched themselves behind the screen of loyalty. We have loyalty, but it is not of the kind which parades on the hustings and the public squares. It is the loyalty of the heart, and we keep it in our hearts. As to that of our hon. friends opposite, we know what it is worth. It is worth about what drunkard's promises are worth; what the bravery of the soldier is worth, who dreads no enemy in time of peace, but who hastens to the other side of the boundary in time of war. Mr. Speaker, I will not continue the debate any further. I consider that during the last two or three weeks enough has been said on the subject. I am so fully convinced that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity is advantageous to the country in general, and the farmer in particular, that I will vote with pleasure for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. BROWN (Chateauguay). I think it my duty to my constituents as well as myself, that I should not allow the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to pass, without saying a few words in favour thereof. We have heard from the Minister of Finance as well as from other hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that the monetary and financial institutions of this country were in a healthy and prosperous condition, and, in a word, everything that you could either ask or expect them to be. When we pause and examine those statements and compare them with statements made by other gentlemen—men holding high positions of trust, men in whom the country have confidence, men capable of judging—we find that their statements do not agree; as, for instance, at a recent meeting held in Montreal, at which the general manager of the Merchants Bank of Montreal declared that the number of failures in Canada were a disgrace to the country, and quoting from the *Trade Review*, published by the Montreal *Gazette*, under date 4th July, 1891—and I am sure that that journal would not print "blue ruin"—in which they state that the number of business failures in the Dominion—including those for Newfoundland—increased 121, or 14 per cent., in six months of 1891 over 1890, while the increase of liabilities was $1,478,282, or 20 per cent. I regret to state that those statements are not so pleasing as those uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite that the McKinley Bill was not hurtful to and that it did not affect the trade of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I claim that the McKinley Bill is so framed that it is hurtful to the trade of Canada in many

respects. In regard to the horse trade, one of the features of the Bill is so calculated as to draw away our best class of horses. For instance, an American horse buyer coming into Canada upon finding out that he has to pay the same amount of duties on a medium or low-priced horse as upon a horse costing $130 or $140, under the circumstances he will naturally buy a horse of the better quality, thus leaving with the farmers of this country the inferior animals, which will in a very short time evidently injure stock-raising, as the stock raised from inferior animals will not bear out for Canada the name she has so justly acquired of producing the best horses on record. We have heard from the hon. member for Leeds that eggs could be shipped to Great Britain or the mother country at a profit. This statement is almost as plausible to me as the shipping of coals to Newcastle at a profit. I will make the statement here, and that from personal knowledge, that the average farmer sells or markets his eggs every ten or twelve days, the general country storekeeper or country merchant making regular shipments weekly—one week in collecting and repacking at shipping points, thus involving four weeks' time. Now, the egg of hens feeding on grass is never full, and handling and rehandling during four weeks in warm weather makes them almost worthless. Admitting that they are placed in cold storage on board of the ship, if they are stale or almost rotten it is a difficult task to make them fresh, and I venture to say that stale eggs as far as my judment goes are poor property on any market. We have heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite that the prices of eggs were just as good here in Canada as before the McKinley Bill came into force, and that Americans would come into Canada and buy our eggs, in spite of the McKinley Bill, with its 5 cents per dozen duty. Now, compare April, 1891, with April, 1890. According to the trade returns of the United States only 24,892 dozens of eggs were imported from Canada during the month of April, 1891, as compared with 450,623 dozens in April of last year—1890. The hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Where have those eggs gone? They have not found a market in Britain nor in the United States. They have gone into local consumption and produced no money. What is the effect of this to-day? Go into the city of Montreal, and what do we find? We find such men as Messrs. Laing & Sons, Masterman, and others, peddling their produce, and we hear them complaining of some firm in the city of Ottawa shipping a consignment of hams to Montreal and causing them to be sold on that market at 6 cents per pound; whereas previously, hams were shipped to Ottawa from Montreal, and this condition arises from the fact that the farmers get no cash for their eggs to-day and cannot afford to purchase meat, hence the fall in price. This information I received from parties engaged in the trade. Mr. Speaker, we who are the loyal Opposition have heard much in favour of and much against reciprocity with the United States. Still, there remains one hon. Minister whose utterances, no doubt, this House, as well as myself, would like to hear on this most important issue. That is the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If we, who are in the Opposition, could impress upon that hon. Minister, and that the hon. Minister should be only one-half as enthusiastic on the question of reciprocity as he was at the time of the recent election held in the adjoining county to that for which I have the honour to come, I have no doubt that reciprocity with the United States would be a sure success. These are the words of the hon. Minister on the occasion referred to.

"I am here as the unworthy substitute of my father, who has gone to Washington to effect a treaty of reciprocity with the United States."

The hon. Minister knows how the people of that county applauded him for his expressions on this occasion, and, knowing the feeling that exists in that and the adjoining county in regard to reciprocity with the United States, should the hon. Minister be instrumental in obtaining such reciprocity with the United States, on his next visit to that county the people there, I assure the hon. Minister, will doubly applaud him.

Mr. RYCKMAN. I will ask the indulgence of the House for a short time as a young member. I have listened earnestly and patiently to the speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I must say that those speeches would be discouraging to one who thought of coming to this country to settle here. If I were a young man, after reading one of those speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite in a foreign land, I would say that Canada is no country for me. I would feel discouraged. They say that our farming lands are depreciated in value, that our farms are mortgaged, that our Government is bad, and that everything we have is going to destruction. I do not agree with them in that respect. Next, we find them attacking the National Policy. Well, in the city I have the honour to represent we had 63 manufacturing establishments in 1878, and in 1891 we have 178. In 1878 we had about 7,000 workingmen and mechanics, and in 1891 we have 13,800 workingmen in our city. These workingmen are the backbone and sinew of this country. We have a good country at the back of us, we have farmers who bring in their produce, and as long as we have the working population in the cities we must benefit the farmers by buying their produce. The various towns and cities in this country all show a great increase in the population and in the number and extent of the manufacturing industries. The increase in railway mileage shows the progress the country is making. In 1878 we had 6,143 miles of railway; in 1890 we had 13,988 miles, an increase of 7,845 miles. The tons of freight carried have increased from 1¼ tons per inhabitant in 1876 to nearly 4 tons per inhabitant in 1890. In shipping, in 1878 we employed 23,102,551 tons in the coasting trade and in the transport of our exports and imports by sea and on the great lakes. In 1890, in the same service, we employed 41,243,215 tons of shipping, being an increase of 18,140,664 tons. I am sure that in view of this increase hon. gentlemen opposite cannot say that our country is going backwards. Take cheese. In 1868 the export of cheese from Canada was valued at only $620,000. In 1878 it reached $3,997,521. In 1890 the value of exported cheese was $9,372,212, the highest in any single year, and greater than that of the United States, as it had been for the three previous years. Take cattle exports. In 1878 the exports of cattle amounted to $1,152,334, and of sheep to $699,337. In 1890 the exports of cattle reached the value of $6,949,417, an increase of $5,797,083; and of sheep, $1,234,347, an increase of $535,010. The growth of this trade will be better appreciated when I state

that in 1868 the total export of Canadian cattle to Great Britain was less than $500,000 worth. Take the products of the mines. Since Confederation Canada has exported about $82,000,000 of products of the mine, an average of $3,500,000 per year. In the first year of the union the export was about $1,500,000. Now, take the products of the forest. We exported during the past twenty-four years about $540,000,000, an average of $22,500,000. In 1890 the exports of home manufactures, including sawn lumber, staves, shingles, box-shooks, &c., were $25,530,003. I would call the special attention to this item of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who spoke upon this question last night. The progress of Canada may be noted in many other ways. For instance, take the bank deposits. In 1878 the deposits in the chartered banks and in the various savings banks were $88,995,126. In 1890 they amounted to $197,895,452, an increase of $108,900,326. In 1878 the money orders received and sent out by the money order branch of the Post Office Department amounted to $7,130,000; in 1890 they amounted to $11,907,862; increase, $4,777,862. In 1878 the letters and post cards carried by the Post Office Department numbered 50,840,000. In 1890 they numbered 116,000,000; increase, 65,160. In 1878 the business of the country required a note circulation of $29,786,805; in 1890 it required a note circulation of $47,417,071; increase, $17,630,266. In 1878 the 4 per cent. bonds of Canada were 6 below par; in the beginning of January, 1891, the quotations showed them to be 9 above par, a difference of 15 per cent. The production of coal in 1868 was 623,000 tons. In 1887 it was 2,387,000 tons, an increase of 1,764,000. Next, take animals and their products. The exports of animals and their products in 1870 were $11,700,000, of which two-thirds were to Great Britain; in 1890 they were over 24,000,000, of which $18,578,722 were to Britain. The total exports of farm products in 1878 were $30,607,752, of which $19,147,608 were to Britain. In 1890 the total was $35,726,275, of which $22,240,548 were to Britain. The increase amounted to $5,118,523 in value. Now, in the face of all these facts, considering the enormous increase that has taken place in our products of cheese, cattle, the mines, the forests, and the increase in the bank deposits, in money orders, in the business of the post office, in the note circulation and Canadian bonds, &c., I am satisfied that when hon. gentlemen opposite still insist that our country is not progressing they must base their arguments on some lines of produce which I have not discovered. I say that the policy of the present Government is one which should be sustained. The Government have fostered the industries of this country; they have likewise, to a great extent, legislated in favour of our agricultural interests, and have taken pains to make this country known to the markets of the world. As long as our farmers raise products of a good quality they will always be sure of an increasing market for all time to come. I am satisfied that I can convince hon. gentlemen opposite by facts and figures that our country is in a prosperous condition, and that the National Policy has been one of the greatest legislative blessings that this country has enjoyed. We have also one of the greatest railways in the world, and I am sure this Government deserves the credit for having initiated that undertaking.

Mr. RYCKMAN.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, in a discussion on this important question it is not right that I should remain entirely silent, coming, as I do, from a Maritime Province which, at the last election, sent but five representatives to support the grand cause of reciprocity. I, therefore, would ask the attention of the House and the indulgence of yourself, Mr. Speaker, while I waste, perhaps, some little time. First, let me say the issue before us in the debate this evening, as it has been for the last three or four weeks, if reduced down to its proper basis and stated in plain English is, whether we in Canada are willing to obtain a treaty of reciprocity or whether we are not? I do not hesitate to say that if the Government were honest in their intentions a treaty of reciprocity could be obtained; but so long as the National Policy, with the results that flow from that policy continue, so long will we be further and further away from securing the end desired, I take it, by the people of the country. The truth is, that this policy was forced upon the country in a form so as to deceive the people in its inception. It was first called a readjustment of the tariff. Next, we were told that it was a tariff which would bring reciprocity, and force the Americans to give us what has been our long-desired boon. In the end we had the results of the so-called National Policy, and I want to direct attention to them. First, we had the unnatural growth of manufactures; then we had the tottering of the weak ones; then we had the combinations of the strong ones to root out the weak ones; then we had the rise of prices, so that those manufacturers might stand firmly on their feet and reap a profit; and finally—and this I do not hesitate to affirm—we have the fact that these monopolists and combinesters, when they once get the people educated to that height, control the Government and retain it in their control. As a proof of my argument I refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). In his speech that hon. gentleman took great pains to refer to the injurious effects of reciprocity or of any treaty with the Americans. He outlined the glories of the National Policy and told what it had done for this country, and what it would do for any country similarly situated; and speaking of the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and also speaking of the remarks offered by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), he said:

"These two gentlemen, by far the ablest in the ranks of their party in this House, meet the financial statement of the Minister of Finance, I submit, more in compliment than in criticism, and passing by the changes which were made in the tariff, though unreadily and unwillingly, they are forced to admit that this Government has had its finger upon the purse of this country, and that this Government is anxious to meet the wishes of those whose interests they are placed here to manage and discharge."

Those are the statements of the hon. member for Haldimand as they appear in the original *Hansard*. I do the hon. member the justice to state that he may have misused the word, but I take it that it is an apt phrase, and bears out most distinctly the true result of the working out of the National Policy. When the monopolies get their hands on the throat of the country, or on the purse of the country, they will undoubtedly hold power, unless the people rise in their might and are able to dis-

cover the means by which this grip is fastened upon them. In regard to the remarks offered by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White), I cannot give him the credit of having the honesty of his convictions, because I know that he would never have sat as a representative of the Maritime Provinces unless the people had believed that in his view reciprocity was not only the best measure for the country, but that he would do his best to secure it. Were he to return to his own county and tell the people that he was not in favour of reciprocity, and that such a measure would not benefit the Dominion, he would not stand a chance of coming to this House as a Conservative member. I, therefore, request the hon. gentleman to give the matter his serious consideration before he records his vote on this question. The hon. gentleman, in fact, made several statements which I take it will not only belie his own action but which are not entirely borne out by the evidence. He said:

"Well, the fishermen have not only, in common with all their fellow-subjects, a free breakfast table, but their fishing gear, their provisions and their fishing tackle are free of duty."

He forgot to tell us the articles which are free from taxation, nor did he name those articles which are taxed? As a matter of fact, only nets, lines and hooks are free from taxation, being articles the fishermen use, under the National Policy. All the other articles used, such as canvas, hawsers, leads, swivels, knives, flour, pork, beef and all groceries used—except pork and beef—for deep-sea and bank fisheries, if bought in bond, are liable to taxation. That policy pursued by the Government is, therefore, adverse to the interests of the people, and it will continue to be adverse to those engaged in that business so long as those hon. gentlemen who come from the Maritime Provinces, pledged to their constituents to support reduction of taxation and all efforts to obtain a policy which will benefit them, support in this House a Government which is directly opposed to those interests. The hon. gentleman further said:

"Now, Sir, the hon. member for Yarmouth has said that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, or the fishermen of the Dominion, I should rather say, have paid some $500,000 duty on the fish they sent into the United States. It may be that, in the first instance, when they delivered their fish in that market, they actually paid the duty; but, Sir, we must remember that the price of fish has very largely increased in the American market."

Let us analyze that statement for a moment, and see where it will land us. There were, according to the official report, about 40,000 fishermen in Canada in 1890. Each man, therefore, will pay of the $500,000 imposed on the fishing interests of Canada $12.50. They get back 80 cents per head, and $160,000 bonus, which is divided among 40,000 fishermen, gives $4 per head, making a total to the credit of each fisherman of $4.80 per head, which, taken from the $12.50, leaves a deficit of $7.70 against each fisherman in the Dominion. The fishermen have to bear that tax, according to the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) and other members from the Maritime Provinces who support that policy which imposes such burdens on the fishermen. There are 27,684 fishermen in Nova Scotia, and the total tax therefore paid in 1890 by them on their fish exports amounted to $213,656. I hold that members from the Maritime Provinces who advocate a reciprocity treaty with the United States when before their constituents should not come here and support a Government which upholds a policy adverse to the fishing interests. If it is adverse to the fishing interests of Nova Scotia it is equally adverse to the fishing interests of the whole of Canada. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) is similarly situated as regards not being able to vote as I believe his honest convictions would lead him to vote. Somehow or other those gentlemen are outspoken in certain districts in favour of reciprocity, but when they come to this House they declare they believe that the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was more advantageous to the United States than it was to Canada, and they put that forward as an argument against obtaining another treaty of reciprocity. The hon. member for Victoria said: The treaty of 1854 was more advantageous to the United States than to Canada. Why did he say that, unless he was preparing to hedge? He said, further, that the Washington Treaty was of some advantage to fishermen and farmers, and the Liberals opposed it. Still, he says that all the advantages were in favour of the Americans. He says, further: The British commissioners proposed reciprocity in various forms and the Americans were unwilling. He did not pretend to give us the outlines of the proposal, nor why it was not accepted I cite these bits from the speech of the hon. gentleman who has placed himself in opposition to reciprocity. He further said the Americans should look for a market here, and not we for a market with them. Then, he further states that the Conservative party are going to adopt it, and that he will support any Government that obtains a reciprocity which he believes will be beneficial to Canada. I would like to know what we have been discussing for a number of weeks in this House, if the gentlemen opposite tell us that they are ready to adopt such a policy as that; because that is the policy which we have been advocating on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I cite those comparatively trivial matters, but I would not do so were it not that the gentlemen who use these arguments come from the Maritime Provinces; and in order that I may show that I am opposed to them on the principles of their policy, I want to show how it is that they are not able to cast their vote here as they should cast it, if we are to judge by their arguments. The question, from another aspect, is a direct issue between the National Policy and free trade, with this limitation, that the Liberal party desires that free trade principles should obtain between this country only and the United States. The only arguments emphasized by the opposite side as against that are, first of all: that it is disloyal to England and will lead to discrimination against British manufacturers, and, secondly, that we cannot obtain a revenue under this policy. As far as the obtaining of a revenue is concerned, we have only to look to England, an absolute free trade country, which imposes a duty on some articles, solely and purely for the purpose of revenue, and which carries on the vast business of the Empire upon a revenue obtained in that way. There is nothing in the world to prevent Canada from carrying on the business of the country just by the same manner of obtaining a revenue as England does, if she wishes. There are a number of articles in the catalogue of the importations into this country, on which it would be perfectly justifiable for us to impose a fair duty for the purposes of revenue.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Name them.

Mr. FORBES. Tea is one, and coffee is another. We could impose a duty upon those articles without danger, as the duty would go into the treasury, not into the pockets of monopolists, and there are several other articles upon which we could also impose a duty. Above all things, we could exercise a policy of economy in the administration of our public affairs, and from these and other resources I do not hesitate to say that all the revenue we desire could be raised for the necessary expenses of the country. The expenditures for public works, and for the further extension of the industries of this country, might easily be raised on capital account. That, I know, would be as favourably accepted by the people as the policy adopted by the Government to-day. The Minister of Finance has told us that he raised $2,000,000 of a surplus last year, and that he borrowed, in addition to that, $3,000,000, and expended the whole $5,000,000 on capital account. I ask him if it is wise for the Government to take $2,000,000 revenue more than is necessary, by taxes on the people, and expend it on capital account? Is it a wise thing to tax the people of the country for $2,000,000 more than is required for the expenses of running the government of the country? I believe it is not a wise policy, and I believe, further, that it is an unnecessary imposition upon the industries of the country. There is another way in which the revenue of the country could be largely increased. The United States to-day raise nearly three times the revenue *per capita* that we do, and they expend more than three times as much *per capita* as we do. They have a tariff of from 50 to 55 per cent., while our tariff is from 20 to 35 per cent. I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that it is an acknowledged fact that the secret of the great manufacturing power in England is the cheapness of the cost of living there. Let us keep down the cost of living in Canada from any increase beyond what it now is and I do not hesitate to say that the statement made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) will be borne out in a few years to a wonderful extent. That statement was, that the manufacturers from the United States and the capitalists from England would come in here, and make Canada the great manufacturing centre for North America. Then the statement by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) would become true: that Canada would become the entrepot for the imports of the raw material which could be distributed from Montreal and from other manufacturing centres in Canada. We would thus raise a large revenue from the imports into Canada of the raw material; as a slight tax discrimination in favour of Canada, as against the tax on the same raw material coming into the United States could possibly be imposed. That could be done, for it is done to-day between the United States and some of those other nations with which she has a treaty. There are a thousand ways in which the revenue could be raised to supply the running expenses of this country. Then, again, if this policy were adopted we would increase the prosperity of the country by increasing the manufacturing industries in the manner I have pointed out, and you would also increase the prosperity of the country by causing an influx of the people into the country, by holding the people which we have in the country already and by enlarging and expanding every interest which we have in Canada. I may point out, Mr. Speaker, that in Canada we do not consume nearly as much *per capita* as we might do, or as they do in the United States; and the moment the people are placed in such a position that they can enjoy the necessaries and some of the luxuries of life to a greater extent than they do to-day I do not hesitate to say that the revenue of the country will increase largely. The Americans are to-day a prosperous and progressive people; they consume as much as they can, and if they find that they import cheaper from England than they can buy in the United States they do not hesitate to do so. If we adopt a policy of reciprocity, which would encourage the coming into this country of large amounts of capital, and which would tend to promote our manufactures to a greater extent than they are to-day, we should at once adopt this policy of unrestricted reciprocity. The Minister of Finance, in his speech, took great credit to himself for giving a free breakfast-table to the workingman, but the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Borden) showed that that statement was not well founded, and that every article on the breakfast-table is taxed. I am sure that the Minister of Finance himself, when he made that statement, must have known that he did so in order to tickle the ears of the country. He did not mean it; he could not have meant it, and I will give him credit for that; because every single thing is taxed that is used on the breakfast-table. The table itself is taxed 35 per cent.; the cloth is taxed, the ironware is taxed, the delf is taxed, the sugar itself is taxed, the bread is taxed, the corn and the meal are taxed, and everything that is used is taxed. There is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House—that is, the effect of the fiscal policy of the Government on interprovincial trade. On that subject I would like to place on record a section of a speech delivered by Mr. Blake at Simcoe. He said:

"On many occasions have I called attention to the necessity of considering the real interests of the Maritime Provinces in the framing of our policy and the failure of the Tory Government to give that consideration. In Nova Scotia for a large part of their staple products—as coal, potatoes, fish and other articles—the natural market is in the neighbouring country. For stating that I have been denounced in the House of Commons and throughout Ontario. I have been called a traitor, but I tell you now what I said was absolutely correct. (Cheers). A wise man has said that he fights a difficult battle who fights against geography, and if you look at the map you will see that Nova Scotia's natural trade for many of her staples is with the neighbouring country, and that the attempt to force them up into the upper provinces is a fight against geography, which has failed. The proximity of the people, the facility of sea transport, the numerous harbours, the opportunity for small vessels taking Nova Scotia products to the neighbouring states and bringing back cargoes of flour and other articles, gives rise to a natural and therefore a profitable trade, and reciprocity, important as it is to all of us, is most important to them."

Now, there is no doubt that these statements are absolutely correct, and they are not only accepted as the view of every man who lives in the Maritime Provinces, but should be accepted by every maritime representative in this House. You cannot force the trade of Nova Scotia or any of the Maritime Provinces up to Ontario. We have natural products there in abundance—the products of the mine, the forest and the fisheries; but all these

things are yet undeveloped. The mines to-day are developed to a limited extent by capital from the United States. Every dollar invested in a gold mine in the Maritime Provinces is American capital; and I venture to say that a large amount of the capital invested in the coal mines is also American capital. One-third of the exports of fish from Nova Scotia goes to the United States. Our lumber trade is entirely with the United States and the West Indies. A certain amount of timber is sent from New Brunswick to England; but that will continue to go in any case. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite are right in saying that if we get reciprocity with the United States, and deal very largely with them, we shall lose the English market. Not at all. The English market will always be open to us, and we shall always be glad to trade with the English people, and they will always be good customers. But to-day our best market is in the American Republic, and it is of great advantage to the Maritime Provinces that we should have that market. As a further argument to show that that market is valuable to us, let us look at the condition of the steamboat trade. We have the Finance Minister bonusing to the extent of $107,000 two lines of steamers to the West Indies, when not a single dollar of public money is given to encourage the lines sailing to the United States. We have a line called the Nova Scotia Steamship Company making four trips a week from Yarmouth to Boston with two steamers, and the stock of that company is nearly all Nova Scotia capital. We have the Canada Atlantic Company, running a fine steamboat from the city of Halifax, another line running from Annapolis, the International line running from St. John, the Boston line with two steamers running from Halifax, and a line running direct between Halifax and New York. All these lines stand on their own bottom, receiving no subsidies from the Federal chest; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that that trade is not worth encouraging. I think it would be more justifiable for us to ask Parliament for a subsidy for those lines than for the lines to the West Indies, because the results warrant the expenditure. Would it not be a more profitable expenditure to encourage our people to trade in those channels in which we know they will get a fair return than to try to foster new channels of trade, which we know are only tentative at the best? But it is only by the second argument that hon. gentlemen are trying to salve their consciences—that for us to attempt to improve our trade relations with the United States means annexation. They tell us we should encourage trade with the West Indies, with Hayti, with Cuba, with South America, with the Cape of Good Hope and with Australia, rather than with our cousins and brothers in the United States. I fail to understand that policy at all. Where the channels of trade are the most easy, where trade of itself finds out those channels, and where the greatest profit can be derived by the people of Canada, there I take it to be the duty of the Government to foster trade. All those steamboat lines of which I have spoken are not only self-sustaining, but they tend to show that in spite of barriers and obstacles which have been put in the way of that trade a large trade has been built up; and we cannot create a trade similar to that with Ontario or the other parts of the Dominion, or with England. Therefore, it is right that the members from the Maritime Provinces should put themselves in a true position before their constituents, and not simply say, as several of them have said, that they favour reciprocity, provided it can be got. Now, the second ground urged by hon. gentlemen opposite why we should not have reciprocity with the United States is that it would be anti-English, or that it would involve discrimination in favour of the United States and against England. Now, that argument arises entirely from the disloyalty cry. I will not deal with it at this stage of the debate, because it has been already threshed out, and in discussing it further I should only be wasting time. Now, the foreign markets to which we have had our attention turned by the action of the Government in the last few years have proved an utter failure. We have had the Finance Minister taking several trips to the West Indies, for which the country paid his expenses. We have had a trade with Spain, Portugal, Germany, France, Italy and Holland amounting to almost nothing. We had a trade with Newfoundland amounting to $2,800,000 in 1873, and last year to only $1,185,000. Now, that is a loss of trade to the great ports of Nova Scotia, and it is entirely due to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Our trade with Holland in 1873 was $13,000; in 1890 it fell to $1,000. Our trade with Spain shows a slight increase, with Portugal a slight increase, and with Italy a large decrease; and hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that these are the countries with which we must deal, while it is an acknowledged fact that 45 per cent. of the whole trade of Canada is with the American Republic. I cite these facts to show how utterly absurd it is to expect Nova Scotia to prosper as she should prosper, with all these disadvantages. The aggregate trade between Canada and the United States has also been commented upon, and I wish to put it on record to show that we are solid on this side in our arguments. I wish to show that in spite of all the encouragement given to trade with Great Britain, we can never have as prosperous a trade with that country as compared with the United States. In 1873 our aggregate trade with Great Britain amounted to $107,000,000 and with the United States to $89,000,000. In 1882 our aggregate trade with Great Britain amounted to $95,000,000 and with the United States to $96,000,000; and in 1890 it amounted to $91,000,000 with Great Britain and $92,000,000 with the United States. In 1890 we imported from Great Britain to the extent of $43,000,000 and from the United States $52,000,000. On our imports from Great Britain we paid a duty of $9,500,000 and on those from the United States we paid a duty of $8,200,000. These show conclusively that the natural market for Canada is the United States, and that we should encourage the sending of our products to the United States in preference to Great Britain, because the former trade is more profitable. Now, the policy of restriction of trade, which is the more appropriate title for the National Policy, tends in the Maritime Provinces to decrease shipping, because it contracts the foreign and does not expand the home trade. Our foreign trade can only go in our shipping bottoms, and if it shows a decrease year by year that decrease can only be attributable to the National Policy. From 1868 to 1874 the average tonnage, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns of ship-building in Canada, was

115,969 per year; from 1875 to 1879, when the Liberal party were in power, the average ship-building rose to 138,193 tons. Take the next ten years, from 1880 to 1890, and it fell away to an average of 51,637 tons per year. These figures show conclusively that the policy of the Government is tending, day by day, to restrict one of the greatest industries of Nova Scotia—the ship-building industry. The tonnage I have quoted is not the aggregate tonnage, inward and outward, but the ship-building tonnage. Let me call your attention, Sir, for a few moments, to the statistics of the fishing industry. The total value of exports of fish to the United States from Canada last year was $2,671,503, and the total value of the same export to all countries was $8,524,508, so that we send altogether nearly one-third of our fish exports to the United States. Reciprocity would enlarge that trade to an enormous extent. If it would not make a complete success in the first year I take it that, under the encouragement given by reciprocity, the fishing industry of Nova Scotia alone would so much increase that it would be one of the most powerful factors of the revenue-producing elements of this country. The duties imposed upon our fish exports to-day amount to about $500,000. That amount would be saved to the people of Canada, for the simple reason that the duty is always paid by the people who send goods to a market not their own. If we have a surplus and desire to seek a market where we can dispose of it, and are met in that market by the imposition of a duty, we must pay that duty. On the other hand, if a purchaser wants an article and comes to us to buy it he pays the price in our markets, and must pay the duty when he takes it across the line. Therefore, our surplus of fish, and lumber, and agricultural products, to a certain extent, have to bear the duties, and it is our exporters who pay. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) ought to be a competent authority on the question of reciprocity, as he has put himself on record in favour of reciprocity or even free trade. In 1888 he said in this House:

"While I am to a certain extent at least a supporter of it here (of the National Policy), I say that I support it on the understanding that it is not to be forever, so to speak, established among us, that it is not to be considered as one of the permanent institutions of the country, but as the strong hand of the people for the time to guard the manufacturers of the country until they shall, by the tariff, have sufficient power of themselves to compete with other nations. If they are not then willing to accept the National Policy, then in my opinion it would be better that we had never had it. Passing from that branch of the subject as to permanency of the tariff, I say this, that if we can get free trade with the United States I am in favour of having it."

The hon. gentleman could only have meant that he supported the National Policy because we could not get reciprocity. But can he put himself on record as having made an honest effort to get reciprocity? Neither he nor his party can put themselves on record as having made an honest effort in that direction. Have they ever told us that they are willing to concede to the Americans the right to export freely to us any manufactures in return for the right to be given us by them of exporting to them our products of the farm, and the mine, and our fish, and of the sea? That is where the wreck of the attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite takes place every time. They are in the grasp of the manufacturers, and if they were willing to concede that point to the United States I dare say the hon. gentleman would be right in his contention that the National Policy should go, and that we would always have been better without it. He added:

"I am in favour of reciprocal trade with the United States. I am in favour of meeting the United States, as it were, step by step, as they may hold out their hands towards us, but I am not in favour of cringing to them; I am not in favour of decrying my own country, and asking them to give us free trade because we are poor. Gentlemen, poverty is no more honourable in a nation than it is in an individual. The individual who is poor is powerless as still water. So it is with a nation, and so it would be with a Dominion like this. In my opinion, if we want the respect of the United States, and if we want the respect of the world, it is our duty to stand upon the greatness of our country, and whilst we say to the United States: "We want to trade with you," we should also say: "We do not want to trade with you because we are poor, but we want to trade with you because we are rich, because we are capable of giving you as much as you can give us, and we can make our relations reciprocal and to the interest of both of us."

Precisely so. We are a great deal richer to-day than when the hon. gentleman made that statement. We know how much greater resources we have to-day than we then had. Why should we not give up some of the riches we have in order to obtain greater riches from the United States. If we have riches undeveloped in our mines, if our farmers have riches undeveloped in their acres, if our forests have riches yet undeveloped, why cannot we sell these and purchase in return other things the Dominion wants? If the Government were sincere I do not hesitate to say that we could get reciprocity to-morrow. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) endeavoured to make a point, that reciprocity could not be obtained except by the concession of our inshore fisheries, and said he was averse to giving up those inshore fisheries. If he looks back to the time of the treaty of 1854, or the Elgin Treaty, he will find that the inshore fisheries were given up. By the Elgin Treaty of 1854 the American fishermen gained the right to fish in British waters and to cure their catch on Canadian shores, rights which were conceded similarly to Canadian fishermen in American waters north of latitude 36. The treaty provided also for the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries, and that Canadians should enjoy the free navigation of Lake Michigan and the use of the state canals in return for the free navigation by Americans of the St. Lawrence and the use of the Canadian canals in like manner. That is the treaty of 1854 which gave up the inshore fisheries, and which the Government of to-day tried to impress upon the people they were going again to have accepted by the people of the United States. The manifesto which was published just before the late elections specifies:

"Renewal of the reciprocity of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries, and with the extension deemed by the Commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States."

There the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) will find that the Government are prepared to give up the inshore fisheries. I do not suppose they meant to give them up for nothing; they would probably get some concession from the United States; but if they were prepared to do that, why would it not be advisable for the successors of the present Government to do it? The inshore fisheries are a matter of substantial importance to the people of Nova Scotia, and they do not intend to give them up without receiving a substantial con-

sideration; and then it must be provided that all persons who use those fisheries shall be subject to the most stringent regulations of our own Government. The Conservative Government also made the Treaty of Washington in 1871, by which the inshore fisheries were again given up, and again, in 1888, Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Chamberlain negotiated a treaty by which they virtually gave up the inshore fisheries, though not in express words. The line of delimitation was fixed by the treaty of 1818 at 3 miles from a line drawn from headland to headland, but it was changed to a line 3 miles from the shores of bays and indentations, so that in the proposed treaty of 1888, the inshore fisheries were practically given up, because the 3-mile limit was brought closer in shore, and that was given up without any compensation. How do we claim any compensation to-day? We have the *modus vivendi*, which has been granted to the Americans by this Government at the dictation of Sir Charles Tupper, in order to prevent a commercial war, because the Government refused to make reasonable concessions to the United States. Why did they refuse? They refused because the manufacturers of this country would not allow them to make those concessions. They adopted a *modus vivendi* by which the licensing of foreign vessels was authorized on the payment of $1.50 a ton into the federal treasury. Under this, American fishing vessels are permitted to enter Canadian ports for the purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits, and the transmision of catch and shipping of crews. These two concessions as to the transhipment of cargoes and crews are what the Americans have always fought for, and these we give up for the paltry sum of $1.50 a ton paid by the American fishermen. They have the right to come into the ports of Nova Scotia to-day to hire men, to buy bait and ice and other things, concessions which we claim as most valuable, almost, I might say, as a heritage in our province, and on which we hoped to get further concessions from the United States; but that has been given up for the paltry sum of $1.50 a ton paid to the Federal Government. How can it be expected that Nova Scotia would feel otherwise than that her interests are slighted? This amount is not spent for the benefit of Nova Scotia at all. Then it is evident that from 1866 to the present day the Conservative Government of Canada has given up the inshore fisheries without any consideration or with very small concessions. We Liberals say that we have valuable rights in those fisheries, that those fisheries are yet in their infancy and are undeveloped, and we only ask the right to encourage them by opening up markets, which we cannot do under the restricted policy of the Government to-day. The interest of the ship-building trade in regard to fishing vessels is not encouraged as it should be, because our fishermen find that their products are met with a large duty wherever they send them abroad. The fishing industry of Nova Scotia, as well as the mining and lumbering industries, is in its infancy. There is another industry off shore which is participated in by the Americans, but they cannot do that successfully unless they have the benefit of our harbours. The best men in their boats are Nova Scotians who have gone over there, and most of their captains come from our province. In the last election I was assisted by an Americanized blue-nose who helped me most nobly, and who said that he believed that the Nova Scotians would have a fair and honourable arrangement with the Americans if they had free access to the American markets. What they want is not to take away our young men, but to ship them on their vessels, which they would build in our ports much more cheaply than they can in their own, and we would sell our fish in their markets, because we do not consume more than a small fraction of our catch in Nova Scotia. Another advantage which a reciprocity treaty would be to Nova Scotians is in regard to the lumber trade. The policy of the Government to-day tends largely to hamper that industry. The taxes upon the necessaries of that industry, such as pork and meal are very obnoxious to the lumbermen. The cornmeal tax is borne and paid largely by the lumbermen. The rebate allowed for the import of corn for consumption is not of any service to the lumbermen, because the corn is consumed largely by the cattle in the woods, and, when a lumbermen sends one hundred men to the woods and has to pay the duty on pork and on meal, he loses it and cannot get it back. He has to sustain one or two hundred men in the woods, and here is where the hardship comes in. He has those stores on hand, and when families are supplied out of those stores and paid for by the labour of the father or the brother working in the woods he increases the prices to the family in order to get back the increased cost that this flour, meal, &c., have been to him. Then it becomes a double tax upon the lumber industry in Nova Scotia: first, it is a tax upon the lumberman himself who sends in men and cuts the timber; next, it is a tax upon the labourers, who do the work; therefore, it is not only an unjust but it is an unfair tax. I fail to see why it is kept on. Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite why they do not ask Parliament for permission, or why they do not take permission, to offer to the United States reciprocity in manufactured articles? They have known ever since 1884 that upon no other terms can they get it. Why, then, do they postpone action? In 1884 the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, then leader of the Government, was well aware of the value that a reciprocity treaty would be to Canadians. A resolution was moved in the House by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and seconded by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In brief, the resolution asked the Government to enter into negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing, and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries. On this motion Sir John A. Macdonald said:

"I do not know any reason why the hon. gentleman who moved this, or the seconder, laid before the House these elaborate statements to show the value of reciprocal trade or trade of any kind with the United States. That is admitted. That goes without saying. We all admit that it would be well that we had a large trade with the United States rather than a small one. * * * * In the first place, there was the original reciprocity treaty which was finally consummated in 1854. The merit of that, so far as Canada was concerned, rested altogether with the Administration of Sir Francis Hincks, the Liberal Government of that day. * * * It was the merit of the Reform party; it was a great merit, and it did a great service to Canada."

Further on he says:

"I believe that the feeling which then exists still exists and that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural products of the two countries, and unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as our natural products, we will never have a treaty. I am quite satisfied the United States will not agree, the country will not agree, the voice of the country will be against a repetition of the treaty of 1854."

Now, with a knowledge of all this before them, I ask why is it that the Government cannot treat this question fairly and honestly? The Liberal party to-day are just as anxious to see the Government get it as they would be to get it themselves. The hon. members in this House from British Columbia are a unit in favour of reciprocity, and I believe that the members from the Maritime Provinces are all really in favour of it; but there is not one among them on the Conservative side that has had the courage of his own convictions and who has dared to stand up here and say that he will vote for it against his own party. They know very well that the Maritime Provinces cannot trade successfully with the other provinces of Canada. While we can deal with them in certain articles when the country is prosperous, we can trade much more to our own advantage with the United States. I say it is impossible for the people of Nova Scotia to come to any conclusion but that no treaty can be beneficial to them but one which embraces not only natural products, but also manufactures, and if the leaders of the Conservative party cannot obtain such a treaty except by giving away our manufacturing interests to the United States they should be willing that the Government do so. Why do hon. gentlemen decry us for wanting to give up our manufacturing interests, when their own leaders have put themselves on record as favourable to giving up our manufactures to the United States if they cannot get equal concessions otherwise from that country? It is simply a question of whether we are going to have trade or not with the United States. The only objection that the Government can urge to such a policy is the question of revenue, but I will not deal with that now. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have treated the people of the Maritime Provinces in a dishonest manner; I will not use the word "hypocrisy," but I will say that when they put forth that last circular to the people previous to the election they led the people of the Maritime Provinces to believe that they intended to give them reciprocity. They told them from every hustings in the constituency I have the honour to represent that they were going to get reciprocity, and we all know what effect that had upon the people of the Maritime Provinces, and I believe upon the people of Ontario and Quebec. Now, then, we know that it cannot be obtained except upon certain terms. Why, then, do not the Government tell us frankly, so that this debate can be ended at once, that they are willing to grant those terms to the Americans? I fail to see where the dishonour comes in. If we are willing to give up the fisheries to a certain extent, if we are willing to give up the trade in natural products to a certain extent—and all these things, it is conceded, are beneficial to Canada—why is it that they are not equally willing to give up the manufacturing interests to a certain extent, especially since the manufacturers themselves are willing to do so? Reciprocity must be had; we have got to have a treaty; better trade relations must be had, and there is only one way in which they can be got, and I fail to see why the Government should treat the country in this manner. Canada has within her borders industries that are yet in their infancy. We have a class of people in Nova Scotia, as we have all over Canada, than whom there are none in the world more intelligent and energetic, more devoted to their own institutions, and more desirous for the prosperity of their country. Give us trade, give us a chance to extend and develop it, and I am sure that the country will advance in prosperity to such an extent as will surprise the most ardent protectionist that ever lived. All we want is the opportunity. Give it to us, and we shall show you what can be done under a reciprocity treaty. We do not claim that the time has come for free trade. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) made a most excellent speech to-day on free trade, and with his principles I can cordially agree; but I do not think the time has yet come for Canada to declare openly in favour of unlimited free trade with the world. But I do not hesitate to say that I shall be in favour of it just as soon as the time arrives when we can adopt it with a certainty of benefiting ourselves. At present we must turn our attention to obtaining reciprocity, and to expanding and developing our trade; and if it is conceded that it is beneficial, all we ask the Government to do is honestly to turn their attention to it, and give the people an opportunity of trying it.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour and at this late stage of the debate it would be unseemly on my part if I should prolong the discussion to any great extent. However, coming from one of the "shreds and patches" of this Dominion, I think it is due to the constituency which I represent and to the "patch" of this Dominion from which I come to say a few words in answer to my hon. friend from Queen's, N.S. In 1867 I had the honour of a seat in this Parliament. I would only see to-night on the floor of this House, even if all of us were together, four representatives from Ontario, five from Quebec, one from New Brunswick, and myself from Nova Scotia, who have been here at that time, all the other representatives having been elected since. I distinctly recollect that questions of trade were frequently discussed in the first Parliament of this Dominion. I also recollect that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) occupied a position very near to the position I now occupy in this House, and then he was an ardent and strong supporter of the Liberal-Conservative party. In 1869, I believe, shortly after Confederation, on account of a change in the Minister of Finance of this Dominion, he notably became disaffected, as he is now, in regard to his position in this House. However, he did not kick over the traces until a year afterwards, when a second Minister of Finance was selected by the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald, and then gradually but surely he left the Conservative party. I notice that a large number of the Liberal leaders in this House are persons who have become disaffected, and who gradually but surely left the party, not because the policy of the party was not in the best interests of the Dominion, but simply

because their own personal feelings or personal interests were not gratified. The question of unrestricted reciprocity is not very generally understood, and I regret to say that after the long discussion to which we have listened in this House I am just as unable to define that policy as I would have been before the discussion commenced. Unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, unrestricted free trade with the United States, and various other definitions have been given which are just as vague to me as they would have been before the discussion commenced. In the Maritime Provinces, however, we have a very high authority on political questions, and unrestricted reciprocity was very clearly defined so far as it applies to Nova Scotia. The Halifax *Morning Chronicle* is the organ of the Liberal party in that province, and in its issue of 18th November, 1890, while answering an article in the Halifax *Critic* in reference to party politics, it fully defined unrestricted reciprocity as it was understood by the Liberal party in the Dominion, and particularly as it was discussed in the Province of Nova Scotia. It said:

"The policy of the Liberal party of the Dominion is deliberately and maliciously misrepresented in a manner not at all unworthy of the most contemptible party hack in the pay of the Government. The Tories are credited at the same time with aims and purposes which none of its leaders have avowed. We challenge the *Critic* to give its authority for the statement that the Liberal party 'appears to have adopted at length a platform in which the chief plank is the practical assimilation of the fiscal system of that of the most intensely protectionist of civilized nations.' This is a mere travesty of the Liberal policy. That party wants unrestricted reciprocity or free trade with the United States, leaving each country to have any protective tariff it pleases against the rest of the world. It does not propose an assimilation of tariffs; on the contrary, it distinctly repudiates that idea."

This is the definition given in the Halifax *Morning Chronicle* of unrestricted reciprocity. It is not commercial union; that has been repudiated by the party. It is not anything else than such a policy as will enable the United States to have their own tariff and permit Canada to have its own tariff. To this definition of the policy of the Liberal party of this Dominion the New York *Tribune*, the organ of Secretary Blaine, on 12th February last expressed its opinion in such a way as to have practically chilled that policy in this Dominion. It said:

"This nation has not the slightest notion of allowing Canada to open a back door as wide as it may please while tariff enactments by the United States are closing the front door against sundry importations at New York and Boston. If anybody is silly enough to suppose that such a plan is entertained by Americans he does not live in this country. All such representations may as well be put aside as utterly and wildly at variance with anything that Americans can possibly be brought to adopt. For that would simply mean this: The United States might impose what duties it pleased upon foreign imports, but any goods could come in free of duty across the Canadian border if the Canadian Government should see fit to admit them free of duty. The United States does not want Canadian reciprocity very passionately at any price or on any terms, but on such terms as these there is probably not a sane man in this country who would assent to reciprocity.

"The one thing which may as well be accepted by all parties concerned as the only possible basis of any commercial arrangement between this nation and Canada is that the people of the United States shall decide on what terms goods from Europe can be brought into this country. Differences of opinion there may be about the admission of this or that product of Canadian industry in exchange for reciprocal facilities on the other side, but no one would for a moment entertain a proposition which would take away from the industries of this country the power to defend themselves by duties on imports as respects goods from other countries than Canada."

This is the declaration of the New York *Tribune*. This is the declaration of every sensible American on the other side of the border. There is no man in this Dominion with a head on his shoulders who would look after the interests of his country if he were living in the United States but who would express the same opinion. How silly it would be for the United States to permit unrestricted reciprocity on the basis that Canada might have a 20-per cent. tariff while the United States had a 40-per cent. tariff. That would be to cause the imports from foreign countries to flow into the United States through Canadian ports, and not a dollar's worth would be imported into the United States through American ports. On the other hand, there is no one in this Dominion who would permit the United States to have a tariff of 20 per cent. on importations from foreign countries while we ourselves would have a tariff of 40 per cent.; because, in that case, all the importations from Europe which would be required for consumption in Canada would come through American ports into this Dominion. Therefore, any person not biassed by political prejudice must admit that no unrestricted reciprocity can be obtained from the United States except on the basis of the same tariff as against the rest of the world, which would mean commercial union. Commercial union has been repudiated by the Liberal party; reciprocal free trade with the United States is absurd on the face of it, and I would be astonished to ever hear a sensible man advocate it in this Parliament, or any intelligent community in this Dominion. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) expressed that opinion of it when it was first launched into the political arena in this Dominion. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition expressed the same opinion of it, and I do not see any reason why the Opposition would adopt it as a policy, unless for the purpose of deluding public opinion on this question. I cannot for a moment believe that there is any person on the other side of the House who has any idea that this policy is a practicable one, and in fact they have abandoned it. They have absolutely abandoned it. It does not make any difference what they say in this House, because we were told last session by the then member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that members of Parliament never speak in the House for the pursose of gaining the ear of the House, but that they always speak for the purpose of giving their views to their constituents. I am sorry to say that this is the case with a great many who have spoken on this question, but I can assure my hon. friends that it never has been the case with myself, and I hope it never shall be. I would much rather discuss this question before the constituency which I represent; and I never fear the result of a fair and honest discussion of it there. I will discuss it here in the hope that my views will have weight with the Opposition, but I fancy my hope will be a vain one. The Opposition abandoned the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I say so advisedly, and I have reason to say so. The Opposition, through one of their leaders, has placed on record a resolution which practically abandons unrestricted reciprocity; it abandons commercial union; and, if it is examined carefully,

I must say that if I am a judge of what it desires to convey it is practically on the lines of the policy which has been adopted in 1879, and successfully carried out ever since in this Dominion by the Liberal-Conservative party. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes), delivered speeches in this House which were to a certain extent amusing, but to no extent instructive. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who I am sorry to see is not in his seat just now, has delivered an eloquent declamation on the principles of free trade; but he never gave one single reason why free trade should be adopted by the Dominion of Canada. He was asked for the reasons, but he failed to give us any. He offered, I believe, to purchase a small pamphlet which has been issued by Henry George, a socialist, and I am almost sorry to say that he stated that Henry George might have a disciple here. That is the only information the hon. gentleman could give us on that question. Well, we do not propose to follow Henry George on his trade policy, or in his socialistic proclivities. The member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) seemed to me to be appealing to a very peculiar constituency, for I know that if he delivered the speech which he delivered in this House in the County of Inverness he would not get a baker's dozen of votes. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) delivered a speech somewhat similar to that which I was accustomed to listen to in Inverness, but the opponent who delivered such a speech in the County of Inverness had the courage of his convictions, and he had no hesitation in saying that he was an annexationist. If the policy of the Opposition is not an annexationist policy, I submit that all the arguments which they use in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, or unlimited free trade with the United States, and all the reasoning which they use for the adoption of that policy in this House, are from beginning to end only stronger reasons why we should become annexed to the United States. If they continue but for a short time their arguments in favour of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity on the same lines that they have been pursuing for a number of years; if we have had no annexationists in this Dominion, we will soon have plenty of them; because no one can give credit to that policy as advocated by these gentlemen without coming to the conclusion that there is no hope for this Dominion except by annexation. Unrestricted reciprocity we cannot have; free trade with the United States on any other terms is impossible; and it does not require the quoting of authorities to convince any intelligent person that the only way in which unrestricted reciprocity can be acquired is by annexation. Apart from the policy which they declared to be unrestricted reciprocity, and the reasoning which they applied to the obtaining of it, there is no other conclusion to which I could come except this: If they convince me that unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union is so essential to the interest of this Dominion I shall begin to weigh it seriously in the balance, and consider whether the sentimental ties which bind Canada to England are to be severed. I would be sorry to believe that they themselves have any idea that their arguments lead to this conclusion. But I am sorry to say that in some parts of this Dominion it has had this effect; and if it is continued much longer the tendency unquestionably will be to encourage an annexation feeling in this country. I would be indeed very loth to believe that annexation with the United States is essential to our prosperity. On the contrary, I believe that under the fostering care of the National Policy, which we have enjoyed in this Dominion since 1878, the Dominion of Canada will prosper in such a way that no one who has any desire to live in comfort and peace will ever wish to be annexed to the United States on the other side of the line. I will now refer for but a short time to the policy of my hon. friends from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) and Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). They were outspoken in favour of free trade. A great many seem to make declarations in favour of free trade, and they point to the policy of Great Britain, which is the only free trade country on the face of the globe, as an example worthy of our imitation. Now, I tell those hon. gentlemen that I for one would be very sorry indeed to adopt any such policy as that for the Dominion of Canada, although it would be a more reasonable policy to adopt than the policy of free trade between Canada and the United States, while building a tariff wall in common with the United States against Europe. We were told in Inverness that the people of England were allowed to buy in the cheapest country and sell in the dearest. My hon. friend from Guysborough seemed desirous to mislead this House, and particularly his constituents, to believe that we could get along fairly well without a revenue at all—that we could buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, irrespective of a revenue to carry on the affairs of the country. But, after all, the very first consideration, as every intelligent gentleman in this House must know, is to raise a revenue in the manner which will bear most lightly on the consumers of this Dominion for the purpose of carrying on the public works and defraying the legitimate expenses of the country. In England that is necessary as well as in Canada, and I may be permitted to quote from Whitaker's *Almanac* for 1890, which is a good authority, the amounts collected from various sources for the purpose of a revenue in Great Britain. The gross amount of revenue collected in the year ending 31st March, 1889, was £92,781,323 sterling—in round numbers, about $500,000,000. We do not require as large a revenue in proportion to population; yet I hold that we require a revenue of at least $40,000,000 a year from all sources in order to enable us to carry on the affairs of this Dominion with profit to the people. Reducing the revenue below that figure will, I hold, necessitate curtailing expenditures in this Dominion which are absolutely necessary for the development of the vast resources of this country of ours. We require a revenue for the purpose of subsidizing railroads, for the construction of railroads, for the improvement of harbours, piers and public works, which are necessary for the distribution of the products of the soil, the forest, the sea and the mine. From the very first day that I had the honour of occupying a seat in this House I never opposed the granting of a railway subsidy in any portion of this Dominion. In 1872 I voted for a large subsidy for the Canadian Pacific Railway, in a Bill which passed this Parliament. I was defeated in 1872 on account of that vote; but I had the courage of my conviction. At every election since that time I have publicly declared that if I was in the House and the same

question came up again I would vote for a subsidy which should be sufficient to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. I never cast a vote in this House for which I am prouder than that vote, and I think no money was ever expended in this Dominion which resulted to the advantage of the country to the same extent as the vote which was granted for the Canadian Pacific Railway. But reverting to the resources of revenue in Great Britain, I beg now to state the figures. The net revenue for 1889 was: Excise, £25,600,000 sterling; Customs, £20,067,000; income tax, £12,700,000; stamps, £12,270,000; post office, £9,700,000; house tax, £1,940,000; telegraphs, £2,080,000; land tax, £1,000,000; stamps in lieu of fees, £796,973; interest on Suez Canal shares, on advances, &c., and miscellaneous, over £2,500,000. These are the sources of revenue in Great Britain; and I would like to know who is the Liberal in this House who would advocate the collecting of a revenue from the same sources in Canada to the amount of $40,000,000, which is absolutely necessary for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of this Dominion? We have been talking very much of a free breakfast-table. The first part of this resolution, which is a practical abandonment of unrestricted reciprocity, I repeat, is an appeal to the prejudices of the poor farmers, the poor miners, the poor fishermen, the poor artizans, and the poorer classes generally. But under free trade, as in vogue in England, they would have to pay a duty of 12 cents per pound on tea, which the National Policy gives them free; they would have to pay an average of $1 a pound on tobacco, which is sufficiently taxed, it is true, under the National Policy. On coffee they would have to pay 4 cents per pound; on spirits from $2.50 to $4 per gallon; and on all the luxuries of the poor man they have to contribute in proportion. Now, if we adopt the policy of free trade, and follow the example of the only free trade country in the world, we must follow it in its entirety, and there is not a Liberal in this Dominion who would dare face any constituency and advocate a similar policy. Yet, this is the policy which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) advocate. If there is any person so silly as to believe that the rate-payers of this Dominion can buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market he must be very silly indeed, just as silly as the New York *Tribune* represented any Canadian to be who would believe that the Americans would allow their front door to be closed against imports from all the rest of the world while the back door of Canada was open, through which these goods could go into the United States free. I beg to call your attention, Sir, to the fact that we have, after all, a free breakfast-table. We have been told that we pay a duty of 75 cents a barrel on flour. The hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell) is not in his place, but I know he would differ very widely from any person who would make such an assertion as that. Flour is produced in Canada far beyond the requirements of this Dominion, and it will be in the near future produced to a greater extent beyond the necessities of the country. We have very high authorities in this Dominion who hold to the position that while the United States produce more flour than is required for home consumption in that country, a duty of $5 per barrel on flour there would not affect the price to the extent of 1 cent. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, is an authority on that point; and if that be true as regards the United States, it is equally true with regard to Canada, and I think I can prove that from the figures quoted by some of my hon. friends opposite. In 1889 we imported into Canada 200,000 barrels of flour. Well, at 75 cents per barrel, the duty would be $150,000. Is there any person in this Dominion who knows anything of the way in which that American flour finds its way to the Canadian market who will believe we pay 75 cents a barrel on flour? The hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) informed us that in the Province of Quebec alone we imported 167,000 barrels in 1889, costing $599,000. Now, Sir, I desire to call your attention to this fact. I have taken the figures as given by the hon. gentleman, and, assuming they are correct, 167,000 barrels, costing $597,000, would be $3.58½ per barrel. I would ask any reasonable person on the other side if the Canadian importer paid the duty on that flour?

Mr. WATSON. What is the quality of the flour?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). That was the average price of all the flour imported. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the average quality of the flour produced in this Dominion would be cheap at $3.58½ par barrel.

Mr. WATSON. What is the quantity of the different grades that were imported into the Province of Quebec?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). That is not necessary for the argument at all. It is an average figure, and you cannot sell flour in the several portions of this Dominion at a lower figure than $3.58½, and I know that the same quality and grades of flour are not sold at that figure on the other side of the line.

Mr. WATSON. The low grades are imported into Quebec.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I presume the people of Quebec are very much like their brethren by the sea; and if there are any people in the province from which I come who are determined to have the best quality of flour it is the French-Canadians, because they know from experience that it is the cheapest grade of flour in the end. If, as our hon. friends opposite allege, the duty was paid by the people of Quebec, then the cost of even the average grades of flour would be reduced to $2.83½ per barrel. Is there any person in this Dominion who will believe that flour is sold at $2.83½ in the markets of the United States? This proves conclusively that, as Mr. Jones, of Halifax, said in this House last year, even if we double the duty on flour it would not affect the price to the extent of one cent. During the discussion of the tariff, on all occasions the position was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite last session that the duty on flour was a barbarous, unnecessary tax, because the revenue did not require the increase. Now, it did not require very much learning in political economy to know that the higher the duty on flour the less would be imported and the less revenue you would collect. As a matter of fact, it can be shown that during the past year the importation into Canada will not exceed 60,000

barrels, and on that 60,000 barrels the producer and the middleman on the other side must divide the loss between them of the 75 cents duty, and must place the flour in the Canadian market at a figure that will compete with the Canadian product. Therefore, I hold that flour is free to the poor farmers of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, to the miners, the fishermen and all the poorer classes. If no other authority would convince me, we have that of Mr. Jones, of Halifax, the late leader of the Liberal party of this Dominion, Mr. Mackenzie, and my hon. friend from Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell). But I feel that every intelligent person on the Liberal side concurs with those gentlemen, and they only make use of what they call this barbarous tax for the purpose of appealing to the prejudices of the poorer classes of this Dominion. The poor artizans, then, get their flour free. They get their meal free, because the tariff is now so regulated that for human food meal is imported free into Canada. They have their tea free, they have their coffee free, they have their sugar free, and they have their molasses free.

Mr. WATSON. No; sugar is not free.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). My hon. friend and I differ on that question. I hold that if you impose a duty for the purpose of protection on sugar or any other article which is useful and necessary for home consumption, and thus encourage the manufacture of it in this Dominion and create home competition as well as competition with the foreign product imported into Canada, you lower the price far below what it otherwise would be in our markets, and it is my firm conviction that if you took that slight protection from the sugar manufacturers in this Dominion the result would be a collapse in the manufacturing industry of sugar, and in a short time the sugar would be imported from the United States through the middlemen who would handle it, it would be sold at a higher price than now, when we have sugar refined in this country. The same thing is true in regard to cotton. You can buy cotton now from 20 to 40 per cent. lower than you could before the National Policy was adopted. That result has been caused by the multiplication of the manufactories, and by the increase in the different lines of cottons made in this Dominion. That creates a competition amongst the Canadian manufacturers and a competition as well with foreign-manufactured goods, and in this way the price of cotton has been reduced from 20 to 40 per cent. in our markets. The same argument may be applied to boots and shoes, to flannels, to all woollen goods which are consumed by the poor artizans, fishermen, miners and farmers, and the poorer classes generally. Abolish the National Policy, abolish incidental protection to those industries, which even the late leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blake, would never consent to, and the result would be that all these factories would go down, that home competition would not exist, and that the monopolists and the combinesters from the other side of the line would have control of our markets, and then the price of these articles would go up. It is only a few years ago that the duty was taken off anthracite coal. The consumers in Ontario and Quebec, and also in the Maritime Provinces, were led to believe that the taking off of that duty of 50 cents a ton would place that coal in the market at a lower figure; but I think experience must have convinced them that since the duty was taken off, the American producer, the carrier and the middleman have raised the price, not only by 50 cents, but by an additional 10 cents, in order to make up for the loss they sustained during the time the 50 cents duty was imposed upon them; and this would be the result in every line of goods which is useful or necesssry for the poorer classes of this Dominion. Besides the free breakfast-table which is given to the poor farmer, and to the miner, and to the artizan, and to the poorer classes of this Dominion generally, the fisherman has other advantages. He has his fishing gear free, he has his hooks and lines free; in fact, he has everything that is necessary for the prosecution of his industry admitted free. So that the first part of this resolution should be eliminated from it altogether, because it is absolutely on the lines of the National Policy, and in no other way can what is useful or necessary for the poorer classes of people be placed in their hands so cheaply as under the National Policy. It is certain that in the United States the fishermen, the farmers, the miners and the mechanics cannot obtain what is necessary for them as cheaply as they do on this side of the line. It is not very long since, when in conversation with one of them, he declared that the feeling against the McKinley tariff in the United States was so strong that in a short time, in his opinion, it would be repealed. The argument of our hon. friends on the other side would lead the country to believe that we would have unrestricted reciprocity but for the policy of the Dominion Government. Since 1879 we have had on our statutes a provision by which we could have reciprocity in the natural products of the soil, the mine, the sea and the forest, but the Americans would not adopt any such policy; and, if we can judge reasonably of the feeling on the other side of the line, they have no intention of doing anything of the kind. So it is not the fault of this Government, but it is the fault of the American Government; and, as it has been well said by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House already, all the arguments which have been used in favour of unrestricted reciprocity should have been used in Congress and not on the floor of this Parliament. The object of the National Policy is well fulfilled in securing a sufficient amount of revenue for all the requirements of the Dominion Government. The National Policy so taxes the people that one-half of the amount of revenue collected is on what is neither useful nor necessary. It is a tax which is voluntarily paid by the people. At least another third is collected from articles which are not consumed by the poor farmer, the poor fisherman, the poor miners or the poor artizans of this Dominion. They are consumed by persons who are able and willing to pay for them as articles of comfort or luxury; therefore, it is only a very small portion indeed of the taxes of this Dominion which is paid by the individuals in the Dominion, to whose prejudices is directed the first part of the resolution which has been tabled by the actual leader of the Opposition in this House. I did not intend to prolong the discussion till this late hour, but as it is my custom when I get started, I hardly know when to stop. I beg to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House, for the patient hearing they have given me.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau; also, the accounts, vouchers and cheques for the following payments, as found in the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the following years:—1888-9, J. L. McDougall, $26.60; J. B. Lynch, $70.55; J. Gorman, $26.90; F. Hayter, $73.95: 1887-88, J. L. McDougall, $103.65; James Patterson, $50; J. Hayter, $222.35: 1886, J. L. McDougall, $50.78; F. Hayter, $218.15: 1885-6, J. L. McDougall, $17.75; John Gorman, $85.67, be produced forthwith for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Seventh Report of the said Committee."

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO EXPRESS AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved that all Rules and Orders of the House be suspended so as to permit the introduction of a private Bill entitled an Act respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company. He said: This company was organized under a charter granted in 1878, and had been doing business for seven years, and was reorganized again in 1890. During that time the records and papers were lost by fire, and the object of this Bill is to render legal the transactions of this company under this charter.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved that Bill (No. 151) respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company be read the first time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF—RECEIPTS.

Mr. LISTER asked, What arrangement, if any, is there between the Government and Mr. Plummer respecting the receipts of the Sault Ste. Marie wharf? Does Mr. Plummer get any portion of the receipts? If so, how much? Is the wharf kept in repair by the Government? If so, what amount was spent for repairs up to the 1st July, 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. The arrangement with Mr. Plummer under the Order in Council appointing him is, that he is to act in the usual way as a wharfinger for all receipts connected under the ordinary tariff of tolls at Sault Ste. Marie wharf, and he is to be paid as his salary $100 yearly out of the receipts. The property in the wharf has been transferred to the Government, as the hon. gentleman has already been informed. The wharf is kept in repair by the Government. The sum of $1,269.31 was expended to repair Sault Ste. Marie wharf in 1889-90.

PAYMENTS TO CIVIL SERVICE OFFICERS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MCMULLEN) asked, Was it not the rule of some or all of the departments some years ago that pay-sheets had to be executed by each Civil Service officer, whether temporary or permanent, in payment of salary? When was that system abolished? On whose recommendation? And what were the reasons given for such abolition? Does the Government intend to reintroduce this system, in face of the developments which have taken place before the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that what my hon. friend refers to is the system of payments in vogue before the inception of the Audit Office, when both temporary and permanent clerks were paid by cash sums. At that time, of course, they receipted each for his appropriation on the pay-sheet. At the inception of the Audit Office that was changed. All the permanent clerks and part of the temporary clerks are now paid by cheques, and these cheques, being payable to the order or endorsement of the person to whom they are made out, are sufficient receipt. It is not the intention to make any change in the arrangement, it being considered satisfactory.

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF TRANSATLANTIC STEAMERS.

Mr. LAVERGNE (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, 1. Whether the mails from England are being landed at Rimouski during this season of navigation? 2. Whether the trans-Atlantic steamers carrying the mails, or other steamers, are visited at Rimouski by a medical man in the service of the Government? 3. Whether Dr. P. A. Gauvreau, of Rimouski, has, in his capacity as a physician, under instructions from the Government, visited any steamers at Rimouski since the beginning of the present season of navigation? 4. Is the said Dr. P. A. Gauvreau now in the pay of the Government, and is he to receive pay or emolument if he does not visit any steamer during the present season; if so, what is to be his pay or remuneration during this season?

Mr. HAGGART. The answer to the first question is, no; to the second, no; to the third, no. In reply to the fourth question I beg to say: Before the opening of navigation this year and before it was known that new arrangements would have to be made for carrying the English mails, the Minister of Agriculture agreed with Dr. Gauvreau that he was to continue his professional services at Rimouski the same as the previous year, at the rate of $700 per annum. Dr. Gauvreau now claims the yearly salary, notwithstanding the non-calling of the steamer, in his quality of quarantine officer. The question, in view of the altered circumstances, of what amount, if any, should be paid to him, is now being considered by the Minister of Agriculture.

PAYMENTS FOR LEGAL SERVICES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. TRUAX) asked, Did Shaw & Shaw, of Walkerton, receive from the Government $183 last year? If so, what services did they render for it, and in what cases did they act?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Messrs. Shaw & Shaw, of Walkerton, received from the department, in 1889-90, $183.79, as follows:—Defending three Indians in the Allenford shooting case: Solomon, $57.85; Johnston, $42.62; Paul, $39.60. Selling liquor to Indians: Samuel Wahbeger, $17.72; Seman Laird, Thomas McVeitty and James White, $26. Total, $183.79.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. TRUAX) asked, Did Mr. A. B. Klein, of Walkerton, receive from the Government, last year, $319? If so, what services did he render for it, and in what cases did he act?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A. B. Klein received during the same period $318.96: Regina *vs.* Paul (Allenford shooting case), $283.84; Regina *vs.* Colclough & Young (selling liquor to Indians), $35.12. Total, $318.96.

EEL-FISHERY AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, By what authority are the Government about to order the destruction of an eel-fishery (brush weir) constructed on the property of F. F. Rouleau, Esq., advocate, of Rimouski, which said property has been held for nearly a century with right of hunting and fishing?

Mr. TUPPER. I shall have to object to the question being put in its present form, as it is contrary to the rules and to the practice of the House in these cases. The hon. gentleman has a motion on the Paper which will probably be reached to-day, on which he can raise the question. The hon. gentleman on reading the question will see that it begs certain points in dispute and contains statements of facts.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. What is the reason given by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will put his question in proper form I will answer him.

THE CASE OF LÉDA LAMONTAGNE.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Whether the Government have granted or rejected the prayer of the petition recently presented, asking for the discharge of Léda Lamontagne, now detained in the gaol for the district of St. Francis?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The petition was received on 15th July. The usual enquiries were made, and the report of the judge was only received on the 20th instant. The petition has not been reported on yet; probably it will be in a day or two.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. Has there been any correspondence between the Government at Washington and the Canadian Government with reference to the detention of Léda Lamontagne in the gaol for the district of St. Francis, in the Province of Quebec, and to the delay in bringing her to trial on the charge of incendiarism, the charge upon which the American Government granted her extradition? 2. If such correspondence exists, is it the intention of the Government to lay it before the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Government at Washington. That correspondence has just been commenced, and as soon as it is complete it will be laid on the Table, if any one wants to see it.

SYSTEM OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McLENNAN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure to provide a system of pensions for the district staff and the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question of introducing a measure to provide a system of pensions for the district staff, and the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps, during this session, is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. FRÉCHETTE) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to extend the limit of time for the completion of preliminary lists, in view of final revision of the voters' lists?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a Bill before the House with that object in view, and I hope it will be considered by the House to-morrow. The question does not refer to the limit of time for the completion of the list. The Bill provides for an extension from 1st to 15th August.

JUDGES IN DISTRICT OF MONTREAL.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. LÉPINE) asked, 1. How many judges of the several courts held in the district of Montreal obtained leave of absence on account of sickness or for any other cause during the past three years, the duration of such leave, the cause in each case, and the names of the judges to whom leave was granted? 2. How many judges were appointed judges *ad hoc* to replace temporarily those to whom leave was granted, the number and duration of all commissions granted for that purpose and for any and what other reasons, during the last three years, and for what courts such judges *ad hoc* were appointed? 3. The number of judges appointed within the past ten years in the district of Montreal, and to what court such appointments were made, the number who have held or now hold, concurrently with their judicial duties, official positions or missions with the consent or authority of the Government? 4. How many applications, verbal or written, have been made to the Government, within the past five years, by or in favour of any judge of any court in the Province of Quebec, or any other province of the Dominion, with a view to secure an increase of salary of such judge; how many judges tendered their resignation; how many were called upon or asked to resign, the dates when such resignations were tendered or called for in each case where pensions were granted? 5. How many Acts have been passed with a view to the creation of additional courts of justice, or the appointment of new judges in the Province of Quebec, and in the other Provinces of the Dominion, within the past ten years,

and how many such Acts were forwarded to the Government for sanction or disallowance, according to law? 6. Are the Government aware that an Act was passed by the Legislature of Quebec, at its last session, authorizing the appointment of two additional judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, having special jurisdiction in criminal matters in the district of Montreal? Is the said Act now in force, and has the said appointment of two additional judges been made, or is it the intention of the Government to make the said appointment at an early day, and if not, why has the said appointment not been made? 7. Is there any correspondence, memorandum or other paper or document, other than the official reports already published, as between the Government and any of the Local Governments of the Dominion, or between the Government and any of the judges of the several courts of the Dominion, had within the past five years, in relation to any subject, matter or thing referred to in the foregoing questions or to the administration of justice generally, or to any judge of any such court; and what is the nature of said correspondence or document? 8. Have the Government received within the past three years any petition, complaint or information, whether verbal or written, with reference to the administration of justice, from any judge of the Province of Quebec, in the district of Montreal, and the other districts of that province. What is the nature of the complaints embodied in such petitions, and is it the intention of the Government to give prompt attention thereto?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question asks a good deal of information which will have to be moved for as a return, but as regards information that can be given in answer to the question I am glad to give it. To the first question my reply is: In 1888 Judge Papineau had six months leave of absence on account of illness. It was extended four months, and was afterwards extended two months. Judge Baby was absent two months on urgent business. In 1889 no leave of absence was granted. In 1890 Judge Church was absent for seven months on account of illness. My answer to the second question is as follows: Hon. Martin Doherty was appointed assistant-judge of Queen's Bench for courts beginning May, 1888, to replace Judge Monk; for courts commencing 1st September, 1888; 15th September, 1888; 1st October, 1888; 16th November, 1888; 1st December, 1888; 15th January, 1889; 1st February, 1889; 1st March, 1889; 15th March, 1889, to replace Judge Baby; for courts opening 15th March, 1890; 1st May, 1890; 15th September, 1890; 1st October, 1890; 15th November, 1890; 1st December, 1890, to replace Judge Church. Queen's Bench: (1) Mr. Justice Baby, appointed 29th April, 1881; (2) Mr. Justice Church, appointed 25th January, 1887. Superior Court: (3) Sir F. Johnston, appointed 9th March, 1885; (4) Mr. Justice Loranger, appointed 5th August, 1882; (5) Mr. Justice Doherty, transferred from St. Francis district 17th October, 1882; (6) Mr. Justice Mathieu, transferred from Joliette 23rd June, 1883; (7) Mr. Justice Gill, appointed 12th April, 1886; (8) Mr. Justice Davidson, 10th June, 1887; (9) Mr. Justice Taschereau, Montreal and Terrebonne, residence transferred to Montreal, 1st December, 1887; (10) Mr. Justice Wurtele, transferred from Ottawa 20th September, 1888; (11) Mr. Justice Pagnuelo, appointed 5th June, 1889; (12) Mr. Justice Tait, transferred from Bedford 5th July, 1889. Mr. Justice Mathieu was appointed revising officer for Montreal on the 26th October, and still holds that office. So far as my department is aware, no Montreal judge has been charged with any mission by Government within ten years. Mr. Justice de Lorimier is the revising officer for Joliette. 4. It is impossible for me to state the number of verbal and written applications. I am not aware of anything that could be called, on the part of a judge, a verbal or written application for an increase of salary, except formal applications by some of the County Court judges. In other respects requests have been implied, from conversations in which the judges have set forward from time to time, or in documents in which they have presented from time to time information which they thought should be in possession of the Ministry in dealing with the question of salaries. The following are the list of resignations:—Queen's Bench: Mr. Justice Monk resigned 20th September, 1888. Superior Court: Sir W. Meredith resigned 29th September, 1884; Sir A. Stewart resigned 23rd November, 1889; Mr. Justice Rainville resigned 12th April, 1886; Mr. Justice Papineau resigned 7th May, 1889; Mr. Justice Sicotte resigned 7th November, 1887; Mr. Justice Chagnon resigned 12th November, 1887; Mr. Justice Buchanan resigned 18th January, 1887. 5. Chapter 7 of 49-50 Victoria (1886), Quebec, increases the number of Superior Court judges from 27 to 28. Chapter 11 of 50 Victoria (1887), Quebec, increases the number of judges of the Superior Court from 28 to 30. These Acts were forwarded to the Government of Canada. Chapter 21 of 54 Victoria (1890) increases the number of the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench from 6 to 8. These three Acts are Acts of the Province of Quebec. 6. We are aware that the Act was passed by the Quebec Legislature last session to appoint two additional judges to the Court of Queen's Bench, having special jurisdiction in criminal cases in the district of Montreal. The Act is not now in force, and therefore the appointment of two additional judges has not been made. It is too soon to state whether the Government will make the appointment or not, as the Act has not been proclaimed. I think that the other information asked for in the remainder of the question will have to be moved by way of motion.

TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTERS—QUEBEC.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What was the number of votes given generally, in the Province of Quebec, at election of 5th March last? The number of votes given in each county for each candidate?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will give the information. The report has not yet been distributed, because of certain irregularities, but it will be before the House in a short time.

PORT GEORGE PIER.

Mr. BORDEN asked, 1. Was the work of constructing the pier at Port George let by tender and contract? 2. If so, who was the successful tenderer, and was his the lowest tender? 3. Who else tendered, and for what amounts? 4. Has the con-

tractor made any claim for extras? 5. If so, how much and on what grounds?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. Yes. Tenders were called for by public advertisement and a contract was entered into for the work in Quebec. 2. Frederick Toms, of Ottawa, whose tender was the lowest, viz., $9,447. 3. One other tender was received, viz., from Ansley Elliott, of Port George, for $9,500. 4. The contractor has made a claim for extras to the Chief Engineer. 5. The claim is for $3,007.37, as follows: (*a.*) To close gap of thirty feet between inner end of contract work and existing structure, $1,800. (*b.*) To close further gap, eleven feet in length, at $66.67, $733.37. (*c.*) Clearing away old work for above eleven feet, $150. (*d.*) Stringers, flooring, bolts, &c., in repairing outer end of old wharf, exclusive of above eleven feet, $50. (*e.*) 800 lineal feet of close sheeting on inner face, with bolts, &c, at 18 cents, $144. (*f.*) 150 feet twelve-inch longitudinal timber, at 20 cents, $30. (*g.*) Five additional mooring posts in place, $20—$100. Total, $3,007.37. Of the above claim the sum of $2,540 has been allowed, made up of the following: (*a.*) $1,800—to close gap of thirty feet made by a storm between the time of receipt of tenders and awarding of contracts. This work was done by special agreement between the contractor and the department, under date 12th August, 1890. (*b.*) $540 allowed to close a second gap nine feet in length, actual measurement, caused by storm after contract was awarded. (*c.*) $50 allowed on this item as a fair and reasonable price. (*d.*) Item allowed, $50—work was done. Items (*e*) and (*f*) not allowed. (*g.*) Ordered by Engineer and placed in work. Price, $100—fair and reasonable.

RAILWAYS IN INVERNESS COUNTY.

Mr. FRASER asked, Was the subsidy voted at the last session of Parliament to the Inverness and Richmond Railway for the purpose of relieving the County of Inverness from the municipal aid promised to the company by the said county? Does the Government propose to grant an additional subsidy to the said line of railway during the present session or at any other time? If so, what amount? Does the Government propose to build a branch railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove Mines, in the County of Inverness? Have the Government at any time promised to build said railway? Was such promise made by the Government, or any person on their behalf, previous to the 5th of March last?

Mr. HAGGART. The subsidy was granted in accordance with an agreement between the company for the first 50 miles of its line of railway and the municipality of Inverness, and as the Act provides it shall be paid on the completion of each 10-mile section, in accordance, as nearly as practicable, with the agreement between the company and municipality of Inverness, and with section 4 of the Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia (1890), intituled: "An Act to enable the County of Inverness to borrow money." The question of an additional subsidy is still under consideration. In answer to the second part of the question, I say that the application to that effect was made by Dr. Cameron, member for the county. Without promising to build this branch, the First Minister promised to have a careful investigation made as to the probable cost of the line and the volume of trade, and this is being done.

QUEBEC BBIDGE.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to initiate, this session, any measure calculated to assist in the construction of a bridge over the River St. Lawrence at or in the vicinity of the city of Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention this session.

DUTY ON PLATE PRESENTED TO THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. FORBES (for Mr. DAVIDSON) asked, What amount was paid as duty on the plate presented to the Minister of Public Works in March, 1889? Who paid such duty? In whose name was said plate imported?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount of duty paid on plate mentioned is $329.30. The importation was made through A. Rosenthal, jeweller, Sparks street, Ottawa.

REVISION OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Whether the Government have instructed the revising officers to prolong the preliminary revision up to the 15th August? If not, is it their intention so to do?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The answer I gave earlier to-day.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. MONETTE) asked, Whether tenders were called for, for the supply of leather and boot and shoe-making findings for the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul during the year 1891? If so, how many tenders were received; what was the amount of each tender and the name of the tenderer; was the lowest tender accepted, and if not, why not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Tenders were called for. Three tenders were received, namely, Louis Chevalier, $1,915.60; S. S. Hubbell, $1,918; Alexis Chouinard, $2,121.30. The lowest tender was not accepted. The second tender, $3.15 higher, was accepted, because the tenderer, who was the old contractor, had supplied articles called for under his former contract of the very best quality, and it was considered in the public interest that his contract should be renewed.

HOURS OF RURAL POST OFFICES.

Mr. LAURIER asked, What are the regulations concerning the opening and closing hours of rural post offices?

Mr. HAGGART. The regulations on the subject of the opening and closing are as follows:—Post offices are understood to be kept open during the ordinary business hours of the locality; and, as a matter of fact, most country offices are open from 7 to 7.30 in the morning till 7.30 to 8 in the evening. If the principal mail of the day arrives in the evening a postmaster will sometimes be required to keep his office open as late as 9 p.m. in

order that letters may be delivered the same day. If no objection is raised by the people of the neighbourhood, the postmaster is allowed to close his office during half an hour to one hour at meal time. Except in the Province of Quebec, no post office is required to be kept open on Sunday. In the Province of Quebec post offices are kept open for a hour, either before or after divine service. On statutory holidays post offices are allowed to be closed for the greater part of the day, the postmasters notifying the public beforehand of the hours during which correspondence will be received and delivered.

FISHERY RIGHTS AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, By what authority are the Government about to order the destruction of an eel-fishery (brush-weir) constructed on the property of F. F. Rouleau, Esq., advocate, of Rimouski, which said property has been held for nearly a century with right of hunting and fishing?

Mr. TUPPER. Under the authority of the general fishery regulations of the Province of Quebec, which prohibit fishing by means of nets or other apparatus without license or permission, the Department of Fisheries gave such instructions.

COMMANDER OF THE *ALERT*.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether Captain Ls. Honorius Lachance underwent an examination as a candidate for the position of commander of the *Alert*? If so, what was the result of the examination, and why was he not appointed commander of the *Alert*?

Mr. TUPPER. Captain Lachance was examined by Captain McElhinney for the position of master of the *Alert*. The result was that the record of service as given by Captain Lachance and the testimonials produced, although very good, were not so satisfactory as those furnished by others. He was not appointed because the examination of another person who has been placed in temporary charge was more satisfactory than that of Captain Lachance.

SETTLEMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN. In withdrawing the motion of which I have given notice:

That, whereas notwithstanding the liberal policy of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald pursued in regard to the North-West Territories, and the well-established fact of the great fertility of the country, their settlement has not reached the proportions expected, this House is of opinion that a policy can be devised which will more rapidly people those territories;

I may say that I intended at first to lay a scheme before the House embracing the North-West affairs generally and bearing upon the direction of population to those territories, but if I were to place that before the House now, it would take too long to discuss it, and so I will drop the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

COMMISSIONER HERCHMER, NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, generally, from the date he became Commissioner to the present time, and especially with reference to his conduct during the last election in Western Assiniboia, and also into the conduct of the officers and the men of the Force in the said constituency during that election.

He said: Last year when I brought before the House the conduct of Col. Herchmer as Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, there was a discussion in which Mr. Blake and the hon. member for Saskatchewan and some other hon. gentlemen took part, and as a result of the discussion, a departmental enquiry was instituted. Mr. Comptroller White, who made the enquiry, had no authority to examine witnesses under oath, and I need hardly say that he had no power to call witnesses before him. The enquiry must, therefore, have been ineffective and unsatisfactory, and particularly when we remember that the officers who might have been examined must necessarily be subject to the interference of Commissioner Herchmer who was the person involved, and that they were, moreover, to be examined in a matter in regard to which the Superintendent General had spoken very strongly in Col. Herchmer's favour. Thus the non-commissioned officers and men who should be called to give evidence against the Commissioner would naturally feel like going to law with the devil in the court of hell. The consequence of this was that an enquiry was made which did not command the confidence of the people of the North-West Territories or of the body of the North-West Mounted Police Force, and I cannot hope that a report based upon such an enquiry would be such as to lead the Government to take the action required in the interest of the North-West Mounted Police and is called for by the people of the North-West Territories. When an officer occupying the position of Commissioner Herchmer, commanding about 1,000 men in such a territory as the North-West, is proven to be detested by his men and to be utterly detested from one end of that territory to the other—and Mr. White, the comptroller, will not attempt to say anything to the contrary—it is not enough to say that he is severe. Other commanders have been severe. That is not sufficient, because a man can be a strict disciplinarian and yet be so much in touch with his men as to command their confidence and their respect. I will not go over the charges which I made against Commissioner Herchmer last year. Those charges remain, and we can substantiate them, if we get a proper enquiry, and I have other charges even graver in their nature than those which I have made. I may say, in passing, that, although the Commissioner is, in my opinion, quite unfit for the office he occupies, the result of my bringing these charges before the House has been that which such action always has, of improving matters. It is a feeling that astonishes me, brought up, as I have been, in England and watching the course of political events there, that here it is considered better, if you can, not to ventilate any matter of this kind in the House of Commons. Why, the best thing for a member of Parliament, whether he happens to be, as I am, a supporter of the Government, or whether he happens to be an opponent of the Government, if he cannot secure a remedy from the Government itself, is to bring the matter before this House, because this Parliament is the real Government of the country, it is the grand inquest of the nation, and this

is the place in which to bring up any grievance, whether it be a small grievance concerning an individual, or a grievance of the greatest magnitude. Just before the late elections, I received a letter from one of the ablest officers of the North-West Mounted Police, in which, after complimenting me on what I had accomplished for that force, he says:

"1. As to the officers, we are no longer treated like dogs.
"2. Grievances of officers and men have been brought before the public.
"3. Big sentences of twelve or six months for trivial offences are now never heard of in general orders.
"4. Whenever a case of any consequence comes up it receives due attention.
"5. That punishment is never awarded before the evidence is heard."

A case occurred, however, just before I left Regina where sentence was awarded before evidence was heard. The man was not heard at all and was sentenced right off.—

"6. That the need of a Pension Bill had been pressed on the attention of the Government and the public.
"7. That since the matter was brought up in Parliament, the police had obtained a better reputation.
"8. That the men had not left the force in such numbers as they used to do."

Well, Sir, if we have accomplished that by ventilating these matters in Parliament, we have accomplished a good deal. But though that has been accomplished, as I will show you, Commissioner Herchmer is utterly unfit for the position. Now, Sir, on the very day that I received a telegram from Ottawa stating that Parliament had been dissolved, I received a letter from Commissioner Herchmer—I was not accustomed to speak to him then, and I am not accustomed to speak to him now—asking me for an interview. I at once sent word that I would give him the interview. He said: "My dear Sir,—will you give me an interview in a matter of importance to the public interest." I gave him the interview; I did not know of what character it was likely to be. When he came to my office I bowed him into a chair, and he then told me that he came to make an appeal to me. He said: "The police force is utterly demoralized." I said: "That is a most extraordinary statement for you to make to me. What have I to do with that?" "Oh," he said, "you are a public man, and you ought to be interested in the welfare of such a force as this." "Well," I said, "how is it demoralized?" He said: "The officers do not care any more for me; Mr. Fred. White does not care any more for me." I said to him: "What officers do not care any more for you?" He said: "Major Steele and Captain Deane." "Well," I said to him, "I may tell you this, that one word *viva voce*, or written ever passed between Major Steele and myself, or between myself and Captain Deane." "Well," he said, "they know they have a strong man fighting against me in you, and that they have a Cabinet Minister behind them." I did not know whom he meant, I did not ask him whom he meant, and he did not mention the name, but they knew they had a Cabinet Minister behind them. Now, Sir, I mention that fact, it can be taken *quantum valeat*. His letter was not marked private, he did not tell me the conversation was private. I say the commander of that force came to me and made that statement. Well, then, he further stated to me: "Now I have come to make an appeal to you." He was good enough to say that he believed me to be a manly man; he said I had fought him openly, as he had fought me. He had come to make an appeal to me, and the appeal was this: That I would not allow him to be driven from that force without having a sworn enquiry into his conduct. He said: "You are not going to let me be driven from the force without an enquiry under oath." I said to him: "Col. Herchmer, I have fought you strongly, but if I see that the least wrong is about to be done to you, I will defend you as far as my poor influence goes, and I will insist on having a sworn enquiry into your conduct." After that I bowed him out of the room, and he left. I should add, however, that he said to me: "Of course you are going to be elected by acclamation; I always knew you would." I may say I knew very well that some months before he was threatening that when the election came on he with his policemen would "let me see." Well, Sir, the election came on, and what did this gentleman do? I found that he was working against me. I telegraphed to Sir John A. Macdonald and to Mr. White that Col. Herchmer was working against me. Mr. White telegraphed to him: "Mr. Davin telegraphs to the Premier that you are working against him. You must not do this, you must not interfere." I ought to tell the House that a Conservative was running against me, so that from the point of view of voting it did not matter to the Government which of us got in.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You were the better man.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not say anything of that sort; but I do say that I had rendered services to the party and the man I was fighting against, had rendered no services. Let me say this: that when two men are running, belonging to the same party, one of whom has never done anything for the party, and the other man has fought for the party—I do not say it is not a fair law of political morality to let them fight it out amongst themselves, but I say that if I were the leader myself I would depart from that political morality, and I certainly would support the man that had been prominent in supporting me. Now, Commissioner Herchmer gets directions that he must not interfere. Remember, he gets directions from his head the Superintendent General that he must not interfere; he gets directions from the Prime Minister of Canada that he must not interfere. How did he obey? How did this military man obey the command of his superior? He wrote a letter to be read to the police at each division in my constituency: "The police are at liberty to vote how they like, but I am in favour of Tweed." Now, you know what the Quaker said when he told the mob not to nail a man's ear to the pump—he meant that they should nail it. What was the result in this case? The result was that the officers and men, who up to that time were in my favour and were determined to vote for me, when the election came round, voted against me, and one of them at Maple Creek went so far as to keep in men that were friends of mine. I happen to know how the voting stood at Maple Creek. Before this letter of Herchmer's was read the voting stood: Davin 17, Tweed 4. The day after it was read the voting stood: Tweed 16, Davin none. I happened to be at Maple Creek on the day of the voting. Major Jarvis was previously in

my favour himself, but I saw him drive down two carriages full of men to vote straight against me.

Mr. WATSON. Government carriages?

Mr. DAVIN. Government carriages, and I can prove, if an enquiry is given, as I hope it will be, that Constables Forbes, Grinton, Brodie and Mc Donald would not vote against their convictions, that is, they would not vote against me, and they were not allowed to leave the barracks. Another, Van Pityus, would not vote against me, and he was given stable duty, and although one of the men, who subsequently drove down with Major Jarvis, volunteered to take the stable duty in his stead, he was not allowed to do so. I, myself, saw Major Jarvis drive down with his two traps full of men to register their votes against me. I said to him: "This is a nice state of things. The police ought to be disfranchised." He said that they ought not to be allowed to vote. I will tell you, moreover, what happened there. I gave directions to my friends there that the two hotels, which were in my favour——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Wait a little, and the laugh will be on the other side of your mouth. I asked the proprietors of those hotels to keep their bars closed during the day of the election, as they were known to be friends of mine, and I can aver that, as far as I saw, they carried out the instructions to the letter, and they also obeyed the law which requires such places to be closed. I am told that they did the same after I left. It was one o'clock when I left, and during the time I was there, what did I see? My opponent had the bar of one of the houses open, that is to say, the back door was open. It was one of those saloons, and the half-breeds were taken in there, and something like seventy or eighty of them, I think, got a glass or two of whiskey, and then they were marched up and voted against me. Friends of mine there said to me: "Do you not see those fellows: they are hanging off, getting liquor; cannot you stop it?" I said, that of course I could stop it, but I would not stop it. I could not conscientiously have done so. I could easily have stopped the men going and voting against me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How?

Mr. DAVIN. I said: "I know very well how it can be done, but I am not going to do it, for two reasons. In the first place, I am conscientiously opposed to breaking down the self-respect of any voter, be he half-breed or otherwise. In the next place, because it is unnecessary, for I can win this election by 300 majority." The answer I received was: "Are you sure? Look at the people there against you." I replied: "You may bet $500 to a cent that I will have a majority of 300." He said: "If you are sure of having a majority, all right." I said: "Very well, let the whole vote go."

Mr. WATSON. How would you get it?

Mr. DAVIN. The friend of mine who spoke to me about it, told me how I could get the vote. What he said to me I am not going to tell to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), because I do not want to give him a wrinkle in election matters that would be perfectly new to him, and especially as he might possibly not have the virtue to resist, as I had. On the day of election in Regina the very first man to vote was Commissioner Herchmer himself. Then he at once sent his own carriage over to the sergeants' mess to take down a body of men to vote against me, and he declared that he would weed them out—that he would weed out those fellows who had the audacity to vote for me. Well, Sir, he at once began to persecute the men. A man named Flindt, who is one of the most respectable men holding any Government position in Canada, a man who stood high in the favour of the Commissioner up to that day, became the subject of his disapproval. The next day there were nothing but frowns for him. A man named Harvey, in the office, happened to send a letter by post instead of having it sent by an orderly, whereupon Flindt, who was at the head of the office, and who was a sergeant of the staff, was brought before Commissioner Herchmer, who spoke very angrily to him, and told him on account of this man's laches, that of sending a letter by post instead of by orderly, that if he was brought before him again he would be reduced to the ranks. Another man named Thompson, of Wood Mountain, was at once told that he was dismissed. I need hardly say that I communicated to the authorities in reference to these matters, and we have stopped most, in fact all, the persecutions that we can get at. I need hardly say that it is as pervasive as the atmosphere. C. A. Corneil, a constable and a saddler, had before the election given great satisfaction, according to Quartermaster Allan. On Wednesday following, March 5th, he went to the store, and Captain Allan said he was up in orders for promotion. That night another constable, senior to him by three weeks, was put in charge of the shop. His name is Corporal Hollister. Allan asked Corneil; "Who is senior, you have been satisfactory, you take charge of the shop." Allan further said to him: "I will put you in orders for promotion." But the other man got the promotion, although there was no complaint against Corneil. Allan recommended his stepson, James Clair, for promotion, and it was to take place after the election. He was immediately sent for by the Commissioner—this being after the election—who said to him: "Here are a number of men who voted for Davin, among them your pets." Allan replied: "Here is your own private secretary, Flindt, who has also voted the same way."

Mr. O'BRIEN. How do you know how these men voted?

Mr. DAVIN. It is an open vote. I promised Mr. Blake last year that if he would make a motion to introduce the ballot into the North-West, I would support it. I have always been opposed to the ballot, but in view of my experience at the last election, I have come to be converted to believe in it. The Commissioner appointed a man named Currier, as acting Quartermaster. Captain Allan refused to be responsible, but the man still continued to perform duties. The Commissioner did not even reply to Allan's letters. Special Constable Waldron, who was a good officer, right after the election was discharged. A constable named Pitts, immediately after the election, was also persecuted. Constable Moffatt went to Dr. Dodd, who voted for me—I did not hear this from the doctor, but from an independent authority—and he was told: "You will get hell for voting for

Davin." I rather think the persecutions have been pretty well stopped, because I at once communicated with Sir John Macdonald and with Mr. White. I received an autograph letter from Sir John Macdonald saying a rigid enquiry would be made into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, and he spoke to me on the subject when I came here. One of the last letters he wrote to me, a few days before his lamented death, was giving me an appointment on that and three other subjects. Unfortunately, that appointment never came off. So there is the case made last year against this man, with which I am not going to weary the House, and this case now of his interfering with the election of a member of Parliament, as he did, and not only interfering with the election but acting contrary to the express orders of the Prime Minister, who was not only the Prime Minister, but was his superior officer, a fact which adds greatly to the weight of the charge against him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolution, I presume, is based on the charges which the hon. gentleman made last session. I presume it is to those charges he refers when he alludes in his resolution to the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, and it is necessary, in order that the House may understand the position of the question, that I should remind it of what took place during the debates of last year. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a number of specific charges against Commissioner Herchmer, on which he based a resolution which formed the subject of a debate during a whole afternoon. The resolution was negatived on a division, but, in the course of the debate I think I am correct in saying, the First Minister promised that a departmental enquiry would take place into the charges which the hon. member had made in his place. The hon. gentleman's view of the case for an enquiry was sustained by other members of the House, one of them the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who, I think, himself suggested that ad epartmental enquiry should be made with a view to ascertaining whether at a subsequent period a fuller enquiry under oath should follow. Later in the year, notwithstanding that this resolution was negatived, the Superintendent of Mounted Police was instructed by the Minister who had charge of that force to proceed to the North-West and to make an enquiry into the charges which the hon. gentleman had made here. Mr. White, in pursuance of that instruction, went to the North-West, and made a careful enquiry into all these charges; and not only that, but he caused likewise public notification to be given, that he was there for the purpose of investigating any complaints which might be brought forward against Col. Herchmer; because the hon. gentleman for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had not only made specific charges, but had made general charges also, which it was understood could be brought forward and substantiated if an opportunity were afforded. The result of these proceedings has been, as I informed the House on the question of the hon. gentleman himself not many days ago, that Mr. White prepared a very elaborate and full report, as to the result of his investigation into these charges. That report would have been on the Table of the House to-day but for an accident. It was sent by the head of the department to the Department of the Secretary of State, to be forwarded here, in the manner in which returns to the Orders of the House are furnished; but this report had not, in point of fact, been called for by an Order of the House, or by an Address, and in consequence of that slight irregularity it has not yet reached me. I will probably have it in the course of the day, and I will lay it on the Table for the hon. gentleman's information. I beg to say, with regard to that report, and in advance of its coming here, that it will contain simply the departmental answer, in so far as it can be obtained, to the charges the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) made in the House last session. Although it is a very full and elaborate document, it will not profess to deal exhaustively with either the specific or general charges which were then made. In consequence of circumstances which I need not go into, it was not possible for the Commissioner to make a thorough investigation at that time of year, such an investigation, under oath, as it would have been desirable to make before the charges could be considered as having been entirely disposed of. On his return from the North-West, Mr. White was instructed by the First Minister to proceed, in the month of November next, to the North-West, when the troops would be at their quarters and when a fuller investigation could be made. Notwithstanding that, the report will contain a good deal of information, disposing of a good many of the charges which the hon. gentleman referred to last year. The report, as I told the House last week, was only completed a few days ago, and that will account for the delay in bringing it down. I have now to say to the hon. gentleman, that, in consequence of what I have stated, the report could not be a very complete one. As it is desirable that an investigation under oath should follow the enquiry which Mr. White made, it is intended by the head of the department, who is the First Minister, that an enquiry shall be made into the charges which were preferred during last session; into any charges that have been prepared to-day, and into any other charges that may be brought forward; I may say that it is the wish of Colonel Herchmer that that enquiry should be conducted under oath, and should be more formal and more ample than the enquiry which has already taken place. I am in a position to state to the hon. gentleman that it is the intention to make that enquiry, as a result of the departmental investigation which I have already referred to, and which was itself a fulfilment of the promise made last year. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is not necessary to press the resolution for an Address to accomplish what has already been determined on.

Mr. LAURIER. I must take exception to one or two remarks which fell from the lips of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) while introducing this motion. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he stated that there was in this country a sentiment quite the reverse of what the sentiment in England is, inasmuch as that there seems to be here, amongst politicians of all shades and opinions, a general disinclination to have grievances ventilated. I cannot say but that this remark might very well refer to the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, but certainly that remark cannot apply to this side of the House. He has no reason to say that this side of the House has ever

been disinclined to ventilate grievances. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman himself is not at all free from the charge which he makes against others. I would think that he does not seem to be very much inclined to ventilate these grievances, for although he has made these charges on the floor of the House on one, two, three, or four occasions, he never took the right step to have these grievances properly investigated. The hon. gentleman stated himself, and stated very truly, that Parliament is the great court of enquiry of the nation. Why, then, did he not ask that these grievances should be investigated by this court of enquiry? This is the place to have these grievances investigated, and if the hon. gentleman, instead of asking as he now asks, a Royal Commission, or as he asked last year, simply a departmental investigation, if he had asked a committee of the House to investigate these grievances, it would have led to an investigation in which, he certainly must admit, there would be a better chance of arriving at the truth than if the investigation were conducted by others. That is the way in which the hon. gentleman should have proceeded, in my judgment, in order to have that justice for which he is now seeking. What has taken place in reference to this matter? Last year, the hon. gentleman made very serious charges against an officer of the Department of the Interior; he was promised a departmental investigation; he is now told by the Minister of Justice that this investigation is not thorough; that it has been at best superficial; and therefore he cannot expect to have very much satisfaction from it. Now he is promised another investigation. Has he any reason to believe that the investigation to be made next fall will be any more thorough than the investigation made last fall? Has he any reason to believe that he will have more justice done to him, and to the public which he represents in the section of the country from which he comes, from this investigation, than was done him by the previous investigation? I agree with him, that Parliament is the great court of enquiry. In this young nation it is the place to ventilate such grievances, and if the hon. gentleman were to move for a committee of the House to investigate the very grave charges which he made against Colonel Herchmer, that would, in my opinion, have been the best method to arrive at the truth in this matter. The hon. gentleman has also complained—and I am not sorry for that—of the interference of public officers in elections. I am very glad to see that we shall have the sympathy of a prominent member of the Conservative party upon that question. I am not sorry that the hon. gentleman has had the interference of public officers against him in his election. I am very glad to see him elected since the issue in that constituency was between two Conservatives, but if it were between a Liberal and a Conservative, I would not say so much. The issue was between two Conservatives, and I am glad to see the hon. gentleman elected, but I am not sorry that in his election he had to fight against the interference of public officers. The hon. gentleman will see that the interference of public officers in elections is not at all to be tolerated in this country, and I suppose that henceforth we on this side shall have his support when we bring that question before the House.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very glad that the Government have decided to grant an enquiry, for it shows that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was perfectly justified last year, when he protested on behalf of the country, against the conduct of Colonel Herchmer. When I was in the North-West myself, I happened to hear something about one of the Herchmers, but I will not go into these details. I am sorry that the Government have hesitated so long to grant the request for an enquiry, because, during the year and a-half since the Government have been put in possession of the facts, they have left Herchmer omnipotent in the North-West. We know what an amount of harm the misconduct of commanding officers of a large force like this may do. I believe the enquiry would be much better held by this Parliament; but at all events it would be good to have one. The enquiry is necessary, not only for the force that may suffer, but for the officers themselves, who cannot remain at the head of the force if the charges made against them are not completely disproved. I will take the liberty to quote here accusations which have been spread broadcast in the press of this country against the officers of this force. I take this extract from a paper which usually supports the Government, *L'Etendard*, of Montreal. It is translated by the McLeod *Gazette*, and is as follows:—

"Last autumn, at the time of the Governor General's visit to the North-West, W. W. Herchmer, Assistant Commissioner and tyrant No. 2, ordered Major Steele, superintendent of the force at McLeod, to retire Inspector Courtland Starnes, the French-Canadian officer from Montreal, from the command of the escort of police, which was to form part of the guard of honour of the Governor General at Lethbridge, saying to Major Steele: 'The orders of the commissioner (tyrant No. 1) are that not one of those d——n French-Canadians is to be given a place on the escort or allowed to distinguish himself in any way.' The result was that an Englishman replaced Starnes. The following evening the same W. W. Herchmer, in the course of social reunion, said to Starnes that all French-Canadians were b——ds, sons of b——s, and sons of w——s; and all this can be corroborated by evidence; the veracity of which cannot be called in question for a moment. The whole has been reported, word for word, to the department at Ottawa, in the handwriting of officers who were witnesses of the affair, and at the request of the comptroller, Mr. Fred. White. Another charge is that the Commissioner, L. W. Herchmer, not long since ordered that a French-Canadian officer should be stationed at a far distant post for several months without being relieved, in order that he might be prevented from seeing his *fiancée*, a French-Canadian lady, in the hope of seeing the engagement broken, and the marriage in question prevented. Officers McDonnell and Howe and Major Steele can prove this. Major Steele received the order, handed it over on leaving to Howe, who in his turn handed it to McDonnell. Inspector Wood was also present. The hateful order was faithfully carried out, and while English officers were relieved every month, the unfortunate French-Canadian was compelled to remain in exile. Another charge. The same Commissioner, L. W. Herchmer, reduced a sergeant-major, a Roman Catholic, to the grade of single sergeant, thus taking away from him a third of his pay, because he failed to attend choir practice by the members of the Church of England in the detachment with their band, while a man capable of conducting the music, and what is more, a Protestant, was one of the band. The said Roman Catholic was banished to another district for his bad conduct. He was simply acting in accordance with his own religious views."

This gives an idea of tyranny and bigotry on the part of these officers which calls for an immediate investigation by the Government. I cannot suppose for one moment that there is one amongst the Ministers, who, having good reason to believe the truthfulness of these charges, would hesitate for one moment to have an immediate enquiry

instituted, and to see that these gross wrongs be not repeated. The paper goes on :

"Still another. French-Canadians have not received their share of promotion, and they do not want them to enter the Mounted Police although applications on their part are numerous, and they make excellent soldiers. The reason given by our tyrants is that the French-Canadians are not tall enough, which is veritable libel."

These are the specific charges, and I might go on reading further. I see by the McLeod *Gazette* of the month of June last that the condition of officers is not overrated, but that the harm still goes on. We have, of course, no power on this side of the House to enforce anything ; but I hope that there will be no undue delay in the organization of the commission of enquiry. If it is true that Colonel Herchmer has been guilty of the thing charged against him—that in fact, as the papers put it, discipline has been maintained in spite of his bad conduct, his injustice and his tyranny—it is in the interest of society at large that it should be put a stop to at once. I read these facts to this honourable House so as to inform the members of the Government, and I hope that when they are so informed they will see the commission is issued at once and that the enquiry shall be of a serious nature, so that the wrong-doing which has been going for so long a time will be speedily put a stop to.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to withdraw the motion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the motion is withdrawn I wish to say one word with regard to the paper which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has read. Of course no officer could remain in the service of the Government an hour who had used such language as the hon. member has read from that paper. I did not understand Colonel Herchmer had ever been charged with using that language. I understood that the charge had applied to another officer of the same name, who not only emphatically denies it, but tenders his oath in denying it. As to Colonel Herchmer, although I understood that the charge was not made against him, he is ready to testify under oath before any tribunal that he never used that language.

Mr. AMYOT. Has the other officer who used that language been discharged ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware what officer used it or that any officer did ; but the officer charged with using it denied, and was ready to deny under oath, ever having used it.

Mr. DAVIN. Perhaps I may be allowed to say, in answer to the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that I watched closely the enquiry made by Mr. White, and I happen to know that it was made as thoroughly as under the circumstances it could be made ; and now that the Government are ready to have an enquiry made under oath, I have the fullest confidence that it will be thorough.

Motion withdrawn.

VETERANS OF 1837-38.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government should bestow some mark of recognition upon the veterans of 1837-38 for their services to the country at that time.

He said : I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government to the claim for recognition of a large number of old men throughout the country who served their country well and faithfully, in 1837 and 1838, under very trying circumstances. It will be in the recollection of some of the members of this House—and if they do not remember the circumstances, they have been taught them in their schools—that fifty or sixty years ago an agitation was commenced in this country by some men who believed there were wrongs to be righted, and injustices and inequalities to be remedied. The agitation which they started threatened to overthrow the constituted Government by force, and they were aided and assisted in their efforts by foreign sympathisers who desired to wrest this country from the British Crown. When this agitation took form, an armed body marched upon Toronto with the intention of seizing the Government and the public archives, in order to constitute another Government. Then a little band of the loyal men of Canada were roused, and voluntered in hundreds and thousands to defend their Government and drive the foreign invader from our country's shores. These men left their homes, their families, and their farms in midwinter, and travelled many miles to their different places of rendezvous, and were formed into militia corps and served in the ranks for many months. Some of them served under fire, and distinguished themselves. Many of these old men allege most distinctly that they were promised for their services grants of land, but this promise, if made, was never carried out. Most of these loyal men who served their country then have passed away, but some remain, and many of them to-day are poor, destitute and in distressed circumstances, and they have held public meetings all over the country and asked for some recognition for their services. Our volunteers who, during the last rebellion, performed no greater services than were performed by these men in 1837 and 1838, who endured no greater privations, have been rewarded by the country for their public services with grants of land in the North-West and decorations ; and these old men, whose cause I plead to-day, ask, with some justice and with confidence, that their services should be rewarded, or, at all events, recognized, but their request has as yet not met with a favourable answer. They point to the fact that the men who served their country in 1812-15 were rewarded, about twelve or fifteen years ago, by a grant of money. It is true, the pension given them was small, $25 or $30 a year, but it was some recognition for their services, and it pleased the men who got it. In the same way, if some small recognition should be made to these men of 1837 and 1838, it would be satisfactory to them, and would be an encouragement to our young men in the future to serve their country in times of public difficulty, when called on to do so. Such recognition would satisfy these veterans, who feel that they saved their country from a great disaster, and secured to it, in a great measure, the high position it holds among the colonies of Great Britain. In bringing their claims before the House, I know I am but a very feeble spokesman for them ; but their claims, I am sure, speak loudly for themselves. These men are scattered through the country and are not very numerous, and it would be a gracious act on the part of this Parliament, and one which would not entail much sacrifice of the public funds, to compensate in some measure their self-sacrifice. But

between 2,000 or 3,000 still survive; if their services could be recognized, they would feel greatly pleased and would go down to their graves satisfied that their services had been in some measure appreciated. Even if a grant of land or a pension cannot be given them, some small recognition should be made which would be satisfactory to them and their families.

Mr. ALLISON. I am pleased to find that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has brought this matter before the House. Some five or six weeks ago I placed upon the Notice paper a question asking whether it is the intention of the Government to make a grant of land to each of the survivors of the volunteers who assisted in suppressing the rebellion in Canada in 1837 and 1838. In answer to my question, the hon. Minister of Militia said it was not the intention of the Government to do so, and the reason he gave was that the services of these men, who took part in suppressing that rebellion, were rendered previous to Confederation, and that consequently it was a matter belonging exclusively to the old Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I am glad to-day to find upon the Notice paper the motion of the hon. member for Frontenac :

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government should bestow some mark of recognition upon the veterans of 1837-38 for their services to the country at that time."

Now, I fully concur in the sentiments contained in this resolution, and believe that this Parliament should grant some recognition for the services so rendered. I believe that that recognition should be a valuable one, say a grant of 160 acres of land to each survivor. We have large areas of land in the North-West, in Manitoba and in British Columbia ; and we find, Sir, individuals, companies and organizations constantly knocking at the door of this Parliament to obtain the withdrawal of these lands from the market in order that they may be placed in their hands for speculation. These men who are asking for these lands have done no service to this country in any respect, and I think it would be greatly to the credit of this House and this Government to grant a certain quantity of these lands to each of these survivors of the men who helped to suppress that rebellion, instead of granting them to men who never rendered any service to their country. It would not draw very heavily upon our land resources to grant this request. A very large number of those old men have passed over to the majority, and only a few comparatively are living to-day. In the United States it has been the common custom, wherever the militia have been called on to do service to protect their country, to recognize their services by grants of land warrants. Now, Sir, I do not wish to base a reason for this land being granted on any example gathered from the United States. I would place it upon a higher plane. I would place it upon the ground of the old flag which we all revere. That flag has floated over this country ever since the pioneers came from the old land and used their axes in cutting down the forest and since then have contended with the hardships which are attendant upon settlement in a new country. When the rebellion broke out, the sons of those pioneers went to the front and defended this country when it was assailed, so I think it is only right to grant them a portion of this land which they so nobly defended. The Minister of Militia has said that this belongs to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but if the people of those provinces had not prevented this rebellion being successful, we would probably not have had a Dominion of Canada to-day, and, instead of the British flag floating over us, the Stars and Stripes might have been floating over this country. We all form part of the Dominion from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific, and I think all should feel an interest in showing some recognition of the services of those who fought in our behalf. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. TISDALE. I propose to say a few words as to the practical part of this subject. I agree with the two gentlemen who have preceded me, and, though I am not in favour of any large measures of pensions being granted in this country, there may be circumstances to justify the granting of pensions. The fact has been referred to that no pensions have been granted by the provinces which, before the Dominion was formed, had entire control of this matter. There is a great deal to be said, no doubt, as to the provinces being the proper tribunal to deal with this case, but they have not acted ; and my support of this motion is based on the ground that these are old men, they are not very numerous, and though they are, perhaps, not of the class that nations sometimes give pensions to, still because they were not wounded or disabled in the war, that is no reason why they should not be considered. They are old men, many of them are needy men, and, whether they were provincial men then or not, they helped to lay the foundations of a nation which we hope to see established here. I know that many of these men need assistance, and deserve a recognition from the Government. Otherwise I think it would be an exceptional expenditure. The question of whether money or land grant should be given would be for the consideration of the Government, but, if the Government do not feel themselves in a position to make such a grant, at all events they can give some recognition, some mark of appreciation of the services of these men, which I am sure many of them would be proud of, in the shape of medals or something of that kind. The men out of whom the right sort of soldiers are made, and their descendants, recognize this sort of appreciation as being even higher than a money grant. I hope the Government will be able to grant them some assistance in a pecuniary way or in land, and I would like to see something further given in the way of medals.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This question was up a little time ago, and I took the ground then that it was not advisable for the Government to make any recognition of those who took part in the troubles of 1837-38 unless the services of both parties were taken into consideration. Are we to reward those men who endeavoured to put down the struggle for freedom, and to ignore those who were instrumental in securing to Upper and Lower Canada the justice which we demanded and in obtaining the foundation for the civil and religious liberties we enjoy to-day ; for, if it had not been for the action of the rebels in 1837-38, it is possible that we might still have been living under the iron heel of oppression of the old "family compact." I say,

that all honour is due to William Lyon Mackenzie and Papineau and the rest of those who took part in that struggle, and their names should be more revered in Ontario and Quebec than the names of those who went out and fought against them when they were fighting in the cause of freedom. If we are honouring those who did good at that time, we must honour the rebels. Why, on the west side of this very parliamentary building, we have a monument erected to one of those rebels, and this Parliament voted $10,000 for a statue to the memory of George E. Cartier. And now we are asked to give a testimonial to the men who fought against the rebels who were in insurrection for the cause of liberty in this country. Lord Durham reported to the British Government that that rebellion was justifiable, and, if we have the Imperial authority for that, why is it proposed to reward those men who fought against the rebels? If any reward is due, it is to the men who stood up for civil and religious liberty and fought for the people and the people's rights, and obtained that measure of liberty which we have now. I hope no one who has any respect for the liberties we now enjoy will do any injustice to the memory of those who tried to uphold their rights and to put down the tyranny and oppression of the "family compact" which ruled the country at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. I will not attempt to answer the argument of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), which seems to be that it is the duty of the Government to support and reward rebellion. I speak on this question because I have some of those old veterans in my riding. They have communicated with me on this subject, and I have had some conversation with some of them about it. I think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is entitled to the thanks of this House and the country for making this motion. It is the only instance in the Canadian history where men who have defended the flag and have endeavoured to put down rebellion, have not been compensated or recognized in any way for so doing. It is true that this took place before the union of Ontario and Quebec, but the fact that a substantial recognition of their services was not made before the union of these two provinces, and before they came into the Dominion of Canada, I do not think is a strong argument why we should not recognize the services of these men. The Dominion of Canada is composed largely of these two provinces in which the field of strife was. Some of those men are living yet, and, as was stated by the member for Frontenac, and by some hon. gentlemen opposite, many of them are, comparatively speaking, dependent upon charity to-day for their living. They were useful in their time; they assisted in defending the constituted authority of the day and supported the flag under which they lived, maintaining what they believed to be law and order in the country; therefore, I say they are entitled not only to respect but to some greater recognition at the hands of the country. Now, many of them, as I said before, are in comparative poverty, they are dependent upon charity, and if anything can be done to support them in their old age I think it would be to the credit of this country that it be done. There are others who are not dependent, but by whom some memento of the past would be cherished and would be recognized as an evidence that the country still remembered their virtuous conduct, and appreciated it, even at this late date. I think it would not require a large sum to remunerate them, and keep them above want in their old age. We have recognized the principle of giving land to those volunteers and others who took part in suppressing the rebellion in the North-West. Why should we not also give our recognition to those who defended law and order in 1837? As I said, we have recognized the principle by giving a land subsidy to every one who took part in suppressing the North-West rebellion, not only to those who were actually engaged in fight, but to those who were under arms at that time and who went west of Lake Superior. In this instance the parties who assisted in suppressing that rebellion got little or nothing in return. Now, as the hon. gentleman stated who introduced this motion, not many of them are living, therefore, it would not require much. They are passing down the decline of life, and have reached old age when infirmity prevents them from being able to earn a proper livelihood for themselves. I know one of them who unfortunately lost one of his limbs, and he would be very glad to receive something. I think it is unfortunate that these men who stood by the flag of their country and defended law and order and the integrity of the country, should be found in this dependent condition to-day, when they have passed the time of life that they can hope to be able to earn anything for themselves. I think it is time that we did something for them. Notwithstanding the fact that there is a union between these two provinces, I do not think that is a justifiable reason why we should do nothing for them. Many old questions have been settled from time to time by Parliament, and the events that took place in 1837 are not by any means so old that we should not recognize the services of the men who took part in them on the side of the Government. I know these men look forward to the time when the Government will do something for them, many hope that their services will be recognized, and I sincerely trust that this House will express the opinion that the Government should do something for these old men, and not only assist them in their infirmity, but also recognize the services which they rendered to the country at that time, and by so doing the Government will give a lesson to future generations as well as to the present generation.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think my hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Somerville) went a little too far when he asserted that the report of Lord Durham, with regard to the troubles of 1837-38, justified the rebellion which took place at that time. I do not think, according to my recollections of that report—which was certainly a very able one, and led to the adoption in this country of many important constitutional reforms, and to the disappearance of many of the abuses which existed prior to that time—I do not think the report went so far as to justify the resort to arms on the part of those who rebelled at that time. It is true that the report alleged, and alleged justly, that great abuses existed at that period, abuses which certainly justified the most determined constitutional endeavours on the part of those who suffered from them, to bring about reform. I may say that while I have in my constituency a few of those old

veterans, my reasons for supporting the motion of the hon. member for Frontenac are rather of a personal character, more so, perhaps, than the reasons which influence other hon. members of this House. I may say that I am the son of a man who took up arms on that occasion. Although he was a Liberal all his life, and although he sympathized to a great extent with the views of those who went further than he did, yet, when armed rebellion broke out, he arrayed himself on the side of the constituted authorities, and believed it to be his duty to do all in his power to maintain the connection between this country and the mother country. We must not forget that those who rebelled at that time were aiming not so much at the correction of the abuses which existed then, as at the actual dissolution of the connection between this country and the mother country. The leaders of the rebellion, or most of them at all events, were in favour, if not of bringing about a union with the United States, at least of establishing a republican government in this country. We must not forget that those who, like my neighbours and my father, saw it to be their duty to take up arms and march a considerable distance to assist their neighbours whose territory was invaded, had to fight against, not merely their fellow-countrymen in rebellion, but a good many invaders who had joined them from the United States, and on that occasion several of my fellow-townsmen lost ther lives. They left widows and children behind them, who would actually have suffered had it not been for private charity. The Government of that day did did not see it to be their duty to come to the relief of those widows and orphans, and so an appeal was made to the benevolence of the people of the country, and a considerable fund was raised which was called the widows' and orphans' fund, and which was administered for the benefit and the support of the widows and orphans of whom I have spoken. I was very young at that time, but I can still remember the alacrity with which my neighbours sprang to arms and marched many miles through mud and snow. Though they were a raw militia, they showed their courage and devotion by meeting the invaders and driving them back over the boundary line, those invaders at that time being in camp very near the boundary line and being armed with American muskets, and having, at least, one American cannon which was captured by the loyal volunteers. There are, as one or two hon. members have said, but very few of those old men now living. I cannot say that any of them in my constituency are suffering from actual want, but they do feel, and feel with a good deal of bitterness, that the services which they rendered on that occasion have not been properly recognized; and I think, Mr. Speaker, they have some reason to entertain this feeling. I have never been satisfied with the excuse which has been alleged from time to time when a similar motion to the one brought forward by the hon. member for Frontenac has been presented to this House. The excuse which was made by a member of the Government, speaking on behalf of the Government on a previous occasion, was not a sufficient one. I cannot myself see now, and I never could see, why it would not be a graceful, a proper and a legitimate step for the Government to take, to recognize the services which those old men rendered on an occasion very trying to them, and very important to the best interest of this country, by giving them at least a small grant of land.

Mr. DENISON. I did not intend to address the House on this question, but the extraordinary remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) induced me to get on my feet. He enunciates the doctrine that men who rebel should be rewarded, as well as those who defend the constitution, provided that, in their opinion, the rebels were right. Well, he evidently believes that the men who rebelled in 1837-38 were right and justified in their rebellion. I certainly do not admit anything of the kind. There is a constitutional way by which men may redress their grievances. In 1837 they attempted this constitutional means, and, because they ignominiously failed, resorted to rebellion. They were led by Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie to take up arms in open rebellion. In the Province of Ontario, from which I come and for which I can better speak, the number of Canadians who took part in the rebellion was very small indeed, but they were indorsed and supported by what they called "Hunters' Lodges"—lodges organized, in the neighbouring states, with the object of subverting our constitution, of declaring Canada a republic, and of doing away with British power on this continent. They failed, and, as is always the case, the majority ruled; and even supposing they had never gone so far as they did, as the majority rules, when they were defeated at the polls they should have been satisfied and not have attempted to take up arms. They still had the recourse of keeping up their agitation of repeating at future elections the expressions they had uttered, and proclaiming their views, and that was the only constitutional way they could further push their grievances. I should like the hon. gentleman, if he has not already read Mr. Dent's book on the rebellion of 1837-38, to read it, because probably his opinion of William Lyon Mackenzie will be somewhat changed after reading it. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) instanced the case of Sir George E. Cartier, a man for whose memory we all have the highest respect. At the time of 1837, Sir George E. Cartier, I understand, was a lad of about 18 years, and as he grew older he freely admitted that he was entirely wrong when he took up arms on that occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DENISON. I am so informed. At any rate, what was the result in Sir George Cartier's case? He became a good subject of Her Majesty, and received one of the highest honours that can be given to a Canadian. He was made a baronet, and he deserved it. He has a statue on Parliament Hill, and he deserved it. But it was not erected because he took part in the rebellion of 1837, but on account of the great services he rendered to Canada, and I hope that any man, whether he is one who took part in the rebellion or not, if he renders good service to this country and regrets the course he may have taken when a young man, may be treated in the same way. If the doctrine stated by the hon. member for North Brant were allowed to have any influence, what would be the case on the other side of the line? There they had a great rebellion lasting four years. The Southerners contended that they had a perfect right to rebel; and from our standpoint, looking on the issue im-

partially as outsiders, we think, I will say for myself, that I think, at all events, that constitutionally they had a ground for rebelling on account of state rights. But does any one suppose that when the Northern people took up the question of granting pensions to their soldiers who served during the war in suppressing the rebellion, they would consider the question of rewarding the men who had failed? Such an idea is highly absurd. Such a proposition would be laughed out of Congress. Yet that is a similar case to the present. In our case they fought only for a few weeks, but in the case of the Southerners they fought during a war that lasted four long years. They failed, and they had to take the consequences. Such an idea as recognizing rebels I never heard of before: it originates with the hon. member for North Brant. It has been suggested that as these events occurred before Confederation, the subject should not be taken up by this House. I think that is beyond the question, for this reason: that the men who turned out in 1837 were Canadians and they are Canadians to-day. They turned out then and did their duty to Canada, and if they earned any recognition at that time and it has not been granted them, surely this House will now, if they are entitled to recognition, do them justice. I think there will be no opposition from members from the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia to doing these men justice, and in the same manner there would be no objection offered on the part of Ontario and Quebec, as the older provinces, if a similar case occurred in the Maritime Provinces or British Columbia. I might also add that when this matter was brought before the attention of the Ontario Legislature, Mr. Mowat declared that it was a question not within the province of the Local Legislature, but one wholly to be dealt with by the Dominion Parliament. Mr. Mowat is no mean authority on these questions. He is a very good constitutional lawyer, and on this question I am quite ready to take his opinion and agree with him that this is the proper House to deal with it. I should be glad to see it dealt with in a satisfactory manner. We have a precedent, as has been mentioned by the mover of the resolution, in the case of the veterans of 1812. A number of men in 1812 turned out to defend this country, both in Upper and Lower Canada, and those veterans are now enjoying a small pension, and I only wish it were more. This, however, furnishes a precedent which can be followed by the House now. If we were justified in granting pensions to the men who turned out in 1812 in defence of their country, which pensions are now being paid in other provinces than the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, surely we have the same right to do justice to the men who turned out in 1837-38. No doubt it would be well to restrict the granting of it as closely as possible, but the number could be easily ascertained, because only those men who turned out in 1837-38 and appear on the rolls either as officers or men would be eligible, and these rolls are no doubt among the archives of Parliament. So there would be no difficulty in finding out who turned out, and the number of pensioners would no doubt be very small. I am very glad to have the opportunity of supporting the resolution.

Mr. McLENNAN. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion. I would say in the first place, that I will be happy to support any motion which has for its object the granting of compensation to the volunteers of 1837-38, or which will insure some recognition for the services of those veterans. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have referred to William Lyon Mackenzie, and if they will look at the history of the life of that gentleman, they will find a letter written by him to Earl Grey in 1849, which contains the following:

"A course of careful observation during the last twelve years has fully satisfied me that had the violent movements in which I and many others were engaged, on both sides of the Niagara, proved successful, that success would have deeply injured the people of Canada, whom I then believed I was serving at great risks. I have long been sensible of the errors committed during that period. No punishment that power could inflict or nature sustain, would have equalled the regrets I have felt on account of much that I did, said, wrote and published."

These are the remarks of William Lyon Mackenzie, to whom the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) refers. As this question has been already fully discussed in this House I shall deal briefly with it on the present occasion. I wish, however, to pronounce myself strongly in favour of compensation being given to the volunteers of 1837-38, and at any time I will be glad to support their claims whether in this House or elsewhere. The subject was before this House on a previous occasion, and it was then said that this was not the proper place to deal with it. When the matter was brought up in the Legislature of Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Mowat stated that the Legislature had nothing to do with it, and he gave his opinion in these words:

"It is quite true that the Dominion Government has chosen to throw off themselves the burden on the provinces, but surely the whole spirit of the British North America Act is that all matters of national concern are to be dealt with by the Dominion and not by the provinces, and if there is any matter that is of national and not of provincial concern, it is surely a subject such as this that the resolution deals with, namely, that the claims of the veterans of 1837-38 should be recognized."

Although Mr. Mowat made this statement, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the Legislature of Ontario, on the 10th of March, 1873, Mr. Boultbee moved for a Select Committee to enquire into the case of the widow and daughters of the late Colonel Baldwin and report thereon to the House, such committee to be composed of Messrs. Wood (Victoria), Cameron, Fraser, Meredith, Rykert and the mover. (Journals Legislative Assembly, Ontario, page 219.) On the 14th of March, 1873, Mr. Boultbee presented the report of the Select Committee on the late Colonel Baldwin. On the 22nd March, the hon. Attorney General Mowat delivered to the Speaker a Message from His Excellency, Lieutenant Governor Howland, which was read to the House (Journals, Legislative Assembly, Ontario, pages 309 and 310), transmitting the Estimates for that year and in the Supplementary Estimates is found at item 15:

"In full claim of the late Colonel Baldwin on late Province of Upper Canada, $4,000."

This was for being instrumental in raising and equipping a corps for the defence of this country, and through the fraud and misconduct of the contractor for the clothing of such corps, Colonel Baldwin became liable for such clothing to the extent of $2,000, and Mr. Mowat paid $4,000. We will here see the inconsistency of Mr. Mowat. He stated, in the first place, that the Local Legislature had nothing to do with this matter, and then he made a grant of $4,000 out of the public funds

of Ontario. I will give you another case in order to show the inconsistency of Mr. Mowat in this matter. This was a case of John Montgomery. On page 244 Journals, Legislative Assembly, Ontario, for 1873, will be found that it was resolved that a Select Committee, consisting of the Honourable Messrs. Richards and Wood, and Messrs. Crosby, Fraser, Patterson, Prince, Farewell and Boultbee be appointed to enquire into the case of John Montgomery and report to this House. On the 26th March, 1873, it was reported from the Select Committee to which was referred the petition of John Montgomery, as follows :—

"That this Committee have examined and report that property to the value of $1,589 belonging to the petitioner was taken from him and destroyed."

On 19th March, 1874, the hon. Attorney General Mowat delivered to the Speaker a Message from His Excellency Lieutenant Governor Crawford, transmitting the Estimates for that year, and in the Supplementary Estimates is found at item 16:

"John Montgomery, compensation for claim against the Province of Upper Canada, $3,000." (Journals, Legislative Assembly, Ontario, 1874, p. 332.)

I may mention that John Montgomery, of the Township of York, innkeeper, whose tavern was the headquarters of the rebels, and from which was fired the shot that killed Colonel Moodie, was arrested on the 11th December, 1837, tried at a special court, found guilty of treason, and sentenced to death, which sentence was subsequently commuted to transportation, and that he escaped from Fort Henry, Kingston—while *en route* to Quebec—to Watertown, in the State of New York. As we have seen, Mr. Mowat gave him his pension of $3,000 on the 19th March, 1874. Now, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Mowat was right in what he said: That the Local Legislature was not the proper authority to deal with this question, then he should not have spent $7,000 of the money of the people of the province in that way. The volunteers of 1837-38 are not a great deal interested in whether the Local Legislatures or the Dominion Parliament should grant the compensation; but there is one thing certain, and that is that some legislative body in this country should give them compensation, or some recognition for their services. I cannot see why the hon. members in this House from any province in the Dominion can object to compensation being given to these men who took their lives in their hands to defend the constitution of this country. I trust that this Parliament of Canada will do something, and if they cannot give these veterans compensation, they should at least make some recognition of their services in the shape of a medal. Whatever grant may be made to these brave men will not in any way embarrass the country, and I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen from Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia, will not object to a grant for these brave men who fought in the interests of the country, and who believed they were doing right. It is a good thing, in my opinion, to encourage a spirit of patriotism in the country, and if we do not encourage our military men in Canada as they are encouraged in other countries, we cannot expect that our people will have the same spirit of patriotism and loyalty. If you go to England you will find in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey monuments and tablets to the memory of the men who fought and died in their country's service, occupying the most prominent position. That makes the people of that country proud of her heroes, and the descendants of those men proud that they had ancestors who fought in the interests of the country. I trust that this Parliament will grant some recognition to the brave volunteers of 1837-38; and if this question comes to a division, I should like to have an opportunity of voting for such a grant.

Mr. CASEY. I confess that I am a little astonished to hear the speech we have just heard from my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan); a speech in praise of those who took arms to put down rebels, and in blame of the rebels. A speech such as that, Sir, coming from a gentleman who gave us to understand the other day that he was a Jacobite, does not seem to me to be consistent with his personal views or ancestral connections. But, Sir, considering the matter seriously, I think the course of this debate has proven the correctness of the old Roman rule, that no general should be granted a triumphal entry into Rome for a victory in civil war, that no monument should be erected to commemorate any such victory, and that all traces of civil conflict should be removed as soon as possible after the conflict is over. The very motion which has been made to-day, has stirred up discussion on the issue of 1837-38, a discussion which can do no practical good at the present time, and which may tend to excite bitterness in the minds of some. I do not wish to contribute to that bitterness by any partisan remarks on the events of that time. I must, however, refer to the question of the patriotic standing of the rebels of that day, in as moderate words as I possibly can. We have heard the question discussed how far Lord Durham's report vindicated the action of the rebels on that occasion. I do not remember that report sufficiently to say how far it did vindicate their action; but I say that their action was justified by the result of the rebellion—that having been successful in its main object, that of obtaining constitutional government in this country, the rebels became patriots, and were accepted as such by all parties in the country. Many of them sat in this House; one of them, who has already been referred to, became a member of the Cabinet, and some of his colleagues are still living and are still in the Cabinet. If the loyal members of the Conservative Government, which included Sir George E. Cartier, had not considered that the rebellion was a dead issue, and that his conduct at that time was no bar to his sitting among loyal men in a loyal Government, they would never have had him as their colleague. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I must say, in rebuttal of some remarks made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison), that if Sir George E. Cartier had not been a rebel in 1837-38, he would probably never have been a member of that Tory Government or any other Government. The fact that he then put himself in accord with the liberal and constitutional aspiration of our French fellow-citizens, his gallant conduct during the rebellion, and the consequent influence he obtained over his fellow-citizens were what enabled him to take a prominent place in politics and obtain a seat in the Government. It was because Sir George E. Cartier was a rebel that he was

afterwards a Conservative Minister. He earned his spurs in politics by earning them first on the field; and his colleagues of both races and both creeds honoured him for it in the past, as they still honour his memory. My hon. friend from Toronto said that those who became rebels had constitutional means at their disposal to right their wrongs, but that they had tried those constitutional means and ignominiously failed in securing redress by them. My hon. friend is correct so far, and it was just because they ignominiously failed to obtain their rights by constitutional means that they were compelled to obtain them by force of arms; it was just because the "Tory family compact" of that day refused them their constitutional rights that they had to take up arms. The hon. gentleman said, that the rebellion was against the majority rule. On the contrary, it was because of the rebellion that the majority became able to rule. Previous to the rebellion the majority could not rule, the minority acting in defiance of and perverting the constitutional majority. The work those men did remains to us. Whether they should be paid a pecuniary reward or not, I do not know; but I think they have a sufficient award in the recollection of their fellow-countrymen. The provinces directly interested, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, have had thirty years in which to consider the question of rewarding those men, and wisely decided not to confer upon them any special mark of distinction; and I think that this House would be exceedingly unwise to depart from that course and to take upon ourselves the responsibility of doing what this motion proposes.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the estimates of the Indian Department, Regina, for 1888-89; the revision of such estimates by Inspectors McGibbon and Wadsworth: the comments on such revision by the Honourable Edgar Dewdney; the comments on such comments by Mr. Vankoughnet, Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs; the comments on all by the late Honourable Thomas White, Minister of the Interior.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return of all correspondence, letters or papers in any way connected with the dismissal, in June, 1884, of one Samuel Johnston, from his position as a Proventive Officer, in Her Majesty's Customs, for the station from Clifton to Dunnville.—(Mr. German.)

Copies of all correspondence connected with the appointment of George Boisvert as fishery officer over that portion of the River St. Lawrence along the front of the County of Nicolet. Also, for copies of all correspondence connected with the issuing of fishing licenses for the County of Nicolet between Fabien Boisvert, at that time Member of the House of Commons of Canada, or any other persons, and the Government.—(Mr. Leduc.)

Copies of all reports made to the Public Works Department by Laforce Langevin against Captain J. E. Bernier, the graving dock master in Quebec and Lévis, and of all correspondence and letters addressed to the said department in relation thereto.—(Mr. Delisle.)

All correspondence between John A. Macdonald, M. P. (Victoria N. S.) or any other parties in the County of Victoria, N. S., and the Government, or any department or official of the Government, previous to the late general elections, in reference to the appointment of a Returning Officer at said elections for said county.—(Mr. Flint.)

Copies of all tenders for the construction of a Post Office building at Strathroy, Ontario, and of all correspondence and papers in possession of the Government in connection therewith.—(Mr. Flint.)

Copies of all petitions, letters, papers, Orders in Council and other documents relating to the retirement of Dr. G. A. Bourgeois, of Three Rivers, as inspector of post offices for the Three Rivers division.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Copies of all advertisements for tenders for the construction of the Barrie Post Office; all tenders received; contract entered into; vouchers for all moneys paid; conveyance to the Government of the land upon which the same are built; together with all letters and papers in any way relating to the same.—(Mr. Barron.)

Copies of all documents, petitions and letters in relation to the fishing rights of F. F. Rouleau, Esq., advocate of Rimouski, which said rights he and his predecessors have always exercised on his property at Rimouski.—(Mr. Choquette.)

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

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. STAIRS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation in reference to the statement I made a few evenings ago in reply to the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Bain). He stated that there was no blue ribbon twine made this year, and I replied that there was. I found out afterwards that I was mistaken; and, in justice to the hon. gentleman, I take the first opportunity, after the fact has come to my knowledge, to correct my statement, and to tell the House that there has been no blue ribbon twine made this year.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the following Orders be discharged:—

House in Committee on Bill (No. 5) to amend the Dominion Elections Act;

Bill (No. 9) to amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons;

Bill (No. 45) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act;

Bill (No. 54) to further amend the Dominion Elections Act; and

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act (as amended by Special Committee).

Motion agreed to, and Orders discharged.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.—(Mr. Charlton.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. The special committee to which this Bill was referred decided to strike out the first six sections of the Bill, in accordance with the opinion expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice when the Bill was under discussion. The position was taken that the offences covered by these six sections came properly under provincial jurisdiction, and they were, consequently, struck out and the seventh retained as the first section. This clause has reference to the publishing of Sunday newspapers. It was held by some members that this section also would come more properly under provincial jurisdiction than under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. It was held, on the other hand, that this Parliament has control of copyright, of matters pertaining to the publication of books, of the postal service, and of the importation of newspapers and other kinds of literature, and should properly exercise control in the matter of publishing Sunday newspapers. It was held to be a matter of very great importance now, when we have no Sunday newspapers published in the Dominion, with the exception of one or two in British Columbia, that this great evil, as it has been demonstrated to have

grown in the United States, should not be allowed to obtain a foothold here, and consequently the special committee determined to retain this section, which reads as follows :—

"1. Whosoever shall on the Lord's Day, either as proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the printing, publication or delivery of a newspaper, journal or periodical, and whoever shall on the Lord's Day engage in the sale, distribution or circulation of any newspaper, journal or periodical printing published on that day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour; provided, however, that the necessary office work may be performed after 9 o'clock in the evening of the Lord's Day, for the purpose of facilitating the publication of the Monday morning issue of any daily newspaper."

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I quite agree in the principle of the Bill, but I think if printers be allowed to work at all on the Sabbath the hour for beginning work should be changed to 8 o'clock instead of 9, as otherwise the proposed law would be a great inconvenience to the publishers of daily newspapers.

Mr. CHARLTON. We were informed by the publishers of newspapers in Toronto that the compositors went to their offices at 9 o'clock. Our desire was to meet the views of the publishers and make such a provision as would facilitate the doing of work absolutely necessary in bringing out their Monday morning issues. If it is absolutely necessary the hour will be changed to 8, but it was made 9 o'clock to enable the printers to attend the evening services.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The printers never work on Saturday evening, and they set the local matter at 8 o'clock on Sunday evening, and then the telegraphic matter comes in.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a good while since I set type, and my experience was that all the matter except the telegraphic dispatches may be set any time after Saturday, and that from 9 o'clock there would be ample time to get the papers to press by 3 o'clock Monday morning.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Under the rules of the union now, printers do not work on Saturday night on any paper in Canada unless on a special occasion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This clause certainly goes a very long way in making what has been regarded all over the world a mere police regulation, a misdemeanour; and I am rather surprised the hon. Minister of Justice should have consented to a mere matter of police regulation, which clearly is within the municipal jurisdiction of the Local Legislature, being made a crime by the law of the Dominion. Then, again, by this Bill you are expressly abolishing for one class of the community what many people regard as the proper observance of the Sunday. You are putting them upon a wholly different footing from any other portion of the community. You are saying, so far as the newspaper men are concerned, that they are not required to observe the Sunday after 9 o'clock Sunday evening, although no such exemption applies to other people. You may prevent any other man from working on the Sunday evening, you may declare it a misdemeanour to do so, but you except one class. This law, if it is considered of universal obligation on religious grounds, is not to apply to this particular class. I think we ought not to legislate in that way. It is right and proper that we should seek to give every person in the public service of the Dominion an opportunity of keeping the Sunday in the way most binding upon his conscience. We have no right to insist that parties shall act as public officials attending the locks and so on, on the canals except where a case of clear necessity can be made out, and the rule of necessity is regarded, at all events from the ordinary Christian standpoint, as a rule of humanity. You do not want to interfere with any person in the preservation of his property if it is exposed to destruction. I think that that rule, at all events, is clearly laid down; but I think, when my hon. friend proposes to expressly legislate that a certain class may go to work on Sunday evening at nine o'clock, that they may enforce their contracts for work done after that hour, he is asking us to legislate in a way the very reverse of the general spirit and principle of the whole measure. You are recognizing a right to abolish the Sunday with regard to a particular class of labour under particular circumstances. It might be very well urged by one who holds to the strict observance of the Sunday that it is not a matter of absolute necessity that a newspaper should be got out at 3 o'clock in the morning, and that, therefore, you should not legislate, with regard to those who are working upon that newspaper, in a wholly different way from the rest of the community. It would have been more satisfactory and more in accordance with the principles of our constitution, if that matter, which is purely a matter of police, should have been left to the Local Legislature. We have the right to legislate with regard to commerce and those matters which are under general control. We have the right to legislate that the Government shall not impose duties upon their employés which will compel them to disregard their religious convictions on that day; but, when you undertake to interfere with the ordinary relations of life, you are assuming that the legislative bodies upon whom the constitution has imposed the duty of legislating on these subjects, as far as legislation is required, will not discharge that duty. Now, whether a man shall work in a shop, a mill, a newspaper office, or a grocery at the corner of some street, on Sunday or not, is a matter for the Local Legislatures to decide. They derive their powers from the people, just as we do, and the law of the constitution says that civil rights are under the control of that Legislature. How do we undertake to reach, beyond the jurisdiction assigned us, and lay our hands upon the subject-matter which comes within local control, by declaring it to be a crime, by declaring that, which everywhere else on the globe is made a police regulation, is a matter of criminalty. It is impossible, on any social grounds, to distinguish between working in a shop and working in a newspaper office after 9 o'clock on Sunday. They stand on exactly the same footing in that respect, as far as social order or social disturbance is concerned. So far as our power to legislate criminally is concerned, they are exactly alike, but, in regard to matters of police, which are under local control, I think that there can be no doubt that the particular subject of my hon. friend's Bill belongs clearly to the Local Legislatures and not to this House. We have a right to close the canals, to regulate traffic on the interprovincial railways, to close the post offices, to close the departments under the control of this Government on Sunday, and to give the Government employés a day of rest;

but, having done that, I think we have done all we have the power to do constitutionally, and if we go further, I think we are going beyond our powers.

Mr. MARA. I understand the object of clause 1 to be the closing of newspaper offices on Sunday in order to allow the employés a day of rest. Two of the leading journals in British Columbia are published on Sunday. The *Colonist* in Victoria has been published on Sunday for thirty years, and the *Advertiser* in Vancouver has been published on Sunday from the birth of that city. The publishers of those newspapers contend that by publishing them on Sunday they give their employés a day of rest, whereas, if they published on Monday, the reporters, printers, proof-readers and pressmen, would have to work almost the whole of Sunday; the mechanical work would have to be done on Sunday. By publishing on Sunday they give their employés a day of rest, they enable them to attend divine worship morning and evening and to pass the rest of the day with their families.

Mr. CASEY. Do they not publish on Mondays?

Mr. MARA. They do not. They publish only six days in the week, and they publish on Sunday in order to allow their employés a day of rest on Sunday. I understood from the introducer of the Bill that he said the mechanical portion of the work could be done on Sunday. I prefer to take the practical opinion of men who have been working on newspapers for thirty years to the theoretical opinion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). But a still more practical view is that taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this is within the powers of the Provincial Legislatures. Certainly the Provincial Legislatures are more in touch with the people in matters of moral reforms or sentiment than this Parliament can possibly be, and, when they have not legislated on this question, I think we may take it for granted that they have not found that any evil exists. In Victoria, for instance, though the *Colonist* newspaper, which is the principal newspaper there, has published on Sunday for thirty years, and though several Sabbath Observance Bills have been brought before the Local Legislature, not one has attempted to deal with the publication of a newspaper on Sunday. It is clear that the leading paper of the community must have received the financial support of the majority of the people, and, therefore, the majority of the people must be in favour of the publication on Sunday. If the people in Victoria or Vancouver were a lawless people, there might be some reason for such legislation, but I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will agree with me that they are as law-abiding a people as any in Ontario. They have as many and as large church edifices as we find here, they attend church regularly, the Sabbath schools are largely attended; they are as God-fearing a people as we find in Ottawa, and I think there is no reason why the people of Victoria should be specially legislated against as is apparently proposed to be done by this clause. I move that clause 1 be struck out.

Mr. TROW. I would ask the Postmaster General as to how the postal arrangements would be affected by this Bill? I understood him to say to-day, in answer to a question, that certain officers in cities and towns were allowed to open the post offices on the Sabbath for the benefit of the public. In the case of this Bill passing, will that be changed, and will it also apply to telegraphing or telephoning on that day? Parties may be suddenly taken ill and may require the attendance of a medical man.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is struck out. There is no provision in reference to the postal service.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to me in terms of surprise at my acquiescing in the passage of this Bill through the Committee in its present form.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In regard to this clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not changed the opinion which I expressed on the second reading of this Bill, and I agree to a large extent with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this is a subject upon which the Local Legislatures can make enactments, without, however, disputing our right to do the same. There are many matters of police regulation in regard to which we have powers under the criminal law. At the same time, it is a matter for the consideration of this Parliament whether these subjects cannot sufficiently be regulated under the powers possessed by the Local Legislatures in regard to police, and, for myself, I still hold the same opinion as I did on the second reading, that under the Local Legislatures this matter and matters of the same kind not only can be but have been efficiently regulated down to the present time. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was, perhaps, right in presuming that I had acquiesced in the passage of the Bill in the special Committee, because I had not objected to its passage there. I must, however, ask to be exempted, during the present session, from any such presumption in consequence of being, as he knows, compelled to pay unremitting attendance at meetings of another committee. I have found it impossible to be present at the meetings of this committee as of other committees of greater importance, because the investigation proceeding before the Privileges and Elections Committee, of which I am a member, requires all the time which could be given to it. Under ordinary circumstances I would have been reluctant to oppose the Bill at this stage, but I hope that, under the circumstances, the House will consider that I am free to present my views at the present stage. I feel, therefore, that I can express the view which I did at the second reading of the Bill, namely, that this whole subject has been sufficiently and amply dealt with by the Provincial Legislatures. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has the Bill in charge, and who represents, in regard to the provisions of this Bill, a great section of the community of Canada who are entitled to the greatest respect for their views on this question, will agree with me, I think, that the first clause of the Bill, the one under discussion, is not an improvement on the law. In seizing this subject by virtue of our powers over the criminal law, we are not making a step in advance in favour of Sunday observance; on the contrary, by nearly all the provincial statutes Sunday labour, even on newspapers, is prohibited, certainly in my own province and perhaps in the Province of Ontario, servile labour of all kinds is prohibited. Now, I assume that the provisions of this clause are intended to prevent Sunday work upon a newspaper except after the hour of 9 o'clock, and for the necessary purposes of a Monday

morning paper. If we leave that to the Provincial Legislatures, as I have stated, in most of the provinces we have a prohibitory enactment going even further. As the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. Mara) has pointed out just now, the Legislature of his province is not only competent, but is the best qualified to deal with the circumstances that call for police regulations of this character; and if in a community like his, where Sabbath observance is as strict and as well cared for as in any other portion of Canada, they think proper to exempt persons from prosecution who are engaged in publishing a Sunday paper, I really think that the Legislature of that province is better qualified to judge of the whole matter than is this Parliament. But if the hon. gentleman will turn his attention to the language of the clause itself, he will find that if it is intended, as I assume it to be honestly intended, to exempt persons who are engaged in the necessary work of publishing a Monday morning paper—and I think the disposition of the House will certainly be to exempt that from any criminalty—it is hardly sufficient for that purpose; because he will see that it only exempts those who are engaged in the necessary office work. Let him contrast that with the enactment of the Provincial Legislature, by which all persons are prohibited from engaging in servile labour, including, I think, the typesetters, certainly the persons working in the engine room, and the person who lights the fire in the engine room; and he will see that he exempts only the accountants in the office and those engaged in the editors' room, but does not exempt the typesetters and the others I have mentioned from prosecution for misdemeanour. Now, in view of the provisions of the whole Bill, and considering the great changes that have been made in it, and considering again, as the hon. gentleman has no doubt had an opportunity of doing, the suitability for this purpose of the provincial enactments on this subject, I would commend this view to the consideration of the hon. member for North Norfolk, representing, as I have said before, and as I know he does, a portion of the Christian community who are deeply in earnest in this subject—I would commend to his consideration whether it is wise for him to proceed with the Bill in its present form this session. The great objects which he had in view in bringing the Bill forward this year was to affect those branches of the public service which are now under our control, more especially the railway service and the canal service, and what do we find the provisions of the Bill to be with regard to these? The provisions in regard to canal service are to legalize the system which we have now in force. The provisions, as regards that service, now are that no canal belonging to Canada shall be operated on Sunday except at certain seasons of the year, and those are the seasons of the year when the canals operated by Canada are operated now; so that the Bill in that regard will not operate at all as a new provision. The provisions regarding the operation of railways are very materially altered since the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill; the provisions in regard to excursions are very materially altered, and as to that it seems to me the provincial enactments on the subject completely cover the case. Now, the hon. gentleman has modified his Bill—in what view? Clearly in view of the adequacy of the provincial legislation to deal with this subject, and secondly, in view of the reasonableness of apparent infractions of Sunday observance which are necessary in the public interest. As regards the railways, the canals, and the publication of newspapers, and having regard to the fact that we have reached that stage when the hon. gentleman really must be brought to consider whether the provincial legislation on this subject is adequate, I question whether it is not wise that he should defer further consideration of the subject until he sees whether the provisions as reported by the Committee, I presume with his own acquiescence, are not sufficient to convince the class of people whose views he represents so worthily upon this subject, that their views can sufficiently be met by provincial enactments which as the member for British Columbia has said, are practically adaptable to the necessities of the community with regard to which they apply. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. I prefer that motion to the motion that the Committee rise, because I have no object to serve in treating the hon. gentleman or the Bill which represents his views, and the views of those for whom he speaks, with any discourtesy, but I wish to give an opportunity for fuller consideration with the view of enabling the hon. member to see, as he is bound to do, if the views of the people behind him will be met by leaving the subject in the hands of the Provincial Legislatures.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Justice says that on certain clauses I have modified my views of this subject, in view of the adequacy of provincial legislation. I have modified my views to a certain extent in view of the desirability of getting some legislation. I have views with respect to this matter, that are not fully met by this Bill; but when this Bill was referred to Committee for consideration, I waived all views regarding this matter which I thought stood in the way for the sake of the success of this Bill, and I believe the Bill reported is one worthy of the consideration of this House. The clause under consideration, clause 1, I admit, is a clause dealing with a subject that might be dealt with by provincial legislation, but I consider the matter one of vast importance as regards the well-being of this Dominion. I do not believe there is any means of demoralization so potent and so lamentable as the publishing of Sunday newspapers in the United States, and I look with dread upon the introduction of that abuse into this country, and for that reason I believe that it is proper for the Dominion of Canada to pass an enactment which will prevent the introduction of that system. We control copyright, the post office system, the transmission of newspaper matter through the mails, we have the power to prohibit the introduction of obscene literature, we have power over publication in this country, and having that power, I believe it is proper and legitimate to exercise it. I believe it is proper and legitimate to pass a law which would prevent the introduction of the Sunday newspaper nuisance into this Dominion, and the Committee thought so too, and this section was framed. It was asserted by the Minister of Justice that we were not taking a step in advance in this Bill in regard to the prohibition of Sunday labour. Whether we

were or not, the hours of Sunday labour necessary to bring out a Mondy morning newspaper are set out in the Bill. On examination it was found that a certain amount of work was required to be performed, and this was classed in the Bill under the heading of "works of necessity," and whatever work was necessary must be done after 9 o'clock, not the kind of office work referred to by the Minister, but office work meaning all work required in a newspaper office for the purpose of publishing the newspaper on Monday morning. It was true with respect to the canals that the provision is not a new one. But it is equally true that the provision with respect to the canals may at any moment be changed; the Government may at its pleasure, by Order in Council, enact that the canals shall be kept open all day Sunday. It may be held that the Bill surrenders a principle by allowing that the canals shall be open from 12 o'clock Saturday night till 6 o'clock Sunday morning, and again after 10 o'clock Sunday night. It may be held, I say, that that is the surrender of a principle; but we believe, in considering this question, that anything which kept the canals closed during the day, which prevented the traffic from interfering with the quiet of that day, which gave the employés on the canals an opportunity to attend both morning and evening service was, if not all we wanted, at least a great step in the direction of right, and it was better to secure this than to go without anything. Of course it may be said, and it may be taken, that this is in some measure a compromise, but whether a compromise or not, to secure quiet on the Sabbath on the canals, to secure for every employé the privilege of attending morning and evening service, means the partial, if not the entire removal of the objectionable features of traffic on the canals. With respect to the provision to keep open the canals after the 15th October, it is one that anyone familiar with the transportation business can readily understand. It may be of absolute necessity at the end of the season to keep the canals open for two or three weeks towards the close of navigation.

The clause of the Bill with respect to railway traffic has been modified to some extent, although not materially. The modifications made in the Bill were found to be absolutely necessary on an examination of the transportation question. The old clause provided that only two passenger trains shall pass each way over a railway line on Sunday. That contemplated the propriety of allowing each two through trains to make American connections by steamboat and railway; but when we took into consideration the facts, we found that the Canadian Pacific Railway, with one through train started each way from west and east on Sunday, would have ten trains in motion on some part of its line and the restriction to two trains would prevent the company operating its line. So the change was made allowing the running of through trains on Sunday. No other change was made with respect to this matter, except to class live stock as perishable freight, and to permit the moving of trains carrying live stock. With these exceptions the provisions stand as before. Sub-section 2 provides:

"At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods."

That is a provision which looks at the possibility, not the probability I am sorry to say, of legislation in the United States with respect to through traffic. As regards that through traffic business we are powerless to regulate it unless corresponding Acts are passed in the United States, and by enacting this clause we place our law in the right position when American legislation, if it ever does occur, takes place.

The section with respect to excursions is not changed. It is as it was in the old Bill, and it is as it stands on the Statute-book of Ontario at the present time. I was sorry to see the position taken by the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I believe that hon. gentleman is a church member; I believe he professes to be in favour of Sunday observance, and the objection taken by the hon. gentleman to the clause prohibiting the publishing of Sunday newspapers is one I regret. I do not see why he should be such a stickler for the observance of provincial rights in regard to this matter. I believe there is no clause in this Bill of such paramount importance as this clause in respect to Sunday newspapers. There is no danger to religion, no danger to morals or the well-being of the community so great as the danger from the introduction of the American system of Sunday newspapers, with their special trains and special steamboats, and an army of newspaper sellers, and the conversion of Sunday into an ordinary week day, with the addition of an extra commotion caused by the circulation of these newspapers, whose circulation is larger than that of the week-day issues. I believe it is strictly in the power of this Parliament and proper for it to exercise the power it possesses to place on the Statute-book a law which will render the introduction of that nuisance an impossibility in this country. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) says they have this system in his province, and there it is not considered to be an evil. I presume it does not operate in British Columbia as it does in eastern cities, where the newspapers have larger circulation. I suppose they have no special trains to carry the newspapers, no special steamers, and no special newsboys to turn the Sabbath into bedlam by crying the newspapers up and down the streets. The truth is, that in British Columbia, with no publication of the newspaper on Monday morning, they have the evil in a mitigated form.

Mr. MARA. You would make this a misdemeanour punishable by fine and imprisonment?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; I would put a stop to it. As against the view of the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara), and the views of his friends from British Columbia, and I have had correspondence with one of the editors in British Columbia, I have to place the views of an editor publishing a newspaper in Windsor, opposite Detroit. He writes that the bringing over of the American Sunday morning newspapers into Canada is an unmitigated nuisance. He says the Detroit newspapers are hawked up and down Windsor on Sunday, and he asks as a protection to his business, and for the purpose of securing the quiet of the Sabbath, that the introduction and sale of Sunday newspapers shall be prohibited. Although the evil may be a slight one in British Columbia, yet if it is allowed

to obtain a foothold in Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Hamilton, Halifax, St. John, and other large Canadian cities we will introduce an evil the magnitude of which we fail to comprehend, and when that evil is thoroughly and fully saddled upon us we will regret we did not adopt this precautionary measure the Bill proposes as a remedy.

An hon. MEMBER. Free trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. But there may be free trade in alcohol, free trade in opium ; free trade can be carried too far, and it may be proper to restrict free trade or rather restrict license. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), who is a practical printer, if he says the hours from 9 p.m. do not allow sufficient time. Perhaps the object of the Bill will be better served by giving the newspapers 8 to 12 instead of 9 to 12. I am perfectly willing to accept his suggestion in that matter, if it is the will of the House. I do not feel able and I do not see it is my duty on this occasion to accept the suggestions of the Minister of Justice. I should prefer to have this Bill considered by the Committee upon its merits. I do not think that I am required to withdraw this Bill. I do not expect to carry it, but I once urged a Bill in this House for several sessions before it got on the Statute-books, and the Minister of Justice to-day is in favour of the provisions of that Bill, although the majority of the House and the majority of the Government were against it when I first introduced it. I have the honour now to present a Bill of infinitely greater importance than that Bill was ; I have the honour to present a Bill in which the entire Christian sentiment of this country is interested. I present a Bill now that is of great importance to this country, and I do not feel disposed to withdraw it, because I do not believe there has been a more important Bill placed before the House this session than the one we are now discussing. I shall abide by the decision of the House to-night, but I shall not voluntarily withdraw the Bill.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It gave me great pleasure when the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) introduced this Bill. I believe this is a question of very great importance, a question which is very closely connected with the prosperity and well-being of this whole Dominion, and I should be very sorry indeed if the hon. gentleman would withdraw his Bill. I believe this legislation is necessary and opportune. I do not care where we look, we see that there is a great deal of Sabbath desecration. It is true we have had a great deal of provincial legislation on this question, and I suppose that it is the policy of the present Administration to secure Sabbath observance, as it has been the policy of past Administrations. I believe that ; but notwithstanding all that has been done in this direction it is a fact that cannot be denied that wherever you look, whether to our railways, our canals or our post office service, you see a great deal of Sabbath desecration, and a great deal of unnecessary Sunday labour—labour that I believe might be dispensed with, not only without detriment to the public service, but with very great advantage to the public interest. It is quite true that the provisions of the Bill we are now discussing do not quite come up to my desire, for I would have been glad if they had gone a step further. I would like to have seen the integrity of the whole Sabbath day observed. I was not fully convinced that it was necessary for printers to begin their work at 8 o'clock ; it may be that is the case, but I was not convinced of it, and I think that the printers require the whole Sabbath's rest. So do the boatmen on our canals. Notwithstanding that this Bill is not as ample as I should wish it. I believe it is a long step in the right direction, and I will be glad to give it my warm and hearty support. I believe that the aim of this Bill is simply to secure that physical rest which is necessary for the recuperation of work people. It would be a great boon to tens of thousands of employés who are now robbed of their Sabbath rest, and who are denied the privilege of attending Divine worship and receiving that moral and religious instruction which they should receive. It may be that it is a work of necessity for printers to go to their offices at 8 o'clock on Sunday evening, and if it is absolutely necessary I will, for one, not object to it ; but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the printing business to say whether it is or not. I would rather be in favour of observing the entire integrity of the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath. As I said before, this Bill does not aim at compelling any man to observe the Sabbath, nor yet to compel him to go to church. It simply aims at securing rest for the weary, so that they may recuperate their exhausted and wasted powers, and be better fitted for discharging their duties on the other six days of the week. I am not convinced that there would be any pecuniary loss entailed in this, because I believe that the man who strictly observes the Sabbath will have better health, will be able to accomplish more labour, and will be a happier and a better man than the man who works seven days in the week. I, therefore, have great pleasure in supporting the Bill as it is now before the House, although I would be glad if it had gone a step further.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the present Bill which he has before the House is of infinitely greater importance than the other one to which he has referred, and which he so ably urged in this Parliament and finally carried through to legislation. I admit that the subject of Sabbath observance, in itself, is one of the most important that could be discussed in this House ; but we are not discussing now the general question of Sabbath observance, but the propriety of going on with this particular Bill. I cannot understand that a Bill which only touches upon four points connected with Sabbath observance should be of greater importance than a Bill intended to preserve the good fame and character of the young women of this country, as was the former Bill introduced by my friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Speaking of the present Bill on general terms, I think, in the first place, that it deals with a matter with which we have no business to interfere, as it comes very properly under the control of the Provincial Legislatures. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Mara) that it is more proper for the Local Legislatures to consider this question, even if it were not so undoubtedly under their exclusive jurisdiction according to our constitution. It cannot be supposed that in this Parliament we can make a law equally suitable to the citizens of the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario.

in regard to Sabbath observance, even if we had the right to do so, which I think we have not. It is not to be supposed that we could suit equally the people of Vancouver Island and the people of Cape Breton in regard to Sabbath observance, even if we had the right to do so. I agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we have not equitable right to interfere with these matters, although we have the power undoubtedly, as the Minister of Justice pointed out. But the power does not necessarily involve the moral or equitable right. We have the power to interfere with these questions only by making crimes out of actions which were previously matters of police regulation. I do not see that it is necessary to make crimes out of such infractions of the Sabbath as are here aimed at. I think they can be suppressed without our reaching out a grasping hand, and, by a subterfuge, taking possession of a power which the constitution did not mean to confer on this House. I do not think it is necessary, or proper, or decent, that we should do so. As to the Bill itself, what is the necessity for forcing it on now, when, according to my hon. friend's (Mr. Charlton) own statement this Bill really makes no change in the present practice.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. CASEY. Well, from what I have been able to understand during this debate, I have not been able to find what change it makes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Read the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I have read and studied the Bill. My hon. friend may have read a meaning which I cannot see in it. The Bill is probably charged with the greatness of his own views on the subject, but I cannot see in it these sweeping changes of that enormous importance which its father seems to find in it. Naturally, looking upon it as his own child, it may appear something more to him than to the rest of us. I find nothing in this Bill to change existing practices except in regard to the case of one or two newspapers published in British Columbia. This first section of the Bill is directed against the printing or publishing of newspapers on Sunday. We are informed by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) that there are two papers published on that day in British Columbia. I had never before heard of any Canadian papers being published on Sunday, and I do not know that there are any others. At all events, there is no crying demand for legislation arising out of the publication in Canada of papers on Sunday; and I must say that I think the practice in British Columbia is much more sensible, and much more likely to conduce to Sunday rest for the employés of newspapers, than the clause proposed by my hon. friend from North Norfolk, because it certainly leaves free to them what we may call the sacred and social part of Sunday, the time from early morning till late at night; whereas this clause does not. It is not a clause to enforce Sabbath observance in newspaper offices, but rather a clause to legalize Sabbath desecration in newspaper offices, and is directly opposite to what my hon. friend's supporters wished to get done when they asked him to take charge of this measure. Those who have an earnest and fervent reverence for the Sabbath, which possesses many people throughout Canada, and who asked my hon. friend from North Norfolk to take charge of this Bill, did not suppose that he would attempt to carry through a measure which legalizes in one branch of industry that desecration of the Sabbath which they so much abhor. I do not see how the publication of a Monday newspaper can be in any sense a greater work of necessity and mercy than the running of a freight train or the passage of schooner through a canal. If it is necessary to have a paper published on Monday morning it is equally necessary that freight and passengers should be allowed to move from place to place on the railways or through the canals on Sunday; and if the exemption of the hours after 9 o'clock is right and moral in the case of a newspaper office it would be equally right and moral in the case of those other industries, and my hon. friend has now expressed his willingness to go a little further. He has chopped one-eighth of the Sabbath by the clause as it stands, and he is willing to chop another piece off and make it one-sixth, at the request of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), whose request he says he considers reasonable. In the second clause we come to something with which I think we have undoubtedly a right to deal in one sense. We have a right to say that employés of the Government on canals shall not work for longer hours than we prescribe; we have a right to prescribe holidays for our own employés; and that is the only part of the Bill which is not going beyond our equitable powers in regard to this subject. But even as regards the canals, I believe the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature comes in. Even if we allow our employés to work for longer hours than those which my hon. friend has prescribed in his Bill, the Local Legislature could restrain them from working if they saw fit. This clause I believe might be annulled by an Act of the Local Legislature saying that no man should work on the canals, opening a lock-gate or otherwise facilitating the passage of a vessel, during the whole twenty-four hours which compose Sunday. The Local Legislatures are quite competent to deal with the question of Sabbath observance on the canals as well as elsewhere; and as this clause practically embodies the existing practice I do not see that there is any great reason for special legislation upon the subject at the present time. As to railway traffic and excursions, some remarks will apply. In fact, my hon. friend from Norfolk himself stated that the clause in this Bill regarding excursions is the same clause as the clause in the Ontario Act. My hon. friend now says that the local authorities do not enforce it—because they have not the jurisdiction. He says, I am not aware that the courts have held that the Local Legislatures have not the jurisdiction. It has been admitted in this House by the hon. Minister of Justice that they have jurisdiction to pass such an Act, and to enforce it. Another hon. friend says that the law in Ontario is more strict than this. For these various reasons I must agree with the motion of the hon. Minister of Justice on this occasion. I yield to no one in my desire that those who may be called upon to labour unnecessarily on the Sabbath day, by the greed of their employers, should be protected from that greed, and should enjoy the right which every man in this country possesses to have one day of rest out of seven. But I consider, with the hon. Minister of Justice, that this Bill is largely beyond our equitable powers, and that so far as it is within our equitable powers its objects are provided for by local legislation, so that there seems to be no necessity for our meddling in the matter. The

Bill will probably lead, not to the object which my hon. friend undoubtedly wishes to secure, a better observance of the Sabbath, but to a slacker observance of the Sabbath. I am not against the strictest possible observance of the Sabbath consistent with reasonable personal liberty; but I do consider that this Bill, in its present chopped-up shape, is not a contribution to the observance of the Sabbath. It is, I say, a boomerang, legalizing the desecration of the Sabbath in some cases where it did not exist before, and adds nothing to the strictness of existing legislation in other respects. My hon. friend from Norfolk thinks that my hon. friend from Bothwell should not be a stickler for provincial rights in regards to this matter, because it is of such great importance. He says that this subject is of infinite importance, and that we should not be too nice about how we enforce a law which we believe to be right. The very fact that it is a question of importance, of vital and tremendous importance, should make us sticklers on the question of Dominion or provincial rights. It it just because it is important that we should not rashly meddle with things that do not concern us; and my hon. friend's logic, that because this legislation is, in his opinion, proper to be enforced, we should not care particularly whether we have a right to enforce it or not, will not, I think, impress the House. That is the only deduction to be drawn from his remarks on the subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I just rise to say that in his comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell I think the hon. member for North Norfolk was scarcely fair. He expressed his sorrow that one whom he termed a member of the Christian church, and therefore bound to be in favour of Sabbath observance, should have made the observations he did. Now, I just wish to point out to the Committee that the hon. member for Bothwell did not raise the question of Sabbath observance at all; he did not say what his views on Sabbath observance were; he simply raised the constitutional question, whether that clause of the Bill was or was not within the competence of this House. In his opinion, it is not within the competence of this House, but within the authority of the Local Legislatures. That is the view he took, and he never expressed any opinion on the merits of the Bill at all.

Mr. BARRON. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his desire to have a regular Sunday observance. I am sure all of us are in sympathy with him in that respect; but, like the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), some of us think that the Bill now before the House will not attain the object the hon. member has in view. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken that it was a little unfair for the hon. member for North Norfolk to attribute to the hon. member for Bothwell that he was not in favour of Sunday observance. I do not think anyone can say that of the hon. gentleman. He simply raised the constitutional point that the Bill was more within provincial rights than the jurisdiction of this House; and that such is the case is evident from the fact that many of the clauses of the Bill, as originally introduced, have been dropped, because it was considered they were within the jurisdiction of the several provinces. If the hon. member for North Norfolk is so anxious, as no doubt he is, that we should have regular Sunday observance, he should drop his first clause and leave the law in regard thereto as it is under provincial legislation, which goes much further than his particular clause. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman allows Sunday desecration to printers to the extent of three hours, from 9 to 12 p.m., whereas the law of Ontario allows no such thing. That law, which, I take it, is the same law as the laws in most of the other provinces, makes it unlawful for any merchant, tradesman, artificer, mechanic, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever, on the Lord's Day, to sell, or publicly show or expose or offer for sale or to purchase any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate whatsoever, or to do or exercise any work, labour, business or work of his ordinary calling on the Sabbath day. Now, the ordinary calling of a printer, of course, is doing that work which the hon. member for North Norfolk says, in his Bill, he may do between 9 and 12 on Sunday night, but which the Provincial Legislature says he must not do at all on that day. The hon. gentleman is, in fact, proposing to introduce a conflict of laws; and the workman who may be summoned for a breach of the provincial law may answer that he is doing what he has a right to do under the Dominion law. At once, therefore, you have a conflict of laws; and I would say to the hon. gentleman, as he is sincerely anxious that we should have a better observance of the Lord's Day, that he should drop this particular clause, which will defeat the very object he has in view, by legalizing Sabbath desecration, so far as the Dominion is concerned, contrary to the provincial law. Then, the clause relating to Sunday excursions is in almost identical language with that of the provincial law, and there is, therefore, no necessity for introducing it here. No doubt, so far as the departmental work of this Government is concerned, it is strictly within the jurisdiction of this Parliament to pass a law regarding Sunday observance, but outside of that I submit, with the hon. member for Bothwell, that we should leave the matter entirely to the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. INGRAM. I have decided objection to that portion of section 3, line 30, which reads: "except one mail train each way." As a practical railway man, I know of no mail trains being run on any railway in the Dominion on Sunday, as at present the closed mails are carried upon the expresses; and if this section were to become law each railway company could start out mail trains as they are run on week days now. That would amount to, for instance in the city I have the honour to represent, four or five railway trains per Sunday, provided the railway companies choose to take advantage of this portion of section 3. I also find in line 37 these words: "or for other acts of necessity and mercy." I have known of cases where trains were made up on Sunday for the purpose of conveying persons to funerals in other sections of the country, and if this became law the companies would be debarred from that right as well as the people from that privilege. In my opinion, this section would open the door wider to Sabbath desecration than it is open at present.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for North Norfolk has expressed his surprise that I should have been opposed to this first section of his Bill, and he seems to think that, somehow or other, the question of jurisdiction is a question of religion. I do not admit that at all. I do not admit that the question as to whether this Legislature or the Provincial Legislatures should deal with the subject referred to in the first section of the Bill is a question of religion. It is a question of politics altogether; and in my opinion it is much better left where it belongs, and that is to the Local Legislature. Even according to the opinion of the hon. member for North Norfolk, it is clear by the provision he makes for the enforcement of this particular section, because he proposes to make its infraction a misdemeanour. Why does he do so? Simply to give this Legislature jurisdiction over an offence which has hitherto, in this country and everywhere else, been regarded as a police regulation. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the enforcement of this by the ordinary police powers possessed by the Local Governments is not sufficient? Will he argue that this matter has become so great an evil that the police powers possessed by the local authorities are no longer adequate to deal with it? Or does he maintain that unless it is declared to be a misdemeanour and made a crime we are neglecting Christian duty? I do not take that view, and I do not think it is proper for this Legislature to assume jurisdiction over the subject by declaring it a crime, when, without such a declaration, it is clear we have no jurisdiction. Then, when you look at the fourth section of the Bill, excursions on the Lord's Day are prohibited and declared to be a misdemeanour. Now, how are those dealt with at present? Under the municipal law of Ontario all the various municipalities have the power to deal with them. I know that, in the city of London, we have a by-law upon the subject, and the steamboat proprietors are forbidden under that by-law to run their steamboats on the Sunday down to Springbank and other places of pleasure resort. The by-law is adequate. There is no possibility, as long as the public opinion is what it is, of their disregarding the provisions of that by-law. Every other city in the province has the same power. Why, then, should we undertake to declare it a crime? Is it because the hon. gentleman desires to legislate on the subject, and to this end that he desires that we should declare it a crime, that he wishes to insist that this House shall take extraordinary powers to deal with this subject, which otherwise it could not deal with at all? I am satisfied to leave the Local Legislatures to deal with the subject. They are amenable to public opinion, and if the laws in regard to the Sabbath or the Sunday are not enforced, if provisions are not made for the observance of good order and decency on that day, the public opinion, the Christian public opinion of this country, will place the responsibility upon those who have the duty of dealing with the subject and who neglect to discharge it. It is not necessary that we should exercise a meddlesome oversight with which the law has not entrusted us. Then, as to other matters, it seems to me that these provisions relating to railways and canals, to the post office and the telegraphs, those matters with which we should deal as far as our own public servants are concerned, are not adequately dealt with by the Bill as it now stands. I am prepared to give the most serious consideration to these matters in order to see how far we can deal with them, how far we can give to those in the public service of Canada the rest and quiet which they require, but beyond that I say we have not the right to go, and, no matter what may be your views with regard to Sunday observance, whether they are attitudinarian, or latitudinarian, or platitudinarian, they will not be adequately dealt with by this Bill. We should exercise the powers that belong to us, and in doing that we will do our duty, and it is not our duty when we undertake to go beyond that. I remember a few years ago arguing upon a question somewhat similar to this, the question of the licensing system, a question which it was said ought to be dealt with more efficiently than it had been by the Local Legislatures; but my answer was, that to the Local Legislatures and not to us belonged the duty of dealing with that question, that it was simply diverting the public attention from those upon whom the duty devolved if we legislated upon it. That is precisely the position here. There are some provisions of this Bill which are within our jurisdiction, and there are others that are not within our jurisdition, and it was those which are not within our jurisdiction that I was discussing before, when I invited the attention of the Minister of Justice to provisions which I thought ought not to be in a Bill carried in this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question as to whether the Committee shall rise is one that I think had better be first considered. It is a question whether there is anything at all in the Bill for the Committee to consider.

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then we will understand that it is so taken. The serious objection taken to the Bill, as I understand, is in relation to the first section. It is that the first section infringes upon provincial jurisdiction, but it is not that the second section or the third section infringes upon provincial jurisdiction. I think, therefore, that it is not giving fair treatment to the Bill by voting that the Committee shall rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and practically killing the Bill, because it is tantamount to saying that there is nothing in the Bill worthy of the consideration of the House. I want this to be understood. I want all who are going to vote on this Bill to understand that if they vote that the Committee rise they are affirming that there is no provision in it which the House is to consider at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. There are provisions in relation to railway transportion, in relation to the closing of canals, in relation to excursions, and the vote proposed by my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, is tantamount to saying that not one of these is worthy of the consideration of the House. I may have inadvertently done an injustice to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman who wishes to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day and desires to provide against the most dangerous forms of the desecration of that day should stickle as to the power of this House to deal with the matter, and legislate on the question of public newspapers, a power which the Minister

of Justice says the House possesses. It is not a question so much of religion, but it is a question of the public welfare and of public morality, and of whether we shall take steps to prevent the introduction into this country of a great evil which exists on the other side, the momentous results of which are before our eyes. We may be told that we have a right to deal with this matter under the provincial and municipal regulations, but that has nothing to do with the question. I say we have the power and the right to deal with it here, and there rests upon us the necessity of doing this if we desire to discharge our duty. It is asked why we should legislate in regard to excursions. They use the railways and the shipping of this Dominion, both of which are within the jurisdiction of this Legislature, and it is right that we should exercise our power in this Parliament. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that Christian public opinion will see that this question is legislated upon. Christian public sentiment in this country demands that this Parliament should legislate upon this subject. It is useless to trifle with this question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I object to having words put into my mouth which I did not utter. I said that the Christian public opinion of this country would demand the proper legislation from the parties who were competent and who had the right to legislate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept the statement of my hon. friend, and I say that the Christian public sentiment demands legislation upon that part of this question which is in the hands of this Parliament. This Bill does not ask this Legislature to exceed the powers we have. The Minister of Justice says this House has the right to pass this section and every section of the Bill, and I repeat that the question to be voted upon is whether or not there is anything contained in this Bill which is worthy of the consideration of the House, and I allege that anyone who votes that the Committee rise votes that there is no one principle or sentiment or section in this Bill worthy of the consideration of this Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN. I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill, in the remarks he has just made to the House, has not clearly exhibited that Christian spirit that we would naturally expect from a gentleman who is seeking to enforce Sabbath observance in this country, and to promote morality in every form, because it is clearly not the exhibition of a Christian spirit for him to attempt to enforce his own views on the House by misrepresenting the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in his legitimate criticism of this Bill. I listened with a good deal of regret to the threats which the hon. gentleman cast across the House, and turning round towards his own political associates, he threatened them, that they were flying in the face of public opinion, and would be held responsible if they voted for the resolution moved by the Minister of Justice, and responsible to this country as men who are not desirous of promoting the moral well-being of the country, and as men who were putting themselves on record as opposed to Sabbath observance. I think every hon. gentleman in this House must see how unfair was that course on the part of the hon. gentleman, how unjust it was, and of how great a misrepresentation of the facts he was guilty by making such a charge and by hurling such a threat against hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. Now, it has been clearly established in this debate that the law, as at present in force in the different provinces, amply provides for such an observance of the Lord's Day as is in line with the public opinion of these provinces. Speaking of the Province of New Brunswick, I may say that we have all the laws we desire for the observance of the Sabbath, and I further say that if this law and five hundred other laws were passed to hedge around the people all sorts of penalties the Lord's Day would not be observed any better than it is at the present time. I do not think it is desirable, in the interest of the moral well-being of the country, that we should surround the people with all sorts of cast-iron laws. I am one of those who do not think that people are made moral or made Christians by legislation. I believe in a matter of this sort that you must appeal to the sentiments of the people, you must influence them by moral suasion, you must lead them to see that it is right and proper that the Sabbath should be observed, and unless they adopt that opinion for themselves, unless they observe the Lord's Day in the way in which it should be observed, then I say that hedging it about with cast-iron laws, such as the hon. gentleman has introduced, will not tend to promote that end, an end which all good citizens have in view; because I think there is no man in this country, no matter what his religious belief may be, who does not think it desirable, in the interest of morality, and of Christianity, and the happiness of the people, that the Sabbath day should be observed as a day of rest, and observed in a lawful and proper manner, as the people of this country do observe the Lord's Day. If the hon. gentleman's Bill prevails the Sabbath day, instead of being a day of rest, would be a day of gloom and unhappiness and mortification. When I was down in the City of Montreal the other day, on a bright and sunny afternoon, I ascended the mountain and saw small groups of people scattered about under the trees, families and friends taking their luncheons and having little picnics to themselves. They had ascended the mountain by means of the railway which was run by the employment of menial labour, and the thought occurred to me that these people, sitting there under the trees on that beautiful Sabbath day, were enjoying themselves in a quiet and legitimate manner, and were much more religious and in a much happier frame of mind—for the terms are, to a certain extent, synonymous—than they would have been had they been cooped up in the city, and unable to enjoy these privileges. As I said before, I think the observation of the Sabbath must be left to the people themselves; their better judgment will prevail, and I for one take the full responsibility of voting against the Bill the hon. gentleman has introduced, not only from a belief that it is unnecessary in consequence of existing provincial laws, but also from the conviction that legislation of that sort is not calculated to promote the end which the hon. gentleman and those whom he represents have in view.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. We want a vote. The question was not put.

Mr. MARA. The question you put was that the Committee rise, and the motion moved was that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; but we have a right to vote on it. I want the chance to stand up and vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been carried twice.

Mr. CHARLTON. I demand a vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Motion agreed to; Yeas 63, Nays 18.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved Second reading of Bill (No, 11) further to amend the law of evidence in criminal cases. He said: This Bill, the second reading of which I now propose to move, has been before Parliament on various occasions and with various fortunes. This is an Act to enable an accused person to give evidence in his own behalf. In the session of 1882 I introduced a Bill on the same subject, in which the accused person was not only made competent to testify in his own behalf, but was compelled to give evidence for or against himself. That Bill received a second reading, and it received a second reading with the assent of the then First Minister. In the session of 1883 I introduced the Bill a second time; the Bill was then read the second time with the assent of the then First Minister. It was referred to a Select Committee; the Select Committee reported in favour of the Bill. The Bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee rose without reporting it. In the session of 1884 I introduced the Bill again, extending it to all cases of misdemeanour and felony, making the accused competent to give evidence on his behalf. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, which reported in favour of the Bill. The Bill received its second reading, but in the Committee of the Whole the Committee rose the second time without reporting it. In 1885 I introduced a Bill similar to the Bill introduced by Lord Bramwell in the English House of Lords, extending its provisions to all cases both of misdemeanour and felony. That Bill received its second reading by a majority of 32, it passed through all the stages in this House and was sent to the Senate, where it was defeated. In the session of 1886 I introduced the same Bill in precisely the same language. The principle of the Bill received the assent of the then and now Minister of Justice, but the Minister declared that as the questions was being discussed in the English House of Commons and House of Lords, and as the Bill had not finally passed there, its passage in this House had better be postponed for future consideration. I venture for the sixth time to submit this Bill for the consideration of Parliament. It is practically the same Bill that received the assent of the House of Commons in 1885, and which was defeated only in the other House. I pointed out on that occasion, and I desire now to point out very shortly to hon. gentlemen who were not in the old Parliament, that the great current of public opinion among the leading men of England was in favour of the principle of the Bill. I pointed out that the leading lawyers at the British bar were in favour of the Bill, that the most eminent judges on the bench had pronounced in favour of a similar Bill, and I pointed out in 1886 that the Parliament of Canada had on four different occasions ratified the principle of the Bill, and now I ask the assent of Parliament for the fifth time to it. We know perfectly well that the old rule that prevailed in Canada and prevailed in England, that the mouth of an accused shall be absolutely closed, has been intrenched upon in various instances. In cases of assault an accused person can give evidence in his own behalf. In cases of assault and battery, in cases of offences under the Canadian election law, in many cases of offences against females, in some cases of misdemeanour, and I believe in some cases of felony, the accused person is allowed to give evidence in his own behalf. In England, for offences under the Plimsoll Act, where the owner of the vessel has sent the vessel to sea in an unseaworthy condition, whereby lives have been endangered, the accused person has been able to give evidence in his own behalf. For offences under the English Explosives Act, for offences under the election law Act, the accused is allowed to give evidence in his own behalf, and also in many cases under the Act respecting the protection of females. The principle of the Bill having been recognized by the British House of Commons and the House of Lords, having been recognized in the Canadian House of Commons, I ask the Parliament of Canada to go a step further, and say that the law may be enacted and applied to every case. There can be no sensible reason, no logical reason, why the mouth of one accused person in one class of crimes should be absolutely sealed, while the mouth of another person in another class of crimes should be open and able to tell his own story. The law ought to be logical as well as reasonable. At present, the law is neither logical nor reasonable. A person accused of a crime desires to give evidence in his own behalf. He desires to place his own oath against the oath of the prosecutor. He desires to explain the special circumstances that tell against him, and he desires to corroborate it by the evidence of his wife. The answer of common sense, reason and justice is that he should be able to do so. The answer of the law is that he cannot do so; his mouth must be closed; he cannot say a word. I say that position is neither reasonable, nor is it logical, and it should not prevail. The prosecutor goes into the witness box and tells his story. He details the circumstances under which the transaction took place. Sometimes he exaggerates; sometimes he lies. The accused person can say nothing. He cannot explain the suspicious circumstances; he cannot expose the suspicious circumstances. His wife can say nothing. I say that state of things is not reasonable, it certainly is not just and it certainly is not logical. I have pointed out that it is unfair, unreasonable and unjust. I have shown that the old rule has been intrenched upon both in England and in Canada. I have pointed out, as I have pointed out before, that the opinion of leading journalists and leading public men, leading lawyers, and judges in England, have pronounced strongly in favour of the Bill. To confirm my position, especially as regards those hon. gentlemen who were not in Parliament when this Bill was before the House on former occasions, I will venture to quote the opinions of some leading law journals, lawyers,

and judges. One English law journal writing on this subject not long ago said :

"The primary object of a criminal prosecution is to elicit the whole truth about a crime. If a prisoner is innocent it can do him no harm to be examined ; it cannot diminish his chances of escape; and, if guilty, it is good that those chances should be diminished."

On the same subject the *Pall Mall Gazette* observes :

"Innocence, as a rule, has more to gain than to lose, as guilt has certainly more to lose than to gain, by telling its own story, and having that story sifted by direct interrogation ; and the cause of truth would undoubtedly gain by allowing in both cases the story to be told."

The necessity for this legislation is referred to briefly and tersely by a distinguished writer on the law of evidence. Taylor says :

"That in all judicial investigations the object to be attained is the discovery of the truth, and no species of evidence ought to be excluded which can materially aid in that discovery; the rules of evidence, so far as practicable, ought to be the same in civil and in criminal proceedings."

Why, I recollect well, Mr. Speaker, and you recollect, too, when a change was made in the Province of Ontario, enabling the defendant and plaintiff in civil actions to give evidence in their own behalf, precisely the same objections were made as are made now, when a Bill is introduced into Parliament for the purpose of enabling an accused person to give evidence on his own behalf. It was then said that it would lead to perjury ; it was said that no man would be safe ; it was said that no man's rights would be safe ; and yet, after having that law in force for many years, nobody would dream of going back to the old system that formerly prevailed. Sir Joseph Napier, a distinguished Irish lawyer and judge, says :

"There are cases in which no one but the accused could expose the falsity of the accusation, and there are cases also in which the accusation would not have been made, perhaps not even contemplated, but for the very rule which may screen it from exposure. The accusation indeed should always be sustained by independent evidence, but for this very reason it should be open to the accused to meet such evidence by his account of what alone he may be able to testify; and, moreover, as whatever the accused may state would naturally be received with jealous suspicion, he should be allowed to submit his testimony to cross-examination, that its value may be tested."

When Lord Bramwell introduced his Bill into the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor of the Conservative Government of that day spoke very strongly in favour of the Bill ; one or two of the ex-Lord Chancellors also spoke favourably of it, and I could quote their remarks from the *Hansard* ; but I will not detain the House to do so at this late hour. Looking at the question in every aspect, there does not appear to me any reasonable grounds why this amendment should not be made in the criminal law. As I have said a moment ago, to certain classes of offence against females the accused person has the right to go into the witness box and to tell his own story of the transaction, while in another class of offence against females the accused person cannot do so. Take, for instance, the case of rape, which is occasionally, though fortunately not very often, brought up in the courts of justice. Certain of our judges have said, and I have heard it stated from the bench over and over again, that this is a charge which is very easily made but most difficult to answer, and most difficult to disprove. The female goes into the witness box ; she tells her own story ; she can get no one to corroborate her, because this sort of offence is not committed on the highways nor within the view of other persons. The unfortunate accused can say nothing ; his mouth is absolutely closed ; his lips are absolutely sealed ; he can say no word, he can say nothing to relieve himself from the effect of the evidence which has been given against him. Now, I would like to know if the Minister of Justice could on any ground justify the exclusion of the evidence of an accused person in cases of that kind. Without taking up the time of the House, and as I believe the principle of the Bill will commend itself to the Minister of Justice and to the majority of this House, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that when I had an opportunity at first, which was in 1886, of discussing this Bill, I agreed in the principle of it. I may say that my own views upon this subject are in advance even of the principles of this Bill. I regard the prohibition which this Bill seeks to remove as one not founded on sound principles as regards the administration of justice. It is a remnant of the system by which interest was considered as a disqualification to testify in a court of justice. The greater part of that prohibition, bearing on civil cases, has been repealed many years ago, in spite of the resistance of some of the most eminent legal minds in ancient and even in modern times. But, I for one, have come to realize in connection with this prohibition that we have something more to consider in administering justice than the mere danger, temptation or tendency to commit perjury on account of interest, and that the paramount consideration of all is the arrival at truth in the investigation of facts. As I have said, with regard to civil cases the prohibition was abolished. The tendency in modern times, as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has stated, has been to allow interested persons to testify, even as regards criminal cases. We have seen a long catalogue of cases, beginning with common assault and extending upwards to much more grievous offences, in respect to which an accused person is permitted by statute to testify. Moreover, there has been a great modification of judicial opinion in the mother country as to the extent to which an accused person, although strictly forbidden to enter the witness-box, is entitled to be heard in his own defence. Some judges have allowed him, even when he is defended by counsel, to make a statement to the jury of all the facts connected with the crime, in so far as that may be within his knowledge, including an assertion of his innocence. Other judges have contended, and have ruled, that it was only admissible for the counsel of the accused to state what the circumstances are, as he has heard them from the accused person. And so, out of that conflict of judicial opinion there has grown up a strong and, I think, a healthy sentiment in favour of admitting, as one of the aids to the administration of justice, the testimony of the accused person himself and of his wife. However, as I brought to the notice of the House in 1886, there has been a strong difference of opinion, among those who are best qualified in the mother country to decide upon that question, as to the safeguards by which that system should be surrounded, if a change should be made. Agreeing, as nearly all the authorities now do in England,

that the testimony of an accused person should be admitted, there are differences of opinion, for example, as to whether the wife should be allowed to testify as well; as to whether the accused person should be compellable to testify, as to whether his wife should be compellable to testify, as to whether the testimony should be subject to cross-examination; and, likewise, as to whether it should be a subject of comment, and a subject of contradicting testimony, brought in rebuttal. As to all these points of detail and restriction, we still find legal opinion in a very doubtful state in the mother country; and in 1886, considering that the Bill of the hon. member proposed to change a system which had been in force for centuries in the mother country, I was very anxious that we should wait, even if we delayed adopting a principle on which we could agree, and see what safeguards should be suggested by the best thought which could be brought to bear on the subject in the mother country; more especially, as we must all admit that it is most desirable, in the interest of truth and the correct administration of justice, that we should have all the aids we can get from all the testimony available on the subject. We all know that the difficulties surrounding the administration of the new principle would be great, in consequence of, it may be, the incapacity of juries to weigh and make due allowance for the different shades of interest which enter into testimony. There are already in this country, in the opinion of a great many people, too many opportunies for the escape of criminals from conviction. There is perhaps two much tendency on the part of jurors, in the investigation of criminal cases, to consider that all that is uttered in the witness-box as of equal weight, whether it comes from witnesses who are interested or witnesses who are disinterested; and those views added to my desire in 1886, when the hon. gentleman's Bill was last before this House, that we should hasten slowly with regard to a great change of this kind, even though I regarded it as a very considerable reform. The subject has not ceased to engage the attention of legal minds in the mother country; and as the hon. member for West Huron has stated, during the present year a similar measure has been brought before the House of Lords and has received the unanimous approval of all who are worthy of respect in judicial matters in that great body; though it has not passed its final stage, but is still under consideration as regards the safeguards by which it should be surrounded. Now, I say to the hon. member, as I said in 1886, that I am in favour of the principle of the Bill. I say to him more than I said then, that on every theory connected with the administration of justice I am willing to go farther: I speak my personal views when I say that I am disposed to adopt the principle of this Bill without restriction. I am in favour of making the accused person, and his wife also, not only competent, but compellable to testify, in order that—due weight may be given at all times to the measure to which interest may affect the creditability of the testimony—those connected with the administration of justice may have every means of ascertaining the truth. I am, therefore, disposed to concur in the second reading of the Bill to-night; and I shall ask the hon. member, in view of what I have urged, not to press the Bill beyond that stage in the present session, more especially in view of the fact that I have offered for the consideration of the House an extensive measure covering the whole criminal law, which is now on the Order Paper. I stated when I introduced that measure, as long ago as the 12th of May, that I would not press it beyond the second reading in the present session, but that I desired to distribute it to all persons connected with the administration of justice in Canada, so as to obtain their views, and so as to have a very full consideration of the measure on the part of members of this House before another session, and then I propose to refer it to the deliberation of a large Committee of the House. That Bill has been printed, and although it is not yet distributed officially it will be in the hands of hon. members within a few days; and a large edition has been struck off for distribution among judges, attorneys-general, members of the bar who desire to consider it, members of both branches of Parliament, and other persons who take an interest in the improvement of the criminal law. I propose to pursue the same course with regard to the hon. member's Bill after its second reading, that it shall be distributed along with the Criminal Code, and the comments of the legal profession invited upon it. I have every reason to believe, from the intercourse I have had with the profession, that the opinion of the public and of the profession is tending in the direction in which the hon. gentleman proposes to legislate; and unless good reasons can be given, which do not present themselves to my mind to-night, I would certainly be in favour of incorporating the provision which the hon. gentleman seeks to have adopted in the Criminal Code which I shall offer to the House. In the meantime, I am disposed to support the second reading of the Bill, for the reasons I have given, and I hope the hon. gentleman will concur with me not to press an important amendment like this to the criminal law when we have tacitly made up our minds to defer making any fundamental changes until the whole subject can be considered in connection with the code which is to be presented to the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt a good deal in what the hon. Minister of Justice says on the subject. There would be a good deal more in it if this were the first time that this Bill had been presented to Parliament. But it will be remembered that this measure received the assent of the late First Minister in 1882, 1883, 1884 and 1885, and that the principle of the Bill was assented to by the hon. Minister of Justice in 1886, although it was defeated on the second reading. The hon. Minister has had five years since 1886 further to consider the principle of the Bill. If the measure has been acknowledged for nine years as one that ought to become law by a large majority of Parliament, as I assume it is by a large majority of the present Parliament, there is surely no reason why it should be delayed. The only reason the hon. Minister of Justice gives is that he is codifying the criminal law, and that it should form part of the codification. Well, it could form part of the codification just as well if it passed the present Parliament as it could if it were allowed to stand over.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is going to discuss the Bill I would remind him that he has not a right to do so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have a right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; the hon. gentleman is mistaken. It is an Order of the Day, and not a substantive motion, on which the mover has a right of reply.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But surely if I move the second reading of this Bill, that is a substantive motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; it is not a substantive motion. It is an order of the House for the second reading of this Bill, and the hon. mover of the Bill has not a right to speak a second time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I was only going to say, and I think the hon. Minister of Justice will be willing to hear me, that if the principle of the Bill is a sound one the hon. Minister ought to let it pass. Before the next Parliament meets there will be a large number of accused persons on trial, and it would not be satisfactory if some of these were improperly found guilty because they had not the right to give evidence on their own behalf. I submit that the hon. Minister of Justice, having affirmed the principle of the Bill, ought to take charge of it and allow it to become law.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit to my hon. friend that he ought to be quite satisfied with the declaration of the hon. Minister of Justice. It is quite a point gained on this most important measure, that the authority of the Minister of Justice should be so emphatically pronounced, as it had been, in its favour. My hon. friend knows that public opinion is slow to move, and I am not sure, though I have always supported the Bill, that public opinion would have supported it at the time. With the weight of the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice and the declaration he has already made, I think my hon. friend ought to be satisfied that he has gained a victory, if I may so call it, in favour of legislation on this subject, and next year he will have the chance of seeing this Bill become law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes; but some poor man will go the penitentiary in the meantime.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports of the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended to Tuesday, 4th August next, and that the time fixed for the posting of Private Bills, under Rule 60, be reduced to one day, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourth report of the Private Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish formally to bring before the House an article that appeared in the Toronto *Mail* of July 13, in regard to some remarks I made. In winding up it closes with the statement, "He expressed the hope that the city would always have a Protestant mayor," referring to the city of Toronto.

Mr. CHARLTON. How is this a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker? The words referred to were not expressed in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be better for hon. members to wait and hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We cannot hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen need not be alarmed. I think I know the Rules of the House fairly well, and I intend to abide by them. Mr. Speaker, I addressed the Orangemen on 11th July in Toronto, and a brief report appears in the Toronto *Mail* newspaper. I wish to make this explanation, because the statement I made on that occasion did not convey any such impression as is there conveyed. I was complimenting the speaker before me, the Mayor of Toronto, and I was referring to the fact that he was an Orangeman and that objection had been taken to his election.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. gentlemen is not referring to any incorrect report of his remarks made in the House, I think he is not in order.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not referred directly or indirectly to any speech made in this House. I was referring to a report in the *Mail* newspaper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is referring to, or making any explanation of, or making any denial of an incorrect report of a speech made by him in this House, he is in order. If he is referring to an incorrect report of a speech made outside of this House, I must rule that the hon. gentleman is not in order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that he cannot make any statement that is not in order on a motion to adjourn the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I was referring to a report, an incorrect report, which appeared in a certain newspaper, when I was interrupted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I said the report was incorrect and did me an injustice. I, therefore, ask leave of the House to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must again call the hon. gentleman to order. The hon. gentleman is not in order if he is referring to an incorrect report of a speech made in another place and not in this House. It does not reflect on the privileges of the hon. gentleman as a member of this House.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose this speech was quoted in this House by an hon. gentleman, how would it stand then?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot possibly put himself in order by referring to a previous debate.

Mr. WALLACE. If you, Mr. Speaker, rule that any reference to this matter is out of order, I will take another occasion and another opportunity of setting myself right before the House and before the country on this matter. I am very sorry to hear hon. gentlemen——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not feel like withdrawing my motion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. If hon. members want to burk enquiry by hon. members on this side of the House by adopting these tactics we will apply the same rule when some hon. gentleman on that side of the House wants to make some explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has exhausted his right to speak by moving the adjournment of the House and not speaking to the motion at the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have now said all I wanted to say.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The question is this. I think the other day the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) quoted a remark said to have been made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace):

"This gentleman, speaking in the city of Toronto on this date only a week ago"——

Mr. LAURIER. Order.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am speaking to the question of order, as to whether the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has a right to correct a statement made in this House. He is not referring to a previous debate for the purpose of discussing it, but for the purpose of correcting a statement. I am now asking Mr. Speaker to consider the matter. The hon. member for Ottawa County said:

"He hoped that never would a Catholic occupy the position of Mayor of the city of Toronto."

Mr. DEVLIN. It was not the statement of the hon. member for Ottawa County.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was a remark quoted by the hon. member for Ottawa County and appeared in *Hansard*:

"I saw the remarks quoted in a French paper of Montreal. I was afraid that, perhaps, he had been misreported, so I took up a newspaper of the city of Toronto, the *Mail*, and I found there exactly the same remarks."

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is in order for the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to say that he was incorrectly reported on that occasion. As a matter of courtesy it should be allowed to any member in this House to correct such a statement, if it is not true.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has he changed his conviction?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would be glad if I were able to rule that the hon. member had a right to correct a report of his speech made in another place, but I find on examining the authority that it is laid down as follows:—

"It is a common practice for members of both Houses to make personal explanations, or to ask questions of the Government before the Orders of the Day are taken up. They may make these explanations in reference to an inaccurate report of their speeches in the official record, or in the newspapers."

I take it that this has reference only to speeches delivered in this House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. But he wants to say he was incorrectly reported.

An hon. MEMBER. That would be a matter of reply.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is a matter of correcting a wrong report of his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was incorrect in ruling that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had not the right to speak again. The motion to adjourn the House was not a motion in amendment, but a substantive motion, and, therefore, he has a right to speak.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to make one suggestion: I think the motion to adjourn had better be withdrawn. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) will have an opportunity, and has a right, to make a personal explanation on this subject before the debate is ended.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw the motion.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: "That the resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday, the 23rd ultimo, be read a second time;" and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I wish now to rise to make a personal explanation. I say that the report which appeared in the *Mail* newspaper—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. You have spoken."

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. gentleman a personal explanation to make?

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to make a personal explanation, and that is the whole object of my rising. What I said was not what was reported in the *Mail* newspaper. In referring to the Mayor of Toronto, I said that objection had been taken to him because he was an Orangeman, and that by his conduct as Mayor he had earned the right to say that Toronto never need be ashamed of having had her Orange Mayor. That was the statement I made. With reference to another statement made in this House, to the effect that myself and other members of this House had asked a gentleman (Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, M.P.) to dine with us in the restaurant of the House of Commons, who had stated that he would tear Victoria's Crown off her head and toss it into the River Boyne: I may say that this House does not need to have an emphatic denial made by me of the remarks attributed to him. I wrote a letter to that gentleman immediately I returned to Ottawa, and after the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) had made these remarks in the House, and this was the reply I received:

"It is absolutely false that I ever made any such statement as alleged. Conybeare, M.P., uttered the same falsehood in South Africa and had to withdraw it in writing, which I have. In Ireland years ago the late

Rev. John Flanagan spoke of King James the Second's crown having been kicked into the Boyne, and has attributed to me the disloyal sentiment condemning the Queen, God save her.

"WILLIAM JOHNSTON."

That is all I need say on that question, Mr. Speaker. I thank those hon. gentlemen on the other side who have been so exceedingly courteous as to give me the opportunity of making this explanation, and I hope the member for Ottawa County will withdraw the statement he made to this House reflecting on Mr. Johnston.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a personal explanation to make also, with respect to the report, a reference to which has just been made by the hon. gentleman. I must say that I read the report of his speech first in *La Patrie*, of Montreal, and entertaining some doubt, because I had hardly thought it possible that any hon. member of this House could give utterance to such dangerous sentiments, and I certainly felt very strongly at the time upon the subject. I then went to the Toronto *Mail*, which I consider the fountain of truth, in so far as that hon. gentleman might be concerned, and supposed to contain accurate reports, and especially upon an occasion such as that in question. I took up the Toronto *Mail*, and I found the sentiment attributed to the hon. gentleman was reported to have been uttered by him, and I availed myself of the occasion, the other day, to protest against it as strongly as possible. I never saw a correction on his part, from the date that this report appeared in the newspaper until this moment. I protested against it then. I am glad, however, to hear from the hon. gentleman himself that he entertains no such sentiments, and his repudiation shows that he is taking a step in the right direction.

Mr. WALLACE. Let the hon. gentleman withdraw what he stated about Mr. Johnston.

Mr. DEVLIN. I cannot possibly withdraw it, and I will not withdraw it.

An hon. MEMBER. Do it.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will not withdraw it. It is well known.

Mr. AMYOT. Is Johnston a member of this House?

Mr. COATSWORTH. He is a member of the Imperial House of Commons.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will not withdraw it, because I am convinced he used the expression.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In resuming the debate upon the motion in amendment, submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I cannot hope to introduce to the House much new matter, if any at all, in the way of instruction or of interest. But I do claim the indulgence of the House, partly upon the ground of the importance of the question now in debate, and partly because I do not often trouble the House with observations on questions which come before it. At the outset, I have to enter my protest against the character of the criticism offered to this House by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his speech delivered some days ago. I had supposed that the hon. gentleman, in addressing this House, would have at least not ventured to travel beyond the lines of decent and reasonable accuracy, and that in his criticism he would have presented a fair statement to the House for the consideration of members. I confess, that upon reading the speech of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is an old parliamentarian, and who is exceedingly well versed in the public affairs of the country, I had expected to find that he would confine himself within the bounds—I shall not say of truth—but within the bounds of reasonable criticism. Yet, what do I find? He introduced a subject which is popularly called chestnutty; that is to say, the administration of the Government which he supported from the years 1874 to 1878; and he introduced a comparison of the result of the financial administration of that Government with the result of the financial administration of the Government which now holds office, and which has held office since 1878. Now, nobody could object to a comparison of that kind, provided always that it is based upon a fair and candid presentation of the actual facts as affecting the administration of the two parties; but so far from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) taking a course of that kind, he began by comparing the taxation in Canada with the taxation in the United States; and what was the statement which he submitted to Parliament? It was this: That the revenue derived from Customs in the United States amounted to $229,000,000 odd; that the revenue derived from Customs in Canada amounted to nearly $24,000,000; that the taxation *per capita* in the United States was $3.66 per head, and in Canada $4.80 per head of the population; and he left the inference to be drawn by the House and by the country that by reason of that state of affairs, which he said represented the actual facts of the case, we were overburdened by taxation in Canada as compared with the United States. Now, why did he omit the taxation arising out of excise? Is not that taxation equally with the taxation arising out of Customs? If he had included that item, he would have found that the just and actual comparison would have been this—that in the United States they derived, from all sources of taxation in the last fiscal year, $372,000,000, or $5.90 per head, whereas we in Canada derived $31,500,000, or $6.07 per head. I grant you, that on the face of the figures there is an apparent difference of 17 cents a head against Canada as compared with the United States. But if you take into account one single item, that of provincial subsidies, which does not apply to the case of the United States, you not only eliminate absolutely this difference, but you have a credit in favour of Canada in point of taxation of something like 60 cents a head. Another complaint I have to make in respect of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk is, that in dealing with the question of expenditure under the Mackenzie Government and under the present Government he began with the year 1875 and ended with the year 1878. Although that Government which the hon. gentleman supported had been in office for a full five years, he struck out altogether from the account two full years, and submitted for the consideration of this House as a fair basis of comparison three years of administration on the part of our friends opposite as against twelve years administration on the part of gentlemen on this side of the House. If the hon. gentleman had taken a fair and candid review of the actual condition of affairs under the two parties, respectively,

he would have found that instead of a decrease in the expenditure under the Mackenzie Government, as he claimed, of $1,048,000 between the year 1875 and the year 1878, the actual result was, that beginning with 1873, just before those hon. gentlemen assumed office, the total expenditure was $19,000,000 —less the items of interest and sinking fund, which he himself deducted, amounting to nearly $6,000,000 —leaving $13,000,000 as the total expenditure, exclusive of those two items; and that when they left office—I take the year ending 30th June, 1878 —the total expenditure was $23,500,000, less interest and sinking fund of $8,186,000, leaving a balance chargeable to them of $15,316,000; or an increase in the expenditure, outside of interest and sinking fund, during their five years' administration, of over $2,000,000, instead of a decrease of $1,048,000, as claimed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, a decrease which he was able to make out only by eliminating two years of the administration of these hon. gentlemen. So, in the matter of the debt, the hon. gentleman claimed that during the Mackenzie Administration it had increased only $27,000,000; but in order to arrive at the result he had to begin with the year 1875, nearly eighteen months after those hon. gentlemen assumed office. If he had begun with the year ending 30th June, 1874, and had carried the figures on for the five years during which those hon. gentlemen held office, he would have found that during those five years the average annual increment in the public debt amounted to $6,933,000, whereas from the 30th June, 1879, down to 30th June, 1891, the average annual increase of the public debt under Conservative administration was $7,888,000—I grant you, an increase of about $900,000 a year as compared with the period during which hon. gentlemen opposite held office: but in that period we have built the Pacific Railway, we have made immense expenditures towards the enlargement of the canal system, we have contributed liberally towards the subsidizing of railways throughout this country, and we incurred other engagements looking to the promotion of our commercial prosperity But why was not the hon. gentleman candid enough to say this? If we compare the five years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite with the last five years of the Conservative Government, the period since the close of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, what do we find? We find that the average annual increment in the public debt during the five years from 1886 to 1891 amounted to $2,898,000, as against an average annual increase in the five years of Liberal rule of $6,933,000. That is to say, during these last five years the Conservative party has governed Canada and carried on its public works, while adding to the debt less than $3,000,000 a year, as against an increase of nearly $7,000,000 a year during the time hon. gentlemen opposite held office. Now, Sir, as I understand it, the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is evolved principally from the idea that the condition of the rural population in Canada to-day is one of comparatively abject poverty, and that the trade of the country is in a condition of lamentable depression. What I contend is this, that it is not enough for these hon. gentlemen to say that the condition of agriculture in Canada is in a state of depression. Assume that to be the case, it is in itself no argument against the policy of the Government. In order to support that contention, these hon. gentlemen must show that the condition of agriculture in Canada is, relatively to the condition of the same industry in the United States or in Great Britain, in a state of depression: and unless they can do so their whole case falls to the ground. Everybody understands that for some years past, owing to the increased production of cereal products, as compared with the increase in the demand, the price of agricultural products has declined; and unless hon. gentlemen opposite can establish that the decline in prices and the resulting hardships upon the farmers have been greater in Canada than elsewhere they have no case on which to base their claim that unrestricted reciprocity will cure the evils of which they complain. Now, without going too much into detail or into statistics, let me quote for the information of the House a statement derived from the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture of the United States, showing the value per acre of the cereal products of that country in the years 1869 and 1889. I find, for instance, that the value per acre of the corn crop in the United States was $17.75 in 1869, and that it had declined to $7.63 in 1889; that the value of wheat, that is to say, the product of wheat per acre, has fallen from $12.76 in 1869 to $8.98 in 1889; in oats the same value has fallen from $14.50 in 1869 to $6.26 in 1889; in barley it had fallen from $22.80 in 1869 to $12.57 in 1889; and rye from $13.20 in 1869 to $7.07 in 1889. Take these principal cereal products, their value in the market per acre in 1889 was less than one-third what it was in 1869; and I have no doubt that the same condition of things will, to a large extent, have prevailed in Canada, and that if there does exist to-day any depression among the agriculturists of this country, if their position is a less favourable one than it was ten, fifteen or twenty years ago, the reason is to be found in the world-wide and universal rule over which no tariff or no Government had any influence whatever. Why, Sir, if you take the value of farm animals you find the same results have been brought about—that is to say, that in respect of horses, cows, other cattle, pigs and sheep, between 1884 and 1890, a much more recent period than as between 1869 and 1889, there was a large and material decline in the average value of farm animals in the United States. Horses declined in value during that period about $6 per head; cows declined about $9 per head; other cattle about $8 per head; pigs about $1 per head; and sheep about 28 cents per head. Now, the House has been fully informed, in the course of this debate, of the state of agriculture in the United States, and I do not propose to quote a single author or make a single statement on that point, nor do I intend to cite any authority showing that the prices of farm lands, that the value of cereal products, that the value of animals in Great Britain, have similarly declined as in the United States and Canada. I take it there is no gentleman in this House, I take it there is no intelligent reading man in Canada, who is not familiar with that fact; and, therefore, I let the fact speak for itself. But what I do say again is this, that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they speak of depression in Canada in order to create a case, must establish the fact, if they are able to do so—and I am satisfied they are not—that Canada, relatively to the United States or to Great Britain, occupies a posi-

tion of disadvantage and inferiority in respect of its productions. We have heard something about the immense mortgages that are said to have been placed upon the farms of Ontario. It so happens that since this debate began the annual report of the loan societies of Canada has been published, and that we are able to derive some information from it as to the position of the agriculturists of this country in respect of mortgages. The comparison, it seems to me, is one of considerable interest. I find, for instance, that the amount of principal and interest overdue and in default on mortgages held by the loan companies of this country was, in the year 1880—which was not a very prosperous year, because the depression existing from 1875 to 1879 had overlapped to some extent into 1880—$4,130,000: whereas, in 1890, on the 31st of December, it was only $2,055,000, or less than one-half of the amount overdue in the year 1880. We will go on another step. We will take the amount of mortgages upon which compulsory proceedings have been taken during the year, the amount of mortgages in respect of which the people have been so poverty-stricken that they were unable to meet the interest. In 1880 the amount was $2,096,000; in 1890 it was $2,062,000—not a great deal less, it is true, but still the position of the farmers, as set forth in the last return of the loan companies of Canada, has certainly not gone from bad to worse as regards the amount of mortgages on which compulsory proceedings were taken, while it is infinitely better as regards the aggregate amount of interest and principal in default. Take the total value of real estate under mortgages as disclosed in this return, and you will find, Sir, that on the 31st of December last it was $216,770,000, a pretty large sum it is true, but the amount overdue was only $2,055,000, or less than 1 per cent. of the total amount of mortgages held. I go a step further, and I contend that farm mortgages are, in a large sense, equivalent to bank discounts. A farmer has not the same banking facilities as a merchant, and if he wants to buy other land, if he wants to extend the area of his operations, if he desires to purchase live stock or erect new farm buildings, what other means can he take? He has not the banking facilities of the merchant to procure money in order to extend his operations, except by means of mortgages; and I contend that it is an utter fallacy to assume, without positive knowledge of the fact and only upon the bare statement, that because the amount of mortgages has increased therefore the condition of the farmer is worse. On the contrary, I say there is a fair argument, I say there is as good an argument immediately behind the return in favour of the view that the increase of mortgages is as good a test of increasing prosperity among the farming population as the increase of banking discounts is a test of the expansion of trade among the mercantile community, provided, as my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Chapleau) says, there is nothing in default in the way of interest due, and I have quoted figures to show that there is no increase in that respect. Now, I take it that as good judges as we have in Canada of the condition, not merely of the mercantile, but of the agricultural classes, are the bankers of Canada. It is true that they do not loan money to the farmers direct, but they are in daily intercourse and in constant dealings with the merchants who are in close touch with the agricultural community and are in a position to report as to their condition. What do I find on that point? The evidence of Mr. George Hague, general manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada, I believe, has been already quoted, but I may be permitted to refer to it once more; and he said, at the annual meeting of the Merchants Bank of Canada, held in June last:

"I cannot share in the opinion held by some that the farmers of Canada, as a whole, are suffering. They are undoubtedly having a trying experience in some districts, but in many others they have done well and are prospering. Bank deposits are a plain proof of that. The manner in which farmers live is another proof of it. The continuous increase in cattle, horses, sheep, and all the appliances of prosperous farming, is apparent in many parts of the country."

And again, in the course of the same address, Mr. Hague, referring to the effects of the McKinley tariff upon the farmers of Canada, said:

"There are some certainties and some uncertainties respecting the operation of the McKinley tariff. What is certain is that it stimulated our export of barley last fall at an increased price. It is certain also that barley has generally maintained an average price since, and that eggs fetched nearly as much this year as they did last. What is uncertain is, whether consumers in the United States will not after all pay the increased duties imposed on Canadian farm products. I am inclined to think they will. But, if not, I am inclined to think that if one market closes another can be opened, and that if our farmers cannot profitably grow one kind of grain they can another. I do not think the export of hay from this province in such large quantities has been an unmixed benefit by any means. With intelligence and self-reliance, the farmers of Canada can meet any tariff disadvantages of this kind, if they will bestir themselves to do it."

Which opinion, I, for my own part, entirely concur in. Let me cite another gentleman on this subject. Mr. B. E. Walker, the general manager of the Bank of Commerce, a gentleman who is in close touch with the trade of Ontario at all events, and at the last meeting of the bank, which took place within the last four or five weeks, he said:

"During the past year the Ontario farmers paid their implement notes and interest and mortgage instalments quite as promptly as in former years, in many districts much better than for many seasons."

And he goes on to say:

"Regarding eggs, whether we eventually, as I think we will, establish a satisfactory market in England or not, 'down to date no one has suffered from the McKinley Bill' but the consumer of eggs in the Eastern States."

I venture to say that the testimony of Mr. Walker, who is a practical man, who speaks without party bias of any kind, a gentleman whose means of information are not open to the members of this House, is more worthy of credence than the statements made on the other side of the House in another sense altogether. In dealing with this question, I am glad to be in a position to submit testimony which I suppose will command the attention, and it ought to command the confidence of gentlemen on the other side of the House, because I assume that there is no one who has a greater claim upon their confidence than the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). There was a time when that hon. gentleman occupied the position of Finance Minister, and when he dealt with the affairs of the country in a manner which may have been pleasant to him but was exceedingly disadvantageous to the people of Canada. He stated then, what I believe to be true, that there were certain tests by which we could arrive at the condition of affairs in this country. Let me quote what he said in his speech in 1877:

"I find that the general increase in various matters which are usually considered reliable signs of the advancement of the population in wealth have been very marked. For instance, it is very well known that the amount of the circulation of a country, at different periods, affords a very tolerable indication of the volume of business done therein; and I find, that whereas on 1st January, 1868, our total circulation amounted to barely $14,000,000, at the same period of the year 1877 that circulation (deducting in each case the Government notes held by the banks), had increased to as nearly as possible $26,000,000, an increase of nearly 100 per cent. Similarly, within the same period, the bank deposits in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, for which alone we have returns, have increased from $29,689,000 to a no less sum than $70,450,000, the absolute increase in that case being 130 per cent.; and the deposits in Government saving banks from $1,686,000 to $7,178,000, an increase of fully 400 per cent., which is specially valuable as showing the growth of habits of thrift and frugality among our population. And although I have not accurate statistics on the subject of life insurance, I believe I am correct in saying that within the past five or six years the gross amount of policies of life insurance outstanding in Canada has increased from about $35,000,000 to about $85,000,000."

Now, that is the test which the hon. member gives, the circulation, the deposits in banks, and life insurance. Let us see how the position then compares with the present condition of affairs; because, if I can show that a large and substantial improvement has occurred we will have the best evidence that can be given, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, of the prosperity of the people. What are the facts to-day? In respect of the deposits in Government savings banks, between 1879 and 1890 we find that there was an increase from $9,207,700 to $41,012,000, or an increase of 450 per cent., showing, according to the hon. gentleman, the growth of habits of thrift and frugality among the people at large. Then, in the chartered banks there was an increase of deposits from May 31, 1879, to the same date in 1891, from $71,954,500 to $152,196,500, or an increase of 110 per cent. In the loan companies—because almost every loan company receives deposits and pays interest upon them, and I must, therefore, consider them—the amount has increased from $9,246,000 in 1889 to $17,893,000 in 1890, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent. In the aggregate the increase in the deposited wealth, in the surplus earnings of the people, has been in twelve years, from 1879 to 1890, from $90,408,200 to $211,101,500, or 130 per cent.; and I submit that, according to the test laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this respect, the condition of the people is better than at any time in the past. Then take the test of the note circulation, and what do we find? The circulation of the banks, excluding therefrom the Dominion notes held as reserves in banks, but including the smaller Dominion notes used in the transaction of the every-day business of the country, amounted on the 1st January, 1879, to $25,329,600, while on the 1st January, 1891, it amounted to $42,553,800, or an increase of 67 per cent. I would call attention to this fact, that the more the banking facilities of a country are extended the less money is likely to be in actual circulation. Those who are familiar with the working of a banking system will understand that cheques to a large extent are used in the conduct of business and that they take the place of notes, so that the increase of the domestic trade of the country measured by the bank circulation is really very much greater than the figures make it appear, because of the extension of the bank facilities to which I have referred. The last test submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I do not desire to go beyond the subjects treated of by him in his speech in 1877—was the question of life insurance. I do not myself attach very much importance to that, but it is evident that the hon. gentleman did at that time, and we have this result: Between 1879 and 1890 the amount of life insurance in force in Canada has increased from $86,273,000 to $248,327,000, an increase of nearly 300 per cent. As I say, for my own part, these insurance figures may be illusory as a test of prosperity, but at any rate they were perfectly satisfactory to the hon. member for South Oxford when he submitted them to the House; and I insist and maintain that in respect of bank deposits, and more especially of bank circulation, which is far the most accurate test you can obtain as to the volume of the business of a country, the condition of Canada as measured in this way is infinitely more prosperous to-day than it has been at any time since Confederation. Now, I want to take up a somewhat debated, but, as it seems to me, a very interesting point, that is, the question of who pays the duty; because it must be obvious to every member on this side, at any rate, that practically the whole basis of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is founded upon the idea that the American duties upon our farm products come out of the pockets of the producers of this country. Well, now, the other night my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), who is a good political neighbour, dealt to some extent with this point, and he thought that it did not make much difference as to the item of wheat, as we only exported about 500,000 bushels a year, therefore it did not make much difference whether we removed the protective duty upon wheat or not. He forgot altogether that by reason of that protective duty we preserved the home market for so much of our wheat as is consumed in Canada, and that practically is all we produce in the country. Moving on to barley, he thought that because the price of barley on a recent date—and he quoted a very recent date—was only about 47 cents or 48 cents at Port Perry, whereas it was 85 cents or thereabouts at Buffalo, therefore the Canadian producer of barley lost the difference between the price at Port Perry and the price at Buffalo. The same with eggs; and he applied the same argument to potatoes. Now, with the permission of the House, I desire for a moment to go into that question of who pays the duty. And again it is my privilege and pleasure to submit to the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite an authority whose validity they will scarcely venture to question, the authority of a gentleman in this House whom I greatly respect, possessed, as I think, of as logical a mind and of as vast a fund of information as any one who sits in the House—I refer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who spoke on this subject in 1877, and demonstrated, to his satisfaction, at any rate, and demonstrated, I presume, to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite, that every copper of the duty imposed upon Canadian products by the people of the United States came out of the consumers in that country. Let me quote from his testimony, because while it is not particularly valuable to us it must be valuable, and ought to be valuable and held in esteem by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the course of the Budget debate of 1877 the hon. gentleman spoke

on this point, and although it is now fourteen years ago, yet the principles then enunciated, if they are sound principles--and I presume they are, from his point of view, at any rate—must survive and be as potent and applicable to-day as when they were uttered by him. Now, what does he say?

"The doctrine laid down in England was that taxation imposed on imports was paid by the consumers of these imports; and if that was the case, the taxes imposed by the Government of the United States on Canadian products was paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States; and if a tax was imposed upon articles entering into consumption in this country imported from the United States it would be paid by the people of Canada."

You see he was perfectly consistent. He says that the importers in both cases pay the duty. He goes on:

"How is the farming population to be made prosperous by increasing the price of such articles? How are farmers to benefit by such a policy? In 1875 we sold to the United States 5,400,000 bushels of barley for $5,359,000. This barley was taxed by the American Government 20 cents per hundred pounds. Who paid this tax? The brewers of the United States or the farmers of Canada?"

There is a pertinent question, and applies as much to-day as it did fourteen years ago.——

—"Beyond question it was paid by the American brewers. The very object of imposing this tax was to increase the price of barley produced in the United States, and how did it increase the price, except by generally increasing the price not only of what was grown at home, but also of that which was imported from abroad? This was the object in view."

Well, now I would like to know—and I regret that the hon. gentleman is not now in his seat—I would like to know whether the hon. member for Bothwell still adheres to that doctrine. If not, I would like to know—and remember he believes this to be a doctrine that is bound to survive under any condition—I would like to know if that principle does not equally apply to a tax of 30 cents a bushel which the American Government has imposed upon Canadian barley? But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with the general proposition; he proposed to apply it to a distinct case, and he proceeded in these words:

"We had sold to the United States 100,000 bushels of wheat for $109,000; and the tax levied on it only increased the price to the American consumer. It made no difference to the Canadian exporter. We sold to Great Britain, in 1875, 2,247,000 bushels of pease for $2,138,675, and we sold to the United States 579,000 bushels of pease for $502,176, and we got to a cent from the American purchaser the price we received from the English producer. Pease entered free into England, and they were taxed 15 cents in the United States. Who paid the duty? If the duty was paid by Canadians, then pease would be 15 cents lower when sold to Americans than when sold to England. It was the consumer and not the producer who paid taxation."

Well, now, hon. gentlemen will remember that in the course of this debate reference has been made occasionally—and, perhaps, inferentially rather that directly—to the question of Imperial Federation, more especially in the trade sense, and what has been the answer of our friends opposite, not merely in this House, but in their journals throughout the country? They have answered that it was an utter fallacy, a mere Utopian dream, to expect the people of Great Britain to consent to a scheme involving discrimination in favour of colonial products, because the tax required in that case would fall upon the consumers in Great Britain. Now, if that be so, how does it lie in the mouths of those same hon. gentlemen to turn around and in the same breath proclaim that a tax imposed by Great Britain upon foreign products will increase the price of the cereal productions, of live stock and provisions of all kinds, going from Canada into Great Britain, while they maintain that the tax imposed by the United States against foreign products does not increase the price of the articles in that country, but is paid by the exporters? Surely there is a glaring inconsistency in their attitude in the two cases. If you argue it down to a nicety, if you say that the duty is paid by the consumer in cases where the country imposing the tax cannot produce enough for its own consumption, then I say the argument applies equally in the case of the United States as respects those articles which we have been exporting to them for the last fifteen or twenty years, such as barley, horses, eggs, &c. That is to say, that whenever their home supply is short the consumer in that country pays the duty, and not the exporter from Canada. But before I leave this branch of the question, it will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ventured to claim that if we had free trade with the United States, that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, which he so anxiously desires, the value of every horse in Canada would be increased by $30 per head. Why $30? Because that is the measure of the taxation imposed by the United States on horses imported from Canada. I could not help thinking what a pity it was that the American Congress in 1890 had not imposed a duty of $100 per head on horses, so that when we came to have unrestricted reciprocity, as hon. gentlemen opposite expected, the value of every horse in Canada might be increased by $100. Surely if the argument is good that the duty of $30 per head will increase the value of each horse by that amount, then a duty of $100 or even $500, given unrestricted reciprocity, would increase the value of each horse by that amount. The simple statement of such a case shows the utter fallacy and absurdity of the hon. gentleman's contentions. But I want to be as fair with the House as possible. I do not propose to argue against the principle of reciprocity. On the contrary, I believe that it is possible, if the Americans will consent, to frame a treaty of reciprocity between the two countries that will inure and conduce to the advantage of both. But I do dissent from the view that the duty imposed by the Americans is taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, no matter whether that duty be high or low, and I want to cite an illustration of the practical working of the American tariff on the products of this country. I will refer to the case cited by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) some days ago. That hon. gentleman said that barley sold at Port Perry at 47 or 48 cents, while on the same day it sold in Buffalo at 80 and 85 cents. Give us free trade between the two countries, he said, and the price of barley in Canada will be increased to 85 cents per bushel. What is the basis of that argument? Is it not just as fair to assume that the price of barley in Buffalo was increased 30 cents per bushel by reason of the increased taxation under the McKinley tariff? Let us see how it practically works. The duty on barley before the McKinley tariff came into operation was 10 cents per bushel. At one time, some years ago, it was 15 cents per bushel, but it has been 10 cents during the last five or six years. On 20th

September last—I take that period because it is a fair one—the price of barley in Buffalo was, for No. 1, 85 cents; No. 2, 80 to 82 cents; and No. 3 extra, 77 to 80 cents per bushel. Let hon. gentlemen remember that this was under the old tariff in the United States of 10 cents per bushel. In Toronto, on the same date, barley was 62 to 65 cents for No. 2, and 58 to 62 cents for No. 3. There was a difference under the old order of things between the price of barley in Toronto and Buffalo of something over 18 cents per bushel. We will not discuss whether the duty was paid by Canadians or Americans; there was 10 cents representing duty and 8 cents representing transportation from Toronto to Buffalo. I will take a month later, 22nd October, after the McKinley tariff had gone into operation. What do we find? That the price of barley had increased to 95 cents for No. 1, 92 cents for No. 2, 88 to 90 cents for No. 3 extra; whereas the prices in Toronto—I do not disguise the fact—had declined to 57 cents for No. 2, and 53 cents for No. 3 extra. What was the operation of the increased tariff on barley? Was it, as hon. gentlemen opposite contend, to reduce the price of barley in Canada by 30 cents per bushel? On the contrary, as the market quotations—and I have taken the prices from the *Globe*—show, the effect of the increased duty in the United States was to increase the price of Canadian barley in Buffalo by 10 cents per bushel and reduce the price of Canadian barley in Canada by 5 to 8 cents per bushel. At the very worst, and it is the utmost they can claim, the effect of the increased duty of 20 cents per bushel was to decrease the price in Canada from 5 to 8 cents, and not, as hon. gentlemen opposite have contended, by 20 cents per bushel. Suppose we had unrestricted reciprocity to-morrow, or suppose we were able to bring about a restricted reciprocity under which Canadian barley would enter the United States free of duty, is any man insane enough to believe that Canadian barley would increase in price 20 cents per bushel? The moment the duty was removed the price would decline, and Canadian farmers, instead of being benefited to the extent of 30 cents per bushel, would be exceedingly fortunate if they obtained 10 cents per bushel. I did intend to refer briefly to the operations of the Treaty of 1854, but I do not now propose to go into that matter, as I am detaining the House at some length. What I would say is this: It is undoubtedly a fact that under the operation of that treaty, or rather during its operation, the condition of the agricultural class in this country was one of extreme prosperity. I go further, and I say this: If you can restore the condition of the markets of the world during the operation of that treaty the condition of our farmers would again be one of prosperity, reciprocity or no reciprocity. Take the United States itself. What an enormous change has come over that country since 1854. In that year they had in that whole country only 16,720 miles of railway; to-day they have 180,000 miles, and what that means in the way of material development every hon. gentleman understands without going into it. The mileage has increased since 1854 more than ten-fold. The population has increased 1½-fold—that is 150 per cent. Take cereal production. What was the product in 1854, compared with the present? As regards corn, wheat, oats and barley, and I take only those four principal cereals, the aggregate in 1854 was 844,167,000 bushels; in 1888, the latest return I have been able to obtain, the aggregate was 3,165,393,000 bushels—an increase in population of 150 per cent. and an increase in cereal production of 400 per cent. Does it commend itself to the intelligence of any sane man to say that if we had unrestricted reciprocity or free trade, restricted or unrestricted, with the Americans, we would occupy as good a position of vantage as we occupied under the operations of the Treaty of 1854? Every item I have mentioned shows the fallacy of the view presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. Take one more point, and I will mention only one, as to the conditions then existing. During the operation of that treaty pork sold as high as $35.25 per barrel, butter 45 cents per pound, corn $1.95 per bushel, flour $10 per barrel, oats $1.03 per bushel, and wheat $2.57 per bushel. Why? Was it because we had a treaty? There is no man in the House who can truly state that, who has a knowledge of the facts. Was the price of wheat in the United States increased to $2.57 a bushel during the period between 1854 and 1866 because we had a treaty? No. It was because, outside of that treaty, there were conditions which cannot be restored, which it is out of the power of man to restore, and I maintain this: that until you can restore the conditions which existed during the operation of that treaty it is utter nonsense to pretend that unrestricted reciprocity will bring back the prices of farm produce to the same rates as prevailed during that time. I do not intend to deal with more than one point further, and it is one which seems to me to lie at the very root of the whole question. We had a general election in Canada not many months ago; we had one party in Canada going over the country from one end to the other, telling the people that if they were returned to power they would bring about unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. I want to know what warrant they have for a statement of that kind? I want to know what evidence they have submitted to this House, from the opening of this debate to this present time, to substantiate their claim that they can obtain reciprocity with the United States. They tell us that it is an absurd and utter fallacy for members and supporters of the Government, for ministerialists, to pretend that they can obtain a treaty covering only natural products—that they can obtain a limited reciprocity treaty; and whom do they quote in support of that view? Is it not Mr. Jas. G. Blaine, is it not Mr. Hitt of Illinois, is it not Mr. Butterworth, is it not Mr. Baker, is it not Mr. Erastus Wiman, and is it not the Republican leaders of the United States, whom they quote in support of their views, that it is an utter fallacy and simple nonsense to contend that we can obtain a limited measure of reciprocity with the United States? Well, now, I insist upon this: That if these gentlemen in the United States are good and credible authorities upon one point they are equally good and credible authorities on the other point, and that hon. gentlemen opposite must show as a reason for the faith that is in them; they must show us, as a ground for the claim they set up for the confidence of the people of this country, that they have assurances from the United States of some tangible character. They must show us from the speeches in Congress, and from the journals of the United States, that if the olive branch is

extended to them, that if an offer of unrestricted reciprocity is made, it will be accepted and availed of by the people on the other side. What is the fact? Why, this question of unrestricted reciprocity, this question of fuller and freer trade relation with Canada, has been discussed in the Congress of the United States, not once, but two or three times over. Has any gentleman opposite ventured to cite a single quotation from the speeches made in Congress in support of their claim? No, they dare not do it, and why? It is because they cannot find from beginning to end of the *Congressional Record* of 1888, or 1889, or 1890, or even of the current year, for the short session which closed in Washington on the 4th March last; they cannot find one single statement which will bear out the view they are attempting to impose on the people of Canada, that we could have free trade with the United States and at the same time retain control of our own tariff. I propose, with the consent of the House, just as briefly as may be, to quote the statements, and the only statements that have been made in Congress, upon these points. On the 1st March, 1889, the question was debated in Congress. Mr. Hitt, in introducing his resolution in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, instigated thereto, I have no doubt, for it is a matter of common notoriety—instigated thereto by Mr. Erastus Wiman and the gentlemen who have been behind him in this country, made a statement, and in that statement he took the pains to explain to Congress what he meant by that resolution. It was a commercial union resolution, it is true, but it was the only resolution to which this gentleman would commit himself. It was the only resolution to which this gentleman would invite the support of Congress, and he said this:

"Commercial union is, in substance, a proposition to extend our tariff system over Canada; to remove the Custom-houses of both Governments from the frontier and put them along the line of the sea, to have our protection system include the continent from the Gulf of Mexico north; to give to our manufactures and other products as free access to the markets of Canada, and allow the Canadians to sell and buy here as freely. Undoubtedly they, in being subjected to the same tariff with us, would in all fairness be consulted as to its provisions, but we, sixty millions, would in all fairness generally have the prevailing voice in determining what the rates should be.

Now, that is the view of Mr. Hitt, but he said more in the course of the same debate, and I will give you another quotation from his remarks, which are somewhat on the same lines. He said:

"What is commercial union with Canada? It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties, or taxes, to be levied on goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of Custom-houses on the north by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada, abolishing their Custom-houses along the same line by which they collect duties on goods we send into Canada, and leaving intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada, as it is between the States. The line of Custom-houses would follow the sea and include both countries. The proceeds of taxation thus collected would be equitably divided, and the fairest way would seem to be in proportion to population."

That is the American view of this policy as propounded by one of its prime authors, and one of its principal exponents. But a little debate arose in Congress upon the proposition which Mr. Hitt submitted; a debate which did not last very long, which did not evoke many speeches, and which did not seem to arouse much enthusiasm; but there is one singular fact in connection with that debate to which I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen. That is: That of the few speeches made, every one of them was precisely on the lines laid down by Mr. Hitt. I will quote to you, as fully as is necessary, because the citations cover the whole ground, from the speeches made in support of this proposition in Congress. And mind you, gentlemen, these are speeches delivered in the Congress of the United States, which are just as important on this question as speeches made in the Parliament of Canada, because it requires two parties to go into this bargain, and whatever our views may be, even though we were unanimous on it on both sides of the House, we cannot move one iota towards the consummation of the project, without the consent of the authorities on the other side of the line. Mr. O. L. Jackson, of Pennsylvania, made this statement in Congress:

"If this resolution tends to anything it is to governmental union with Canada. It means in the future what is popularly termed annexation of Canada to the United States."

That is the interpretation made by a gentleman sitting in Congress, without any special sympathy for the resolution, but taking simply the commonsense view of the matter as it appeared to him, as a plain business man. Mr. Ben. Butterworth of Ohio, whose name is somewhat familiar in Canada, although he is not now a member of Congress, said on that occasion:

"I have advocated removing every barrier and hindrance to full and free trade between Canada and the United States. I have believed, and do now, that such unhampered trade relations would lead to political union."

That is the view of Mr. Butterworth. One other gentleman, and one other only, spoke in the course of that debate—Mr. Baker, the member for one of the districts of New York, whose name has become somewhat familiar to the people of Canada, because it was Mr. Baker who addressed to Mr. Blaine in the month of February last that letter asking him whether he had committed himself to the opening of negotiations with Canada. Mr. Baker appears to be somewhat of a fervid orator, and this is what he said:

"I remember, Mr. Speaker, that when in the dark days of rebellion our call went forth to the brave men of the North to volunteer in defence of the Union, over 46,000 Canadians enrolled themselves among its defenders. The time is coming when they will be in the Union themselves, a part of us, they and their children, and their lands. God speed the day! I am hoping to see the day of Canada's richest blessing when she becomes a part of our Confederation. 'Commercial union' we will not favour, except as a means to a speedy end."

It is of the highest consequence to us, in deciding this question, to consider the view of it taken in the United States; and I again ask, what warrant have these hon. gentlemen, what evidence have they to submit to the Parliament of Canada, to show that, if they were in office to-morrow, they could carry out their scheme of unrestricted reciprocity on any other conditions than such as would be humiliating and abhorrent to the national sentiment of the people of this country? But it may be said that, though that was the case in 1879, yet, owing to the missionary work performed by hon. gentlemen opposite since then, a different view has come to prevail, and that the Congress of the United States are now coming to join hand-in-hand with the Opposition party in Canada. Now, let us see how the case really stands. Those who read the Toronto *Globe*, as I do with a great deal of care every day, will remember that, during the whole

time the McKinley Bill was under discussion, there was a daily correspondence in that paper from Washington, promising that a resolution in favour of unrestricted reciprocity would be submitted in the Congress of the United States, and assuring the people of Canada that it would receive a large and generous support, intimating, indeed, that it would be adopted by that body. Now, there was this much warrant, and this much only, for those statements—that a resolution was introduced into the Senate of the United States by the Hon. John Sherman, the distinguished Senator from Ohio; and the moment the terms of that resolution were made known in Canada, it commanded the unanimous support of the Conservative press in this country, because they saw that it was a fair resolution such as the Government of Canada could reasonably and properly accept, and could join hands with the Congress of the United States in carrying into effect. Let me read that resolution; and I venture to say that there is not a gentleman sitting on this side of the House who will not agree that it was a fair one. Here it is—introduced by Mr. Sherman on the 2nd day of September, 1890:

"And whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to enter into such commercial arrangements with the United States as will result in the complete or partial removal of duties upon trade between Canada and the United States, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be designated to represent the Government of Canada, to consider the best method of extending the trade relations between Canada and the United States, and to ascertain on what terms greater freedom of intercourse between the two countries can best be secured."

I say that is a reasonable proposition, which the Government of Canada could properly accept, and upon which I think they would be glad to proceed in the negotiation of a treaty. If there was, as hon. gentlemen opposite contend, a disposition on the part of the leading men in the neighbouring country to accept overtures from Canada looking to broader and freer trade relations between the two countries, surely it would have been shown by the adoption of a proposition of that kind, with regard to which Mr. Sherman said:

"I think these two measures would open the door to reciprocal relations between the two countries as far as we ought to go now. If the commissioners should report any proposition that meets the favour of Congress, well and good, no harm is done."

This was a proposition which, whether a man was favourable to it or not he committed himself to nothing by accepting—colourless in one sense, yet full of practical consequence in another. Yet what was the reception of that resolution in the Senate of the United States? Mr. Sherman's voice was the only one raised on its behalf, and it was not even pressed to a vote, because Mr. Sherman knew that it would be overwhelmingly and ignominiously defeated. Now, in the course of the debate on the McKinley tariff in the Senate of the United States, speeches were made *pro* and *con* upon almost every item that affected the trade relations of the United States with Canada; and while it is true that in respect of lumber, iron ore, and one or two other items, the Democratic party were favourable to freer commercial intercourse between the two countries, yet on the broad proposition not one single man raised his voice in favour of it except Mr. Sherman. Among the gentlemen who took part in the tariff debate in the United States Senate, no less than sixteen were utterly opposed to any measure of reciprocity with Canada, either partial or unrestricted, while only nine were favourable to any kind of reciprocity with Canada; and of these nine only one, Mr. John Sherman, was favourable to going the length of even considering so broad a measure as hon. gentlemen opposite have submitted to the consideration of this House. Now, I do not intend to quote from the organs of the Government of the United States, though I might quote the opinions of such journals as the New York *Tribune*—recent opinions, expressed since this debate begun; I might also quote the opinion of the New York *Press*, a paper established by the Republican party on the eve of the last presidential election, with the view of influencing opinion in the State of New York, and which may be considered as voicing the opinion of the President of the United States himself. Both of these journals are absolutely and unqualifiedly opposed to any measure of reciprocity with Canada except that of commercial union, with the understanding, implied if not expressed, that its consequence shall be the political absorption of this country by the United States. Now, as I understand the position of the Conservative party on this question, it is this—that they are favourable to as large a measure of reciprocity with the United States as is consistent with Canadian interests, as is consistent with the control by Canada of its own tariff, and as will avoid discrimination against the mother country. If hon. gentlemen opposite adopt the same view, if they adhere to the principle that we must retain control of our own tariff, if they adhere to the principle, as they have done repeatedly in the past, down to three years ago, that there must be no discrimination against the mother country, then we are at one, and when the commissioners go to Washington in the coming month of October, their duty will be to find a basis, if a basis can be found, for negotiating a treaty, always subject to these limitations, which limitations—I only speak for myself—I will insist upon in any treaty which may be made with the United States. Now, what of the future? If we are to have a trade arrangement with the United States, there must be two parties to it. What is the position in the United States to-day? It is not what it was in 1888, when this agitation began, and when, on the 1st of July in that year, Messrs. Wiman and Butterworth, and some of their friends made speeches at Dufferin Lake. Then the Republicans had control of both Houses of Congress, but that control has since passed from them. Instead of a majority of eighteen in the House of Representatives, as they had in 1888, they are to-day in a minority of about 140. The tidal wave which swept over that country last October buried them so deep that the day of resurrection has been postponed, for goodness knows how long. How do they stand in the Senate? They have to-day in the Senate of the United States a majority not more than eight, which is quite as apt—I think more so—to disappear within two years as it is to increase in number. What follows then? As every man who has ever read an American newspaper, as every man who has even a smattering knowledge of American politics, knows the free trade party of that country, as it is termed, is the Democratic party; and if that party comes into office,

as it is just as apt to do as the Republicans, it will, until it obtains control of both branches of Congress as well as of the Executive, be a moral as well as a physical impossibility to effect any treaty arrangement. And if the Democratic party should obtain control of both branches of the Legislature and the Executive, what will be the consequence? We will have the enactment of a Bill somewhat on the lines of the Mills Bill. The duty on Canadian products will be struck off—not to benefit Canadians, not because hon. gentlemen opposite say Canadians pay the duty—but because the Democrats and the majority of the people of the United States believe that these duties fall upon the consumer in the United States. And if we should have the Mills Bill enacted to-morrow, so far as our trade relations with the United States are concerned, we will have secured everything that any man can desire, everything that is necessary to conduce to the advancement and prosperity of this country, and we will have secured that without surrendering one iota of control over our own tariff and without having set up a wall to the extent of one inch against the mother country, under whose ægis we have so long lived and so greatly prospered.

Mr. ALLAN. At this late period of the discussion, I have no desire to prolong the debate. I feel, however, it will be my duty to say at least a few words upon a question in which my constituents are deeply interested and to which I owe my seat in this House. I can scarcely hope, after the very many able speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen on both sides, to say much or even anything that will throw additional light on the great question now engaging our attention, and the subject having been pretty well exhausted, it is not my intention to travel over the broad field traversed by previous speakers, but to confine my remarks, as far as possible, to the question before the House. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has devoted an hour and a half to prove that the treaty which the Government are trying to negotiate will be of no value if negotiated. His whole argument has been to show that a commercial treaty with the United States, covering the natural products of the two countries, will be valueless to this country. In that contention, he has only followed the line taken by all the hon. gentlemen who preceded him on that side of the House. One thing has been established in this debate, and that is, that hon. gentlemen opposite are really not in favour of any treaty, whether of unrestricted reciprocity or not. That, I think, has been clearly proven in this debate, and the whole argument of the last speaker has been to show that if we succeeded in negotiating any such treaty it would be of no value to us. He has even gone so far as to contend that, in the case of a product like barley, the Americans pay the duty, and that in every other line the Americans are affected by the imposition of the duty and not the Canadians. Except when he alluded to a few figures comparing the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie with that of this Government, the hon. gentleman took up his whole time in endeavouring to prove that a reciprocity treaty, on which the Government appealed to the country, if we succeeded in getting it, would be of no use to the country. I ask then, why did the Government then appeal to the people? I ask, why is this Parliament assembled at this very inconvenient season? I will read the reason given by Sir John Macdonald for holding the election when he did. The reasons, as published in the Government organs of the 5th of February last, are as follows:—

"Sir John Macdonald's Government, not long ago, made a definite proposal to the Washington authorities for the settlement of all existing differences between the two countries. It involves partial reciprocity, the enumerated articles to include quite a number of natural products. But the proposition discards any idea of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Moreover, these propositions were invited and suggested by the Washington authorities. Commissioners from Canada and Great Britain will start for Washington on 4th March, the date of the opening of the new Congress."

Here we have it stated that the proposition for reciprocity was initiated by the Secretary of State of the United States; and yet we have the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) devoting at least fifteen minutes of the last part of his speech to show that it would be utterly impossible to get any treaty whatever from the people of the United States. Well, I would ask the hon. gentleman why the country was plunged into the turmoil of a general election last March, and why we are assembled here at this inconvenient season of the year? The avowed purpose was, as stated by the paragraph I have read, to take the feeling of the country upon this question of reciprocity. I admit that very little time was given to the people of Canada for the consideration of that question. The election, for certain reasons which no doubt are well understood on the other side, was hastily held, and it was impossible to get an intelligent opinion from the electorate on that question. However, the reason I have mentioned was that given for holding the election at that time, namely, to obtain the opinion of the people as to reciprocity, which, as the Government stated, was desired by the Secretary of State of the United States. Yet we are told by the hon. member for Cardwell that we have no chance whatever of getting a treaty with the United States, and that if we did get it, even in articles of barley and other things of that kind, in which we, on this side of the House, think it would be a great advantage to our farmers to have reciprocity, it would be of no use to us because the duties are paid by the Americans. I regret I am unable to join in the congratulations of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the present condition of affairs in this country. I would be glad to know that I was in error as to the depression that now exists. I would be glad to know that I was entirely astray as to the condition of our agriculturists, manufacturers and others; but I am convinced that, with the exception of a few pampered manufacturers, there is a widespread depression in every department of business throughout the country. Representing a riding which, as an agricultural riding, is second to none, coming as I do from the County of Essex, for which nature has done so much, I must say, speaking from the point of view of the farmers and under very favourable circumstances, that they as well as others have suffered from this depression. Now, I propose to call attention to the sugar duties, on which very little has been said since the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) gave a full exposition of them in this House. I am well aware that some hon. gentlemen have attempted to answer his statement. But, with the exception of a few carping criticisms the statement which he made in reference to the

sugar question has not been answered. I propose to show that this policy, for which the Minister of Finance has received the congratulations of gentlemen on that side of the House at the present time. does take out of the pockets of the people of this country a very large amount of money. Credit is given to the Finance Minister for removing the duty on sugar. If the duty had been removed several years ago I think credit would be due. It has been the view of the party on this side of the House that too much money has been taken out of the pockets of the people and that all unnecessary taxation should have long ago been removed. The fact that the Finance Minister was able to take off the sugar duty now only proves that it should have been taken off before, according to the contentions of hon. gentlemen on this side. As to the policy of taking the duty off sugar, I believe it was understood by every retail dealer in the country, and certainly by every wholesale merchant, and it was evident that no other course could be pursued by the Government. The fact that the stocks of sugar, as far as the distributors of that article were concerned, had run down to the smallest point shows that it was understood that this duty could not be maintained in view of the fact that the Americans had removed the duty. When sugar was selling 12 lbs. for $1 in Canada compared with 23 pounds and 24 pounds in Detroit, it was evident that the duty could not be maintained, and if the removal of this duty under these circumstances is an evidence of statesmanship on the part of the Finance Minister, then every retail merchant in this country is a statesman, because every one of them expected the removal of the duty and acted accordingly. I propose to show by correspondence which I have on this question that the refiners are taking a very large amount of money out of the pockets of the people over and above the price of sugars in New York, which is in a protected country, and, if a comparison is made with the markets of England, I believe it can be shown that the refiners of Canada to-day are taking almost the full amount of the duty. The figures I have were obtained on the markets on the 8th July. The price of granulated sugar in Montreal on that date was 4⅝, less 2½ per cent., or $4.51 net per 100 lbs., while in New York the price was 4¼, less 1 per cent., making $4.21 net, or a difference of 30 cents per 100 lbs. in favour of the Canadian refiner. Bright or extra C sugars, as they are called, were quoted in New York at the same date at from $3.56 to $3.94, less 1 per cent., and without actual samples it is difficult to make a comparison in this grade, but it would be fair to take the average of $3.75, or, even if we take the outsides figure $3.94, it can be seen how much higher the prices are here, when I state that such sugars could not be bought under 4⅛ to 4¼ in Montreal at that date. For example, take the New York average price, $3.75, less 1 per cent., equal to $3.71 net; as against the lowest price in Montreal, 4⅛, less 2½ per cent., equal to $4.02½ net, or a difference of 31½ cents in favour of the Canadian refiner. Or again, take the highest New York price, $3.94, less 1 per cent., equal to $3.90 net, against the Montreal price of 4¼, less 2½ per cent., equal to $4.14, and there is a difference of 24 cents per 100 lbs. in favour of the New York sugars. Yellows are quoted in New York at 2⅞, less 1 per cent., or $2.84½ net, against $3.75, less 2½ per cent., or net in Montreal $3.65, or a difference of 80½ cents per 100 lbs. in favour of the Canadian refiner, that is, if the quality is the same, and there is certainly very little difference. In a letter that I have, the results of some actual tests that have been made as to the value of sugars in New York and in Montreal are given. This letter is from one of the largest dealers in Ontario, and he says:

"On comparing sample number six, quoted at $3.75, less 1 per cent., say $3.71 net, I find it equal to a sugar just bought by us in Montreal at $4.25, less 2½, say $4.14, or a difference of 43 cents per 100 lbs. And sample number twelve, at $3.31, less 1 per cent., say $3.28, cannot be matched in Montreal under $3.75 to $3.87½: and taking even the inside figure, at which we cannot to-day secure anything, say $3.75, less 2½—$3.65, you have a difference of 37 cents. In other words, Canadian refiners are getting from ⅜ to ½ a cent per 100 lbs. more for yellow sugars than refiners in New York."

These comparisons are made between New York and Montreal, comparing Canada with a highly protective country where they have a protection of half a cent, and even then, we find that Canadian refiners are taking money out of the pockets of the people of this country to the extent of at least $1,000,000 a year. I have here a circular from a prominent Liverpool firm dated 20th June, 1891, and I want to compare the price of English sugars with ours. This is what I find. Brown sugar at 12s. per cwt., or $2.61, duty 80 cents, freight 12s. 6d., exchange on the basis of 110 1/16, and 10 per cent, for primage, 1 per cent. brokerage and 1 per cent. bank commission, and insurance, say ½ per cent., and we have the total cost of English sugar laid down in Montreal at $3.62½. The refiners' price in Montreal even at the average of $3.75, less 2½ per cent., would be $3.65, and in this calculation no allowance has been made for discount in Liverpool which used to be 2½ per cent. There has been very little importation of sugars for some time from Liverpool, and in regard to this point of discount I was not able to obtain information, but it is supposed that the same rate of discount exists to-day. Even without that, the prices of sugar from England, according to this comparison, are less than the prices of the Montreal refiners. In any case, the fact is established that our refiners are taking from 30 cents to 43 cents per 100 lbs. out of the people of Canada over the prices which obtain in New York, and almost, if not altogether, to the full extent of the duty, namely, 80 cents per 100 lbs., as compared with the English sugars. I will continue the comparison. Bright sugars were quoted at 14s. 6d. in Liverpool; add the duty, freight, brokerage, commission and insurance, and they would be laid down in Montreal at $4.20, while the Montreal price was $4.25, less 2½ per cent., or $4.14. Also, this calculation is without the discount. Now, with reference to granulated sugar, the figures show a difference of about 49 cents between the price of the granulated in England at the present time; these figures have been supplied to me by a large importing house, or a house that handles a large quantity of sugar. The prices they have given are the prices received on the 8th of July, and upon comparing samples, there has been found to exist a difference between the two markets of Montreal and New York of 43 cents per 100 lbs. This, I think, establishes the statement that has been made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), that the refiners at the present time are taking, as he stated, 31 cents per 100 lbs.

out of the pockets of the people of Canada. As a matter of fact, they are taking much more, if they are taking that amount, over and above the prices in New York, and nearly the full amount of duty, when compared with the English prices. In dealing with this question, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), spoke about sugar, claiming a reduction of $5,000,000. In this calculation he stated that it would be proper to take off about 25 per cent. for the retailers' profit. Why, Mr. Speaker, any one who knows anything about the sugar trade of this country knows that so far as the retailers are concerned, sugar is, and has been, handled at cost price, or with a very slight fraction of profit, if any, in order to cover shrinkage, and in this calculation he states that $1,500,000, I think he said, should be deducted for the retailers' profit. So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the calculations the hon. gentleman has made in reference to sugar are altogether wrong, and he will find that such is the case by consulting any merchant in the House, or out of it, because every one understands that sugar is a commodity which the retail dealer handles at cost, or if there is any advance, it is merely a fraction to cover the shrinkage in weight, in addition to the freight charge. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) thought that he had answered the argument of the hon. member for Brant in reference to sugar. Speaking of the hon. member for Brant, he said:

"He told us that he found the lowest average price of granulated to be 6⅛ cents a pound, but he made the average price of granulated and yellow together 6·64 cents per 100 lbs., or one cent and a-half more than the price of granulated. This is evidently a mere error in calculation, for the hon. gentleman sees that the average price of the two could not be higher than the price of the highest, the granulated sugar."

Well, that would be all right provided the statement was correct. If that hon. gentleman had taken the pains to hunt up the *Journal of Commerce* in which the hon. member for Brant obtained the figures which he submitted to the House, he would have found that 6⅝ cents was not the highest price of granulated, that frequently during the year quoted it had gone up to the high price of 8 cents. After referring to the quantity of granulated sugar, and so on, he says that this calculation of the hon. member for Brant is about $2,000,000 out of the way. The fact is, the calculation of the hon. member for Brant has not been dealt with at all, there was no error in it, as hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to show. The quotations submitted to this House were taken from the *Journal of Commerce* the first day of every month for one whole year, and the hon. member for Brant took the lowest quotations, and in this way, I believe, the hon. member for Westmoreland made his mistake. He confused his figures in reference to this 6⅝ cents per pound, and left himself in error on this sugar question to the extent of $2,000,000. The 6⅝ cents alluded to the quotation of a single day. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in the remarks he made about sugar, stated that under the tariff at present, 14 Dutch standard, a very large quantity of sugar suitable for use would be introduced and used in the Lower Provinces. Now, I wish to read a letter in reference to that point, which states:

"Of sugar under 14 Dutch standard, very little, if any, will be brought into this country."

That is the statement made by an importer. Every one in Ontario that has any idea of sugar and qualities, knows that this quality will not be used, and the fact that the tariff has been reduced to the low standard of 14 will prevent any quantity of sugar being brought in that will be of any value to the consumers of this country. By lowering the standard of sugar below that of the Americans, which is 16, the Government will destroy our prospects of developing the trade that we expected to build up with Jamaica. We have been at great expense in showing our exhibits in the Island of Jamaica with the view of making a treaty of reciprocity with that country, but the way that this sugar tariff has been arranged will now prevent us from making a treaty of that kind with that Island. The 80 cents will effectually prevent any of that sugar being brought in, because it is a quality much above 14 Dutch standard, and I fear that this action of the Government will throw the trade of that Island largely into the hands of the United States, who are offering terms of reciprocity in raw sugars and other things. I think, Sir, that I have shown that under this tariff the people of this country suffer to the extent of from one to two million dollars annually on sugar alone. With the exception of a few industries like this that are permitted to prey on the people of this country, who are allowed to keep their hands in the pockets of the people, there is very little prosperity among our manufacturing industries generally. Our cotton mills are not prosperous. They have reached a stage of their existence under this tariff when combinations are beginning to form. It has been well known for some time that our cotton mills are running upon part time, and by combination have been paying for idle looms. In almost every department, with the exception of the industries that have been benefited by the tariff, the manufacturers are anxious for wider trade arrangements. Almost all other manufactures are in a state of dulness and depression. Now, in reference to the farmers of this country, the hon. gentleman devoted some little time to endeavour to show that their position had been improved in respect to mortgages. The statement that has been already made in this House showing that the number of mortgages and chattel mortgages in Ontario had been vastly increased during the last few years, and I will not occupy the time by repeating it, proves that a large number of the farmers of this country are practically in the hands of the sheriffs, because the very last thing a farmer will do is to raise money on a chattel mortgage. In regard to the prices of commodities, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has rendered it unnecessary for me to go into an elaborate argument to show that the prices are lower, because he admits the fact. Every one, he says, knows that prices have been lower. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) did not know it, because he entered into an elaborate argument, which will be found in his speech, to show that the prices were somewhat higher in 1890 than in 1879, and it has been the line of argument pursued by a great many hon. gentlemen opposite. But, as a matter of fact, I think every one at all conversant with the prices of grain in this country must know that agricultural produce has averaged much lower since the introduction of the present tariff than before. I am not prepared to say that it is all on account of the tariff; but what I do say is, that when this

tariff was advocated in 1878, the position taken by the supporters of the new policy was that the prices of farm produce would be increased, and that a home market would be established all over the country. What is the fact? Where is the home market to-day? As a matter of fact, from all the evidence at hand, the population of the country has not increased to any considerable extent, has not increased to the same extent it did under the old policy. It is to be regretted that the census returns are not down, but from the data we have I think it is shown that the rural population has been decreasing for some time. I will quote the figures for a few of the old counties. The population in 1879, in the County of Norfolk, was 18,540; in 1890, 16,283; Welland, 1879, 19,109; 1890, 16,934; Lambton, 1879, 30,659; 1890, 33,909; Huron, 1879, 51,592; 1890, 46,815; Bruce, 1879, 45,176; 1890, 40,859.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Where does the hon. gentleman get his figures for 1890?

Mr. ALLAN. The table is one compiled from returns of the township assessors of Ontario.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I thought so.

Mr. ALLAN. They form the only data we have. They are the only figures before us.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If you wait a week you will get the correct figures.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How do you know?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I believe so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We will hold you to that.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You will be only sorry for it when they come.

Mr. ALLAN. What has been the result of this policy? What has happened since the introduction of this policy in 1879? We have added to the public debt nearly $100,000,000, the tariff taxation has been increased over 50 per cent., and the trade of the country has not increased to any very great extent. I have here statistics to show that the trade of the country under a revenue tariff during a period of three years was larger than under a protective tariff during the three years ending 1890. The total revenue under a revenue tariff was in 1873, $217,304,616; in 1874, $216,756,097; in 1875, $195,505,636, or a total of $629,560,249. The total trade under a protective tariff in 1888 was $193,050,100; in 1889, $198,802,614; in 1890, $209,414,733, or a total of $601,427,000, being less than the trade of the country during a similar period twenty years ago under a revenue tariff. For all these sacrifices we have not received corresponding advantages. The taxation has increased from something over $24,000,000 in 1879, to $37,000,000 in 1889, or $12,000,000 more annually taken out of the pockets of the people. In regard to the public debt, to which allusion has been made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), I was not prepared to have the old hackneyed figures brought up again; but my recollection of a comparison of public debts between the two Governments is, that any slight increase in the public debt under the Mackenzie Administration, was due to works laid out or under construction by the previous Government. It may be said that a large portion of our debt is due to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But did not hon. gentlemen opposite tell the people that public lands in the North-West would be sold to recoup the older provinces for the immense outlay made in regard to that great work? We were told that by 1890 the large sum of $69,000,000 would be returned to the people from sales of land in the North-West; but, as a matter of fact, there has been no return whatever from that source, or a very slight one. I believe the first year there was something brought into the treasury over and above the expenses of conducting the department, but during the last few years there has been no return from the sales of our lands in the North-West. The promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite have not been carried out, and if you divide the burden involved by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will be found that the proportion to be borne by the people of the south riding of Essex is no less than $400,000. The result of all that has been, for I do not think the depression in the value of land is due altogether to the National Policy, partially to depress the value of land in Essex and elsewhere. If hon. gentlemen opposite could show that our market had been increased, that our farmers had obtained a home market as promised, that our population had increased, that the tall chimneys promised to be raised all over the country had been erected, then they could claim some reason for the large amount of taxation to which the people of this country have been subjected. But, Sir, in no case have they attempted to show that, unless, indeed, we take the argument of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who has stated that his constituency has increased very materially in the last ten years. However, inasmuch as part of his constituency forms a part of the city of Toronto, I think, or at any rate a portion of Parkdale, for I am not sure whether it is incorporated in the city or not, that is not to be wondered at. I say, that with that exception, and with the exception of a few counties immediately adjoining the cities, the home market has not been increased, and the farmers have not received better prices for what they had to sell. We on this side of the House are to-day advocating the extension of the home market. We believe, Sir, that with unrestricted reciprocity, we can get the best home market that we have ever seen in this country; we believe that we would have, all along the line, a home market equal, and better than that of the home market enjoyed by West York. We would have the markets of Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Philadelphia and all those large cities. Give us a treaty of reciprocity, and I believe that there will be ushered in an era of prosperity never before known or experienced in this country. We have evidence that what we say in this respect will become true; we have evidence of the wonderful increase of trade resulting from the reciprocity treaty of 1854, for the year prior to that treaty, the trade of the country amounted to only $23,000,000, and that in the last year of that treaty, our trade amounted to the large sum of $84,000,000. And, Sir, I believe that if we had unrestricted reciprocity now, our trade would quadruple; it would increase at once with leaps and bounds. I believe that this policy of unrestricted reciprocity would advance the price of everything that the farmer has to sell, and cheapen the price of everything that he has to buy. At the same time, I believe, that if this policy is adopted,

it would benefit a very large class of our manufacturers who want a more extensive field for that which they have to sell. It would cheapen production, and in no other way could prosperity be secured to this country to the same extent as by a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity. I think, Sir, that when the American Secretary of State, according to the announcement made to the electors of Canada, invited us to confer in negotiating a reciprocity treaty, that it is not altogether hopeless to expect that such a treaty will be negotiated. I am satisfied that if the Government can get a treaty in natural products, that we, certainly, ought to be able to get a more extended treaty. At any rate, I believe that it should be the policy of both sides of this House to get the very best treaty that we possibly can from the American people. That is the policy on this side of the House; but, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, all their speeches, with only one or two exceptions, and you can hardly except them, have been directed against reciprocity, even in natural products. They have argued that it would impoverish the farmers of this country and that it would not give us better prices. We are told that, as the Americans pay the duty on barley, what does it matter to us about the imposition of that duty? That was the argument of the hon. gentleman who spoke last on the other side of the House, and I now propose to give an authority upon the question of "who pays the duty," which, I think, he will be bound to receive. Sir John A. Macdonald, speaking upon this matter, said:

"I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. going into the United States, whereas the produce of the American farmers was allowed to be brought into this country free. It is said that the consumers pay the duty, and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement, but when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no answer. I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line and 100 acres on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets $1 a bushel for it. He takes and gets but 85 cents per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. for taking it across the imaginary line. How can it in this case be said that the consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who said that?

Mr. ALLAN. Sir John A. Macdonald. Even if that speech were not made, I think that those who have any knowledge of the barley trade in this country are aware that the Canadian farmers do lose the amount of the duty, and do pay the duty on barley. The very fact that the Americans produce a very large quantity of barley, almost as much as they want, and our barley having no other market, necessitates and obliges the people of this country to pay that duty. If we had another market for Canadian barley the argument of the hon. gentleman might be good, but as a matter of fact we have no market for barley except that of the United States. The statistics of the trade of this country prove that. An hon. gentleman on the other side, who addressed the House the other night, held out great hopes in reference to the cultivation in this country of the heavy English barley. He said that the two-rowed barley was suited to this country, and that we would soon be able to ship our barley to England. Now, I have made enquiries on this subject. I have talked with maltsters and others in reference to two-rowed barley and obtained their opinion. I have particularly spoken on this matter to a maltster in Detroit, who was formerly a resident of Chatham, and who has been engaged in the barley trade all his life; his opinion is the opinion of a practical man on this subject, and he states that it would be impossible to grow "two-rowed barley" in this country for any length of time, and to maintain the weight necessary to suit the British market.

An hon. MEMBER. At a profit.

Mr. ALLAN. They will not be able to grow it at all, because year after year, owing to the warm climate we have in Canada, the weight will gradually grow lighter. At any rate, at the present time the duty of 30 cents upon barley is a very great blow to our farmers. They will find this fall that they will have to pay the duty upon barley. As a matter of fact, I could read the quotations of the prices of barley between Canada and the United States which will show the immense difference in the price in the two countries, because of this duty. I will take the quotations from the Toronto *Empire*, after the imposition of the duty on barley last fall. The price of barley "No. 3 Extra" on 14th November, 1890, in Toronto was 53 cents, and in Buffalo the same grade sold from 86 to 88 cents. On 19th November the price in Toronto was 53 cents, and in Buffalo 88 cents. On 22nd November the price of barley in Toronto was 53 cents, and in Buffalo 90 cents. I think the hon. member for Cardwell did not dispute that barley was higher in the United States, he admitted that in his argument; but when hon. gentlemen look at the fact that the Americans produce so much barley, and that we have no other market than the United States for our barley, it must be evident to every one who wishes to look at this question in a candid light, that the Canadian farmers pay the duty on barley. I will quote an authority as to who pays the duty on horses, which I think hon. gentlemen opposite will also be bound to respect. Sir David Macpherson, speaking at Walkerton in 1878, made use of the following language:—

"If we produce that which our neighbours have not, and which they must buy from us, we can put our own price upon it, and leave them to pay the duty imposed by their Government. In that case the consumer unquestionably pays the duty. But our neighbours and ourselves produce similar commodities, and producers have to compete with their producers. On their way to the American market our producers have to pass through the American Custom-house and pay the American duty, and when they reach the market they can obtain no more for their commodities than the American producer who pays no duty. * * * * Suppose a farmer in this country takes five horses valued at $100 each to Detroit to sell. The duty on horses in the United States is 20 per cent., which the Canadian farmer must pay before he can enter the Detroit market. That is, he must pay $20 for each horse, and on his five horses $100, or the value of one horse at the United States Custom-house, before he can take them to the market. Then he will get no more than a Michigan farmer will get for five equally good horses. Suppose that he and a Michigan farmer each sell five horses—each gets $500 for his horses. The American takes his $500 home in his pocket; while the Canadian takes homes only $400."

I think, Sir, that argument is very clearly put. The very fact that we are shipping horses into the United States, where, it is estimated, there are 13,000,000 horses, and that we have no other market for our horses, makes it quite evident, to my

mind at any rate, that the Canadian farmer pays the duty on every horse which he sends to the United States. The duty spoken of here is the old tariff rate of 20 per cent.; but the duty now is 30 per cent., or $30 on horses under a value of $100, which would make the duty, in some cases, more than 30 per cent. Now, the number of horses we send to other countries is so small that the United States is practically our only market. In the county which I come from, it is estimated there are 16,000 horses; and it is apparent to people living along the border, who pays the duty, because horses are higher on the United States side, by the amount of the duty, than they are on the Canada side. With this duty removed, our people could add $30 each to the value of their horses, which would mean an increase in the value of the horses in that county alone of nearly $500,000. It is impossible for us to get any other market for our horses. There is no demand in England for the kind of horses we raise, while there is a large demand in the United States, and, if the duty were removed, that demand would increase very rapidly and very largely. Why, Sir, if our farmers had the opportunity to raise horses for the United States, I believe we could drive the American farmers almost out of the market. It is true, some localities in the United States produce almost the same kind of horses that we do; but it is well known that the Canadian horse is more sought after and more highly valued by the American people; and if the duty were removed there would be a very large trade in horses, which at the present time are practically unsaleable. It is to-day almost impossible to sell an ordinary common horse; but give us free trade in horses and it will benefit this country to an enormous extent. Give us free trade in barley, and the farmers of this country will continue the cultivation of a crop which has proved more profitable to them than anything else. In regard to eggs, hon. gentlemen opposite claim that it is possible to ship them to England, and in this debate they have given us some evidence on that subject. But in a very short time the absurdity of attempting to ship eggs to England, at any rate during the hot season, will be demonstrated. In yesterday's paper I find a letter regarding that matter which I will read.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). What paper?

Mr. ALLAN. It is the *Globe*.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I thought so.

Mr. ALLAN. The letter states:

"Very sorry to say the goods arrived in bad condition. The cases are very much broken. The waste will be something enormous, and, as every case wants turning out, it is impossible for me to know the waste before next week. The eggs look apparently fresh and all my customers were very glad to get them. They are not quite so large as those I got from you last winter, but looking bright and fresh they were easily disposed of, but they all have come back. Customers report them musty, but friend Butcher sticks to them and will try and let you out with as little loss as possible. Your eggs have been good stock when you packed them, but they have suffered in transit immensely. In fact all Canadian eggs arriving seem to run all in bad condition. F——'s eggs arrived here last week, also W——'s, in worse condition than yours, and doubt if we can sell them at over 3s. per 120. No use, this hot weather is too much for so long a journey for Canada eggs, and I don't think it will be a success no matter what other dealers say. I give you my honest opinion."

Such is the opinion of a commission house in the old country in regard to the egg trade. People who have any knowledge of the egg trade in the western part of Ontario know that American buyers have been in the habit of sending their teams through the country daily, or at any rate three times a week, to pick up all the eggs they can find in the villages and in the country stores; and these eggs are shipped so that they can be placed upon the tables of the American people and consumed within a few days after they have been laid. That is the market we have hitherto had for our eggs; but to-day, as a result of the McKinley Bill, the price of eggs in the United States is 5 cents or more a dozen higher than it is in Canada. Now, we have shipped 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 dozen of eggs a year to the United States. It is well known that the prices in New York and in other American cities average as high as they do in England; and I hold that it will be simply impossible for us to export eggs to England with any degree of success in the summer time. I venture to say that the men who are now shipping eggs to the old country will find in some cases that there will be an almost total loss of their consignment. I have noticed such cases in the shipment of other perishable articles. For instance, I have known a consignment of apples to be sent to the old country, when charges were actually made against the party shipping them, not enough having been realized to pay for the barrels. In an article like eggs, which should be consumed within a few days after they are laid, it must be evident that our best market is that of the United States, and it is a home market. In reference to the poultry trade, that may be considered a very small matter; but before the McKinley Bill was put in force hucksters could be found on every concession and side line in the County of Essex, daily picking up all the live chickens they could buy. That trade has now almost entirely ceased. You will not see a rig once a week where there used to be scores of rigs passing through that and other counties. Now, this is a matter of some importance, in the poultry trade, the egg trade, the barley trade, the horse trade; and in the matter of wheat, I believe the time is coming when the American market will be an important market for wheat. It is true this last year or two, owing to deficient crops, prices have been perhaps a little higher in Canada than in the United States, but the best commercial writers on the other side say that the American people have reached their maximum of exportation, that they will never again export the quantity of wheat they have exported, and it is estimated by some that in a very few years the Americans will be importers of wheat, Though we have the English markets for our wheat, it very frequently occurs that the price is better in the United States, and those conversant with the trade will understand the importance of having a market they can sell in at all times. The Americans offer us that market. Buyers of wheat along our railways would always be able, if we had access to the United States, to sell futures, when quotations suited, if they did not want to ship, and save a matter of three or four cents in storage. In a very few years the prospects are that the market for wheat in the United States will be a very great advantage to us in Canada. It is altogether very likely that we have reached the last of short supplies of wheat in Canada. The very fact that the Manitoba yield promises to be not less

than 20,000,000 bushels, and that we have some 900,000 acres or something like that under cultivation, shows that, with the increase which must continue in this country, we will have a very large quantity of wheat to export, and you will never see our prices higher than the markets of the world. We in all probability will never see a short supply of wheat in this country, and though we have the English market, if we had the American market as well, very frequently a far better price could be obtained there.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Name a time when it was better in the United States?

Mr. ALLAN. That has occurred very often. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) gave figures showing that New York was considerably higher at one period. This very often happens, apart from supply and demand. The hon. gentleman who, I believe, is in the wheat trade, knows that speculative prices sometimes rule in that country, and that we would benefit by those prices if we had free access to their markets. The hon. gentleman will remember the great corner in Chicago wheat, when, if we had had reciprocity, we would have obtained the full price of the Chicago corner for wheat that was ready for shipment. The same remark applies to New York. Take the quotations for May. Our wheat lying in the elevators at home in the fall, we could sell for May delivery in the American market, which is perfectly legitimate and proper, and free from loss or danger in any way. It would inure to the advantage of the farmers, and the dealers would be in a position to pay the farmers very often several cents more per bushel. The home market for wheat may be of some service in years of scarcity, but as the area in Manitoba increases, and the production must increase, in all probability we shall never see a short supply in this country again, and if we had a free market in the United States there would be a very large demand for seed wheat. I presume we could sell about half of what we would have to spare for seed wheat. With reference to the other products of the farm, there are hay and sheep and many other articles which would seek an outlet in the United States. Take the question of hay. In one case, in the riding of my hon. friend who sits to my right, last year during the election one party in that riding had three hundred tons of hay. The market price at that place was only $3 a ton less than right across the river. On that hay alone this gentleman figured up a loss of over $1,000. He had also been a believer in the National Policy and supported the party of hon. gentlemen opposite; but when he saw how his interests were affected, when he saw that the farmers were deprived of their natural markets—for they are our natural markets—and that he was losing to that extent, he became a supporter of the policy advocated by the Liberal party. In the matter of beans, every one knows that the United States is the market that fixes the price. There has been a duty of 40 cents a bushel imposed upon beans, also a heavy duty on potatoes, barley, hay and other articles under the McKinley Bill, and, on the basis of our shipments in 1889, we would have to pay on these articles $5,820,000, whereas under the old tariff the duty amounted to $2,980,550. Now, the United States is our market for these things, if we get access to their markets. Take the County of Essex. I venture to say that the land there would increase at least 50 per cent. at once if we had the markets of the great cities of Detroit and right along the lakes through Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, Philadelphia and New York, containing a population amounting to something like 8,000,000 or 10,000,000, and which are within a day's access of this country and furnish a home market for everything. With regard to horses, if the bars were taken down between this country and the United States we would have dealers over here every day buying horses, as it is much more convenient for them to go to Ontario and Quebec than it would be to Illinois and other states, and the trade in horses would vastly increase. We would have a good market for barley, which is now imperilled and which we will lose. I maintain that in almost every article of agriculture, perhaps, except Indian corn and pork, the farmer would be benefited; but in the matter of hog products, to which hon. gentlemen opposite often allude, we had protection on dressed hogs before the National Policy was introduced. We also had protection on cheese and on many other articles, and it is not at all due to the National Policy that we have a duty on hogs. With the solitary exception of pork and corn, I say it is impossible to protect the farmers of this country; and in the matter of dressed hogs, if any one will look at the increase which is going on in the production of that article, he will see that in a very short time we will have a surplus and the prices will come down to the level of the markets of the world.

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

After Recess.

Mr. ALLAN. The constituency which I have the honour to represent produces four or five times as many dressed hogs as any other portion of the country. The County of Essex is the great county for the production of dressed hogs. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to go to Washington in October, and to deal with reciprocity in agricultural products only; they propose to give reciprocity in dressed hogs and in corn, and in all other agricultural articles that have been named. So far as the question of unrestricted reciprocity is concerned, the whole County of Essex, if they can secure cheaper markets to buy in, will very willingly relinquish the advantage they have in the duty which is imposed on dressed hogs. The policy of the party opposite, if they have any policy, is to have reciprocity in natural products only, and they have on the Statute-book an offer, which I believe has since been repealed, offering reciprocity in—

"Any of the following articles: that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bean seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, pease and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salt or smoked)."

Now, in dealing with this question, I have found the same difficulty in the county whence I come as is found in this House. During the last contest, the candidate who opposed me stated that the commissioners, when they went to Washington, would negotiate a reciprocity treaty, but would leave out dressed hogs. We have found that,

wherever this question is dealt with, the same inconsistency is apparent. They have one policy for one part of the country and another policy for another part. In Essex they will leave out dressed hogs, in Lambton they will leave out coal oil, in Nova Scotia they will leave out coal, and if you go over the whole country you will be unable to find from any one of their speakers, as you will in this House from any hon. gentleman on the other side, what their policy is. We on this side have a distinct policy, and that is to secure the broadest possible reciprocity treaty with the United States. That can be easily understood, but hon. gentlemen opposite are all things to all men. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) the other day stated that that party had always been consistent. I contend that ever since the inception of the National Policy they have been inconsistent. In 1874, their chief financial spokesman denounced the increase of duties as being an attempt to enter the thin edge of the wedge of protection. In 1876 he was opposed to the increase of duties, and when the National Policy was proposed, it was impossible to know what the policy meant, except that it was a policy of aliases in order to suit every province. In one province it was a readjustment of the tariff, in another province it was an increase in the tariff. If any man had been going around with as many names as the Conservative party had for their policy at that time, which was *alias* National Policy, *alias* protection, *alias* readjustment of the tariff, he would have brought up in the penitentiary; and I contend that to-day, if their speeches mean anything, they mean that they are opposed to any system of reciprocity, and yet we have to look at the spectacle of our High Commissioner going into the presence of Mr. Blaine and trailing the honour of Canada in the dust, we see him going, as I may say, on all fours, before that American statesman. I contend that the people of Canada were humiliated by the spectacle of the High Commissioner going to Washington in that way. When the reasons were given for the dissolution of Parliament, and an appeal was made to the country, the Government were arraigned for uttering a falsehood. It was believed by their opponents that they had no intention of negotiating a treaty, and that Mr. Blaine told the truth when he said that he had not initiated that negotiation, and we had his denial in the letter which was published addressed by him to Mr. Baker. When the 4th March came round and our commissioners went to Washington and had that short interview with Mr. Blaine, what do we find? At the very outset we find the utterances of our High Commissioner as follows:—

"I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote which I have seen, in reference to the invitation of the negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries, that I believe it arose from the negotiations which had recently taken place between the United States and Newfoundland, and that, upon that being communicated to him by Sir Julian Pauncefote, he had expressed his willingness to open negotiations for reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States."

There is a confession that the Government of this country, in appealing to the electorate, uttered falsehoods throughout in order to deceive the electors when they stated that the initiation of the movement for reciprocity was taken by the United States, and we have the further spectacle of the High Commissioner going to Washington to ask for a treaty which they say will be no good, we have him trailing the honour of this country in the dust. He says:

"I then told Mr. Blaine that I wished to remove the idea, if he entertained it, which has been promulgated in Canada and the United States, that the present Government of the Dominion was not warmly in favour of the most friendly relations with the United States. In an article which I had recently sent over my own signature to the *North American Review*, I had undertaken to give conclusive evidence upon that point, and that I need further only refer them to the fact that when Sir John Macdonald, who was one of Her Majesty's Joint High Commissioners, submitted to Parliament for approval the Alabama Treaty, which settled also all the then pending questions between Canada and the United States, he was fiercely denounced by the leaders and press of the Liberal party for having basely sacrificed the interests of Canada in his endeavours to promote friendly relations between Canada and the United States. I added that I had experienced the same treatment from the same party when I submitted, for the approval of Parliament, the Treaty of Washington of 1888. I was then charged by the leader and press of that party with having conceded everything to the United States and obtained nothing in return, so great was my anxiety to remove all causes of dissension between the two countries."

Here I maintain we have the humiliating spectacle of our High Commissioner, who went with the other commissioners of this country to Washington, going into the presence of the Secretary of State of the United States, and confessing that they had uttered falsehoods here in regard to this matter, and acting in the interest of party politics and traducing their opponents in this country. I trust that if ever the party on this side of the House send delegates to Washington or anywhere else, they will comport themselves with more dignity, and that the party opposite will not be ashamed of the steps they will take. Now, I do not think it necessary to go further into the trade question. I have touched upon the effects of the tariff as applied to the farmers of this country; I have pointed out the advantages of getting access to the markets of the United States, the very best of home markets; I have pointed out the enormous trade that has already taken place between these two countries under the high duties that have existed, a trade which, during the 12 years the National Policy has been force, has reached over one thousand millions of dollars. I have not referred to the tariff and its effects upon the lumber interest, that has been dealt with; but I did intend to deal with that, and with the marine interest, the mining interest, and all these other interests, but I feel that I would be trespassing upon the time of the House in taking up these questions. I wish now, Sir, to advert to the loyalty question which has been raised by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), a gentleman who poses as a statesman, and who thinks it the proper thing to throw across the floor the charge of disloyalty against this party. I can very well understand a gentleman taking the position that a certain policy may lead to annexation, but his utterances were that the member for South Oxford knew that his policy would lead to annexation. Now, did the hon. gentleman think what that really implied? Why, Sir, if the hon. member for South Oxford is disloyal, then the gentlemen that sit behind him are also disloyal, and the people who sent us here are disloyal, for they are firm supporters of the policy of reciprocity with the United States. And on what grounds are charges of this kind made? Why, Sir, we have

the opinion of a statesman quite as great as the hon. member for Albert, and I will read a letter that was written on this very question by the Hon. John Bright to the President of the Board of Trade at Detroit, which was read at that great convention in 1865 when Nova Scotia's greatest son so distinguished himself. The great English statesman gives his opinion as to whether the freest possible intercourse between these two countries would be disloyal to the old land, or would necessarily lead to annexation, and I put against the opinion of any hon. gentleman opposite the opinion of that great statesman whose whole unselfish life has been devoted to the strengthening of British interest, and the cause if humanity everywhere. John Bright wrote:

"The project of your convention gives me great pleasure. I hope it will lead to a renewal of commercial intercourse with the British North American provinces, for it will be a miserable thing if because they are in connection with the British Crown, and you acknowledge as your chief magistrate your President at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free as if you were one people under one Government."

Now, that is the utterance of John Bright, a man who devoted at least fifty years of his life to the promotion of British interests, and whose name will go down to posterity as an honoured name. That is the position that we take on this side of the House. We are here to represent Canadian interests, and we do not believe that free trade with the United States would result in annexation. I believe, Sir, that anything that would give prosperity to this country, that will develop our resources, that will keep our young men at home, that will build up our own northern half of this continent, will have the effect rather of preventing annexation. I believe if we can secure unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, any annexation feeling that may exist in this country will entirely disappear. It is stated that we are the annexation party, and charges of that kind have been hurled across the House. The name of Mr. Farrer has been mentioned, a journalist of prominence in this country, whose life has been chiefly devoted to writing editorials on Tory newspapers. This party is not responsible for his articles, although the most of them were written when he was upon the *Mail* and other Tory papers. Now, I state that there is no Reformer in this country, no representative man, against whom the charge of disloyalty would lay; I say there is no leading politician on our side who is entitled to be considered representative in any way, against whom you can bring that charge. But can you say the same thing of the Conservative party? Why, Sir, the fact is that there is a prominent member of the Conservative party who is an avowed annexationist, and who is known to be such, and yet he was returned to the Legislature of Ontario and holds a prominent position in that Legislature, a man who lives in the county which I have the honour to represent—I refer to Mr. Solomon White. That gentleman is an avowed annexationist, and after giving expression to his views, he was elected by the Conservative party to the Local Legislature as one of the leaders of that party, only second in command to Mr. Meredith. I say that this charge of disloyalty can fairly be brought against one member, at least, of the Conservative party; but what a howl would go up if the Reformers of this country were to return an annexationist to Parliament? Why, Sir, we would never hear the last of it. They tried to make us responsible for what Mr. Farrer said, a newspaper writer who is responsible only to himself; but here is a gentleman returned to the Local Legislature who stumped the greater part of the Province of Ontario, four or five years ago, in company with his leader, Mr. Meredith, now the chief of the Conservative party in Ontario—he is an annexationist, and no one on the other side of the House can deny it. This Mr. White, member of the Local Legislature for North Essex, when we had the honour of a visit from the High Commissioner at Windsor, was on the platform with Sir Charles Tupper. He has always taken a prominent position at any Conservative meeting, and is recognized in western Ontario as one of the most prominent Conservatives. I shall prove the charge that I have made against him, because I believe it is a serious charge. I presume a gentleman has a right to advocate annexation to the United States if he wants to do so, but having taken the oath of allegiance as a member of the Legislature, I think it is an improper thing for him to advocate annexation. I have in my hand a fly-sheet, being an advertisement issued in the city of Toledo, announcing a lecture. The fly-sheet reads as follows:—

"ANNEXATION OF CANADA.—An interesting, instructive and thoroughly descriptive reading on the Dominion of Canada, by Captain 'Mac,' with a lively and entertaining lecture by the Hon. Sol. White, ex-M.P., the gifted, eloquent and able native American orator, ex-member of the Canadian Parliament, who has had the courage of his convictions, and become publicly outspoken on this absorbing and 'future great' question. A committee of prominent citizens will occupy the platform. At Memorial Hall, Sunday, March 14, at 8 p.m. Doors open at 7 p.m. Admission, 25 cents. A few reserved seats at 50 cents."

There is the advertisement. This gentleman formerly held a seat in this House, and now has a seat in the Local Legislature, and he, a prominent Conservative, went to a neighbouring city and advocated annexation to the United States. I propose to read newspaper comments on that lecture. Among them are the following:—

"ANNEXATION OF CANADA.

"HON. SOL. WHITE AND CAPT. MAC AT MEMORIAL HALL.

"There was but a slim attendance at Memorial Hall last night, to hear what was advertised as a lecture upon the annexation of Canada, by the Hon. Sol. White, ex-member of the Canadian Parliament. It would have been more appropriate to have announced it as readings of the history of Canada from the time of settlement by the Jesuit Fathers, by Captain Mac. The captain's discourse, or rather readings, occupied more than one hour, without one word about annexation, unless the terms are such as to annex the States to them, rather than Canada to the States.

"When Mr. White came forward he said that he did not intend to deliver a lecture, but simply to have a short conversation with his hearers. He spoke of political union as a panacea for the ills which at present exist and which interfere with the friendly relations existing between the two countries. He paid a tribute to the admirable manner in which the laws were administered in Canada, which he averred were in many respects superior to their administration in the United States, but it is evident that a political change must take place some time, and whether or not this may be deemed a fitting time for its discussion, he thought that the best change possible will be political union with this country.

"He was glad that leading statesmen in the United States, like Senator Sherman, were discussing the subject, for it would tend to bring the people of both countries more together, and so cultivate a more friendly feeling. Mr. White spoke of the reciprocity treaty which he believed was ended by the United States Government in a spirit of pique, because it was thought that the Canadians favoured the south in the war of the rebellion. He denied that such was the case, for while there were a few sympa-

thisers, the majority was favourable to the north. Then the Government of the United States adopted a tariff which discriminated against Canada, and which the latter had for fifteen years endeavoured to get mitigated, and struggled along with a law against a high tariff, until in self defence it had to enact a retaliatory measure. At the present time Canada is entirely free from any dictation by England, and Canadians are contented. They pay no taxes to the English Government, and although the lieutenant-governor is appointed and receives his salary from the revenue, it is the only item of expense, and he is but a mere figurehead. No administration can exist in Canada without the consent of a majority of the representatives, and herein the power of the people is more manifest then in this country.

"It will, he said, be a glorious consummation if the union of Canada and the United States can be harmoniously accomplished, and so as to leave no sting; neither does he think that England would oppose such union, for she has given to her colonies perfect freedom. There need be no change in the laws, for they are similar in both countries, and both are derived from the common law of England. Canada he maintained is at this time one of the best customers of the United States, for her purchases are greater than from England; but so long as she remains a dependence of a European power, she cannot avail herself of the tide of European emigration, whose prejudices are unfavourable to settle in a country under European domination.

"Mr. White is a good speaker, his address easy and manner captivating. Toledo *Commercial*.—March 15, 1889."

"ANNEXATION OF CANADA.

"Capt. McAdam is busy making preparation for the lecture of the Hon. Sol. White, to be given at Memorial Hall next Thurday. The subject, 'Annexation of Canada,' is growing in interest, and will continue to grow, until the question is solved. The ball which the Hon. Ben. Butterworth sat in motion, has increased prodigiously, and with our Canadian neighbours, has cast all other political issues into the shade. With Americans the question is somewhat mixed, and those who would study it understandingly, should attend the lecture on Thursday evening. The captain is going to make it interesting by providing a band of music which will discourse national and patriotic airs.—Toledo *Blade*, 11th March, 1889."

"CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

"The Hon. Sol. White, ex-M. P. P., will deliver his lecture upon the 'Annexation of Canada' at the Memorial Hall this evening, prior to which Captain 'Mac' will speak on the 'Dominion' and present some interesting items of his experience. Several prominent citizens will be on the platform.—Toledo *Bee*, 14th March, 1889.

"Hon. Sol. White, of Windsor, is at the Hamilton.—*Blade*, 15th March, 1889."

"CANADIAN ANNEXATION.

"Next Thursday evening Sol. White, of Windsor, Canada, ex-M.P., will lecture at Memorial Hall on Canadian annexation.—Toledo *Blade*."

"ANNEXATION OF CANADA.

"HON. SOL. WHITE AND CAPTAIN MAC SPEAK AT MEMORIAL HALL.

"A very small audience at Memorial Hall, last night, listened to a reading from Capt. Mac, and a speech by Hon. Sol. White.

"Capt. Mac's reading was of an historical nature, and it was hard to understand what bearing the matter had on the question.

"Hon. Sol. White is an easy and interesting talker. All arguments being considered he thought the times pointed to a speedy union of the two countries. Their common parentage, their similarity of laws, their manner of living, no less than the principles upon which the two governments are built, freedom and equality, point to a union as the ultimate result.—Toledo *Bee*, 15th March, 1889."

Here are tickets of admission to the lecture on annexation by a Conservative member of Parliament. The ticket reads:

"Annexation of Canada. Entertaining and instructive lecture by Hon. Sol. White, ex-M.P. Admit one. Memorial Hall, March 14, 1889."

This is the gentleman who when the High Commissioner visited Windsor, was the chief man on the platform, and as the High Commissioner was hoarse the Hon. Sol. White, as he is called, took a very prominent part in the meeting. A very laughable incident occurred. It seems the High Commissioner was about to attack the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Mr. Farrer, and Mr. Sol. White, the annexationist, was put up to read the article, and this was enjoyed immensely by the vast audience present. You now have the evidence that a prominent Conservative only two years ago advocated annexation to the United States and has since been returned by the Conservative party to Parliament. I have here Detroit papers which contain speeches delivered by Mr. Sol. White. The Detroit *Journal* reports Mr. White as saying,

"England could do nothing to increase Canada's prosperity, and the only course to that end lay through annexation. He looked forward to the day when there would be one grand country on this continent."

The Detroit *Sun* reports Mr. Sol. White as follows:

"A revolution in politics is expected to occur within a short time in Canada as a large majority of its people favour unrestricted commercial trade with this country. Mr. White put the finishing touches on his speech by saying 'We should unite upon fair terms and become one grand country on this continent.'"

I have here affidavits from a number of reporters of the press and a number of people at Windsor who have heard Mr. White advocating annexation, so that it is utterly useless for him or any one else to deny that he is an annexationist. Here are some of these affidavits:

"STATUTORY DECLARATION, REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA, 1886.

"DOMINION OF CANADA, County of Essex. } IN THE MATTER OF

"I, AURÈLE PACAUD, of the town of Windsor, in the County of Essex, newspaper publisher,

"Do solemnly declare: that at a meeting in the Opera House, in the Town of Windsor, during the mayoralty campaign of 1890, I heard Solomon White, M. P. P. for North Riding of the County of Essex, in answer to a question asked by a person as to his views on political union, in the audience say: 'I am in favour of political union.'

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

"Declared before me at the Town of Windsor, in the County of Essex, this 18th day of April, A. D. 1891. } (Sd.) "AURÈLE PACAUD.

(Sd.) "H. COWAN.
"A Commissioner, &c."

"DOMINION OF CANADA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, County of Essex. } To Wit:

"I, DEXTER VAN ZANDT, of the Town of Windsor, in the County of Essex, reporter for the *Evening Record*, do solemnly declare that Sol. White, M.P.P. for the North Riding of the County of Essex, did on the 6th day of March in my presence and in the presence of one Perkins, reporter for the *Evening News*, while speaking of the result of the Dominion elections, use the following words:

"'The result is not astonishing to me, but I am more than ever convinced that the next issue to come before the Canadian people will be political union with the United States. I will begin work to-day with that object in view.'

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

(Sd.) "DEXTER VAN ZANDT.

"Declared before me at the Town of Windsor, in the County of Essex, this 18th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1891. }
(Sd.) "N. A. BARTLETT,
"A Commissioner, &c."

"STATUTORY DECLARATION, REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA, 1886.

"DOMINION OF CANADA, } In the matter of the alleged
COUNTY OF ESSEX. } loyalty of Solomon White, M.
P.P., for North Essex.

"I, EDWARD R. KRANICK, of the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, Canadian reporter of the Detroit *Journal*:

"Do solemnly declare that during the recent political campaign in the town of Windsor, I asked Solomon White, M.P.P., for the North Riding of the County of Essex, if he was not in favour of closer relations with the United States. He replied: 'Yes, I have always been in favour of political union.'

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting extra judicial oaths.

"Declared before me at Windsor, in the County of Essex, this 26th day of April, A.D. 1891. (Sd.) H. COWAN. } Sd.)) "ED. R. KRANICK."

It is well known in our part of the country that Mr. Sol. White advocates annexation. What I hold is this, that the party which is so loyal, that the party which is constantly talking and preaching loyalty and throwing insinuations across the House that the members on this side are not loyal, has returned to Parliament as a representative of the people a man who is an avowed annexationist. There is a man returned in a representative capacity, while, as regards Mr. Farrer and others, the Liberal party cannot be held responsible for their utterances, any more than the Conservatives could be held responsible when he wrote articles when on the *Mail*, and especially so, seeing that Mr. Farrer, during nearly the whole of his life, has been a prominent editorial writer on Conservative newspapers in this country. This charge of disloyalty is not a patriotic charge, and hon. gentlemen, if they were the patriots they pretend to be, would not be continually hurling this charge across the floor of this House. I will give the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) an opinion of the present loyal Government, not written or found in the Liberal press of this country, but in an independent Conservative journal. The Toronto *Telegram* says, in reference to these very points:

"Honesty and purity are the watchwords of true patriotism. A Ministry cursed by members whose lives are unclean, whose pockets are filled with the country's money, cannot match our ideal. The old flag never floats over a pirate ship, and genuine patriotism is not the business sign of a robber's cave."

These are the utterances to be found to-day in the independent Conservative press of this country, and in view of these facts, and in view of the record of the present Government in general, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the least hon. gentlemen opposite say upon the question of loyalty the better. These gentlemen very often read in this House extracts from the American papers, to give their opinion that a portion of the Canadian people are disloyal. Why, Sir, it would be almost impossible to think that the Americans could have any other opinion, in view of the fact that these gentlemen opposite are themselves continuously stating that the party on this side of the House is a disloyal party. If the Americans did not believe it, why it would be tantamount to saying that the gentlemen on the other side of the House are uttering falsehoods, because the whole burthen of their song, and I have heard it on a hundred platforms and from almost every speaker that has risen on the other side of the House, is, that they are a loyal party, and that the party on this side of the House are a disloyal party, and then they quote extracts from the American press which are the result of the very charges they have made themselves. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up any further time. I have spoken on this question at a much greater length than I expected to, and I thank the House for the very kind manner in which they have listened, to this, which I may call my first speech in this Parliament, for although I have spoken on motions, this is really the first speech I have made to the House, and I thank hon. gentlemen for the very kind attention and consideration which they always extend to young members.

Mr. SPOHN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this late hour, and at this late stage of the debate, to occupy very much time in the remarks I have to make to this House. The questions before this House have been discussed from various standpoints, and in almost every conceivable light, but there is a great industry in this country which has not received the attention during this debate that its importance demands. We have listened to speeches on behalf of the different combines and combinations which have representatives and advocates in this House, and I propose, for a few moments, to compare the industry I speak of with some of these combines, and to try, if possible, to correct the fallacies that their special pleaders intended to produce. After the agricultural industry of the country, this industry to which I refer is the most important we have. It employs more men and has more capital invested in it, and consequently tends more to promote the prosperity of this country than any other. Its operations also tend to enhance the value and to give a market to a farming produce, but there is a critical period in the history of this industry, and at the present time it is giving the Government a good deal of trouble, and about which they are very much concerned. I refer, Sir, to the lumber industry of this country, and the effect which the lumber industry has on the country at large. It is an historical fact that the Government of this country, in its anxiety to look after the interests of the Red Parlour, put on a hostile tariff for the protection of the combinesters of the Red Parlour, which was detrimental to the agricultural and other industries of this country. As a result of this, the United States Government retaliated and brought forth the McKinley Bill, and realizing the two great industries of the country which could be most easily reached and injured, this Bill was practically framed to strike a blow at the lumbering and agricultural industries of Canada. Now, I do not propose to discuss the effects of the McKinley Bill on the agricultural industries of this Dominion. That subject has been ably treated by the member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) and others who are so well capable of discussing it from the farmers' standpoint, and I propose to discuss simply the lumbering interests of the country, and these interests as affected by the McKinley Bill in its operations. Before doing so, I propose to quote from the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He sees trouble ahead for the Government, and he has appealed to the Government for relief. His remarks go to show that the northern part of our country is being depopulated, because of the policy of the

Government in reference to the lumbering interests. The hon. gentleman said :

"It will be in the recollection of the House that, shortly after the passage of the McKinley Bill, when the American import duty on lumber was reduced, the Government evidently after a good deal of hesitation, decided to abolish the export duty on saw-logs. I want to call the attention of the House to the very unsatisfactory condition in which our lumber trade is placed under the present conditions, and I do that in the hope that, when the Government consider this matter with the United States Government, they may be able to place this on a more satisfactory footing. I refer to this as a matter which affects a very important element in our future national interests. The Government of this country, as I have said, after a good deal of hesitation, decided, in deference to the wishes of the lumber trade, to abolish the export duty on saw-logs. That has brought us into this condition, that at the present moment there is going on from a large part of the timber country of the Dominion, and especially in the Province of Ontario, and especially from that portion of the province which I represent and in which I feel the most interest, a two-fold diminution of our timber property. In the first place we have a very large quantity of the raw material being exported to the other side, there to be manufactured into lumber. This has already grown to such proportions that I am assured upon excellent authority that during the next season the export of saw-logs will amount to a quantity variously estimated at from 80,000,000 to 140,000,000 feet. That means a very large diminution in the employment of labour and capital upon our side of the line, and it means a corresponding benefit to the saw-mill owners upon Lake Michigan and elsewhere on the American coast. * * * I admit that the subject is a very difficult one. It would be exceedingly injurious to the present owners of saw-mills to at once reimpose the export duty, because that would subject them to a duty of $3 a thousand feet upon their produce going to the other side, whereas at present I am told by lumbermen who are largely engaged in the trade that the reduction of the duty has enabled them to dispose of a large quantity of inferior lumber which was previously unsaleable in the American market. * * * * There is the small town of Midland in the riding represented by my hon. friend from East Simcoe, and the trade there is paralyzed. Three or four saw-mills are shut up in consequence of this export. In Parry Sound, the saw-mill is shut up because an American firm has purchased the mill and all the limits, and, undoubtedly, if any of the lumber is cut at all, it will be cut in quantities not worth exporting, but the whole of that stuff, hundreds of millions of feet will be sent across the line and will be lost to us. The same thing is true in regard to various portions of the Georgian Bay, and will apply to all the waters running into the Georgian Bay and extending to the headwaters of the Ottawa, so that the result will be more serious even than I have mentioned. I hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration. Everyone will admit that the difficulties are great, but it is the business of the Government to meet difficulties. That is what they are there for, and I trust they will find some means of meeting this difficulty in such a way that if we are compelled to dispose of our lumber, it will be disposed of to the best interests of the people of this country, and that we will not be reduced to the condition of mere exporters of the raw material when we should use it ourselves to the best advantage."

I am glad to see, Sir, that the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) recognizes the extent of this trouble, and if we take his own figures into consideration, we will find that in the matter of labour alone, the Georgian Bay district will lose over $250,000 by this exportation of logs. The State of Michigan gets the benefit of this, and the money that should be spent in manufacturing the lumber in Canada is spent in the United States. The lumbermen, with their families, are obliged to follow the logs, and the result is that we lose our population. The member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) turns to the Government and asks for relief ; but, Sir, the Government can grant no relief ; there is no relief in their policy ; the only relief is in the policy of the Opposition, the only relief is in reciprocity with the United States. I said that the object of the McKinley Bill was to strike a blow at the two most

vulnerable points in the trade of Canada ; and how well it has succeeded the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has set forth in part. Now, the McKinley Bill put a duty on lumber of $3 per thousand ; and what was the immediate result of that ? The immediate result was to bring the members of the Government to their knees. The Government cried *peccavi*. The Government asked for pardon and forgiveness of its sins, and took off the export duty on logs. But here the trouble just commences. The effect of taking off the export duty on logs was that many of the saw-mills on the Georgian Bay were closed up ; and the lumber that used to be exported to the United States is now being sent there in the log. The northern part of Ontario, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is forced to admit, is becoming depopulated, and the money that should be legitimately spent in manufacturing saw-logs at the different ports of the Georgian Bay, is spent in Michigan. Now, the hon. member for Muskoka—I am sorry he is not in his place to-night—became alarmed, and properly so, because he saw what was going to happen, and he called on the Government for relief. But, as I said before, they could afford no relief ; they are between the devil and the deep sea. If the $1 a thousand duty on lumber continues, many of the mills on the Georgian Bay district will remain closed ; and if the Government reimpose the duty on logs, we will have to pay $3 a thousand duty on lumber, and the saw-mills on the Georgian Bay that are still running, as well as those in the Ottawa Valley, will be closed ; the lumber interest of this country will be paralyzed and ruined ; and before I get through, and show you the extent of the lumber interest of this country, you will be able to realize the harm that will be accomplished. Now, there is nothing left but reciprocity. There is no other ray of hope, Why, my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) the other day fancied that he saw a little cloud rising in the east no larger than a man's hand, and this cloud was to be a panacea for all the ills that have overtaken our misgoverned country. But the hon. gentleman was mistaken. That cloud is fast disappearing. It could not withstand the penetrating rays of the sun of reason, and is dissolving into thin air ; and all that remains is its image as a pleasant fancy in the minds of some few dreamers. But, Sir, my hon. friend from Albert did not go back far enough in his search for scriptural knowledge. Had he gone back far enough he would have found another cloud. There is another cloud hovering about us which the rays of light and reason only tend to brighten ; and as it hovers and brightens it is hailed with delight by the people of this country and the members on this side of the House. But, like that other cloud of other days, it is a cloud of darkness and dismay to the Egyptians ; but, Sir, that bright cloud of reciprocity, although viewed with dread and consternation by hon. gentlemen opposite, will reach the zenith of its glory as sure as to-morrow's rising sun shall reach his in our natural heavens. Now, Sir, I said that we have in this House the representatives of the different combines in the country ; and that those representatives have made their influence felt with the Government is quite evident. First, we have the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) who so ably represents the whiskey interests of this country. Now, that hon. gentleman is horrified when the proposition is made that the farmers

should have their corn free of duty to fatten their cattle and hogs; but in his long and tedious speech he forgot to tell us that he has free corn to make whiskey for exportation. And when we remind the hon. gentlemen opposite that the farming interests of this country are declining, when we show them that the value of farm land is declining day by day, they tell us that we do not understand farming properly, and that we must change our mode of farming—that we must raise stock for exportation. But, Sir, if we are compelled by the policy of the Government to raise stock for exportation, why have we not as much right to have free corn to fatten our cattle and hogs as the whiskey rings of this country to have free corn to make whiskey for exportation? And although the whiskey millionaires in this country and their representatives in this House have so much influence with the Government, what have they done for the country, and how much labour do they employ? Well, Sir, I propose to show, and in my calculations I will take the figures of the census of 1881, because we have no later reliable figures, although we are told that we shall have the report next week. The distillers of the Dominion employ 285 men, and they pay in wages $116,000 a year, while the saw-mills of this country employ 44.474 hands and pay in wages $8,357,000 a year. Why, the brewers employ more men and pay more wages than the distillers; they employ 1,411 men and pay yearly wages to the amount of $567,000. Still, the the Government in their wisdom increased the duty on malt 100 per cent. and the duty on whiskey but 20 per cent. Well, Sir, next to this important whiskey representative, we have the gentleman who represents the binder twine combination, or, in other words, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). Now, he gets indignant to think the farmers should require binding twine free, and he even goes so far as to argue that it is in the interest of the farmers that the combination should be allowed to tax them for their benefit. Of course, he has great influence with the Government, and he shows his influence, because at his dictation the Government have refused to take off this duty on binder twine. It is all right from his point of view that the Government should tax the farmers a quarter of a million dollars a year to make a little fortune for him, and to enable him to contribute his quota to the Red Parlour; but in his speech he forgot to tell us all. To show you the hollowness of his argument and the insincerity of his statements, he forgot to tell us that when a binder twine factory was started in Toronto—that refused to join the binder twine combine—that could make a binder twine for 9 cents a pound, the combination with which he is connected took out an injunction against the Toronto company to hamper them, and at the present time there is a law suit pending to prevent the Toronto company manufacturing binder twine so as to relieve the farmers of the country to some extent. Then, after the binder twine monopoly, we have our smooth and oily friend from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff). He proposes that he should be allowed to tax this country to the tune of $935,000 a year, and for what? For the privilege of allowing us to buy our coal oil from the coal oil combination; and his particularly profitable industry employs only 490 men and pays only $190,000 a year in wages. And, Sir, last but not least, we have that sweet-tongued son of Nova Scotia, who represents the great sugar combination of this country as well as the City of Halifax (Mr. Kenny). That industry employs 723 men and in return taxes the Dominion $2,000,000 a year, and contributes its quota to the Red Parlour. Well, Sir, it strikes me as being very suspicious that the hon. member for this great sugar combine and the hon. member for the binder twine combine should both come from the same riding. It almost leads one to conclude that they have a sort of little local Red Parlour down there of their own. I do not propose to take up any more time with reference to the combines; but I propose now to speak purely of the lumber interest. Of course, that interest has, in the course of the last ten years, greatly increased, as the lumbermen employ better machinery they can consequently turn out more lumber. However, in 1880, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the export amounted to $16,530,000, and in 1890 it amounted to $26,071,000. Taking that same ratio, we find that the lumber trade in 1891 will put out something like $50,000,000 worth of lumber and be worth over $600,000,000. In 1881 the mills used up, according to the census returns, in raw material, $21,134,000 worth, and the output was $39,326,000 worth, and they paid in yearly wages $8,347,000, and the total value of the lumber trade was in 1881, $471,912,000. Now, I have a table here which I will not take up the time of the House in reading, but will merely hand into *Hansard* with the permission of this House:

	Hands employed.	Raw material.	Yearly value output.	Yearly wages.
		$	$	$
Brewers.....	1,411	2,282,000	4,768,000	567,000
Distillers.....	285	1,092,000	1,790,000	116,000
Oil refiners.....	490	2,241,000	4,049,000	190,000
Sugar refiners...	723	6,100,000	6,800,000	363,000
Foundries and metal working	7,789	3,581,000	8,773,000	2,724,000
Sash, door and blind.....	2,878	2,692,000	4,872,000	997,000
Saw-mills.....	44,674	21,134,000	39,326,000	8,356,000

These figures I have given do not include the number of men employed in the woods nor the great number of men employed in the manufacture of square timber, rafting and so forth, but they give some idea of the great magnitude of this industry; and instead of the people being taxed to keep up this industry, as they are in the case of the binding twine, sugar, oil and whiskey combines, it is a blessing to the country, gives employment to thousands of families, makes money more pletiful, and would do much more for us if we were not hampered by the miserable retrograde policy of a Rip Van Winkle Government. The lumber interest employs 61 times as many hands as all the sugar refineries, 156 times as many as all the distilleries, 234 times as many as oil refineries, and the binder twine combine is simply nowhere. These combines are supported by the people's taxes, and the same policy which fosters them compels the lumber interests of this country to pay taxes to the United States. I will show you, Sir, what this wise policy of our Government with reference to the lumber trade is doing for the country, and what it will continue to do, and I will conclude by showing you what can be done and will be done when we pass under the guidance of an honest and competent government, when we will have a government directed by a leader who has not

touched the unclean thing, whom all respect, his party adore, who stands out in bold relief, in spotless purity, both in private life and as a public man, and who in these dark days of political immorality, remains a grand example of "the noblest work of God, an honest man." In the County of Simcoe we do a large lumber trade. There are 150 saw-mills in the three ridings of Simcoe. One firm cuts 75,000,000 feet a year, another 18,000,000 feet per year and another 17,000,000 feet per year, and so on. In the town of Midland, not such a small town as you might infer it to be from the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), but an important town, the terminus of the Midland system of the Grand Trunk Railway, a town with one of the finest harbours on the inland waters, a town which has extensive docks and lumber mills and rolling mill—in fact a town which is destined to become the shipping port for the grain from the North-West, unless the policy of this Government destroys it—well, of the many saw-mills in Midland there is but one running to-day. All the others are closed. One of the mills which had been closed up started a few weeks ago to cut a few logs left over after the fire at Sturgeon Bay. Now, Sir, one of these mills which is closed, cut last year nearly 18,000,000 feet of lumber, and employed, in its different departments, 380 hands.

Mr. SPROULE. Why were they closed up ?

Mr. SPOHN. Simply because this Government, in refusing to have reciprocity, allow a duty of $1 a thousand feet to remain on lumber exported to the United States, and have taken off the dollar duty per thousand on the logs exported, so that the owners make more money by taking the logs to the United States instead of cutting them here.

Mr. SPROULE. That is correct. The Government were wrong in taking the export duty off logs.

Mr. SPOHN. By the time I am through I hope my hon. friend, if he is open to conviction, will be turned from the evil tenor of his ways. Well, that mill has been shut down, and the logs, which would otherwise have been cut in Midland, are now cut in Michigan, and these 380 hands and their families have been compelled to follow the logs, thus depriving Canada of many good citizens, and the town of Midland is thus becoming depopulated and is losing the advantage it would gain by the expenditure of this large sum of money, were the logs cut there as they should be. But this is not an isolated case. The hon. member for Muskoka says the town of Parry Sound is in exactly the same condition. This dollar of duty on lumber induced the mill-owners to take their logs into the United States and manufacture them there; and I want to remind the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the men who are taking these logs to Michigan to-day used not to have their logs cut by the thousand in Midland but owned one of the finest mills in this country, in Midland, and rather than cut their logs there they have taken them to Michigan simply because they can make money by so doing. But the trouble does not stop here. Midland, at one time, did a large grain trade with Chicago, but to-day vessels cannot carry grain to Midland as they are unable to get any return cargoes, while at present grain is being carried from Duluth and Chicago to Buffalo for 1¼ cents a bushel, for the simple reason that return cargoes can be had of coal; and notwithstanding the fact that Midland has one of the finest harbours in the world, a harbour in which the *Great Eastern* could sail with safety, and notwithstanding her extensive docks, she never will advance and never will amount to anything as long as the present Government is in power. But if we had reciprocity with the United States and the duty of $1 a thousand taken off lumber, which must follow as a matter of course, these logs which are being towed to Michigan and cut up for the benefit of the people of Michigan would again be cut up in Midland and there would be no logs sent to Michigan from the Georgian Bay. Thus you see that reciprocity is not only good for the farmer but for the lumber trade and for every other trade of importance in this country. If we had reciprocity with the United States, our lumber, instead of being shipped in the rough would be planed here, and the lower grades of lumber would be manufactured here. Then vessels could bring grain to Midland and get a return cargo, so that they could afford to bring grain from Chicago and Duluth to Midland for one-half the rate for which they carry it to Buffalo. The result would be a great expenditure of money in this country, and the whole country would feel the benefit of the capital and labour which would be thus expended. What affects Midland affects all the lumbering towns and cities in Ontario. For instance, the town of Gravenhurst should be the manufacturing centre for the Muskoka Lakes, but this affects that town as it does every other town and city in Canada. I have been speaking of the effect of the McKinley Bill on the lumber trade as it affects us on the Georgian Bay, but now I propose to come nearer home to some of you. Some people think that, because the logs cannot be towed from the Ottawa valley, this does not affect the Ottawa valley, but I will show you that it does affect the lumber trade of the Ottawa valley as it affects the trade of the Georgian Bay. I am informed that you had a box factory in Ottawa which was run by E. H. Barnes & Co. and employed 150 hands, but when the United States put a 35 per cent. duty on boxes, that box factory shut down; but that is not the whole history of your box factory, E. H. Barnes & Co. took the machinery out of the Ottawa box factory and carried it to Rouse's Point on the other side of the line, and they are there now manufacturing boxes for the American market, and the people of Ottawa lost the factory and the 150 hands and their families, and the United States gained. Thus you see the result of the policy of this loyal Government at your own doors. Further, E. B. Eddy had a box factory, but, like E. H. Barnes & Co., it was compelled to shut down. Having given these examples to show the state of things in the east and in the west of the province, I have no doubt that the same state of things exists more or less over the whole country. Still further, the effects of reciprocity would be more beneficial to the country because there would be a great variety of wood manufactures started at once. In the west, a planing mill is considered a necessary adjunct to every saw-mill. They do not ship their lumber in the rough from the saw-mills in Michigan, as we do here, but the lumber is planed and then shipped to all parts of the United States. Our lumber could be planed in the same way and manufactured, and this would give employment to a great number of men. We know that it does not pay to ship the lower grades of lumber to the United States, because the duty is the same on all grades.

Whether we have lumber worth $25 a thousand or only worth $7 a thousand, the same duty of $1 has to be paid, so it hardly pays to ship the lower grades of lumber to the United States. We could manufacture the lower grades of lumber here. Everyone who knows anything about the lumber trade is aware that there is an immense market in the Eastern States for the Ottawa valley lumber, and a larger market in the Western and Central States for the lumber manufactured on the Georgian Bay. Why is not a great portion of that planed and manufactured here? Why do we not manufacture the lower grades of lumber here? Simply because this glorious, old, antediluvian National Policy, which hon. gentlemen opposite swear by, prevents it. Our people are leaving us, our country is becoming dead and dormant, simply because we are cursed with a moribund Government, but once give us a live and honest Government, that will look after the interests of the country instead of the interests of Uncle Thomas—and themselves—then we will have prosperity in the land and all will be happy. See what is taking place at your own doors in addition to what I have told you. Some of your largest lumbermen own or have interests in planing mills in the United States, simply because if they planed their lumber in Canada they would be compelled to pay $2 per thousand duty upon it. James McLaren, J. R. Booth, Bronson & Weston and John Charlton, all own or are part owners of planing mills in the United States. Would it not be better for you if they were to take advantage of the facilities with which the Almighty has blessed you at your own doors, a water power which costs little or nothing; would it not be better, particularly for the city of Ottawa, if all this lumber, instead of being shipped away in the rough, could be planed here? It is almost impossible to estimate the benefit it would be to the city of Ottawa, and yet we have the members for Ottawa supporting the Government. Now, Sir, I want to make this matter so plain that all, whether they want to understand it or not, must understand it. I want to go so far even as to make the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) understand it, so I will therefore trouble you with a few figures in reference to the planing and manufacture of lumber, to show how much could be saved to the country, in hopes that the hon. member for East Grey will see the advantage of it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He is the leader of the Government now.

Mr. SPOHN. If he is the leader of the Government, and we succeed in convincing him, we will convince the whole Government. Lumber is cut 1 inch, $\frac{1}{16}$ and $\frac{1}{32}$ of an inch in thickness. When green, it weighs about 4,000 lbs. per 1,000 feet, partly dry from 3,000 to 3,500 lbs., and dry 2,500 lbs. per 1,000 feet. An average carload weighs 30,000 lbs., so that a car can carry 8,000 feet green, 10,000 feet partly dry and 12,000 feet of dry lumber. Lumber is generally shipped partly dry, that is, from two to four months after being cut. The freight varies with the distance and the lumber is graded differently in different localities. For the calculations I am going to make I intend to take the grading on the Georgian Bay, and also the freight from the Georgian Bay to Buffalo. At the present time, rough or unplaned lumber has to pay a duty of $1 a thousand, and planed lumber $2 a thousand, and planed tongued and grooved $2.50 a thousand, and lumber manufactured or partly manufactured 35 per cent. Thus the duty on planed and manufactured lumber virtually prohibits its exportation. To be properly planed the lumber must be dry, so that a car that carries 10,000 feet partly dry, as it is generally shipped, could carry 15,000 feet dry and planed, because we not only gain by reduced weight but by reduced thickness also. Lumber is planed on both sides to $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch thick for the Eastern trade. Lumber in the rough is $\frac{13}{16}$ of an inch in thickness, while after being planed it is only $\frac{25}{32}$ of an inch, thus losing $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch in thickness, and consequently $\frac{1}{8}$ in weight. So, you will see that a car that can carry 10,000 feet partly dry will carry 15,000 feet planed and dried. The freight to Buffalo is $33 a car, so that if we had reciprocity with the United States the lumbermen would save from $7 to $8 a car in freight alone, besides the duty of from $2 to $2.50 a thousand, which is a saving on the average of at least from $32 to $35 on every car we ship over and above the present profit, whatever that may be. Now, you can imagine what this would do for the city of Ottawa. Just fancy the lumbermen being able to save $32 to $35 on every car they ship over and above what they save to-day. They could afford to give better wages, to employ more hands. It is not necessary for me to tell you that not only Ottawa, but every town and every place in the Dominion of Canada where lumber is manufactured, would flourish. Now, part of the lumber that is shipped from Georgian Bay is shipped to Buffalo and Tonawanda. The latter town has been built up by the lumber trade; in fact, Tonawanda has been called the city of planing mills. A large portion of the Georgian Bay lumber is shipped there in the rough, and is planed and reshipped to different parts of the United States. I was in Tonawanda not a great while ago, and while there the proprietor of a planing mill told me that he could plane lumber and ship it to Kansas and sell it cheaper than he could sell the same quality of lumber in the rough, simply on account of the extra freight on the rough lumber. In Tonawanda they employ 5,000 hands in planing and handling lumber. Just fancy the boom that would take place in our Canadian towns if these hands with their families could be distributed among them in working up this lumber. Of course, you know Ottawa lumber does not go to Tonawanda, but is shipped in a different direction; but the Georgian Bay lumber goes, a portion of it, to Tonawanda, and if the towns and lumber districts of the west that shipped this lumber to Tonawanda could have the advantage of the residence among them of 5,000 hands, with their families, you can imagine what prosperity that would bring. There are thousands of dollars paid yearly on Canadian lumber, in duty, in the town of Tonawanda. It is not necessary for me to discuss the question of who pays the duty on lumber, because we all know that the lumbermen of this country pay the duty on every foot of lumber they send to the United States. Now, in speaking of reciprocity with Canada, this proprietor of a planing mill in Tonawanda told me that if they had reciprocity between Canada and the United States he would be compelled to move his planing mills from Tonawanda to the lumber districts of Canada within two years, because the extra freight

on sawdust and shavings would be to him a little fortune. I am sure you are all satisfied that had we reciprocity with the United States Mr. Booth, Mr. McLaren, Mr. Bronson and Mr. Charlton, who own planing mills in the United States, or are interested in these manufactures in the United States, would move their planing mills here, where they could be under their own supervision, and consequently we would be benefited to the extent of the labour and capital employed. Now, I propose to give you just one or two examples before I close. I will try to be brief, because I know there are a number of gentlemen who wish to speak after me, and I do not want to take up more time than is absolutely necessary. Every lumberman knows that it does not pay to ship the lower grades of lumber to the United States. These low grades of lumber could just as well be manufactured here as in the United States if we had not to pay this prohibitory duty. Although the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) laughs at the idea of our sending lumber to the United States, I can assure that hon. gentleman that for certain grades of lumber we have no other market. Now, shipping culls, Georgian Bay grade, are worth $7 a thousand at the mill; 1,000 shipping culls cut up and planed would make at least 500 feet of wainscotting; it would make a little more than 500 feet, but I wish to be on the safe side, and I will say 500 feet, although, as a matter of fact, it makes some 600 feet. Wainscotting is worth in Buffalo $40 a thousand. The labour for making wainscotting costs $1 a thousand. It takes 24,000 feet of culls to make 12,000 feet of wainscotting, worth at the mill $168; cost of making, $12. Now, the freight to Buffalo is $33, the total amounts to $213; 12,000 feet of wainscotting at Buffalo, at $40 a thousand, would be worth $480, so there would be a return for the shipper over the price of lumber and labour of $267 a car. Now, then, take the article of doors. The ordinary four-panel stock doors are made out of what we call cut-ups and better, worth at the mill $22. These doors are worth here $1.50 wholesale, they are worth in Buffalo $2.20 each; 1,000 feet of cut-ups and better will make thirty-six four-panel stock doors; 12,000 feet will make 432 doors, or a carload; 432 doors in Canada at $1.50 each would be worth $648; 432 doors in Buffalo at $2.20 each would be worth $950. Now, if we want to ship a carload of doors to Buffalo we pay freight $44 a car. I have in my calculation quoted freight at $33 a car, but in shipping doors and manufactured lumber the freight is $44 a car. Now, the duty on $950 at 35 per cent. would be $332.64, clearance paper $3, total expenditure of shipment, $379.64. This, added to the $648, the cost of the doors in Canada, makes $1,027.24 as the total cost of delivering doors in Buffalo. But doors in Buffalo are only worth $950, so that the shipper actually loses $77.24 on every carload of doors shipped to Buffalo. If we had reciprocity with the United States the shipper would get a return of $273 on every carload over the cost of the doors and freight. For some time doors were being manufactured in Canada and shipped to Buffalo at a period when they charged a duty on the price in Canada. But like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, they soon changed this, and did as he did in reference to binding twine last year, they charged a duty, not on the price of doors in Canada, but on the price of doors in Buffalo, and the consequence was that the duty was prohibitory. I wish to refer very briefly to our tanneries. It affects the tanneries of this country in the same manner. We export to the United States thousands of dollars' worth of tanbark every year. It is worth here about $3.50 a cord, while in Chicago its value is $8.50. The freight on a carload of tanbark to Buffalo costs $33. The freight on dry hides from New York to Georgian Bay is 25 cents per 100, and the amount of hides a carload of bark would tan would cost for freight only $3 from New York to Georgian Bay. So the tanner saves $570 on every carload of hides by taking the hides to the tanbark than by taking the tanbark to the hides, whether we ship the tanbark to New York State or Chicago or Milwaukee. If we had reciprocity, instead of shipping tanbark to the United States, hides from the United States would be brought to the tanbark, and the result would be that we would manufacture leather for the United States. We have at Penetanguishene one of the largest tanneries in the country, and there are large tanneries also at Orillia and in Muskoka, and I am told by men who thoroughly understand their business that they can manufacture and deliver leather at Chicago, Detroit and Buffalo 2½ cents per pound cheaper than it can possibly be produced in the United States. But the duty on leather entering the United States ranges from 2 cents to 5 cents per pound, and so the exportation of leather there is practically prohibited. This summer a tanner from the United States in passing through the northern part of Canada made this remark: that if we had reciprocity he would build a tannery near the tanbark district which would employ 300 men; and Mr. Miller, of Orillia, assured me he would employ five times the number of men he does to-day if we had reciprocity. More than this. While we to-day could deliver leather at Detroit, Chicago and Buffalo for 2½ cents cheaper than it could be manufactured in the United States, if the Government removed the duty on stearine, which is not made in Canada, but which is used in leather manufacture, leather could be manufactured here 3 cents per pound cheaper than it can be in the United States. So, not in one article but in many articles the Government are interfering against the manufactures of this country. From these facts it is clear that reciprocity with the United States would enrich this Dominion by millions of dollars annually. More than that: it would give a better market for our farmers. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who spoke of giving a better home market to our farmers, I should like to ask him if this would not be better than to send a great quantity of our raw material across the line. I desire to refer to an unfortunate remark made by the hon. gentleman in closing his speech the other day. He said the electors knew where to keep the Opposition, and that had the election contest continued two weeks longer there would have been few members on this side of the House. I should like to ask if it was the efforts of the farmers of Grey in this direction which reduced his majority from 500 to 19. If, in a contest lasting three weeks, his majority was reduced nearly 500, where would he be to-day had it lasted two weeks longer? I am not surprised that such a change took place in his riding, and if the hon. gentleman will only get 1,000 copies of

his speech made the other night printed and circulated through the riding, so that the farmers can digest it, that address will prove his valedictory to his constituents. I wish to direct attention briefly to the remarks made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) in regard to the farmers' position and the number of mortgages. I will merely quote from a letter sent by the registrar of the County of Simcoe in respect to mortgages in that county, and in doing so I may say he speaks of the three richest townships in the county. The registrar writes as follows :—

"COUNTY OF SIMCOE REGISTRY OFFICE,
"BARRIE, February 25, 1891.

"The mortgages range from $300 to $7,000 or $8,000; the probable average would be $1,000.

"The three townships selected are the richest and most prosperous in the three ridings of the county, and are almost wholly settled and owned by resident farmers.

"The books of this office show :—

"(1) That the Township of Tecumseh is divided into about 647 parcels or lots, as held under patents from the Crown. Of these 647 lots 432 are mortgaged and 215 are unencumbered, or 67 per cent. mortgage.

"(2) That the Township of Nottawasaga is divided into about 623 patented parcels. Of these 490 are mortgaged and 133 are not mortgaged, or 78 per cent. mortgage.

"(3) That the Township of Oro is divided into about 569 patented lots. Of these 399 are mortgaged and 170 are not mortgaged, or 70 per cent. under mortgaged.

(Sd.) "SAM. LOUNT,
"Registrar."

I wish to submit for the information and enlightenment of hon. gentlemen opposite the closing remarks made by Principal Grant when he welcomed the teachers to Toronto the other day. I have no doubt when he made these remarks he had such members as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in his mind. Principal Grant said :

"Count those men as enemies of the race who seek to erect or strive to maintain barriers between the British commonwealth and the United States or who teach that it is a good thing for neighbours to have no intercourse with each other. Join hands and never forget that we at least are children of the light."

I have shown the advantages that would arise had we reciprocity with the United States. I need not continue my remarks further ; but for these reasons, and I believe they are sufficient reasons, I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure at this late stage of the debate that brief speeches will be acceptable to the House. The subject that has been brought to our attention by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been debated I think from all standpoints, and it would be difficult indeed, more particularly for a new member, to bring before the House anything new, any arguments that have not been turned over and over bearing on this question. However, I hope before I sit down that I will be able to emphasize some of the arguments that have been advanced to show why the amendment proposed by the hon. member should not receive the sanction of this House. The policy of the Liberal-Conservative party has always been what it is now, a policy of Canada for the Canadians. Our true desire has been to make a home market for our own people and to retain that home market for our own people, but continuously endeavouring to extend our trade with other countries in such a way as we can, always on fair terms to Canada. I may say that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party has always been a policy of friendliness with our neighbours to the South of us, because we cannot expect to obtain anything from that country which would be of advantage to Canada unless we continue to live on friendly terms with the people of the United States. So, looking back even forty years, I find that in 1849, when there was a differential tariff against the United States, that was removed, and one tariff was raised and the other lowered, so as to make the tariff against the United States and Great Britain the same, and thus we showed a disposition to live on friendly terms with our neighbours to the south of us. In the same year our first statutory offer was made to place on the free list products coming into this country from the United States as soon as they admitted similar products into their country. And in 1854, in order to settle the difficulties that then existed between the two countries, a reciprocity treaty was negotiated. It has been claimed by hon. members on the other side of the House that this treaty was not negotiated by the Conservative party ; but I may here remark that an hon. gentleman who had much to do with the bringing of that treaty into operation was afterwards closely identified with the Liberal-Conservative party in this country. That is a circumstance that is well known, because we all remember that the advent of that hon. gentleman to power, under the leadership of the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, marked at the same time the departure of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) from the Conservative party. This treaty of 1854 remained in force for some twelve years. It was abrogated, not with the desire of the Canadian people, but at the whim of the American people, who thought, perhaps, that we had not fairly dealt with them during the time of their unfortunate war. In 1868 again, to show that we are disposed to live on terms of friendliness with the American people, we re-enacted the statutory offer, and in 1869 we solicited again the treaty of 1854. In 1871 the treaty of Washington was negotiated—a treaty that remained in force until the year 1885, when it was abrogated, as in the case of the former treaty, not by the desire of the people of Canada, but by the action of the people of the United States ; and in order to show our desire to continue our friendly relations between the two countries, the late Government allowed the fishery articles of that treaty to remain in force some six months after the treaty had been abrogated, hoping that the treaty might be restored, and that the difficulties which existed in connection with our Atlantic fisheries might be set aside. In 1878 our statutory offer was again re-enacted, and in 1888 another treaty was negotiated by the Liberal-Conservative party in power in this country. That treaty was negotiated in the interests of the people of Canada. Our representative on that occasion was Sir Charles Tupper, and although that treaty did not receive the ratification of the American people yet we realized that it was in the interest of the people of Canada, because it received the sanction of this House, and it possibly would have received the sanction of the Senate of the United States had not polititical reasons prevented it. At that time, again, to show our good-will towards the people of the United States, and in order to show that we were desirous of living on terms of amity with them, and desirous of trading

them on such terms as would be reasonable and fair to the people of this country, and at the same time fair to the people of the United States, Sir Charles Tupper made another offer to settle the difficulties that existed at that time, and in the direction of broader trade relations. The words which he used and which were inserted in the report are as follows: —

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fisheries Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Then, Sir, again in 1890 and 1891, still desirous of perpetuating this good-feeling between the two countries, still again desirous of taking advantage of every opportunity to bring about such better trade relations between the two countries as could be obtained, taking advantage of communications which were going on between the American Government and the Government of Newfoundland, our Canadian Government, ever alive to the best interests of this country, intervened, and desired to be included in those negotiations. And we remember that a submission was made that a new treaty might be negotiated on the basis so submitted, and a basis was then submitted upon which this new treaty might be negotiated. That basis was a renewal of the treaty of 1854, with such modifications as the altered circumstance of the two countries would call forth—the reconstruction of the treaty of 1888, the protection of our mackerel fishery, the relaxation of our coasting laws on the sea coast and also on the inland waters, as well as some other minor matters that would be taken into consideration, and one broad treaty negotiated, not only settling all the differences and difficulties that existed between the two countries at that time, but on the basis of widening the trade relations between the two countries. We know the result of this. It is that negotiations are to come up in the month of October next, when possibly this matter can again be satisfactorily arranged. I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, in order to show that while the Government of this country appealed on the 5th March on the lines that we then set out, and that while our rallying cry was the old flag, the old policy and the old leader, that cry was strictly correct. The old leader has left us; but we are still under the old flag, and we still pursue the old policy—a policy of obtaining for Canada, as we persistently have been attempting to do from time to time, as we did in 1854, as we endeavoured to do in 1866, as we did in 1871, and again in 1878, and in 1888—we are still endeavouring to obtain for Canada the best possible terms in our trade relations that can be obtained for this country. Now, Sir, what does our policy mean? We say that we desire to uphold these good relations that exist between the two countries. We are willing to extend our trade with the United States, but only on terms that would be fair to the people of this country. We believe that we have something substantial to offer to the people of the United States without sacrificing our interests. Under the treaty of 1854 the advantages were in favour of the United States. They sent into the Provinces of British North America some $95,000,000 more of products than we sent into the United States. They had no reason, therefore, to complain that that treaty was unfair to them, nor would they possibly have abrogated it, or terminated it, had it not been for a jealousy at the time which we say was not well founded. However, we are not prepared to go the whole length of renewing the treaty of 1854. For my part, I consider that it would not be in the interest of this country that such a treaty should be negotiated, and I think it was well that the submission that was made was worded in the way in which it was, when it stated that such modifications should be made in the treaty of 1854 as the altered circumstances of the two countries called for. Now, Sir, during the time between 1854 and 1866 the great American west had not been opened up. These great wheat fields were not in existence, and the result was that the United States, instead of being such large exporters of wheat as they now are, were really purchasers of wheat from Canada. The matter is now reversed, and it would not be in the interest of the people of Canada to-day that we should have free trade in wheat and flour between the United States and Canada. In the matter of pork we may say something of the same kind. In the years between 1854 and 1866 pork was shipped from this country to the States. The great city of Chicago had not its existence then as a pork market, and we would not desire at the present time, nor would it be in the interest of the people of this country, that we should have a renewal of a reciprocity treaty which would embody free trade in hogs and hog products. I say that would not be now in the interest of the people of this country. When we look at the reports of the Ontario Government furnished by Mr. Archibald Blue, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, we find, by a special report that was given in November last, owing to the increased impetus that was given to the raising of hogs because of the duty that had been previously placed on hogs and hog products by the Government of Canada, an increase in the number of hogs raised in the year 1890 equal to 36 per cent. of the number raised in the previous year; and these, valued at $8 each, would amount to a sum to the farmers of the Province of Ontario alone equal to $2,444,000, without taking into consideration the other parts of the Dominion. So that, whatever should be included in a reciprocity treaty with the United States, the article of pork or hog products should not be included. The same remark applies to oats. From 1854 to 1866 oats were shipped largely from this country to the United States; but the case is reversed at the present time. They produce in the United States large quantities of oats at a lower price than we do in Canada; and were the gates open they would ship large quantities of oats to this country, to the detriment of our farmers; so that we could not afford to have free trade in that cereal. If we compare the market prices of oats in the different months from July to December, in the five years from 1885 to 1889, we will find a difference in the average price in Chicago, as compared with the price in Ontario, of 8 cents a bushel. Now, the crop of 1890 was equal to about 52,000,000 bushels; a year or two previous it reached 65,000,000; but taking it at 52,000,000, I assume—without taking into consideration the large crops of oats in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces—that if the farmers of Ontario alone were to sell only one-half of their oat crop they

would lose under reciprocity, on the basis of the Chicago prices, over $2,000,000. Therefore, it would not be in the interest of the people of this country to have free trade in that article. But, Sir, though there are certain articles in which we cannot afford to free-trade with the United States, yet I believe we have something substantial which we can offer to the people of the United States in return for such a measure of free trade as will be fairly in the interest of the people of this country. I read the other day an account of a meeting of the United States Senate Committee on the relations with Canada, held in Boston, on September, 1889. It was then stated in evidence by Mr. S. F. Dutts, of Boston, as follows:—

"All the fishing interests of Boston had always been in favour of reciprocity. Canada had much to give in return, as 99 per cent. of the fish brought to American ports by American vessels were stolen from within the three-mile limit, and American fishermen must have Canadian bait."

Now, this is a strange confession to be made by an American, if it is true. But even if it is only half true, that indicates something substantial which we would have to offer to the people of the United States as a compensation for the admission of articles from Canada which it would be in the interest of Canada to have admitted free into the United States. We remember also that the American people paid us the large sum of $5,000,000 for certain privileges which they enjoyed from 1871 to 1885. Now, I presume that they do not desire to repeat that payment, and they would rather be prepared to grant us some trade privileges in place of such a large amount of money. There may be other concessions which we can offer them. Therefore, I say that we have something substantial to offer to the people of the United States in order to procure from them free trade in such articles as it would be in the interest of this country to include in a treaty. It has been asserted, however, and repeated on the floor of this House by some hon. gentlemen opposite, that the United States would not be willing to negotiate a treaty which would not include manufactured articles. I have listened carefully to the arguments which have been advanced in support of that statement, and the only evidence which I have heard presented in support of it was a letter said to have been written by the Hon. J. G. Blaine to a Mr. Baker, somewhere in the State of New York, in which he said that the people of the United States would not negotiate any treaty in natural products alone. I beg here to draw attention to the fact that the Government of Canada have never proposed to the people of the United States to negotiate a treaty in natural products alone; so that Mr. Blaine was quite correct when he made that statement. The American Government have shown their willingness on other occasions to negotiate partial reciprocity treaties, and therefore we have some reason to hope that they will also agree to negotiate a partial or limited reciprocity treaty with Canada. We have an instance of this in the case of Brazil. The people of Brazil could not afford to free-trade with the people of the United States, because they could not afford to sacrifice their revenue. But the people of the United States met them half way, and proposed that the operation of the McKinley Bill as against their coffee, sugar and hides should be suspended, if the people of Brazil would admit at a reduced rate of duty the products of the farm, the factory and the mine of the United States. Now, Sir, that is an evidence that the people of the United States are willing to meet the people of any other country even half way, and to negotiate with them a treaty of even partial reciprocity. But, Sir, if the people of Canada cannot obtain from the people of the United States a reasonable treaty of reciprocity, such as will be in the interest of this country, and not a jug-handled arrangement in their favour, then I say we had better remain as we are: and in the historic language of the hon. member for South Oxford, which has been quoted over and over again in this House:

"We have men and ships, and we will carry the war into Africa. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We will find new markets for ourselves, and cut them out."

Unrestricted reciprocity, such as has been defined in this House, such as we on this side understand it, and such as I believe is generally understood in the country, would compel Canada to relinquish the control of its tariff. That is something that would be very objectionable indeed to the people of this country. The name unrestricted reciprocity implies that such would be the nature of the treaty. It implies that the utmost freedom must exist; that the Custom-houses between Canada and the United States must be removed; that the imports into this country by way of the St. Lawrence, Halifax or Vancouver would pass into the United States, where no tariff or Custom-houses would prevent them. I remember that a short time ago the hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell), I think, in addressing the House, said that under unrestricted reciprocity the natural products and the manufactured goods of this country ought to pass or would pass as freely between the two countries as the waters of the great lakes. I read the report of a speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition at Abbottsford, in his own province, some time last autumn, and which appeared in the *Globe* on the 9th of October, in which the hon. gentleman is reported to have said that the Custom-houses would have to be removed. True, the hon. gentleman has told us that there was no French reporter present on that occasion; but I believe it is not contended that the report is not substantially a correct one. Unrestricted reciprocity, I hold, would mean discrimination against Great Britain. It means that Canada must ask Great Britain to negotiate a treaty with the United States, which will absolutely prohibit the manufactures of Great Britain coming into this country, while we will grant at the same time free trade to the people of the United States. Is it reasonable, I ask, that the people of this country should go to Great Britain and do what hon. gentlemen opposite, had they succeeded on the 5th of March last, would have had to do? It would have been their bounden duty to proceed at once to Great Britain and ask her consent or assistance to negotiate a treaty which would raise a high tariff wall against the manufactures of Great Britain and give free admission to those of the United States. If we should insist on such a condition, could we expect England's protection, could we expect to retain the advantages we enjoy by reason of our connection with Great Britain? These advantages are various and noticeable.

I may mention one or two which have been referred to, from time to time, but I desire to emphasize these, because they are matters in which the people of Ontario and the other provinces take a deep interest. Reference has been made to the cattle trade, which is a large and increasing trade of great importance to our farmers. Now, Sir, if we allowed the cattle of the United States to come into this country and pass over our own railways, and be exported by vessels sailing from Montreal and Quebec to Great Britain, along with Canadian cattle known to be free from all kinds of contagious diseases, could we expect that, under those circumstances, Great Britain would continue the privileges she has granted in favour of Canadian cattle? Such an expectation would be unreasonable, and in a short time the farmers of this country would loose all the privileges and advantages they now enjoy in this matter. The same remark will apply to the question of cheese, another product of great interest to our people. Were we to permit, as we would be obliged to do under free trade, American cheese to come freely into this country and be exported with our own, in a very short time the market in England for Canadian cheese would be destroyed, as it would be impossible to distinguish between American and Canadian, and the great advantage we have of selling our cheese as Canadian cheese would be lost to us, and we would suffer financially in consequence. I will read an extract from the writing of an hon. gentleman who, I believe, is well known to many members of this House. I refer to the Hon. James Young, a man whose authority in Ontario has long been accepted, a man whose advice has always been accepted as the words of wisdom, a Liberal of the Liberals, and a member of the Reform party. The Hon. James Young says:

"What Canadian statesman, unless he had lost all regard for British connection, could seriously propose to Great Britain to negotiate a treaty, or even consent to legislation, discriminating against her own commerce and building up that of a rival?"

But we need not rely on such authorities to ascertain what is truly the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We can go to the father of this policy, because it had not its birthplace in this country, but is a child of foreign birth. Ask Erastus Wiman what he says about it, and he is the man who organized the policy and framed its details. He spoke at Louisville, Kentucky, in February last, and made a very plain statement indeed with reference to this matter. He said:

"The Liberal party propose unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which will carry in its train a perfect settlement of the fishery trouble, opening up every advantage along five thousand miles of coast line fisheries. It will agree to admit American manufactures free of duty to all parts of Canada, in return for the free admission into the United States of all her products. Meantime, it proposes that a duty shall be maintained against foreign goods, including those from Great Britain, as high as those that now prevail in the United States."

That, I think, is sufficient evidence as to what the meaning of this policy is; but if more evidence were necessary we might quote indeed from a Canadian authority. We have the writing of Mr. R. W. Phipps, Forestry Clerk of the Ontario Government, who, in a letter of the 19th February last, made this statement, and I may say that being an officer of the Ontario Government gives him on this question a right to speak for hon. gentlemen opposite, because they are in sympathy with those who in this House moved the amendment we are now discussing:

"Next, with regard to discrimination in favour of the States. Let us take the plain truth. The States neither will nor can grant reciprocity in manufactures to Canada unless Canada makes her tariff against the rest of the world as high as that of the States, for doing otherwise would allow the cheap manufactures of the world to enter through the back door of Canada."

Unrestricted reciprocity, again we say, means direct taxation for revenue purposes. If we admit from the United States goods on which we have heretofore collected a revenue, that would at once result in a loss of $7,500,000 to the revenues of this country. But that would not be the only loss. If we are to have free trade with the people of the United States, and to have a tariff wall as high as that now around the United States around the Dominion of Canada, we cannot expect the continuance of our trade with Great Britain, France and Germany, and other countries; but nearly all the goods that come into this country would come by way of the United States, the result of which would be that we would lose in revenue on goods now coming from other countries equally as much as on those coming from the United States. It would mean, instead of a loss of $7,500,000, an absolute loss of at least $15,000,000 to the revenue each year, or $3 per head, or $15 per family, if equally distributed; but I do not believe it would be equally distributed. If this amount has to be raised by direct taxation I believe the largest proportion would fall upon our farmers. It has been alleged, with regard to the Province of Ontario—and I will speak more particularly of that province, as it is my native province—it has been alleged over and over again, although I think the estimate is too large, but it is the estimate of hon. gentlemen opposite—that the people of Ontario pay three-fourths of the revenue of this country. Now, if such be the case, and such is the allegations of hon. gentlemen opposite—and I base my argument upon their assertions—the people of Ontario would be called upon to pay about $11,000,000 loss of revenue. If that were put upon the farmers of Ontario—and they would have to bear the greater part of the burden—it would be equivalent to about $50 on every farm of 100 acres. I hold that the people of the Province of Ontario are not prepared for any such measure. They do not believe in any such policy. No policy would be acceptable to them which would carry in its train direct taxation. However, we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the country this is the statement made to the people, that they are going to economize, that by their economy they will be able to carry on the affairs of the country without resorting to direct taxation. Let us look at their history in regard to economy. In a matter of this kind it is a good thing that they have a history. In the Province of Quebec I assume that hon. gentlemen are not able to show where their friends are economizing, and if we look in that direction we shall have very little hope that such economy would be exercised in carrying on the affairs of this Dominion without direct taxation, if we had free trade with the United States. We may look also to the rich Province of Ontario, a province which obtains a large subsidy from this Dominion, a province which has vast resources from woods and forests, a province which derives large revenues from the sale of public

lands, and also from the operation of the license system, and yet that province, which has been under the benign rule of the Reform party for 18 years, is unable to carry on its affairs without borrowing millions of money. Again, let us look at the condition of affairs under the régime of hon. gentlemen in the Dominion from 1874 to 1878, and let us see if there is any hope, if we had free trade with the United States and the consequent loss of revenue, that they would so economize as to be able to carry on the affairs of the country without resorting to direct taxation. What is that history? Deficit after deficit, year after year, piled up one after the other. I think there would be no hope there to induce us to entrust those gentlemen with carrying out such a policy. But unrestricted reciprocity means not only that we should relinquish the control of our own tariff, it not only means a discrimination against Great Britain, it not only means direct taxation on the people of this country, but it means something worse. It would mean the destruction of our National Policy, by which the industries of our country have been built up and a home market has been established and enlarged. I will give you a statement from one whom I consider an excellent authority on a matter of this kind. Mr. Cobden, the author of free trade, once said:

"The farmers' interest is the interest of the whole community, and is not a partial interest; and you cannot injure the farmer more than when you injure the manufacturers, his customers."

If we destroy the home market of this country, we destroy the best interests of the farmers, who sell their goods to the manufacturers. Our trade makes a very favourable comparison with that of the United States, and I think it behooves the people of this country to be very careful how they disturb their relations, either with the United States or with any other country. Comparing our exports and imports with those of the United States, it may be surprising to some hon. gentleman to learn the great excess of the Dominion of Canada over the United States. In 1889 the Canadian imports amounted to $22.70 per head, while the United States imports amounted to only $11.46 per head, leaving an excess in Canada of $11.24. The exports of Canada, in the same year, amounted to $17.57, while those of the United States amounted to $11.44, or an excess in favour of Canada of $6.13 The total for Canada was $40.27, and for the United States $22.68, or a difference again in favour of Canada of $17.59. Now, there is something else still which I desire to say unrestricted reciprocity means. It not only means the relinquishing of the control of our own tariff, discrimination against British goods, direct taxation on our people and the destruction of our National Policy, but we are told, and I think it has been stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that it means for the American people the transfer of the trade and commerce of this country to the cities of the United States, or, in the historic words of the hon. gentleman, it means a monopoly for the Americans of the regions beyond, whose trade and commerce, if once transferred to the people on the other side of the line, no man would be able to take away from them. Why should we transfer the trade and commerce of this country to the cities of Boston and New York? Why should we build up American cities such as Buffalo, Cleveland and Detroit, and other American cities, whose names have been rung in our ears from day to day? Why should we transfer to these cities the trade and commerce which has done so much to build up our own Canadian cities and to build up a home market at our own doors? Have we ever taken into consideration the actual value to the country of a city like Montreal or like Toronto? It has been estimated, in fact I may say it is well known, that the products of the farms of the Dominion of Canada are yearly of the value of about $350,000,000. These figures are accepted as being as nearly correct as possible, and from them we can arrive at a conclusion as to the value of a city such as Montreal or Toronto. In 1889 we exported $35,000,000 of the products of the farm, $22,000,000 to Great Britain and $13,000,000 to the United States, leaving $315,000,000 of the products of our farms to be consumed by our people in the Dominion of Canada. If five million people consume $315,000,000 worth of the products of the farms, it is easy to see that a city of 200,000 would consume nearly thirteen million dollars worth of the products of the farm: so that a city like Toronto actually consumes more of the products of our farm than the whole of our exports of those products to the United States. Shall we transfer the trade of cities like Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, St. John and Vancouver, and the other growing cities in this country, to New York and Boston? Shall we break down those cities and destroy their trade and commerce in order to build up the trade and commerce of another country? It is claimed, however, that unrestricted reciprocity will give us a market of 60,000,000. This matter was well referred to the other day by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), and I only desire to emphasize in passing what he then so well said. Let us be careful in considering this matter. Are we going to trade with 60,000,000 of people, or are we only going to trade, under such circumstances, with a few border states? Would we in this country expect, under free trade, to send wheat all the way to California? Would we expect to send flour to Minneapolis? Would we expect to send pork to Chicago? Would we expect to send corn to Kansas? Would we expect to send cattle to Texas? Would we expect to send horses to Kentucky, or flowers to Florida? Such, I say, would be unreasonable. This sufficiently illustrates to my mind, and I believe the mind of every hon. gentleman, that we cannot expect, under such circumstances, to trade with every state in the Union, and that instead of having a market of 60,000,000 of people it would be minimized to that of a few border states. We must remember, at the same time, that if we are to have additional privileges in the way of a larger market, if we are to have a market of 60,000,000, we are also to have 60,000,000 of competitors for our own market; that is to say, they have 12 times the population we have; every cotton factory in this country would have to compete against the product of 12 cotton factories in the United States; every woollen factory in this country would require to compete against the products of 12 woollen factories in the United States; and every tannery in this country would require to compete against the products of 12 tanneries in the United States; and so with the manufacture of boots and shoes, with the manufacture of gloves—in fact, with every kind of manufacture in our country. That the home market is the best

for the people of Canada is a question, I believe, beyond dispute. It takes the largest part of our products and pays the best prices for them. Great Britain is the next best market for the products of Canada, and the United States simply classes as the third consumer of the products of the farms of this country, taking only about 3 per cent. of the products of the farms of this country. Now, why sacrifice the greater markets for even the fancied advantage that we might gain by a more intimate connection with the United States? Hon. gentlemen state, however, that owing to the high American tariff our farmers are hard up. We have heard this day after day, and I think, Mr. Speaker, if there is one class of people in this country who have been abused, and severely abused, over and over again by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is the farmers. I pity those farmers. I am the son of a farmer, and I sympathize with those men in the west who are abused day after day by hon. gentlemen who sit within the precincts of this House, and who talk in such a manner of the financial standing of a large class of intelligent people who are not permitted to come into this House to defend themselves; I say I sympathize with these people, and I trust I shall not make any remarks detrimental to their interest. I feel it a pleasure to stand up and speak on their behalf. They tell us they are hard up, but I say to hon. gentlemen, let anyone of us go to the United States—you may go, if you please, to the empire state of the Union, you may go to the best part of that state, in the Genesee Valley, you may drive through the finest counties you can find there, and I do not believe, and I have never yet found a man who discovered, that the people even in that favoured part of the United States could compare in their horses, in their barns, in their fences, in their carriages, and in all their farming accoutrements, with many portions of the Province of Ontario. They tell us the farms are all mortgaged. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, business men mortgage their property when they desire to raise money, when they desire to furnish ways and means for the purpose of carrying on their business, and they have a perfect right to do it, and if the farmer chooses to borrow money to enable him to buy another farm I say he has a perfect right to do it. I have had some experience in connection with mortgages in this way, having been an officer in a registry office in one of the western counties for a considerable number of years, so that I speak from practical knowledge of the purposes for which the farmers usually give mortgages. Whether they are given to cover indebtness, whether they are given to assist the members of the family to establish themselves, or whether they are given for the purpose of improving the lands, or for the purpose of acquiring other farms, I say without hesitation that I believe four mortgages out of five, at any rate, two-thirds of the mortgages in that county, were given for the purpose of acquiring other farms. How often this occurs. A farm comes in for sale adjoining another farm owned by a well-to-do farmer. However, he has not sufficent money available to purchase that farm, and he mortgages the two farms and secures, we will say, an additional 100 acres of land. In the course of a few years he pays off the mortgage, and the result is that he has 200 acres of land instead of only 100 that he had before. I say, without fear of satisfactory contradiction, that in respect to three-fourths of the mortgages throughout the county that I have reference to, show me a man who has a mortgage on his farm and I will show you a man who is prosperous. These are the men who are making money, these are the men who are using their property for the purpose for which it ought to be used: they are using it as a security for the purpose of enabling them to buy other farms and to increase their wealth, and I know to my own knowledge that these men acquire land and become better off in the course of years than those who do not undertake to mortgage their farms in order to acquire additional lands. Now, I desire before I sit down to make reference to one other statement which I heard made in this House in reference to the farmers. I believe the statement was made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) a few days ago when addressing this House. He stated that the farmers of the Province of Ontario, in accordance with a carefully tabulated calculation which he had made, in the articles of fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats and pease, had lost the sum of $70,000,000 during eight years—that is to say, that during a period of eight years the farmers of Ontario—I repeat it, because I consider it was a monstrous statement—the farmers of Ontario in eight years lost the large sum of $70,000,000 in growing pease and oats, barley, fall and spring wheat. Now, I I took his statement, I took the same report to which he refers, and I made a little calculation also. However, I discovered that the hon. gentleman had charged the land with everything that he could possibly charge against it. He assumed that the farmer sat down quietly in his house on a rented farm: he charges the land with the rent of the farm, he charges it with the taxes, and he charges it with the seed grain, and he charges it with the manure that is placed upon the land. I will not take exception to any of those charges. I allow the hon. gentleman to charge every acre of land with all these items, but I do take exception to his charging the land with the cost of the ploughing, the cultivating, the sowing and drilling. After fitting the land or cultivation, and putting in the crop, I take exception to his charging the land with the cutting of the crop, with storing it in the barns, with the threshing and with the marketing. In order to make this calculation as strong as possible against the farmers, he assumes that every item of expenditure, that every piece of work that is done on the farm, is paid for; that not only the manual labour, but the horses are hired, and the machinery is hired, to do this work, and is paid for by the farmer. We know, Mr. Speaker, that is not the system on which farming is carried on in this country. The farmers go upon their farms, they do a portion of the work, and they hire the balance of it, and what they make out of the sale of their grain is the profit accruing to their labour, just the same as the profit in another man's business is that which accrues to his labour; and what do we find as a result? That, instead of a loss of $70,000,000 during those eight years, we find that the farmers of Ontario, in the growing of these crops alone, after making due allowance for every possible loss the hon. gentleman has claimed, would actually have a clear gain of $200,000,000 as consideration for the labour they had expended on their farms. This, I say, is just an instance of the kind of statements

sent broadcast in depreciation of the farmers. I will assume that the farmer did not do all the work on the farm, but actually paid for one-half of the labour, and in that case the farmers would still have a clear gain of $100,000,000 accruing to them as profit for their labour during those eight years. I observe also, on comparing Mr. A. Blue's statement with respect to the value of farms, farm implements, buildings and live stock, in 1882, with that in 1889, that the increase in the value of farm property was raised from $882,624,610, in 1882, to $982,210,664 in 1889, or an increase in the value of farm property of $100,000,000. Yet they tell us the farmers are poor. I desire to say a few words with respect to the all-important question of duty, and I do not intend at any length to discuss the question. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Allan) declared that the duty on barley shipped from this country to the United States was paid by the Canadian producers, and he gave as his opinion a speech delivered by the late Sir John A. Macdonald. I remember having read that speech over and over again. Sir John Macdonald said: Take two farmers having each a farm, one on each side of the imaginary line in the eastern townships, and he spoke of barley raised on one farm and then on the other farm. Sir John Macdonald said in that case (and allow me to draw particular attention to the language used) the Canadian farmer paid the duty. But he did not insist for one moment that in every other case he did so, but it was only in that particular case where the barley on one side of the imaginary line was of equal value with that of the farmer on the other side. Although in that case the Canadian producer did pay the duty, yet that was no opinion on the part of the late Sir John A. Macdonald that Canadian producers paid the duty on barley grown in my own county, the County of Halton, or in Prince Edward, or in any other county in Ontario. But if we do wish to know who does pay the duty on barley, or on horses, or on other articles exported to the United States, I am willing to leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referred to a speech delivered some time ago by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—a speech delivered, I think, in this House. I had not the pleasure of hearing it; I am not aware I ever read it; but there was another speech delivered by that hon. gentleman that I have read, and I remember very well the day on which it was delivered. I believe it was delivered in the riding of Centre Wellington at a beautiful spot a short distance from Fergus, on a beautiful Saturday afternoon. Mr. Mills, according to a report in the *Globe* of 16th July, 1877, said:

"The Americans put a tax on our pease, while England admits them free. We received as much per bushel from the American buyer as we did from the British. The Americans put a tax of fifteen cents on each bushel of oats they imported, and yet we got as much from the United States as from England. Who paid the American tax? From 1854 to 1866 there was free trade in horses, and the average price received was given as follows:—

1854	$65.27	1860	$81.97
1855	74.26	1861	81.40
1856	77.08	1862	77.13
1857	76.09	1863	75.79
1858	79.07	1864	78.46
1859	84.77	1865	79.61
1866	$92.79	1871	$93.96
1867	78.68	1872	101.38
1868	82.14	1873	105.01
1869	82.97	1874	107.44
1870	87.97	1875	104.62

Mr. Mills concludes by observing that his figures establish:

"The incontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

He further said:

"Now, if the 20 per cent. duty on horses had been paid by the Canadian farmer he would have received smaller prices during the years protection was in force than he did during the years of reciprocity, but the fact was he received higher prices."

I feel it is unnecessary to dwell further on that subject, for such an opinion will receive weight in this House, and be of value to us in any action we may take with respect to reciprocity with the United States. I referred to the Hon. Jas. Young a short time ago, and I desire now to give his opinion. In 1877, in a letter to the *Globe*, Mr. Young said:

"It is fallacious to assume that the Canadian farmer pays all the duties on the horses, cattle, barley, &c., which are exported across the lines. For forty years the Liberal party has been taught differently, and demonstrations of Adam Smith, confirmed by all great living political economists, as well as by practical experience, clearly prove the contrary."

I leave this question, then, with hon. gentlemen, and I will proceed to touch on another matter which has been referred to—the subject of eggs. I find that in 1890 we exported to the United States about 14,000,000 dozen of eggs. Under the McKinley Bill there is a duty of 5 cents a dozen, and we are told that it will be a great injury to our people. During the elections we were told that Canadian hens would have to give up laying, for it would be impossible to export eggs to the United States under the new tariff. But it is very remarkable that the price of eggs refuses to go down in this country, and we cannot to-day for our own table buy a single dozen at any lower price than 12 months ago. Where will the Americans obtain 14,000,000 dozen of eggs except from the people of this country? There is no doubt that the Americans prefer eggs coming from a northern climate, because they are of a better quality; they will give more for eggs from Canada because they receive a better article. Are the Americans going to do without eggs simply because a duty of 5 cents has been imposed? No; they will eat as many eggs as before and they will purchase them from somewhere. We were told that they would procure them from the Western States, but there is a difficulty in this, because in a new section of the country, where you have to go long distances from one village to another, where the settlements are sparse and the farms large, it would cost possibly 4 or 5 cents a dozen to collect eggs for shipment to a place like New York, whereas in the Province of Ontario, with our thickly-settled country, and our villages close to one another, as a matter of fact, and I know it from practical experience, eggs can be gathered for 1 cent a dozen for the purposes of shipment to the United States. Therefore, the difference in the cost of collecting eggs for the purpose of shipment to the United States between a thickly-settled province like Ontario and a thinly-settled country like the western states is equal to the whole duty. Hence, we need not be surprised at all

that the price of eggs is equally as high to-day as at twelve months ago. References have been made in this House to a certain gentleman in the County of Huron: I need not mention his name, for it has been referred to different times, but I am well acquainted with that gentleman, and he is familiarly known as the egg king of Canada. I know that he does handle a very large quantity of eggs indeed, and his opinion at all times, when given candidly, would be valuable; but knowing that this same gentleman is a shrewd business man, it does not appear to me that after going to England, and spending three months enquiring into this matter of shipping eggs to Great Britain, he would come back and tell the people of this country, without discrimination and without hesitation, all the information that he had procured with reference to that industry. I am more inclined to the opinion that he would reserve that knowledge to himself, and that he would make the best use of it he possibly could in his own interest. But, Sir, I need not discuss this question further, because I can quote an opinion which an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House told us this afternoon was an invaluable opinion. That hon. gentleman gave us some quotations regarding eggs from the *Globe* newspaper, and he gave it as being a thoroughly reliable report, and something that should be accepted as evidence.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I shall give him some more of his own medicine. I shall give him a little more of his own evidence, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will again say "hear hear." In the Toronto *Globe* of the 7th October I read the following from its Washington correspondent:—

"This is the story that comes from northern New York: Canadian eggs have of late years found a ready market, and now that a duty of 5 cents per dozen is put on them the consumers are that much out without the slightest benefit to New York State producers. The consumers feel that the McKinley tariff is a little less than robbery, while the farmers who a few years ago thought such a measure would benefit them have been educated up to a point where they see that it is no benefit at all."

That is the opinion of the *Globe* newspaper with regard to the egg trade; that is the opinion that the hon. gentleman valued so much. The same article in the *Globe* newspaper contains the following reference to potatoes:—

"Canadian potatoes would be a great boon to the people here if they could get them without paying a duty of 25 cents per bushel."

"For several days past Canadian-grown potatoes have been coming across the river at Ogdensburg, Morristown and Cape Vincent for use here. The price paid for them by the consumers is from 70 to 80 cents per bushel. Within a week it is predicted by the dealers the price will go up to $1 per bushel, and perhaps higher."

This is the story that comes from northern New York, says the *Globe* correspondent. Hence the difference between the 70 and the 80 cents, and the $1 per bushel, is just the addition that will be made by reason of the additional tariff that had been imposed. In another part of this article it furnishes the same kind of evidence, and the writer in the *Globe* says:

"The big seed houses in Jefferson County have been doing their best to get in this season's crop of pease and beans before the new tariff wiped out the larger part of the profit of the business. For these concerns Canadian pease and beans are a necessity, because the varieties they cultivate and handle cannot be grown to advantage in New York State."

Here we see that they wanted potatoes in New York State, and that they had to bring them in from this country, and hence, as the *Globe* newspaper says, they were compelled to pay the duty upon them. I do not wish to detain the House at any greater length discussing these matters. I would just desire to say that under the National Policy the Government has been able to accomplish a great deal in the interest of the people of this country. They have been able to strike off altogether the duties on many of the articles which are considered as the prime necessities of life. We remember years ago when the stamp duty was removed—a duty which was at least vexatious to this country. Since then the duty has been removed from tea, the duty has been removed from coffee, and the duty has been removed from sugar.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman says "No," but he understands quite well that the duty has been absolutely taken off raw sugar; that sugar from No. 14 Dutch Standard and under is admitted absolutely free of duty. Raw cotton is free, wool is free, hides are free, and the duty on salt has been greatly reduced; so that I may say that every article which can be considered as one of the prime necessaries of life is admitted into this country to-day absolutely free of duty. What duty does the farmer pay on necessaries for his table, or on what he wears? What duty does he pay on his breakfast table, or dinner table, or supper table? His coffee is free, his tea is free, his sugar is free, his flour is free.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, it is free, because he produces it himself from wheat grown on his own farm. His beef is free because he produces it on his own farm, his pork is absolutely free—yes, and his eggs are free, for he does not require to pay 5 cents per dozen duty on them. His poultry is free, his potatoes are free, and his apples are free. What is it that the Canadian farmer requires upon which he has to pay a duty? Let us take the article of clothing, which would be regarded as among the prime necessities of life. For his ordinary wear of Canadian tweeds he has his clothing absolutely free, because the wool from which that clothing is made comes into this country free of duty. The clothing is made in Canadian factories. It is manufactured by Canadian workmen, and the Canadian workmen buy the produce of the Canadian farmers, which is entirely free of duty. I say, again, that the Canadian tweed, if the Canadian farmer chooses to wear it, is absolutely free of duty. If farmers, as they can afford to do, desire to buy either broadcloth or foreign tweeds, then, like others, they pay the duty upon these goods; but the cotton goods of the farmer are free, his underwear is free of duty, his hat is free of duty, his boots and shoes are free of duty, because the raw hides are brought into this country free of duty; they are tanned by the Canadian tanners, the boots are made up by Canadians who live upon the products of the Canadian farmers, and wears the product of Canadian looms, all free of duty. His carpets are free, unless he chooses to buy the better article; and so on. I contend that of the prominent necessaries of life there is very little indeed that is not absolutely free to the great consuming classes of this country. But, Sir, as to

the condition of the people of this country, I desire to close these remarks by citing one or two opinions. One of these is the opinion of the Hon. James Young, a Liberal of the Liberals, now, as he has always been, a Reformer, who, writing in the *Globe* newspaper in 1887, said:

"I do not believe that in the most favoured parts of the Union the masses of the people are wealthier, healthier or happier than in our noble Province of Ontario, whilst in the majority of states and territories their position is quite inferior to ours in almost every respect."

But I desire also to add another testimony which I know will be accepted by every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. On the 1st of July last the *Globe* newspaper put on its holiday attire, and for one day at least it was able to speak well of this country, and this is what it said:

"If the fathers of Confederation could meet to-day and take stock of what has been accomplished they would find that the country has enjoyed a very considerable measure of material progress. A large railroad mileage has been built. The North-West has been opened for settlement. The scattered provinces are joined by two great political highways. The average of comfort among the people is higher than it was, and the individual wealth greater. The Dominion has successfully resisted some of the ailments which attack young countries. Most of those who cut a figure in 1867 have passed away, but there is no scarcity of light and leading. This and much else that is satisfactory might fairly be dilated upon by the artificers if they could return and see."

I think, Sir, that this opinion is sufficient to settle the question as to whether the people of this country are in better circumstances to-day than they were in past years. Now, just one word about the exodus, and I desire to be very brief—briefer than I intended to be. The New England States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, are as favourably situated as are the older provinces of Canada—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. They have their seaport towns, and they have equal facilities with this country for increasing their population by immigration; but what do we find? The census of 1890 shows that the State of Maine has only increased in the last ten years 1·75 per cent., the State of Vermont ·02 per cent., and the State of New Hampshire 8·31 per cent. I also find that the rate of increase in other states during the past ten years has fallen short of the rate of increase in the previous ten years: in Ohio from 20 to 15 per cent., in Indiana from 18 to 11 per cent., in Iowa from 36 to 17 per cent., in Missouri from 26 to 23 per cent., in Michigan from 38 to 28 per cent., and in Illinois, Chicago not being included, from 15 to 15½ per cent.; and the chief census commissioner of the United States attributes all this decrease to the decline in agriculture. The increase in the whole United States during the last ten years was simply 24 per cent. Now, I was surprised to find the hon. member for North Norfolk, in a speech delivered, I think, on the 6th of January last, in the city of Toronto, before the Young Men's Liberal Club, stating, and to hear him repeat the statement on the floor of this House, that had it not been for the exodus from this country to the United States the Dominion of Canada to-day ought to have a population of 8,000,000 instead of 5,000,000. The hon. gentleman could not have been aware that for this country to have a population of 8,000,000 would have necessitated our population increasing between 1880 and 1890 at the rate of 80 per cent., an increase which has never been heard of in any country; and why should we expect the population of the Dominion of Canada to increase at the rate of 80 per cent. when the population of the United States, during the same period, only increased at the rate of 24 per cent.? Now, I have made a comparison to show the relative increase in population which has taken place in the New England States and in the older provinces of Canada in the last fifty years. I find that fifty years ago the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, had a population of 1,954,000; in 1890, according to the last census, their population had increased to 4,693,000, an increase of 2,739,000, equivalent to 140 per cent. Now, fifty years ago the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island had a population of 1,065,000; whereas to-day, making due allowance for the new provinces to the west, they have a population of 4,765,000, an increase of over 3,700,000, or 340 per cent., against an increase in the New England States of only 140 per cent. In other words, the old provinces of Canada, fifty years ago, had 1,000,000 less population than the New England States, and to-day they have 100,000 more. I think that is a satisfactory showing for the Dominion of Canada as far as population is concerned. And now, Mr. Speaker, I desire not to detain this House any longer. In closing, let me say that Canada is a noble country. Canada has produced one of the greatest ornaments of the stage, Albani; Canada has produced one of the greatest scientists of our age, Sir William Dawson; Canada has produced one of the greatest statesmen of the 19th century, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald; Canada has a healthy climate; Canada produces hardy men and lovely women—you see them all around you; Canada has the largest territory of any country on the face of the globe; Canada has the longest rivers of any country on the face of the globe; Canada has the broadest expanse of fresh waters of any country on the face of the globe; Canada has the longest continuous line of railway of any country in the world; Canada has the largest wheat areas of any country in the world; Canada has the richest forests of timber of any country in the world; Canada has the richest mines of coal, iron, nickel, gold and silver—yes, and the most valuable fisheries of any country on the face of the globe; Canada has some of the best educational systems that are to be found in any country in the world; Canada belongs to the greatest empire on the face of the globe or that has ever existed; and Canada is ruled over by the most virtuous queen that has ever graced a throne. Who would not be a Canadian? Who would say ill of such a country?

Mr. MURRAY. After the prolonged discussion that has taken place on the Budget debate, I do not intend to weary the House by speaking at any great length. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken from this side have dealt so fully and ably with the subjects of the National Policy and unrestricted reciprocity that, indeed, I do not think there is anything left for me to say; but still, as one of the new members, representing an important constituency, I consider I would be derelict in my duty if I were to remain silent. So far as the question of reciprocity is concerned, I think that

the arguments have been very well exhausted, and that, if I did nothing more than heartily endorse the opinions and sentiments which have been expressed so clearly on this side, and which have shown so conclusively the pernicious effects of the National Policy and the beneficial results that would follow unrestricted reciprocity, that would be quite sufficient. Those speeches have been so very convincing that they ought to carry conviction even to some of the ultra-Conservatives, the extreme party men on the other side; and, on the other hand, they ought certainly to win over to our side those hon. gentlemen opposite who are independent—and I should hope that some of them are independent, and that they are not at all slaves to party or feeders at the National Policy crib. Now I have listened attentively to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, speeches which they prepared at great length and with which they occupied the time of the House for an hour, two hours, and three hours, and I have failed to see, in any of their arguments, why the people of this country were called upon at the last election to pronounce upon the policy of the Government. I failed to understand then, and have not discovered since, on what pretext the Government went to the country. I was led to believe, and the constituency I have the honour to represent was led to believe, that the Government were anxious for a treaty and disposed to effect a treaty, so far as the natural products of both countries are concerned; but I find, judging by the tenor of the speeches we have heard during this debate from hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are all directly opposed to any such treaty. Yet the gentleman who opposed me—that is, the Government candidate—stated clearly above board that the Government were negotiating a treaty of that kind and only appealed to the country to ascertain the sentiments of the people. He stated that the Government and their supporters were prepared to effect a treaty, so far as the natural products of both countries were concerned. I hold, Sir, that a great many gentlemen on the Government benches have been elected on that plea. I hold they have been elected because the people believed they were disposed to favour reciprocity in natural products, and I contend that the Government, in advising the Governor General to dissolve Parliament, did so prematurely and under false pretenses, since they are not now disposed, as far as we can judge, to enter into any treaty for reciprocity. There were three candidates in the field during my election—an independent and a Government candidate and myself. The independent candidate was in favour of closer trade relations with the United States. Now, if either of these hon. gentlemen had been elected instead of your humble servant he would have been bound to support a policy of closer trade relations with our neighbours; and I repeat, the Government, in asking His Excellency to dissolve Parliament, did so prematurely and on false pretenses. I would like to know why the House was dissolved? Can any hon. gentleman in this House tell, from the explanations given by the Government and their supporters, what the reason was for dissolving the House and calling us to sit here three or four months in the heat of summer? What could have been the object of the Government? It may be that these gentlemen well knew what was coming. Whether it was they dreaded that the tide was setting in favour of the Liberal policy or whether they dreaded the revelations that have since taken place I cannot tell, but they appealed to the people and obtained a verdict on false pretenses. We have heard a great deal said about the National Policy and the great benefits done to the country by that policy. We have seen hon. gentlemen get up, one after the other, and endeavour to make it appear to this House and the country that the farmers are largely benefited by that policy. I represent a farming constituency, and I represent also lumbering interests. I have been connected with the various interests of the country, the lumbering, the farming, and other interests, for the last thirty years, having been a business man in the Ottawa section for the last thirty years, and having good opportunities for knowing the position of the farmers in that district. In 1878 I was a candidate for a seat in this House. Prior to that, we heard something about the National Policy, in 1877, when the question was brought up in the then Parliament; but who ever heard of the National Policy before Confederation? Who ever heard anything of it during the first Parliament of Canada? What gave it birth? Is it not true that when the Mackenzie Government came into office they did so under adverse circumstances, and that general depression prevailed, not only in Canada but all over the world? And is it not true that the few manufacturers who approached the Government and wanted an increase of duty were told plainly by the Government of the day that that could not be done? Speaking on the question of duty, what was the case under the Mackenzie Government? The duty on imported goods was 15 per cent., and they raised it to 17½ per cent. Did not Sir Charles Tupper oppose that increase? Was he or the Conservative party then in favour of the National Policy? Nothing of the kind. But the Conservative party, when they were undergoing sentence of punishment for their criminal conduct, conceived, with that ingenuity only criminals possess, this policy. They said: We will take advantage of the situation; we will go to the people and say we have a policy to protect the manufactures of the country. We will say to them: tax yourselves to support our manufacturers, and you will create home markets and make yourselves rich. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) alluded to the promises then made, that manufactures would be created all over the country, that smokestacks would appear everywhere. Why, Sir, in the County of Pontiac, when I was a candidate, that was the argument used by our opponents. They said: Vote for the National Policy, go in for protection, and you will have home markets right at your doors, and smoke-stacks will take the place of your pine stumps. That was the plea on which they went to the farmers of the country; but have these promises been fulfilled? I say the National Policy has not created the home markets which these gentlemen pretended. I have seen no evidence of it in the Ottawa valley. At the last election I appealed to the people again, and I was more fortunate than I was in 1878, when I went down with the dead men. Still, I was satisfied that the time would come when these men who succeeded then would be hurled out of office, and that time is fast approaching. I asked the people at the last election: Where are the smokestacks that were promised. They were nowhere to be seen. I pointed out a little smokestack with half a dozen

logs around it, and I asked if that was an evidence of the beneficial results of the National Policy. I said: Compare your present condition with all you have done, with all the work you have given, man, woman and child, and is your position to-day relatively better than it was in 1878? I am sorry to say no great difference could be seen. The people of Canada were deceived, they were humbugged—if I may use the word—and to say that the farmer is benefited by this National Policy appears to me to be the grossest absurdity. The hon. gentleman who has just made an eloquent and able speech says that the very fact of the farmer having his land mortgaged is an evidence of prosperity. The thing is absurd. As a business man, if I hear that any of my customers has his land mortgaged I say: Good bye; your land is gone. Instead of the National Policy having been a benefit to the farmer it has been a curse. In 1878 I said to the farmers: If these gentlemen can show you that, by exacting from your pockets $1 in order to protect the manufacturer, you will get $1 back, or even a percentage of it, you may be right to vote for the National Policy. But what is the object of protecting the manufacturers? It is in order that these men may keep power, and the manufacturing interests are those that have helped to keep them in power. The National Policy has created monopolists and combinesters, who have made themselves wealthy at the expense of the country. I might go on at great length and show this House the effect of the National Policy; if I thought it necessary, I could show that this policy has been of no benefit whatever to the farmers, and that property has depreciated in value; no matter to what cause you may attribute it—there is the fact. The hon. gentleman who preceded me said that Canada was a great country, and he spoke of her lovely women, and so on. We will admit all that, but Canada has not prospered commensurately with the increase of our annual expenditure and our national debt. It has not prospered in the same proportion either in population or in wealth. I think we ought to see more evidence of general prosperity than we do if the country is such as we are requested to believe; but, as a business man and a merchant of over thirty years' standing, I must say that I never saw trade more stagnant than it is to-day, or the farming community in a worse condition. If we have all those advantages to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and if the National Policy has brought about these blessings, I say we should have greater evidence of prosperity than we now enjoy. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to unrestricted reciprocity have charged the Liberals with being annexationists. When they have nothing else to say their newspaper organs charge us with being annexationists. I do not remember when any of our leaders signed an annexation manifesto or expressed annexation sentiments. We favour unrestricted reciprocity because we believe it would be in the best interests of both countries. We advocate that policy in the interests of the country, not in the interests of a party. Have we anything to gain as a party by being annexed to the United States? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that unrestricted reciprocity will lead to political union, and they say we will be gobbled up by the United States, as we are only a handful of people. If that is the case, what will we be as a party? There is no logical reasoning in that. We favour unrestricted reciprocity because we believe it will be beneficial to the country, and I think we have given sufficient reasons to show that. If we believed that annexation would benefit the country we would not hesitate to say so. Whenever we think annexation to the States will benefit this country morally, socially, financially, and in every other way, we will not hesitate to say so, but we like this country, we like the system of government under which we live, if we had only an honest Government, a Government which would carry on the affairs of the country economically. Hon. gentlemen say: If you had unrestricted reciprocity, where would you get revenue? Well, we will not require so much revenue. I think the government of this country can be carried on very much more economically. We are over-governed altogether. For my own part, I think we should get rid of the Senate business, or have that body elected in some other way. I think it is a useless piece of Government machinery; it is the fifth wheel to a coach—a lot of gentlemen appointed for life simply because they are supporters of a political party. I do not care whether it is the Conservative party or the Reform party. They are appointed in many cases because the people refuse to elect them. I believe it is a wrong thing to have any of these gentlemen in the Government. Look at our Premier. He is not personally responsible to the people. The present Government had to take the Premier out of the Senate, and he has no responsibility to the people. I say that we could dispense with that institution. I say we could do away with half of the Civil Service. If we had unrestricted reciprocity we could remove many Custom-house officers, and we would only spend money on such public improvements as are actually required for the benefit of the country. Then we would not require the revenue which is now collected from the people on that account. Sir, we would do away with many other things. Look at the Franchise Act. The Government have taken hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the people to operate that most infamous Act. Was there any necessity for that Act? Did the people of this country ask for it? Did they petition for it? No, Sir. That Act was another piece of rascality, if it is not unparliamentary for me to say so; it was a most infamous and rascally act on the part of the Government, that cost the people of this country hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then we would do away with many other things; the Mounted Police have been mentioned, and many other large and unnecessary expenditures could be saved to the country. But, Sir, these gentlemen are in office, and want to keep an army of their friends employed at the expense of the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the record of the Conservative party, from what I know of it, is a bad record. I know something of the record of the Conservative party in 1872. I remember when the Hon. Edward Blake proposed to amend the Controverted Election Acts; he desired to make the election law as stringent as possible in regard to bribery, and I remember that the Government of the day opposed the proposition. Why, Sir? Because, as the result showed, they wanted to use Sir Hugh Allan's money to carry the elections, by fair means or foul, and they carried them by foul means. I was a candidate myself in 1872; I have

been a candidate too often for my own interest. I know how the Conservative party conducted elections at that time. I know that in the county I ran for they used money wholesale to bribe the electors; and not only that, but in some Conservative strongholds they actually took possession of the polls, and they voted everybody that was on the list, all absentees, living or dead—I was going to say men, women and children, and I might as well say it, because in one township where there were 668 voters the Conservative party polled 666. Well, Sir, I protested the election; I appealed to the House for fair play, and my petition was thrown out on a technicality. The partner of my opponent who defeated me was Speaker of the House, and he was the gentleman that threw out my petition. I said then that if the Conservative party were disposed to resort to such practices and to do such gross acts of injustice they were a party not worthy the confidence of the people of this country. Then Sir, look at the efforts of the Liberal party to adopt the ballot system. Did the Conservatives ever treat their opponents fairly and squarely in any election? I say they did not, unless they hoped to enjoy some undue advantage. Then they adopted their gerrymandering tactics, and the practice of "hiving the Grits," as Sir John A. Macdonald used to say, they did it in order to get the advantage of their opponents. Then they came to the Franchise Act, and then to this huge gigantic swindle, the National Policy, and they have been patching that up ever since. They tell us time and again that it has been endorsed by the people. I say it has not been endorsed by the people; I say the people have been unduly influenced by other means, but they have never endorsed the National Policy. If the Conservative party had faith in that National Policy, why resort to these other methods? Why not meet their opponents fairly and squarely on the merits of the question, on the merits of the National Policy? In one of my elections what did they do? The people of the town of Pembroke gave to the Canada Central Railway Company a bonus of $75,000, and they afterwards petitioned this Government to get relieved from the payment of that sum. They pleaded with the Government for three or four years, but the Government would pay no attention or entertain the petition, as we were informed on good authority. But on the eve of an election, I think it was in 1882, when I was a candidate for Parliament, Sir Charles Tupper sent a telegram to the Government candidate which was read at the first political meeting, and he said:

"Pembroke is to be relieved of its railway indebtedness, subject to the ratification of Parliament."

Now, Sir, was not that a piece of wholesale bribery? Could you call it anything else? I say if the Government had any faith in their National Policy, why endeavour thus unduly to influence the people at that particular time? Was it not most disgraceful? If they had any shame in them, would not they be ashamed? Would they not say: This is too glaring? Would they not say: We had better wait until after the election? No, Sir, they were afraid; they were afraid of their shadow, and they came to the rescue of the town of Pembroke. We do not thank the Government for coming to the relief of Pembroke. True, I, as a ratepayer in the town of Pembroke, benefited to a certain extent, and I was very glad of it. It was simply an act of justice, but if it was just why did not the Government do it before? Why did they leave it to that particular time? I say that such is the record of the Conservative party all through; this act was in keeping with their whole record. They may talk about the population of this country increasing. Why, Sir, hundreds of people have been leaving the country. On one occasion I saw on a train of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway several families on board going to Minnesota. I asked them what they were leaving for; they said they could not make a living, they could not get cash for their products, they could not get anything to do, and so they were obliged to leave. I asked them where they were going; they said they were going to Minnesota. I said: "Do you expect to better your condition there?" They said "Yes," and pointing to another man on the train they said: "There is the gentleman we are going with; he is going to give us employment when we get there." These are facts that came under my own observation. I went to this gentleman and I said: "Are you taking these people to Minnesota with you?" I supposed they were voters; I did not know where they were going, and I had an idea of soliciting their votes, and I think I would have got them if they had remained. But unfortunately I found they were going to leave the country, and I lost their votes. This gentleman told me that he was going to give them all employment on his farm; he said he had employment for 15 or 20 hands and sometimes 25, for the whole year round. I said to him: "What kind of a farm have you got?" He said: "I have got a good farm." I asked: "What is land worth there per acre?" He said his land was worth $60 an acre. I asked him what he raised. He said he raised flax. I said: "Is flax profitable?" He said: "Yes; we grow flax very profitably." "But," I said: "How are these people going to get along?" "Well," he says, "they can settle on land later on; they can get land always from $4 to $5 and $7 an acre." I said: "Even then, how are they going to pay for these lands?" He said: "One or two good seasons of flax will pay for the land." Now, Sir, there is a fact that came under my own observation. I say, with regret, that our people are leaving us too rapidly, and we have not sufficient inducements held out to them.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Would the hon. gentleman give me the name of the party that was taking them away?

Mr. MURRAY. The hon. gentleman asks me the names of the parties?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No; I asked the name of the party that was taking them away, upon whose lands they were going to work. And afterwards, will he tell me where they were to be settled on land?

Mr. MURRAY. Does the hon. gentleman doubt my word?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I do, most decidedly.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the hon. gentleman doubt my veracity? I think the hon. member for Algoma is personally acquainted with me. He knows a little of my history as a public man, and I do not think he has ever known me to tell a direct falsehood.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Not at all.

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is what he charges me with. I was giving a fact that came under my personal observation, where farmers in the Township of Leslie——

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Give me the name of the individual that took these men away. I have known the hon. gentleman for many years. I asked the name of the individual.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have riled the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No; you have not.

Mr. MURRAY. I am very sorry that he doubted my statement. I am also very sorry that I cannot give him the particular names of those people. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am prepared to back up my statement with further evidence. I can assure the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) I have no object in belittling my country, that I am as good a Canadian as he is. I am a native Canadian, and brought up in Canada as well as born in it. I have the honour to stand within 20 miles of where I was born; I am standing in my native County of Carleton, and I would not say one word to belittle my country. I have given as much evidence as has the hon. gentleman of my faith in the future of my country. Anyone who knows my history as a business man in the Ottawa valley knows that I have shown as much faith as he or any other hon. gentleman in the future of this country. I have given substantial evidence of my faith. I have endeavoured to develop the trade and resources of the country, and I have spent every dollar I have made in this country. I am a Canadian pure and simple, in every sense of the word. Not only have I spent here every dollar I could make, but I have risked my credit. I feel, therefore, all the worse to see the country in its present position. I feel for my country and for my countrymen. I know that we have a healthy climate, rich resources in forests, minerals and fisheries and fur-bearing animals, and that our agricultural resources are very great indeed. But I contend that agriculture and every industry is taxed to death. I say that this country is neglected. Many portions of Ontario and Quebec are neglected and do not receive aid for railways, while large amounts of money are given to wild-cat railways and to building canals that are for the benefit of favourites and supporters. There is a great deal of money wasted in that way by the Government of the day. There was money wasted in my own county. On the Culbute Canal $500,000 were sunk, which might as well have been thrown into the river. The canal was projected to help a Government supporter, and money has been thrown away. This is the case there as well as throughout the Dominion. The credit of the country was given a few evenings ago to a railway that may be very deserving, but is not deserving compared to other railways. Take the County of Pontiac. We have the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, unfinished, as is known, that got a small Dominion subsidy; besides people have had to tax themselves over $100,000, or, including interest, $160,000. A deputation came here to interview the Government on the subject and ask the Government to relieve the county under the circumstances, and the late Premier, Sir John Macdonald, said the matter would be fairly considered. I trust the Government will yet fairly consider the position of the county and do them simple justice. If they come to the relief of that road, then we will say they are doing the right thing, especially at this moment, when justice should be done to the county. I trust the Government will not overlook such an enterprise as that, but will give further aid to that very deserving enterprise. In doing that they would help to keep the people in the county who are now leaving it. We have a large territory in the county yet undeveloped, and it would afford a stimulus if we obtained a little assistance to help to construct the road as far west as possible. There is another enterprise that I think should be assisted in order to keep the people in Ontario and Quebec. There is a large section undeveloped between Mattawa, North Bay and Sudbury, and north to Nippissing towards James' Bay. We have the Nipissing and James' Bay Railway, which has obtained a bonus form the Ontario Government for the first 50 miles of $150,000. I believe they have applied here for a subsidy to carry the road to Temiscamingue. It is perhaps the best wooded country in the Dominion, being rich in pine, birch and hemlock. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) referred to tanneries, being established where there is hemlock. There is room there for hundreds of tanneries and for factories of different kinds to manufacture the raw material of the lumber into doors and other articles. We have some of the best belts of land in the province, and the reports of the surveyors show we have a large tract at the head of Lake Temiscamingue that is capable of settling millions of people. That country is altogether overlooked, and unfortunately we see trainloads of people pass near it every day. The trains from Boston to Sault Ste. Marie carry hundreds of immigrants through here to settle in the United States. If they were going to settle in some part of Canada or in the North-West it would be all right; but these people who pass through might be kept here, for this country would meet their requirements—but the Government overlook it. Are they waiting until that country is made an electoral district and sends a supporter? If they are going to wait that long I think they will fail. But speaking of the agriculture of Ontario and Quebec, what is the position of those provinces in this House at the present time? Do we not stand here with a majority from the two great agricultural provinces of the Dominion?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I challenge the hon. gentlemen to look at the very first vote given, and they will find that the united vote of Ontario and Quebec gave a majority in favour of the policy of the Liberal party. I think we had a majority of three or four votes. What does that go to show? It shows that the great agricultural provinces of Canada are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. I will say, in conclusion, that I am glad to be here to have an opportunity of meeting my opponents, and to be with my friends in advocating the policy which they believe will tend to the best interests of the people. I am proud, Sir, to be here to be a supporter of the Liberal party; I am proud to be here associated with our old leader, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I am sorry to say that through physical debility he is not as he used to be, but notwithstanding that, we honour and revere

him, and the people of the constituency which sends him here are a credit to their country. I am proud to see associated with him some of his old colleagues —for instance, his Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright), perhaps one of the best-abused men in Canada. Why is it that the other side abuse that hon. gentleman? Has he committed any political crime; is it because there is a single blemish on his character? No, Sir, but it is because they know well he is an able man. They say, because he has gone to Boston and attended a board of trade banquet there, and met very distinguished men, that he is an annexationist and supports annexation. Have we seen anything in his utterances to that effect? No, Sir, we have not. Conservative and Reformer alike, in this country, ought to be proud that we have in Canada a man who can go there and be spoken of as the Americans speak of him, a man on whom the press of the United States have conferred the highest eulogiums. I am glad, too, that we have the Hon. Mr. Laurier as our leader to-day. We did not object to the Hon. Alex Mackenzie because of his nationality or religious views: we stuck to him as true Liberals, because he was an honest man: we stuck to him on account of his honesty of purpose, and because he was a patriot and a man who loved his country, and tried to do the best for her. That is the reason we were loyal to Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, and for the same reason we will stand loyally by the Hon. Wilfred Laurier. We admire our leader as a Canadian, irrespective of whether he is a Frenchman or an Irishman or a Scotchman. We are proud of him as a Canadian, and I hope the day is not far distant when he will be the Premier of this country, and when he will have his hon. friend to his left as Finance Minister, and other able men around him in his Cabinet. When the day comes that the Hon. Wilfred Laurier is Premier, confidence will be renewed among the people of this country; they will take fresh courage, they will have something to live for and to hope for; but at present, even the friends of the Government in power are ashamed of their own leaders. They know very well that they cannot redeem themselves; they may stick to one another here; they may stick to the huge white elephant of the National Policy as long as he has a limb to stand on, but if we, the Liberals, were to-day in their position—no, we would not like to be in their position; I would rather be in the position which we occupy ourselves—I say that if we, the Liberals, were in the position in which the Government is to-day we could not hold together for twenty-four hours, because there would not be a man with the slightest sense of honour who would stand by us; and we would not expect them to do it in the face of the revelations that have been made. But, Sir, what is to come? That is the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have been a little harsh, and perhaps I have spoken with too much feeling, but, Sir, I could not help it. I think that these gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have been imposing upon the people of the country too long; they have burthened and taxed the people of this country, and the people are awakening to the sad condition of affairs. We wish that the people of Canada should be educated as to the true situation, and I think they are getting pretty well educated, to their cost. These gentlemen have said that if they had ten days longer before the election we would not have a corporal's guard. We know that the last ten days is the time when the Tories get in their work; they go around to the electors and wake them up at night; that is the time they use the boodle; we know very well how they do it, but I challenge them to go to the country now.

An hon. MEMBER. We will do it in good time.

Mr. MURRAY. Why did you not wait until after the census; why did you not wait for the regular life of Parliament; why did you not wait until you had a proper voters' list; why did you not wait until the people of Canada had an opportunity of pronouncing on your National Policy? You were afraid to do so, and you prematurely dissolved Parliament and snatched a verdict from the people at a time which you thought was best suited to yourselves. I must apologize to the House for speaking so long.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all; go on.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think it would be fair to hon. gentlemen who want to follow me. It is nearly twelve o'clock, and I believe there will be a division to-night. I believe that we are all anxious now to have a vote taken as early as possible, and I shall say nothing further than to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, for the kindness with which you have listened to my address.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is undoubtedly an old friend of mine, and when we begin to talk politics in the constituency that he lives in, and the constituency that he at present represents, it brings back to my mind some very peculiar reminiscences for the last fifteen or twenty-five years. Now, Sir, the first attack that I notice by the hon. gentleman from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) made was one on the honesty of the Government. It is not for me to stand here and defend the Government, because the hon. gentlemen who compose the Ministry are perfectly able and willing to take care of themselves; but when that debate comes up in this House we will have an opportunity to show that greater scandals existed among the party to which the hon. member for Pontiac now belongs. We will show, Sir, that when their Government was in power——

An hon. MEMBER. You will, in your mind.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). We will show you in your mind, and we will show you practically as well, that scandals generated in the Liberal party. We will show you that scandals generated during your five years of power, and they were scandals that could not be allayed even by members of the Government; and we will show you, further, that very many members of your Government were implicated in these scandals. That is a debate that is going to come up in this House later. It is not for me to defend the Government now against the accusations made by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray), but we will discuss the whole thing later on, and show you where you were wrong. Now, Sir, the Senate is attacked. Well, as I always understood, the Senate is a very respectable congregation of individuals—gentlemen in the country who are chosen not only for their intellectual, but for their financial standing. They are chosen, Sir, as a balance wheel to the somewhat

erratic legislation that is liable to take place in this House. We have an example, and a very good example indeed. The House of Lords in England may remedy the hasty legislation of the House of Commons, and if it is not wise and judicious, those older and more experienced gentlemen who compose that House, quietly put their big feet down and stop it. Now, Sir, the Franchise Act has been attacked by my hon. friend from Pontiac. Fortunately for him he lives in or rather represents a Quebec constituency. If he lived in Ontario as I do, he never would say one word against the Franchise Act, because a greater iniquity was never perpetrated on the people of Ontario, than the Provincial Franchise Act that we have in force there. The Dominion Franchise Act is the fairest that ever existed in Ontario. I have spoken before on this subject, and what I have said has not been contradicted, even by the very fluent member from the adjoining county to that of my hon. friend from Pontiac. What I say is that so many electors are disfranchised by the Ontario Franchise Act that the Dominion Act qualifies the voters to vote in the unorganized districts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You can say "hear, hear," but I am proud to reiterate the statement questioned by the hon. gentleman who has assumed so many facial changes in this House since I came here, that I did not know him when he moved from his seat in the corner and came over here. Sir, the Dominion Franchise Act enables men to vote in the unorganized districts of Algoma, and no doubt also in the unorganized districts in Quebec, who could not possibly have a vote otherwise, and, consequently, I say it is a good Act. Now, it has been said that the railway vote in my district can elect any man who is set up to be elected for the Dominion House. Sir, I repudiate with scorn any such assertion. My friend of the facial changes laughs, but I can laugh because I am the winner; you are the loser; and I can say that only for the Dominion Franchise Act not one of these men in the unorganized districts of Algoma would have had an opportunity to cast his vote at the last election; and, Sir, they did it intelligently. For whom do you suppose they cast their votes? For a good Tory, and more than that, their votes accumulated to such an extent that that Tory came down to this House with a majority of nearly 450, a respectable majority too, a majority not to be despised. When the Franchise Act is attacked, it is like going into my own house and there with a club seeking to "lambaste" me all around my own house. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Pontiac has suggested that we might cut down the expenditure on the militia by nearly one-half. That is not an original idea of his. I have heard the same suggestion from the hon. member for North Norfolk in one of his campaign speeches, when he was suggesting the means for remedying the deficiency in the revenue that was going to result from unrestricted reciprocity. When the hon. gentleman mentioned that to-night I was reminded of a circumstance that occurred a short time ago in my own district. There the volunteers, scattered over an extent of country probably 1,500 miles in length, wanted to be brought into camp—not the Grit camp, as represented on the left side of the Speaker, but brought into camp where they would perfect their drill and organization and become efficient soldiers. I brought that matter to the notice of the hon. Minister of Militia, and he would have been very glad to meet my views if he could; but, unfortunately, this honourable House, both sides of it—the other side was worse than this side—refused positively to appropriate a sufficient amount of money for that purpose. But I do not think anything would be gained to this country by depriving the volunteers, the defenders of this country, of the necessary amount of money to enable them to perfect themselves in the exercise of the evolutions, and the drill, and the parade, that they should have to make them good soldiers. But, Sir, before I get through to-night I will have occasion to deal with some of the gentlemen on the other side who belong to the volunteer force, and I will show wherein consists the loyalty of the gentlemen who wear a sword and swagger in the Queen's uniform. Now, Sir, when I interrupted my hon. friend from Pontiac, I did so conscientiously and honestly in order to specify an individual who told him a certain thing. As I understand debate in this House, when an individual makes a statement an hon. gentleman may take exception to it. It is not that I take exception to the broad statement; but I, as a plain individual, accustomed to deal with people who state straightforwardly and honestly what they believe, asked the hon. gentleman to give me the name of the party who told him that those people were passing by the doors and flocking away from the constituency he belonged to, and going off to another land. I think that I was perfectly justified in asking for the name of the individual. The hon. gentleman did not give me the name of the individual, but he simply asked if I doubted his statement. Well, as he is a railway contractor, like myself, I am inclined to take his statement *cum grano salis*. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray), and I am sorry to be obliged to score an old chum, because, if my recollection serves me aright, at one time he belonged to the same party to which I have now the honour to belong, but there is this difference, that I did not change, whereas he did. I find in after years, as the tide of life flowed in upon the hon. gentleman, that he sought greater distinction that we in the old days dreamed of. He became the sheriff of the county. He occupied that very high position where it is incumbent on any individual to put the noose around the neck of the criminal. I never attained that dignity. I cannot hope to attain that dignity as long as the Mowat Government is in office in Ontario. But the hon. gentleman did more than that. He found, during the last contest, that very many influences were brought to work to elect members in different parts of the Dominion. Among others, our hon. friend who has just spoken, levanted; he flitted, as it were, from the county to which he belonged, and he meandered across the Ottawa River and sought election at the hands of a strange electorate. Now, the ballot system has been scored by the hon. gentleman. Well, the ballot system in the Dominion is certainly an honest system, and I really wonder that the hon. gentleman, who has been a member of the Local House in Ontario, and who knows the iniquities that are perpetrated under the Ontario system, should have ever mentioned the matter here. Sir, under the Dominion system, the ballot

is secret, as it was intended originally it should be and as it always will be, unless the law should be changed; and, as we are advancing, not backward, but forward, the ballot system cannot retrograde. A man can step to-day into the booth and cast his ballot for the candidate, and the deputy returning officer or poll clerk or scrutineer cannot know how he voted. I will not detain the House with explaining how the hon. gentleman was elected in Ontario; but it is a most iniquitous system, the iniquity of which has been pointed out to the Ontario Government often, but has not been remedied to this day. I maintain, without fear of contradiction, that the system of the ballot in the Dominion is a better system than that which exists in Ontario to-day. The hon. gentleman has laid himself open to many criticisms, and I feel sorry to be obliged to score him, because, leaving his politics out of the question, the hon. gentleman is a very decent fellow to meet, and all that, for the harmony of the thing and with jolly good fellows; but with regard to the increase of population, I can only say that in the district I have the honour to represent, if the population has not doubled in the last ten years, I am prepared to resign my seat in this House and go back to the electorate and ask for their vindication of it. But instead of the district I have the honour to represent decreasing in population, it has doubled, and I hope as a good, loyal, true and honest Canadian that it has trebled in population in the last ten years, and I venture to say when the returns are brought in, if it has not trebled, at least it ought to be doubled. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman to give us the name of the individual who was so fresh as to state to him in his constituency where all these people were going. He did not do that, and, consequently, I can have very little more to say on that subject, but will draw the attention of the House to a subject intimately connected with the hon. member for Pontiac, and not only for Ponctiac, but the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) who has so eloquently discoursed on the iniquities of the individuals who took part in the Dominion elections. Sir, there is a most peculiar fact connected with our elections in Ontario as well as those in the counties of Quebec adjoining Ontario or the sparsely settled counties. There is a fund there which is called the Government roads fund. A very peculiar feature of this fund is that to this day in the district I have the honour to represent no individual has been able to find out how that money was expended. But we have an idea, and a very good idea, and I trust in time we will be able to get to the bottom of this system. The idea expressed by certain individuals is this, that if $1,000 is to be expended in a certain part of the district, at least $500 of this has to go into the *pouche* of the individual manipulating the grant. The result is that certain men are employed and certain individuals are paid for their time, and the consequence is that in almost every portion of the unorganized part of Ontario, instead of the money going to improve the roads, as intended by the electorate, it goes into the hands of individuals who have been convicted of the most outrageous bribery and corruption. Within the last few days I have had occasion to read the evidence in regard to the East Algoma election petition, a petition which was brought against the return of a member for the Ontario Legislature. Certain individuals say that local politics have nothing to do with us here. They are all one party, and I think that has a great deal to do with us here. It shows the bribery and corruption which exists among those officials whereby at times they can corrupt the electorate and subvert their wishes and return a member here as well as for Ontario who is not the choice of the honest electors. I find that an election took place on the 5th June, 1890, in the district I have the honour to represent in this House. At that election the honest electorate returned to the Legislative Assembly in Toronto a gentleman who was above reproach. The election was immediately protested, and by whom do you suppose it was protested? Was it by the honest electorate of the district? No, it was by the Ontario Government officials, and one of them swore that he had mortgaged—not his own farm, he did not own anything—but his wife's farm, for $500, in order to put it up as part of the deposit. The license inspector and the license commissioners also went down with money in their pockets to make up the $1,000 necessary for the protest. The case came to trial. Mr. Justice Osler and Mr. Justice Ferguson met there a few weeks ago, heard all the charges made in regard to that election, and then they complimented the boodling Conservative, the boodling Tory, upon the purity of the election which took place in Eastern Algoma. The judges then proceeded to investigate the charges against the boodling Grit candidate in Western Algoma, and their decision is reserved till the 5th September, with what result the House will probably see if our friends opposite will not draw a short bow and let us go away from here, and will not indulge in such terribly long speeches.

Mr. CASEY. What are you doing now?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am speaking to a question. I am not like a gentleman opposite who rejoices in the sobriquet of "Ananias" or another gentleman who has the sobriquet of "the Scavenger," and I am determined that I will make my voice heard in this House, no matter what hon. gentlemen may say. It afflicts my heart to hear them talking that way. I have a soft spot for the gentleman who has just asked me what I am doing, and he will hear from me later. This debate has assumed a very wide range.

Mr. MULOCK. I should say so.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). What is that you say, Mr. North York? I will give you a dose the first thing you know.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Order.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I do not want anyone to post me, Mr. North Brant. This subject has assumed a very wide range, but before proceeding to discuss the question itself, I wish to refer to what the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Allan) has said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Give us facts.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). We will give you facts, all you want, before we get through with you, and you will be sorry you asked for them. When the hon. member referred to this sugar question, I supposed he was a great sugar refiner. I thought he must be a little more than a candy baker, but before he concluded I thought the hon. gentleman must be probably a country storekeeper, and when he undertook to dilate upon the duties taken off

from sugar by the Finance Minister and the present Government, I thought the hon. gentleman was in very deep water. And there is no doubt he was, because that is a subject which requires very careful handling and very careful consideration. I find hon. gentlemen will discuss any question at all, whether they understand it or not. The sugar duties are matters of very great importance to the country and require a great deal of consideration, but, being an humble individual in the ranks of this party, I would never take upon myself the responsibility of dilating upon the sugar duties. I find it is a fact, and it is one acceptable to the country, that the Government have reduced the duty on sugars by three millions and a-half, and that is sufficient for me and for my people whom I have the honour to represent in this House. The hon. gentleman went further and made a bold statement which lacks truth. You say you cannot call in this House an individual, or what you call an hon. gentleman, a falsifier, or say that he does not tell the truth. I have been accustomed to use the plain unvarnished English, and when a man states what you know is not the truth, you simply call him a l-i-a-r. When you find an hon. gentleman who preceded the member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray), who came I think from one of the Essexes, stating that the cotton mills are partially shut down——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Some of them are shut up altogether.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma)—I say he is stating what is not true.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says I am stating what is not true. I say that one of the largest cotton mills in Canada to-day, in the town where I live, is closed up.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken was not the individual —I was going to say the hon. gentleman—but he is not the individual who made the assertion. Well, Sir, yesterday I came from a town where the cotton mills are in full blast, and I saw on the streets of that town the boys and the girls who were working in that mill, parading the streets in the evening, well dressed, respectable and well-to-do, and these factories are running, not half time, but full time. Now, after dealing with the frivolous arguments that have been presented by the other side, let us come down to the solid arguments of this debate. Now, what are they? The hon. gentleman from South Oxford has moved an amendment. What does that amendment contain? Sir, it appears to me a good deal like an old friend rigged up in new clothes; it appears to me a good deal like what we understood during the late political contest to be the policy of the opposite side of the House; it appears to me to be this: That the National Policy, according to their idea of things, was a failure, and the hon. gentleman has moved a catch amendment to it. Now, in the district I have the honour to represent, we have vast industries; we have all the industries that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford spoke about in his amendment. We have the mining industry, we have the agricultural industry, we have the fishing industry, and we have the labouring classes. Now, what is the object of the amendment? The object appears to be to enable the party opposite to go forth to the country and say to the electorate that the present Dominion Government was not prepared to reduce the duties upon articles used by these agricultural classes. It goes a little further than that: it provides that the freest interchange shall take place between the Dominion of Canada and the United States in the natural products and the manufactured articles of the two countries. Now, Sir, that brings us to the old question, that brings us to the discussion that took place upon the hustings of the Dominion of Canada, by the two parties previous to the 5th of March, and what was the result after the discussion took place? The result was that to this House was returned a majority sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country, and not only that, but a majority larger than the great Liberal-Conservative party had when they were returned to power in 1887. Now, when we look at the resolution before the House, we can only consider what the electorate of Canada is prepared to say to that resolution. Well, I will speak of my own district, a very large one, the greater Ontario, if I may so call it—because the other is the lesser Ontario—a district that is at least 1,200 miles in extent, a district that has natural facilities for hundreds of thousands of honest and willing labouring men, a district capable of receiving the exodus that has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen opposite; and if they were honest in their contention they would say, whenever that exodus comes up, that we have a district large enough to absorb all that exodus. We have a district there composed of lumbermen, of miners, of agriculturists, of railway men and fishermen. Sir, the fishing industry is probably one of the largest in that whole vast district. We have there a district capable of absorbing all the surplus population of the Dominion of Canada, where they can find good wages, and where, if they have come with an honest purpose and with the intention of settling, there is not a man who need go away without having made money, and done what is right by himself and the people that have sent him there. Sir, we have in that district probably the finest agricultural land that lies outdoors in this great Dominion of Canada. That district, I am sorry to say, is not sufficiently known, it ought to be better known, and for that reason it requires my voice to be raised in the halls of the nation to plead to the gentlemen on the other side of the House not to send their surplus population to the United States, but to let them come to us and we will take care of them and we will do well by them. In the eastern part of that district there is a vast Island 100 miles long by 40 miles wide. A short time ago it was described in one of the geographies of the Ontario Government, authorized to be used by the children of Ontario, and what do you suppose was the description of that vast district? Sir, that is a district in itself larger than half a dozen counties in the Province of Ontario. How do you suppose that the Education Department of Ontario described that vast district? It says: The Manitoulin Island is 16 miles long, principally inhabited by Indians. That was the statement, the broad statement, that went forth to the children of the Province of Ontario who are living east of that vast district. Well, Sir, that Island, instead of being about 16 miles long and principally inhabited by Indians—and if I weary the House with a little explanation of this kind, I trust they will bear with me, because every individual knows

that to the heart of a man who has made a certain country his own, that country is dear, and consequently he can but say what he believes to be best in the interest of that country. That country is my home. The more settlers that come in there, the greater my prosperity : and the greater the prosperity of every individual who has the courage, and the manliness, and the hardihood to leave his home in the east and come to make a home for himself in the west. Now, Sir, that Island is possessed of land that I would venture to say—as I have had an opportunity to travel over it—it is such as that any farmer in the Province of Ontario will be glad to go and cultivate. I have known there farmers who have raised crops that would astonish the old farmers in Ontario ; I have known them to raise crops that would astonish the best agriculturists in the Province of Quebec. Although the wheat-fields lie to the west of us, we have a heritage that is not to be despised, we have a heritage there that is second to none in this great Dominion of Canada, as I will proceed to show a little later on. If we cannot raise wheat such as Manitoba raises, we can raise at least other products that bring the very highest prices in the markets of the land ; and why should we shout for unrestricted reciprocity? Adjoining that vast Island that has the greatest capabilities, we have along the shore of Lake Huron a country not to be despised. We have pleasant valleys and running brooks, the very best agricultural land it is possible to find under the sun. We have a country settled by a prosperous and happy people. We have a people there that has not yet recognized the "blue ruin" tirade preached through the lesser Ontario. The "blue ruin" was to a certain extent preached there, but it was ineffectual, because our people are happy, prosperous and well-to-do and satisfied with their lot. But we have vast districts of land there, and all we require are settlers to come in and settle our agricultural and arable land and make it a grand fertile country, and I venture to say that this will be equal to any county in Ontario. It is not only the agricultural land on which our people depend for a living. We have there the greatest gift that the Lord in his bounty has bestowed on mankind. We have in the hills that adjoin that agricultural district the greatest deposit of minerals that can be found in Canada, and not only in Canada, in North America but in the world. I see the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) laughs, but he is one of the individuals who has benefited by being a speculator in that district. This is a very common thing to laugh at the expressions of those who have the welfare, prosperity, and happiness, and well-being of their people at heart, but it is another thing to accomplish beneficial results. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but many have been glad to benefit by a small investment that has returned them more than a hundred fold. From Sudbury west to Port Arthur, and even west of that, the mineral portion of our country lies. We have there minerals that the Lord has deposited in the hills.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Hon. members may laugh, but they go there to make money when they fail in the east. We have gold, silver, nickel, which is one of the greatest economic minerals to-day. We have vast deposits of iron that by the expenditure of a small sum any individual may take up, notwithstanding the obnoxious mining law of the Ontario Government, that contemptible law by which the milch cow has to furnish the money with which to run the province. Their resources are limited, but out of our mines they exact an increased amount of money from every acre of land which has been taken up there, and, in the next place, they exact from all mines, under this Mining Act, a royalty. The consequence is that the capitalists, not from the United States, to which hon. gentlemen opposite would wish us to look, but the solid capitalists that send their money here for permanent investment become scared. They say, how do we know that Mowat is not going to do as Mercier did? These two men, without doubt, have influenced the mining capital of the world and have prevented them coming here to develop our mines. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke in regard to the fisheries of that district. No hon. gentleman has any idea of the fisheries of the district to which I belong. We have a lake coast of 1,500 miles. The Minister of Marine has taken every precaution that good and judicious administration could devise in preserving those fisheries, not for the present fishermen so much as for future generations. But if the fisheries of Lake Superior, Lake Huron and the Georgian Bay are going to become a permanent industry, a complete revolution should take place in the administration as it exists at present. The fishermen who come from the constituency of the hon. member for Lambton are prepared to deplete our fisheries when they have an opportunity. They come there temporarily, and as soon as the fisheries are depleted they take up their nets and go away. The experience heretofore has been this. In Lake Ontario the fisheries to-day are practically depleted ; in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay the fisheries are to a great extent depleted, but to-day we have the finest fisheries on the continent of North America in Lake Superior, and those fisheries should be, and they are being, protected by the wise and judicious administration of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have spoken of the mining, fishing and agricultural advantages of the district I have the honour to represent. If I went with a hypocritical tear in my eye to the agriculturists of that district and asked them to send me to this House as their representative, I would have failed. I do not know exactly whose supporter I was going to be. The leader of the Opposition was ostensibly the leader, but there was another perambulating the Province of Ontario, the "blue ruin" knight from South Oxford ; he went through the country and had a good deal to say about the fad that was being discussed by the electors at that time. If I had gone to those people with a hypocritical tear in my eye, as gentlemen did in other parts of Ontario, I doubt very much if I could have got a corporal's guard, and I am satisfied I would not have had the honour to stand on this floor and address those who have listened to the rambling words that fell from the lips of a Western Highlander. There are a few things to be discussed with reference to the fad proposed by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I see the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) is smiling, and he had better look out, because I am loaded for bear.

I am just on the hunt for game of that kind, but I will not say anything if he keeps quiet. I did not go to my constituency with a hypocritical tear in my eye, as many hon. gentlemen opposite did to the agricultural communities in their constituencies. I have explained that my constituency is a vast and varied one, the productions are as vast and various as the soil and climate, and I represent people of different nationalities, different tastes and different pursuits. Hon. gentlemen on the other side represent themselves as friends of the farmers. I only know of one hon. gentleman in this House who invaded my district, and I think he only addressed a mining community, but he did not say one word to them about the Mining Act passed by the Ontario Government. However, he said in this House, that if it were not for that law I probably would not have got a majority in Sudbury. Let me tell that hon. gentleman that in going through that vast district of over 10,500 miles, and during three months of a canvass, I never once attacked the Ontario Mining Act. I have yet to hear from the opposite side of the House a definition of their policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which is our old friend commercial union arrayed in new clothing. I have yet to hear a definition of that policy from the so-called leader of the Opposition. He has sat there in his seat during this discussion from the 23rd of June until the present day, and he has never given us a detail of his policy. We, on this side of the House, are in favour of a fair measure of reciprocity; but, Sir, unrestricted reciprocity, such as gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to understand it, the country wants none of it; and for this reason. In the district that I represent, the farmers produce beef and pork, and I have seen them receive on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway $5.50 per hundred weight for pork, and $6 for beef. When you talk unrestricted reciprocity to these hard-headed farmers, they simply say that it means taking off the duty on beef and pork, and letting in the beef free of duty from the prairies of Montana and Ohio to undersell them in the Canadian market. They do not want the rattle-snake pork from the west to come into their district and compete with them. It might suit some of the lumbermen, it might suit the member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) or the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), but it does not suit the people whom I represent, and they are too sensible to be carried away by an absurdity of that kind. Now, Sir, during the contest in my district, unrestricted reciprocity was placed very unfairly before the people; it was placed just as unfairly before them as it was placed before the people of Ontario, and, Sir, I will say this: Had the people of Ontario been educated up to the absurdity of the fad, you would have found a very different verdict from these people when the elections took place on the 5th of March. We found the plumed knight from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) parading this country from one end to the other, and preaching to the people sectional prejudices. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Allan) addressed the House to-day on what would accrue to a certain portion of the agricultural community, provided that unrestricted reciprocity were adopted; and that reminds me of a story which I heard from a very reliable authority, and it was to the following effect:—During the election in the constituency of South Essex, it was represented to the farmers that just as soon as the election was over, just as soon as it was decided that the Reform party was in power, all the farmers had to do was to cross over to Detroit and sell their products free of duty. To such an extent did that absurdity go, that on the 6th March last, a day fatal to the party that sits to your left, Mr. Speaker, some of the farmers in that constituency loaded their waggons and started to sell their hay until they were overtaken by the Customs officers in the streets of Detroit. They believed what they were told by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that, as soon as the election took place, they could go over there and sell their produce and they would have to pay no duty upon it. The people of the district I represent could not be deluded by the Liberal platform speakers, who tried to deceive them in that way. They said: Vote for us and you will have free trade. Well, free trade as I understand it, was not an issue in the late election at all. It was only a one-sided jug-handled free trade that they proposed between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. They said: Vote for us, and you will have closer trade relations with the United States. Well, Sir, I do not understand yet that that was an issue in the country. They said: Vote for us and you will have reciprocity. A political opponent even went so far as to place on his bills: "Vote for the advocate of reciprocity." But reciprocity did not enter into the contest that took place on the 5th of March at all. Reciprocity as I understand it was only a side issue. The pure and simple issue between the parties of this country was the National Policy *versus* Unrestricted Reciprocity. Now, Sir, we can look back with pride to the time the National Policy was inaugurated. The time at my disposal to-night is too limited to enable me to go into the subject thoroughly; but, Sir, I venture to say, and I am prepared here with facts to prove, that since the National Policy was inaugurated by that grand old chieftain who led the Conservative party so many times to victory, the farmers have got better prices for their produce and they have paid less for everything they have been obliged to consume. Now, Sir, there are other reasons why unrestricted reciprocity should not be adopted by the electors. Has one hon. gentleman opposite been able to explain how they are going to make up the deficiency in the revenue which is involved in unrestricted reciprocity? There is one thing that the farmers of Canada object to, and that is direct taxation. The hon. member for North Norfolk proposes that one-half of the militia expenditure should be cut off. I am here working to get a part of that expenditure for a battalion in my district; a greater and worthier battalion does not exist in the Dominion of Canada, and the only thing it lacks is that *esprit de corps* which comes from men being associated together, and performing those evolutions which it is absolutely necessary every battalion should undergo. There are other objections to the fad that was propounded by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am only sorry that I have not time to discuss them fully to-night. Now, I want to say a word in reference to a remark of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) during the course of his speech. If there is a man I like, it is a Highland Scotchman, that is, a true Scotchman, and not a mongrel—I mean those gentlemen who are descended from David, King of Israel,

because we look back with pride to that ancestor as the progenitor of the race to which we belong. I find that the hon. member for Guysborough made use of these words:

"There were three classes who were attempted to be caught by this loyalty cry. One class were those who were really loyal."

I hope I belong to that class; I hope that my friends belong to that class.—

"The class who believe that the institutions in this country are the best in the world."

We all believe that; we would not change them for any institutions that would follow the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, which would incur the annexation of this country to a foreign land.—

"The second class consists of those who are anxious to leave the Conservative party, but are standing off and saying, we cannot leave that party, because it states that the other party is disloyal. The third class were the chapper little gentlemen——"

I do not see the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); I am sorry he is not here.—

—"who appear on certain days in the uniform of Her Majesty, and are never heard except when they say they are willing to lay down their lives for their country when there is no battle to be fought."

Well, Sir, the hon. member for Guysborough reminds me a good deal of the story of the individual who was drafted as a conscript in the American war, and who said: "You can take all my wife's relations, every one of them, but leave me at home." Now, Sir, loyalty, when it comes to be discussed in this House, has to me almost a sacred sound. Loyalty, Sir, conveys to my breast the feeling that existed in my ancestors when they left the Mohawk Valley over a hundred years ago and came across to Canada and settled in the wilds of this country; and I doubt if there is any other hon. gentleman who can look back to a record such as I have the honour to look back to. Sir, those men left good homes in a fertile valley, and they came to Canada—for what? You may say it was a sentiment, but it was more than that. It was because they would not live under a disunited empire. That to my mind is loyalty, and that is a loyalty which I hope will exist in the breasts of all good, honest Canadians, who have the welfare of their country at heart, and who will repudiate with scorn any idea that the machinations of a party on your right or on your left should ever lead the country to a fate that we should deplore.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) My intention is not to make a speech nor long to occupy the attention of the House at this late hour of the night, especially as the debate on this question has lasted for over a month. However, I think it to be my duty, under the circumstances, owing to the gravity of the question raised by the motion before you, to do more than support it with my vote; I think it my duty to make known, not only by my vote, but by my voice, the views of the electors of the county which I have the honour to represent. Before discussing the main question embodied in the motion now under consideration I must take up a few statements which unfortunately were, but should not have been, made in this House. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), in a speech which he delivered last week, made certain assertions which were not accurate and which deserve to be corrected. The hon. member had the courage to speak of and protest the innocence of his party.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma).

He went even further, and he accused the members on this side of the House of attempting to divert the attention of the electors of the country with what he called paltry and insignificant scandals. My intention is not to discuss what he called paltry and insignificant scandals. Time will come later on to deal with that. Let me only say now that these paltry and insignificant scandals monopolize at present the attention of the electors of the Dominion of Canada. Is there a man in this House and in the country who is ignorant of the revelations which have been made before the committees since the beginning of the session? Is there a man who can believe that the hon. member for Hochelaga was sincere when he said that these revelations were paltry and insignificant scandals? Let us open the newspapers—I will not say the Opposition newspapers, but many of the papers which have always given the Government a cordial support—let us open *La Presse*, for instance, and we will read articles where the acts which were revealed before the investigation committees of this House are strongly censured. Let us open the *Star* of the 22nd and of the 24th instant, and in these two numbers articles will be found denouncing the Government scandals. Let us open *Le Canada* of the 10th of this month; let us glance at the same paper of the 24th instant, and we can see what that paper thinks of the situation; we can see with what severity it speaks of the facts which are now brought to light before the committees. And it will not be argued that those papers are opposed to the Government. Even the *Evening Journal* of this city, of the 26th instant, branded the different acts of the Administration now revealed before the committees. Under the circumstances, I think the hon. member for Hochelaga would have done infinitely better in not speaking of scandals. But what was his object? He wanted to divert the attention of the public, if not that of the members of this House, by mentioning would-be scandals which he says were revealed in the Parliament of Quebec. This is not the time to discuss the matters which came before the Parliament of Quebec. We have not the documents, nor is this an occasion for discussing these matters; but let me by the way repudiate what the hon. member said. He told this House that a committee had been formed in the Parliament of Quebec to hold an investigation on what our opponents have called the Whelan-Pacaud scandal. I regret to say that the hon. member is mistaken. There was no committee appointed to hold an investigation into this matter. There was not one member to be found in the whole House of Quebec who would take the responsibility of bringing forth an accusation; but it was the Government who appointed a Royal Commission which made an investigation. The hon. member said the Government prevented the witnesses from testifying. Such is not the truth. The witnesses were not prevented from answering the questions put to them, but on the refusal of some of them it was contended that the commission had overreached its powers; a brief of prohibition was taken against it, and the question has become a matter for the courts to deal with. Such are the facts as they occurred. The hon. member must have been very short of arguments; he must have considered his position very unsound to try to divert public opinion from the scandals in Ottawa by means of such accusations. Did he think he was

able to prevent the electors of the country and the members of this House from denouncing the scandals that are every day being brought to light before the different committees of this House? I hope not. There is another point which the hon. member for Hochelaga has unfortunately touched. I refer to what he said of Hon. Mr. Mercier. He said:

"Now, His Excellency the Count Mercier, who is being serenaded and promenaded, and drummed and fifed, to-night, arose in his seat and said to the majority: No, you must not order these witnesses to answer the committee; but we must conceal those who refuse to answer."

Mr. Speaker, I regret that a member of this House, and especially the member for Hochelaga, should exercise his irony on the marks of distinction given by the Pope to a Catholic of the country. If a Protestant had risen and said such things we would have been right in thinking them unseemly; but when we see a Catholic, who particularly poses as such—I wonder he did not go as far as a certain Montreal newspaper, and mention the white breeches; no doubt he did not think of it, and willingness was not what failed him—when we see a Catholic member, I say, speak ironically of such decorations and honours, I believe it is the duty of some member of this House to protest against such impropriety, and I am sure that in protesting as I do now I reflect the opinion of the Catholics of Canada in general, and of the Province of Quebec in particular. Now, I will only say a few words on the question of reciprocity. Everybody, doubtless, remembers that the last general elections took place at the time they did under the pretext that the Government wanted to better their position for concluding a treaty of commerce with the United States. Notwithstanding the long dissertations which we were treated to by the members of the Ministerial party, each in his particular line, the one saying that it was not possible to make a treaty with the United States, others contending that it would be advantageous to make a treaty restricted to farm produce only, and others again asserting that it would be altogether against the interest of the country to make a treaty of commerce with the United States, that we have nothing to envy anyone—notwithstanding these dissertations, I say, I have no doubt that I reflect the opinion of the electors of my county in saying that they are in favour of reciprocity with the United States. And in order to prove that they are favourable to the idea of reciprocity I will mention under what circumstances the last election took place. To give an idea of the ground on which the battle was fought in my county I will read a few short extracts from the manifesto published by my opponent, Dr. Coulombe, during that election. This gentleman, in order to frighten the electors of the county, and to induce them to vote against the policy of the Opposition, which was reciprocity, said, in his manifesto:

"Unrestricted reciprocity means annexation."

A little further on he explained what annexation is:

—"Annexation means for the French Canadians the abolition of the French language. Annexation means also the education of the children by the state. The education of the children could no longer be entrusted to the church, even should the latter want to do the work gratuitously. Annexation also signifies the breaking up of all our constitutional laws. Annexation also means the direct taxation of the people."

Dr. Coulombe also gave figures to show the losses that the treasury would suffer from the adoption of the policy of reciprocity. He reached the total figure of $18,782,208. He outdid the member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), and yet he is pretty strong on figures. He also contended that the policy of the party in power was a policy calculated to bring about the free admission of the natural products of Canada into the United States, and he would then exclaim:

"The policy of the Liberals means Canada for the Yankees, a differential tariff against the mother country, direct taxation to the amount of forty dollars per year for a family of ten persons."

I wonder why he did not say it meant war? In my county, as in all the counties of the district of Three Rivers, political affairs are not the only things you have to deal with. Your opponents always work prejudices for all they are worth, in preaching in all styles and manners that Liberalism is condemned, and insinuating that the party of the Opposition in this House, styled the Liberal party, is imbued with the errors of the Liberalism which is condemned in Europe. This prejudice has been so carefully nurtured during the last twenty-five years, always to the benefit of the would-be Conservative party, that for a great number of electors the word Conservatism is the synonym for religion, and the word Liberalism is the synonym for infidelity. Dr. Coulombe did not content himself with what I have mentioned above. He took upon himself to invoke the name of a religious authority. He inserted in his programme a passage from the writings of Bishop O'Brien, of Halifax. If only a man were content to quote correctly the opinion of these eminent prelates. But he extracts, from documents taken I know not where, sentences that in no way render their thought; and it is such that have been presented to the voters at the last elections. The County of Maskinongé has always elected members supporting the Conservative Government, and so strong was the sentiment for unrestricted reciprocity in the county that notwithstanding all the means employed in favour of the Conservative candidate the county returned a man favourable to that policy; and I will add that the majority which was given me at the last election is such as has not been given to anyone for a long time in the county. When in 1878 the so-called National Policy was inaugurated, what were the reasons given for the adoption of this policy? It was practised in all styles and manners; it was said on all the hustings, and the papers friendly to the party spread it everywhere, that with protection we would see a change in the state of things then in existence: that we would see an end to the emigration of our countrymen to the United States; that with protection we would see manufactories arising everywhere; that with protection the people would become more prosperous; that our labouring classes would find work everywhere, and that consequently all would go well and happily. These theories were so fine that the people believed in that prosperity which was promised them; but after twelve or thirteen years of experience, what have we seen? We have seen emigration double and become a plague for the country. We have seen no manufactories building up. On the contrary, we have seen here and there a few manufactories come down. We have not seen

the people finding work and bread here, but we have seen the farming community giving way, so to speak, under the burden of taxes which it had to pay upon the goods it was in need of, while it was impoverished by the losses sustained on the products it had for sale. Now, Mr. Speaker, since we have reached a point where we can say that the experience of the past has superabundantly established that the National Policy has not fulfilled the promises made, is it not time to remedy this state of things? It is exactly what the electors have understood. I will take the liberty to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is the Minister for the district of Three Rivers, and to ask him to cast a glance over that district—to go over the different counties of that district and to tell me if the National Policy has done any good or any harm to the people. Let him tell me what are the manufactories which the policy of his Government has caused to be erected in that district. Let him go into the County of Champlain. There he will see, on the St. Maurice River, what is perhaps the finest water power in the world, a water power capable of running all kinds of manufactories with as much advantage as, and even more advantage, than in any other part of America. A company has already spent more than a million dollars on this water power, but it only uses it to make pulp. This water power can be utilized for a number of things; but as that company has no market to dispose of its goods it cannot expand as it might if a large market was open to it. Let us come back to the city of Three Rivers, which is represented by the Minister of Public Works. Let me mention just here that the city has already given and still offers considerable bounties to manufacturers, besides the divers geographical advantages it affords. Will the Minister of Public Works point out to me the manufactories which the policy of his Government caused to be established in Three Rivers? There is a manufactory of water pipes which was established some years ago. The principal manager of the firm was telling me the other day that the National Policy is of no use to him. There is a shoe factory, which is considerable. It is now recognized that the National Policy gives no protection to the shoe manufacture. I find a proof of it in the city of Quebec itself, with which the hon. Minister of Public Works is very well acquainted. Far from being useful to the shoe manufacture, I am not afraid to say, from the testimony of men engaged in that industry, that the National Policy is mischievous to it. In the city of Quebec are to be found the largest shoe factories of the country. One of the managers of these factories said lately—and I have it from a reliable source—that he could compete advantageously with the United States if he had no duties to pay on his goods at the entrance of the American market; he added that his trade would double if he could find an adequate market for his products. How could it be otherwise? Leather does not cost here any more than in the United States. Labour is cheaper. Are we to grant our own people less intelligence and less ability than those who live on the American territory? Then, why could not our products compete with the products of the neighbouring country? Because they cannot enter the market. We have in this country the finest railways in the world; we have immense water powers; we have transport facilities by rail and water. What, then, are we in need of? We need a market in which to dispose of our goods. Let the doors of the American market be opened to us, the market of that country of sixty to seventy millions people, and we shall see prosperity once more all over our Canada. I will continue mentioning other counties of the district of Three Rivers, since I have begun calling the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to these facts. In the County of St. Maurice is a woollen factory. This factory is not very important. It supplies the local wants rather than those of a large trade. Its success is due to the energy of its owners, Messrs. Delisle. There is no other manufactory in the County of St. Maurice.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I will call the hon. member's attention to the fact that this woollen factory of Yamachiche failed three times under the Mackenzie Government, and that it is now prosperous under protection.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) The statement of the hon. member proves nothing. It is rather hard to believe that if this manufactory failed three times in four years it was the fault of the Government. In one of the parishes of my county there were iron works turning out different wares; this establishment was born with the régime of protection, and through a strange coincidence it just failed as the régime is going to die. There was, at St. Ursule, a tannery; it has been closed for two or three years. We have another tannery at Louiseville; I am told it is going to wind up. At any rate, it is very slow. There is a great saw-mill in the County of Maskinongé. Hon. members of the left, especially the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), have shown what would be the advantages to saw-mill owners and lumber manufacturers in having access to the American markets. In the parish of St. Ursule there is a manufactory of pulp, which only runs at intervals and without profit for its owners, because it cannot sell its goods in the United States. In the County of Berthier is a large leather manufactory. In a conversation with its manager a few days ago I was told by him that it would be infinitely better for him if we had commercial reciprocity with the United States. I think it my duty to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to these facts. I think he ought to cast his eyes on the district which he represents, and ask himself if protection has been for us the boon it was promised to be, if it has bettered our position or has not rather lead us to poverty. I do not believe that there is a man in this House who can contend that land has not depreciated in value all over the Province of Quebec; and the same thing may be said of the other provinces, judging from the reports of the hon. members who represent them. The National Policy is one of the causes of this depression. It is time that a protest should be entered against the present state of things. Why make a privileged class of individuals in this country? Why a policy which is wholly in the interest of one class—the industrial class—to the detriment of another class—the agricultural community? We have a right, and it is our duty to lay bare our grievances. I hope that the Government of the day, if they have time to do so, will see to bettering the situation. However may the members of the right discuss the opportuneness of a treaty with the United States, I believe that to answer and refute

the objections which they brought forward I cannot do better than to quote the words of a man in whom they have had entire confidence, and who has been dear to their party. Here is what Sir John A. Macdonald said in a speech delivered in this House on 28th March, 1884:

"I do not know any reason why the hon. gentleman who moved this, or the seconder, laid before the House these elaborate statements to show the value of reciprocal trade, or trade of any kind, with the United States. That is admitted. That goes without saying. We all admit that it would be well that we had a large trade with the United States rather than a small one."

So do not discuss the opportuneness of a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Sir John tells you that it is so evident that it goes without saying—that all admit it. The contention of the hon. members of the right, that we have nothing to envy our neighbours, and that there would be no advantage in making a treaty with the United States, is therefore contradicted by the very chief of these gentlemen. I do not fear to state here that a great number of Ministerial members of this House were elected on the platform of reciprocity with the United States. They declared that it was necessary, and that the Government meant that this reciprocity should be limited to natural products. Now, Sir John tells them that we can never hope for a treaty of commerce with the United States for the natural products alone. Here are his words:

"I believe that the feeling that then existed still exists, and that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural productions of the two countries."

A little further on he adds:

"That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as for our natural products, we will never have a treaty. I am quite satisfied the United States will not agree, the country will not agree, the voice of the country will be against a repetition of the treaty of 1854."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have thoroughly refuted, with the words of the former chief of the Government, the objections offered by those who contend that we can have, and that the Government will give us, a treaty of reciprocity with the United States for our natural products only. I do not fear to say here that in the district of Three Rivers my hon. friend, the member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers), won his election through promising to the electors that the Government would give commercial reciprocity in natural products. In the County of Champlain the same course was followed. Now, the electors of the rural counties being determined upon a change in the present state of things, the two hon. gentlemen were elected. It is upon the strength of these promises that their constituents voted for the Ministerial candidates. Therefore, these hon. members will find it their duty to represent the views of their constituents, and it seems to me they must vote in favour of the resolution now before the House.

Mr. WATSON. At this late stage of the debate and at this late hour, I would not take up the time of the House were it not that, as some of the members coming from the district west of Lake Superior and who support the Government, have expressed their views on this subject, I think it is my duty, as a solitary supporter of the Opposition from that country, to give utterance to the opinions of those who think with me on the subject under discussion. We were put to the inconvenience of a dissolution of this House before Parliament had run its natural term, and despite the declaration of the Government that a dissolution would not take place at the time it did. The election was held at a very inconvenient season, especially for the North-West, and the pretext given by the late First Minister, in his address to the electors, was that he wished to have a fresh representation from the people, so that he might be able to form an opinion as to how public opinion stood in favour of reciprocity in natural products. Hon. gentlemen opposite told us during the campaign that the Conservatives were in favour of reciprocal trade in natural products, but what have we heard from them during this debate? I need not here dwell on the visit of the deputation to Washington, because all that it did was to go there and return, without initiating, much less accomplishing, anything, and in this debate that question has been carefully avoided by hon. gentlemen opposite. Their whole argument has been restricted to a defence of the old National Policy. The Government appealed to the people and came back a great deal weaker than they went, and I am satisfied that, had time been given for a fair discussion of the reciprocal trade question, had the elections not been sprung upon the people unawares, hon. gentlemen opposite would not be in power to-day. I am satisfied, from what I have learned of the means used to carry the constituencies by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Liberal party had the majority of the popular, honest vote recorded on the 5th March last. We have had the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) addressing this House, and they are the only two representatives of the North-West who have so far spoken in this debate. The hon. member for Assiniboia said he would not discuss the trade question at all, and he did not discuss it. The hon. member for Lisgar referred but very briefly to the trade question, contenting himself with making a few broad statements without giving any good reasons for coming to the conclusions at which he arrived. A considerable portion of his remarks were taken up with a eulogy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, he has done that before. He spoke also in the highest possible terms of Manitoba and the North-West, and in this respect I fully endorse all he said. But I must say that if Manitoba and the North-West are prosperous, they are prosperous despite the manner in which their progress has been retarded by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. No better proof, Sir, could be given that the country is a good one than the fact that it has made such progress under such unfavourable circumstances. The hon. gentleman then went on to speak of the last elections, and indulged in considerable glorification over the large representation returned to support the Government west of Lake Superior. In this connection let me quote his own words:

"That when we went to our constituents the people were saturated with the idea of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. But the more and more that question was discussed the more and more the people came to the conclusion that they would have none of it, and the fact that the people of Manitoba and the North-West returned the members representing them in this House by such very large majorities was largely owing to

unrestricted reciprocity being the policy of the Opposition, in fact it was more largely owing to that circumstance than anything else. The self-complacent member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) never would have been here had it not been for the enormous amount of support given him by the most powerful paper in the province, the Manitoba *Free Press*."

I may here say that the *Free Press*, if I am not greatly mistaken, supported all the members who were returned to this House. So far as the hon. member for Lisgar is personally concerned, I am not aware that he discussed the public questions on the public platform at all, but carried his election by a still hunt. He carried it by the usual means which I believe are resorted to by hon. gentlemen opposite. In speaking of the Liberal party, the hon. gentleman took occasion to have a fling at that party. He is one of those peculiar individuals who always like to support the powers that be, and if there should be a change I have not the least doubt but that we would find him supporting hon. gentlemen who are on this side of the House to-day. He said, speaking of the leader of the Opposition:

"I believe that the hon. gentleman thinks himself to be the man of destiny, but he may rest assured that so long as unrestricted reciprocity is the main plank in his platform, the Heavens will not reveal his political destiny."

Now, speaking of the leader of the Opposition, one of the great reasons urged by hon. gentlemen opposite why he should not be returned as leader of the Government was the fact that he is a French Canadian; and I am glad to be able to set up in opposition to that ground an authority to which we are all disposed, I think, to give more credence than to the hon. member for Lisgar and his friends. I find that the *Canada Presbyterian*, speaking of the leader of the Opposition, says:

"No statesman in Canada is rising faster than Mr. Laurier. His clean record, pure character, conciliatory manner, and lofty eloquence are giving him a stronghold on the esteem and confidence of the people without distinction of creed or party. He fights fairly and is always a gentleman. Canada needs first-class men on both sides, and the people, as a rule, are beginning to see that patriotic, statesmanlike qualities should be appreciated wherever they appear."

That opinion, coming from a paper, which perhaps represents a greater number of Protestants, of strong Protestant feeling, than any paper in the Dominion, must have great weight; and when we find a religious paper of that class giving expression to such strong sentiments in favour of our leader, we have reason to be proud that we have such a man at our head. On this side of the House, we do not care for a man's creed or religion, but support him because of the policy he advocates. Now, there are several reasons why the North-West returned so many members to support the Government. So far as the territory is concerned, it is hardly necessary for me to give any reason for the election of Government supporters, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia gave sufficiently strong evidence the other day to show the peculiar way in which elections are carried in the territories; and if there is one economy in Government expenditure which it would be an easy matter to carry out, it would be the saving of that portion of the election fund destined for use in the territories, for as long as you have open voting there, the Government might as well nominate a candidate and declare him elected as go through the farce of an election. In Manitoba strong influence was brought to bear, that of personal interests and corporations, which outweighed the trade question altogether, and in fact the trade question had no influence in the return of the members at all. We had there a member of the Tupper family, who happens to be the solicitor of the Manitoba and North-West Railway, and who, I suppose, felt, for the time being, that he was in Nova Scotia trying to coerce the employés of the Intercolonial Railway. That gentleman called the employés of the Manitoba and North-West Railway together in a station house, into which he would not allow a friend of mine to enter, at the time, unless he happened to be an employé of the road, and there in that meeting he gave those present to understand that it would be greatly in their interests to vote for the Tory candidate. We also had the influence of that mighty and great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, a railway of which, I say as a Canadian, we ought to be proud, a railway which is well equipped and is one of the finest railways in the world, but, when they lend their influence to elect a candidate or candidates in a province where there is no other railway corporation to resist them, they have a mighty influence and no one knows that better than myself. We had the president, Mr. Van Horne, writing a long letter in the press in support of hon. gentlemen opposite. He believed in protection and thought it was in the interest of the country, and as a business man, working in the interests of his road, perhaps he was right. He believes in protection, his road is protected, and so long as he is protected against competition from the south, so long will he be able to carry trade between the different provinces at a greater rate than if we had reciprocal trade with our neighbours to the south. I believe that reciprocal trade would encourage competition in railways. It would cause a diversion of trade in different directions, and it might injure the Canadian Pacific Railway temporarily, but it would be a great benefit to the people by giving us greater railway facilities. The member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) is a Tory of very recent date. He used to be a strong Liberal, and I believe he felt the downfall of the Mackenzie Administration in 1878 so badly that he actually cried. But he has seen new light. I do not blame any man for changing if he has good cause. He may think he has, but I do not. The greater portion of his time was taken up in showing how poorly off the people of the United States are. It seems to me that no better argument could be used in favour of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House than that the people of the United States are poor, and we have to admit that we are getting poor ourselves, and no doubt, if we had half the term of protection which they have had on the other side, we would be poorer than we are, so we should take warning by their example and stop before we get worse. The hon. gentleman said:

"It therefore cannot be said we are suffering in Manitoba to any extent on account of the National Policy. The farmers of that province are doing much better than those in Dakota."

I believe they are, but the reason is that we have better natural resources in Manitoba than they have in Dakota. Then that hon. gentleman went on to criticize the land regulations of the Mackenzie Administration. I lived in Manitoba when those regulations were in force—I went there in 1876—and I say that the land regulations of the Mackenzie Administration, which gave 160 acres of a free homestead to every actual settler, were the

best regulations which were ever in force in Manitoba or the North-West. We found that hon. gentlemen opposite, when we had a rush of immigration into the North-West for a few years, changed their regulations from day to day, and those regulations were so obnoxious that the people left the country. They changed the homestead from 160 acres to 80 acres. Large reservations were made, and frequent changes were made in the regulations. During the years 1882 and 1883 a large tract in Southern Manitoba might have been occupied by actual settlers, but all of that country south of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was altogether reserved from settlement, so that thousands of people left that country simply because at that time, between the colonization companies and the reserves to the south of the Canadian Pacific Railway there was hardly an acre of land available for homestead settlement in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman said our regulations were much better than those in Dakota. In those years of which I speak, when the Government were only giving 80 acres of homestead and 80 acres of pre-emption, and were reserving all the lands south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from settlement, in Dakota a homestead was given free after five years' residence, or after one year's residence at $1.25 per acre. Pre-emption was given after six months' residence for $1.25 per acre, and a tree claim on condition of 10 acres of trees growing at the end of five years. I know that settlers went to Dakota and availed themselves of the privileges they could obtain there in preference to staying in Manitoba or the North-West. I agree with the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), when he said that what we wanted in Manitoba and the North-West was people. We want settlers. That country is not worth anything to the Dominion of Canada unless we have peoplethere. We should encourage immigrants to go there, and we are finding that, notwithstanding the circumstances in which we are placed to-day, the natural advantages of Manitoba and the North-West are proving so much superior to those of Dakota that numbers of people are coming in from the south. But what is the Government doing to encourage them? We have again the Customs officer in the way, and we find that a settler who is coming in from Dakota and is bringing his household effects with him, has to bind himself that he will not dispose of any of his effects, no matter what they may be, for two years. I say the Government should lift that embargo from the settlers who come in from Dakota and should allow them to bring their goods in free. There has been a large improvement made in Manitoba and the North-West during the last year. I find by the bulletin published by the Manitoba Government that we have this year 1,312,136 acres in grain cropped to be bound with a binder. We have under wheat 916,664 acres, against 746,058 in 1890; under oats we have 305,644, against 235,534 acres in 1890; of barley we have 89,828 acres, against 66,035 in 1890; of pease we have 555 acres, potatoes 12,705, and roots of other kinds 9,301 acres. These figures show that we have a large increase. We find that in 1890 there were in Manitoba 13,807 farms, and in 1891 that number has increased to 18,935 farms. That is encouraging, notwithstanding the disadvantages under which we are placed. In speaking of the tariff question, some gentlemen think it is not logical to say that the people in any country will have to pay the duty both ways. I claim that you can lay down no hard and fast rule as to who pays the duty. It depends entirely on the effect that the article which is imported or exported has in the market in which it is sold. I take the view that so far as beef and wheat are concerned they are not affected to any great extent by protection, either in Canada or the United States. Both countries export those articles to Great Britain, and there they find a free market. Consequently, in discussing this question I think we can fairly leave these articles out of the discussion altogether. Where do we find our great trade? Our great trade, outside of beef and breadstuffs, which cannot be affected, as I have said, by the tariff, it is in the United States market. I will not, at this late hour, and at this stage of the debate, go into all the different lines of articles in which we trade; but there is one article in particular, one grain crop, to which I wish briefly to refer, and that is the barley crop. In Manitoba we have been experimenting to find some crop that will mature early, so as to escape the occasional early fall frost. Now, there is no crop so profitable for a farmer to grow as barley, so easy on the soil, a crop that is so safe in Manitoba, as it matures in a short season. I am in hopes we will find a variety of wheat which we can raise without danger in any year in any portion of Manitoba. At present the Experimental Farms are trying to find some quality of wheat that will mature earlier than the Red Fife wheat. Now, where do we find a market for our barley—the six-rowed barley—but in the United States? We are trying to encourage the growth of two-rowed barley. That barley has just the same disadvantage as wheat; it takes longer to mature than the six-rowed barley, and we have to find a market for that barley in England. I find, in looking over the markets for different years, that barley is a grain upon which I claim the Canadian producer has to pay every cent of duty when it is exported, simply because all the barley we export to the United States does not affect the price in that market, and the duty is simply the toll we have to pay to get it into that market. I have here a table which clearly demonstrates that the duty and freight are just about the difference in the prices of barley, say in Toronto and Oswego, for the last ten years:

	Toronto.	Oswego.	
	cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1881	80 to 96		1 14
1882	50 to 82	0 95 to	1 00
1883	70 to 75		0 67
1884	62 to 68	0 75 to	0 76
1885	60 to 70		0 73
1886	55 to 62	0 70 to	0 77
1887	62 to 65	0 72 to	0 75
1888	67 to 73		0 85
1889	42 to 50	0 65 to	0 70
1890	63 to 67		0 85
1891	54	....	....

In 1891 there is practically none exported on account of the McKinley tariff. Now, I wish to consider this matter from the standpoint of what I believe to be the greatest industry in Canada—the farming industry. On barley, as a great many other of our products, I claim that we pay the whole duty when we export it to the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. How are you going to help it?

Mr. WATSON. Previous to the elections the hon. gentleman and his friends gave us to under-

stand that they were going to help it by negotiation for reciprocal trade in natural products.

Mr. TAYLOR. So we are.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can find any consolation from the fact that nearly all the members on that side of the House who have spoken have strongly protested against any trade whatever with the United States; and from the indications we have, they do not wish to send a delegation to Washington for that purpose. It seems to me they occupy a position a good deal like a man who was looking for work and praying to God that he might not find it. If they go to Washington it will not be because they want to go. Now, a broad statement has been made that we buy all the necessaries we require to carry on agriculture in Canada as cheaply as they do in the United States. I have taken the trouble to inform myself on this question, and I court contradiction from any hon. gentleman who sees fit to contradict me. I will give comparative prices. I find that in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, on 11th July, and in Bradley, Dakota, on 5th July, these are the prices of machines and different articles sold to the farmer. They are sold by the agent to the consumer, and it is the consumer's price I am going to give you. It has been stated that these implements and other articles required by the farmers can be purchased as cheaply in Canada as they can in the United States. It is held by hon. gentlemen opposite that such articles can be purchased as cheaply or cheaper now than they could previously to the National Policy being inaugurated. I ask hon. gentlemen to compare the prices to-day in both countries. It is no argument to say that these articles are as cheap now as they should be because they are cheaper than they were ten or twelve years ago. Everybody knows that the improved modes of manufacturing machines has lessened the price and the cost to the consumer. I find that in Bradley, Dakota, during this month, the price at which barbed wire was sold was $4.50 per 100 lbs., and in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, it was $6.50 per 100 lbs., a difference of just $2. Now, if we make a calculation as to what that costs the farmer, if we consider the amount that is received in duties and the amount that I claim it costs the consumer on account of this iniquitous tariff, I find that if a farmer wants to fence a quarter section of land, 480 rods, of three-strand fence, he requires 1,440 lbs. of barbed wire, for which he has to pay 2 cents a pound more than his neighbour across the line--that is to say, $28.80—not of duty, because the amount of duty received is very small; but I claim that in every instance the manufacturer in Canada puts the price right up to the top notch, and charges all he can. I take the prices in Dakota and the prices in Manitoba, and I make a comparison. These are the prices at which these articles are sold to the consumer. I will take the article of binders. I must say that the men who handle American binders in Manitoba must have large profits, but I will give the figures I have received from reliable sources at which these machines are sold. The McCormick or Deering binders sold in Dakota, 5-foot, for $110; in Manitoba, $183; 6-foot binders, $115 in Dakota and $190 in Manitoba; 7-foot binders, $120 in Dakota, $195 in Manitoba. These are given to me as the cash prices in both markets. Now, our Canadian binders are sold at a somewhat less figure than American binders. But the American binders are sold in Manitoba, and it is not for me to reflect on the good judgment of the farmers as to their choice of binders. They pay their money and they take their choice: Brantford binders, 6-ft., $155; 7-ft., $160. Frost & Wood, $150 and $160. Massey's, 5-ft., $140; 6-ft., $145; 7-ft., $150. I am satisfied these are the accurate figures for these machines, sold both in Dakota and Manitoba; and it is important to the people of Canada, because these prices must affect the people of other provinces as they do the people of Manitoba. We had a discussion on another commodity which is used largely by farmers throughout Canada—that is, binding twine. I gave the figures in job lots on that occasion during the debate. Those were contradicted, and I have taken the trouble to inform myself of the prices at which binding twine is sold to the farmer. I found the prices on the dates I mentioned, during the early part of this month, in Bradley, Dakota, and Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, as follows:—Standard manila in Dakota, 9½ cents; in Manitoba, 14 cents, or a difference of 5 cents per pound. Sisal in Dakota, 9 cents; in Manitoba, 13½ cents, or a difference of 4½ cents per pound. Jute in Dakota, 7 cents; in Manitoba, 9½ cents, or a difference of 2½ cents per pound. Pure manila in Dakota, 13 cents; in Manitoba, 16½ cents, or an average difference of 3½ cents per pound. If you will take 2½ lbs. per acre, and I am glad to say there is a prospect of an abundant crop during this year in Manitoba, and no doubt it will take at least 2½ lbs. of binding twine to bind every acre in that province—but if you take 2½ lbs. per acre and the price at 3½ cents as the difference, the sum will be a very large one. We have in Manitoba alone, not including the North-West, 1,312,000 acres of grain to be cut with binders this year. If you average that up at the price I have given you will be convinced that I am right in stating that the total extra cost of the binding twine for 1,312,000 acres is $124,640, or on 19,000 farms, which is the number of farms we possess, an annual cost to the average farmer of $6.56. What do we derive in revenue on account of the tax? The sum of $1,277.76. That is the revenue we received last year from the whole Dominion, and the figures I have given of the quantity of binding twine to be used this year are for the Province of Manitoba alone. I have received a letter from a constituent of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and he addresses me thus:

"CLEARWATER, 11th July, 1891.

"R. WATSON, Esq.

"DEAR SIR,—I have just seen the debate on the binding twine tax, and am surprised that the duty was not removed or lowered. The Americans have compelled the Government to lower the tax on sugar, and to be consistent it should also be on twine. In this part of Mr. Daly's constituency we have a strong farmers' league formed—not a political alliance, but merely for protection in our commercial interests to endeavour to stem the action of combines and monopolies that are sucking the life-blood out of the farmers, cutting us off at both ends, giving us the smallest possible price for what we have for sale and charging us the highest price for what we buy; and binding twine is one of the articles we are specially taxed on. After corresponding with and getting offers from different firms, both in the Dominion and States, we have ordered from Robert Rogers, of Clearwater, who is agent for the McCormick firm, of Chicago; he supplies us the best standard or mixed manila twine at 14 cents; we think it a better twine and more feet to the pound than the machine men here are selling at 17 cents; the order is for about

35,000 lbs., which is a saving of $1,000 from the prices asked here, but we have to pay the duty, which is 2½ cents per pound, which on 30,000 lbs. is $750, and as you know that the farmers here have not cash to pay for twine till after harvest, or we could have done a good deal better, as I know some parties across the line who have bought their twine at 11 cents—that is, for what is called manila; but I fail to find pure manila on either side. So that if it were not for the duty we could have our twine for 11½ cents laid down in Clearwater, which would be to farmers in this small district, say about a quarter of one municipality, a saving of about $1,700 from the price asked by the dealers here, and this is only a sample of many other necessaries we are compelled to pay enormous prices for. Take coal oil: we have had to pay 35 cents per gallon for a miserable Canadian oil, and 45 cents for American oil, when our neighbours across the line get their 5-gallon can for $1. We as farmers hope the day is not far distant when the tariff will be either wholly abolished or put down to a rate that we will be able to get the necessaries at something like values, and not be taxed to keep up combines and millionaires.

"I see our Tory Manitoba representatives are quite satisfied with the Government policy towards this country, but I fail to find any Tories here but are just of the same opinion as I am as regards the duties, only at voting time, and they would smuggle a dollar's worth of sugar or a can of coal oil when they can, and think it no sin."

Robt. Rogers is president of the Conservative Association in Manitoba. Still, he does not think it is disloyal to deal in American binding twine and implements, and to be able to sell to the farmers cheaper than they are able to buy from the Canadian manufacturers. That is a letter which certainly should have weight in this House, as it gives the actual experience of a farmer in Southern Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. Give us the name.

Mr. WATSON. James Laidlaw.

Mr. DALY. A good Grit like yourself.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, and an honest man, he expresses, no doubt, the opinion of all the farmers, irrespective of politics, in the section in which he lives. He buys his binding twine from the president of the Conservative Association in Manitoba, who handles American twine and American implements. I think another article which shows the benefit which must arise from reciprocal trade is coal. Our geographical position prevents our people trading with each other as conveniently as they can with their neighbours across the line. Our coal is mainly at the ends of the Dominion, in British Columbia and Nova Scotia. The people of Nova Scotia have greater facilities for taking their coal to the United States than to central Canada. We also know that British Columbia has greater facilities for taking their coal into the United States than to Manitoba or Ontario. I claim that with reciprocial trade the people who operate the coal mines would be benefited, if not to the full amount of the duty, to almost the full amount. I feel satisfied that the people of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, will be benefited to almost the full amount of the duty on coal coming into our country. On account of our geographical position it is impossible for Nova Scotia coal to come far west, and I do not believe there is a ton of Nova Scotia coal shipped west of Montreal; and not a great quantity is shipped to Montreal, even, as people prefer to buy the American coal and to pay the duty, rather than pay the long haul and extra freight on the coal from the Eastern Provinces. In speaking of coal, I may say that we have a small importation of coal from Great Britain which amounts to almost nothing. I find according to the last Trade and Navigation Returns that we exported to the United States 574,856 tons of coal, at an average price of $3.68 per ton, at a total value of $2,126,000. I claim that this. to the producers of coal in Canada, if my contention is right that they would benefit to the extent of the duty of 75 cents per ton, the duty collected going into the United States would be the extra price of 75 cents per ton, or $431,142 of an extra price to the producers. On the other hand, we import into Canada from the United States 1,346,678 tons of coal, at an average of $2.52 per ton, making a total value of $3,387,611. Now, I claim according to my argument, we would save the whole duty to the consumer of 60 cents per ton, which would amount to $808,000. So, Mr. Speaker, the total saving to the coal industry, and to the consumers of coal in Canada, by reciprocal trade in coal between Canada and the United States, would have amounted to $1,239,142 last year, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns. We have large coal fields in the North-West Territories, and we have some coal in Manitoba; but what has been the policy of this Government in respect to those coal fields? The policy of this Government in pretending to open up these coal mines in the interest of the people, who should have the benefit of them, has been to place that coal in the hands of a monopoly. Against the wishes of the members on this side of the House, the Government has subsidized a railway for the Lethbridge Coal Company, without compelling them to carry coal for anybody except themselves, and consequently the Government gave them a monopoly. All we have to do to prove that the statment that I now make is correct is to point to the fact that the further you go west of Winnipeg on the Canadian Pacific Railway the dearer the coal becomes. The nearer you come to the coal fields the higher the price of coal, which shows clearly that the price is regulated only by the competition of American coal. Coal is sold in Winnipeg for $3 per ton less than it is sold in Calgary, within a short distance of the coal mines, and this shows that there is a monopoly in that article, and a monopoly which does act injuriously to our people in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The policy of the present Government is not to give us cheap coal in the North-West, but to give the friends of the Government a monopoly of the coal fields, and to subsidize railways for the purpose of making the coal dear to us, because they have given these railways a charter to the boundary line, and this monopoly company find it more profitable to ship their coal to Montana and the western states than to ship it east to Manitoba. I shall say a few words in reference to the commission which we sent to Jamaica looking for trade, and in reference to the commission which is to be sent to Washington to try and negotiate a treaty. We have sent a commission to Jamaica for the purpose of encouraging trade with Canada, but if the Government act with as little judgment in sending their delegation to Washington as they are acting with the delegation to Jamaica, we may expect the same sorry results. If we are to have any trade at all with Jamaica, the return which we must get in trade for the natural products which we send them, will be sugar. But we find that the sugar which the masses of the people of Canada can consume, namely, a good light-brown sugar of "No. 16

Dutch Standard," is prohibited from coming into Canada free of duty, and nothing but the darker sugars, which are supposed to be refined before being fit for use, are allowed to come in free, again legislating in favour of the refiners. The Americans have allowed sugar of "No. 16 Dutch Standard" to come in free to the United States, and consequently we have destroyed any chance we had of the West Indies dealing with us. They are allowed to send there better grades of sugar duty-free into the United States, and they will buy their goods in that country which they are allowed to import their products into. The Minister of Finance, by this change which he has made in the sugar duties, has utterly destroyed any chance we ever had of trading with the West India Islands; and he has destroyed entirely any benefits which might result from that commission to Jamaica. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give you the list of farm implements which are necessary to the farmers of Manitoba, and I will show you the excessive price we have to pay for the implements, on account of the protection that is placed on these goods. The following statement will explain this:—

Name.	No.	Value.	Duty.
		$	$
Fanning mills	410	5,280	1,848
Horse powers	18	1,289	451
Portable steam engines	8	8,205	2,871
Separators	32	12,729	4,455
Parts above machinery	.....	7,972	2,790
Sewing machines	347	6,952	2,431
Harrows	6	104	36
Binders	54	6,167	2,158
Seed drills	132	3,713	1,299
Mowing machines	49	1,910	668
Ploughs	1,064	21,496	7,396
			26,403

We see by this that there were 54 binders and 1,064 ploughs imported from the United States into Manitoba last year. The farmers of Manitoba certainly know what kind of implements they want, and notwithstanding that these implements are manufactured in Canada, they buy them in the United States and pay the duty upon them; and the Government by another twist of their Customs management increases the duty on these articles above what it should be. There were 54 binders imported last year into Manitoba, and the average price on which the Government compelled the importer to pay duty on was $114 each, and which, at 35 per cent., amounts to $39.90. That amount is collected on every binder that goes into Manitoba from the United States. Now, binders can be bought wholesale for $75 each, and I claim that the wholesale price is the price at which they should be entered at the Customs. The duty on a binder, the price of which is $75, at 35 per cent., would be $26.25, so that by that peculiar turn of the Customs law by the Minister of Customs he compels the farmers of Manitoba who wish to use American binders to pay an extra duty of $13.65 above what they should in all justice pay. There were 1,064 ploughs imported into Manitoba last year, the total value of which was $21,496. These ploughs are also valued by the Customs at $20 apiece, which is much above the wholesale price. The duty on $20 at 35 per cent. would be $7. Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the reports of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba—and I venture to say these reports will not be contradicted, as they were very carefully prepared—from 1890 to 1891 there was an increase in the number of farmers in Manitoba of 5,060. Now, each farmer will require at least one plough, at an increased cost of $7; so that for the 5,060 farmers this would amount to the enormous sum of $35,420 which the farmers have to pay, in one year only, more for their ploughs than they would have to pay if we had unrestricted reciprocity. The amount of duty collected on the number of ploughs imported into Manitoba from the United States last year was $7,396. Now, I will give an illustration to show who pays the duty. Last year we exported a large quantity of potatoes from Manitoba, as they were in good demand in the States, and we imported ploughs, so that we simply exchanged our potatoes for ploughs, and let us see what the results were. You can buy a plough in Chicago for $16; allow for freight and profit on the plough $4, and the plough should be sold in Manitoba to the consumer for $20. But you have to add to the price $7 of duty, so that the plough really costs the consumer $27 with the duty, as against $20 without the duty. Now, potatoes were worth last fall 50 cents a bushel before the McKinley tariff of 25 cents a bushel was imposed upon them, and after that they were sold for 35 cents a bushel, showing clearly that the amount of the duty was simply deducted from the price. Remove that duty altogether, and what do we find? We find that with a plough at $20 and potatoes at 50 cents a bushel, 40 bushels of potatoes would buy a plough; but with the plough at $27 and the potatoes at 25 cents a bushel, it costs the Manitoba farmer 108 bushels of potatoes to buy the plough. That is a fair illustration of how the duty affects the farmers in Manitoba. We have nothing to protect in Manitoba. In some districts of Ontario there may some reason for protection; but I defy any gentleman in this House or out of it to show wherein we in Manitoba can be benefited by it. On a great many articles which we import the duties collected are very small, so that the loss of revenue resulting from their removal would be trifling compared with the benefits which would be derived from reciprocal trade, and I think we certainly ought to use every exertion to secure it, even at the expense of those few industries which the change might force to the wall. Now, the following figures show the large extra cost to the farmers of Manitoba on the four articles which I have selected from the list, compared with the small amount of duty collected on them:—

Articles.	Extra Cost to Consumer.	Duty Collected.	Loss to Consumer over Duty Collected.
	$	$	$
Binding twine	124,640	1,277	123,363
Barbed wire	86,490	1,897	84,593
Ploughs	35,420	7,396	28,024
Binders (1,000)	45,000	2,158	42,742
Totals	291,460	12,728	278,632

Now, we have heard certain reasons given in the course of this debate why some hon. gentlemen have been returned to this House. I can assure you, from my knowledge of the elections, that the trade question was not discussed at any length whatever by the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. Their great stock-in-trade, when I had the opportunity of meeting them, was the loyalty cry. Now, I would like to ask this House and the country who are the loyal people of Canada?

An hon. MEMBER. The Conservatives.

Mr. WATSON. Well, from their acts I have grave doubts of it. They are not true Canadians, at any rate, because we find them taking up with Imperial Federation fads and with annexation. Why, Mr. Speaker, we had it demonstrated this afternoon that a leading Conservative, the second in command in Ontario, is a pronounced annexationist; and we can see to-night, from the number of white shirt-fronts on the other side of the House, that there are a large number of Imperial Federationists among the hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that all loyal Canadians should stand by Canada; and all that we on this side of the House ask—and I think we are loyal in doing so—is a fair field and no favour. With that I believe we have nothing to fear from the United States or from any other nation in the world. I believe that we can surpass any other nation in the world in the production of those things for which the country is naturally adapted. But this attempt to foster industries which are not natural to the country at the expense of the masses of the people ought not to be tolerated; and the men who are building up a few manufactories at the expense of the masses of the Canadian people are not patriots to Canada, and are causing the people to be dissatisfied, and driving them out of the country. I believe that with reciprocal trade Canada, instead of having the paltry population which she has to-day, would increase rapidly. I believe that our natural resources are greater than those of any other country in the world. We have fertile plains, minerals, fisheries, timber, and we have a people who, I believe, are not surpassed in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister of Finance says all right, and I hope he will agree with me. If there is any one man who is more responsible than another for this protective policy, though he is only carrying out the wishes of his party, it is the Finance Minister, who imposes obnoxious duties, which tend to drive our people out of the country. I am not one of those who say that all the manufacturers of Canada are bloated monopolists. I have some knowledge whereof I speak, and I regret to say that the manufactures of Canada are not in a healthy condition. That is much to be regretted; but how could we expect otherwise? They have been encouraged to go on and increase their establishments, and then they find that they have not sufficient consumers to use their goods. Now, Sir, what we want is more people, and how are we going to get them under the present system? The manufacturers to-day are taxed the same as the farmers are taxed. They are taxed in almost every article that goes into their manufactured goods. The manufacturers of agricultural implements are suffering to-day, and with the exception of two or three there is not among them a solvent firm in Canada. Why is this so? It is on account of the tariff. You tax their iron, their bolts, their labour, and everything that goes into the goods they sell. The manufacturers of 1883 did not ask for a 35 per cent. tariff on manufactured goods, but simply asked that the duty should be taken off raw material. The Government refused, and said they would retain the duty on raw material, and add 10 per cent. to manufactured goods. I believe our manufacturers do not require protection, but can compete with all the world. Why, as proof of this, we need only look at Canadians abroad, and we will find that wherever they go they are appreciated, and particularly in the United States, where they are even given the preference over the native Americans. I will have to omit a good deal of what I intended to say to-night, owing to the lateness of the hour, and will conclude with saying that one great want of the North-West is more people, and one of the greatest boons to the North-West would be to remove those vexatious taxes which are imposed on the articles required by the farmers to cultivate the soil. A man coming to that country has to lay out a certain amount of money, and if we could enable him to establish a farm at less annual cost than is required to-day we would be doing a great deal to encourage emigration. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite who support the Government, I hope that the members from Manitoba and North-West who support the Government, will insist on the Government spending at least the vote which Parliament gives for the purposes of immigration. Last year we found that the report was spread abroad that the members from Manitoba had succeeded in getting the Government to increase the grant for immigration, but the Government apparently have not nerve enough to spend the amount voted for that purpose, thereby showing they are not alive to the necessities of the North-West, or of Canada as a whole, because there is not a portion of the Dominion in which the future of Canada is bound up so much as in the North-West. I believe that our great wheat-fields will not only produce the amount we intend to export this year—and we intend to ship over 20,000,000 bushels—but we will be able to export the full amount of 70,000,000 bushels of grain, which the Minister of Railways predicted would be our output in the very near future, if you give us such legislation as will encourage the settlement of our great fertile plains. It is in the interests of the Government and the country to endeavour to secure, by means of reciprocity, that trade which is necessary to build up our country. Let me tell the few hon. gentlemen opposite, who are seeking to interrupt my remarks by scraping their desks, that I take their action as an indication that I am saying something which does not agree with them, and in that I find matter for congratulation, as no doubt our future Minister of Finance, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has found cause for congratulation, in the abuse which has been so lavishly dealt out to him this session by the ultra-Tories and protectionists. Thanking the House for their kind attention, I shall now resume my seat.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time I have had the honour of taking the floor, I beg the indulgence of both sides of the House for the few remarks I desire to offer.

I think were I to keep silent on this important question I would not be doing what is right towards my constituents, who elected me during my absence in Italy. I will begin by saying a few words in answer to the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris). According to him, protection should have built up manufactories in his county, because that would have been a good thing for the hon. member. He also spoke of railways. I must say that if we have great railways in the country we owe them to the Conservative party. The Liberal party was always opposed to the building of these railways as well as to all the great national enterprises. Mr. Speaker, we have already discussed for a month the great question of the Budget. It is a very important question, and one which deserves to be discussed. The hon. Minister of Finance has announced this year a surplus of more than $3,000,000. This is just what riles our opponents. If we had had a deficit they would have been satisfied. The programme of the Liberals is to find fault with what is well. In the last twelve years we have had 24 millions of surplus, and we have to congratulate the Government on such a result. It was said, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure had increased. It is true that the expenditure has increased by some millions of dollars; but we have something to show for them. Under the Administration of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie the expenditure increased also, but there were deficits of a couple of millions yearly. I am in business, and as a business man I consider it is better to spend 36 millions and have a surplus than to spend 24 millions and have a deficit. That is my policy. Mr. Speaker, for more than a month we have been talked to about protection. I can tell this House that protection has saved the country. It is said that protection never gave any one his dinner, but protection has given many the means of making money. I remember, Mr. Speaker—I was a young man then—I remember days, weeks, months and years of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, from 1873 to 1878. I was then beginning my career in business, and I can speak with full knowledge of those times. The workman was without work; there was no market for the farmer; flour was $8 to $10 a barrel. Money was very scarce, and commanded 8 and 12 per cent. of interest. My hon. friend the member for Arthabaska said the other day that money is dear. He ought to remember that in 1878, in his own county, money was at 15 and 20 per cent. on notes, and one had to take off one's cap to get it. Well, if to-day you can get it for much less, so much the better. Mr. Speaker, I want to be short. I am a new member in this House, and I do not want to take time at this late hour of the night. However, I must tell you that I am a merchant, a manufacturer and a farmer at the same time. I can prove to this House and to the country that in 1878 the farmers paid dearer for wheat they bought for their daily needs and for their table. I was a merchant at the time, and I remember that from 1873 to 1878 we sold Japan tea for 55 cents a pound, and now I sell the same tea for 45 cents. We then sold sugar, brown sugar——

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) What is brown sugar?

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. It is sugar to sweeten your tea. We sold in 1875 for 10 cents a pound, and until a few days ago the present price of it was 7 cents. Now that the duties are abolished we sell it for 5 cents. Dried apples were selling for 12 cents a pound; they are now 9 cents. Flour was $7 and $8 a barrel; now it is $5 and $6. I can prove that. My knowledge of business is not only from theory but from practice. Should any one on the other side of the House deny my statement I am ready to produce my bills. Cotton warp, which farmers buy every day to make flannel, sold for 45 cents per pound in 1878; it sells to-day for 35 cents per pound. It is protection which has done that. White cotton used to sell for 14 cents, we sell it to-day for 10 cents. Shirting sold for 16 cents; it now sells for 12 cents. Print sold for 16 cents; it now selis for 12 cents. Canadian tweed, which is an article of importance for our farmers, is now satisfactorily manufactured. My clothes are of that tweed, and I am proud to wear them. That tweed, which sold for $1.20 in 1878, sells now for 90 cents or $1. Waggons sold for $75; we sell them now for $50. Ploughs sold for $9; we sell them to-day for $7. Scythes sold for $1.20; they are now $1. Mowers were $80; they are now $50. Nails, which the farmers need for building, sold in 1878 for $5; they now sell for $3.50. Axes which we sold for $1.15 we now sell for 90 cents. Coal oil, of which so much has been said, used to sell for 50 cents in 1873, and we sell it now for 20 to 25 cents, Imperial measure. Woollen underware, which sold at 75 cents, are now sold at 50 cents. Wincey, which sold for 16 cents, now sells for 10 cents. Pianos and harmoniums, which then sold at $200 and $250, are now 40 per cent. cheaper, because they are manufactured in the country. The tariff is therefore in favour of the farmer, and I will prove to you later that the farmers' products sell higher to-day than they did in 1878. The hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) spoke of the tax on flour. It is a great cry in the Province of Quebec, which is sounded very high during election time. The hon. member says that the Province of Quebec imported 167,000 barrels of flour, representing a value of $597,000, and that the farmer paid $88,000 on that flour. I regret to say that the hon. member is not well informed. I am a flour merchant, and I sold as many as 36 car loads of flour a year, and I must say that I never bought a car load of American flour. Therefore, I paid no duty, and the farmers who bought it paid no duty. As a proof that we pay no duty, I will say that flour sells at $6.50 in the United States and we sell it for $6. Perhaps some of the provinces pay duty on flour, but I know that the Province of Quebec pays none, because we buy no flour from the United States. But supposing that the Province of Quebec should suffer from this, revenues are needed to carry on a Government, and if we had not such a protection Manitoba would not grow wheat in such large quantities, and we would have to apply to the United States for it. Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign I heard clamourings on all the hustings against the tax on sugar and on flour. It was the programme of the Liberals. The hon. Minister of Finance has just abolished the whole duty on raw sugar. If he had removed the tax on flour the Government would still be criticized. Well, there must be something for the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to find fault with. Much noise is made about the McKinley Bill. I must say that the McKinley Bill has not had altogether the result

which the Liberals were hoping for. Although they claim to be in favour of the people, they would have liked to see the McKinley Bill kill the farmers of the Province of Quebec. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, all the articles reached by the McKinley Bill sell higher to-day than last year, and I must say this is not pleasing to our opponents. Potatoes, eggs, hay and sheep sell higher this year than they did last year. The only article upon which the Bill is detrimental to the Province of Quebec, is horses. I must say that it is not the McKinley Bill which interferes with the sale of our horses, but it is the use of electricity which decreases the demand for horses. It is not the protective tariff which prevents the sale of horses, but the lack of demand in the market. The hon. member for Arthabaska has said that the Province of Quebec is a very poor province. I believe that the hon. member did not think of his country when he said that. He said that land had decreased in value by half, and was so depreciated that those who held mortgages did not dare enforce the sale, because they feared they could not realize the amount of their debt. The hon. member refers to the Credit-Foncier. I have been inspector of this company, and I have made loans whenever the opportunity presented itself. It is a company that makes no loans when it is not sure to recover its funds, and it makes a great number of loans. The company is not obliged to sue the farmers in order to be paid; they pay without that, and, while paying, still make money.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Their means of making money is to go to the United States.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation). I believe there are many in the United States who would rather not be there. I think it is very bad to depreciate one's country, through prejudice and party spirit. I am happy to say in support of my position that the Province of Quebec is not so poor as the hon. member for Arthabaska has said; that in my county one-fourth of the farmers loan money, and three-fourths live in easy circumstances. People are well off; they have good stock and good land. Their lands are not mortgaged to their creditors to the extent we are told. I would like to see the hon. member for Arthabaska go into the district of Megantic; he would see that three-fourths of the farms are not mortgaged; many are mortgaged for a good reason. A father of a family has a good farm: he wants to establish his son; he must naturally borrow $500, $600, or $1,000, and he has to give a mortgage. I do not call this a mortgage, when he borrows in order to buy property. Our farmers are well off. You can enter any house in the townships of my county and you will see a good table, as at a *seigneur's*, and a piano or a harmonium, in three-fourths of the houses. Our farmers have good vehicles, good horses. Our people are not poor.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) They are gentlemen.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) All gentlemen. It is said that the population decreases in my county, and that people are so poor they are obliged to go to the United States. Well, since the last census population has increased over three thousand. This does not signify that we are growing poorer or that the population is going to the United States. They have spoken long and often on the other side of the House on the subject of economy during the last month.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) A word about Bancroft.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) I will speak of Mr. Mercier; it is as good. They speak of economy; they ought to speak of the Province of Quebec, where the expenses are over one million more that they were before. That is the economy of the great party that was to save the province, and which increased the expenditure by over a million a year. If we had two or three Governments like that we would have to take the road to the United States.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I challenge the hon. member to prove this.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) It is said on the hustings that it is the Liberal party which works for the bread of the poor. Well, I say that such is not the truth. We have a sample of that policy at Quebec. If there is an extravagant Government it is the Province of Quebec which has it. Mr. Speaker, this great Liberal party which claims to give bread to the poor is trying to get to power by all kinds of means. In order to reach it, it hunts up scandals. True, they cannot reach it otherwise than by scandals. We all know this great Liberal party which, once in power, is to work in the interest of the farmers; once there, all their policy is to borrow and spend. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) said the other day in his speech that we have no other market for our sheep than that of the United States. Well, our best market is England. The hon. member was perfectly right as to lambs; but for old sheep the market is England. They sell there from $6 to $10 a head; while in the United States they only bring from $4 to $6. England at one time found itself in the same position as we do ourselves to-day. It did not produce enough for its consumption. England did not say: We must annex ourselves to the United States, to Germany, or to Denmark. It said: We must produce as much as we spend, and it did.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I call the gentlemen on the right to order. There is no hearing what is being said for the noise.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentlemen should not throw paper; besides being unseemly, it is dangerous.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a fine country, and when it is said that the country is poor, I say that is not the truth. When we have in the savings bank an increase of $1,700,000 in a single year, I say that our country is not poor. Mr. Speaker, I must give my constituents my political programme; I must say that I have always been a Liberal-Conservative, and that I am glad of being so. I approve the course of the present Government in looking to an agreement with the American Government for a treaty of agricultural reciprocity, without giving a single inch of ground. If articles are allowed to pass on fair exchange, well and good. I must say that I have in my county an important industry. I refer to the asbestus mining. Last year this industry paid $36,000 per month in salaries, or $360,000 for ten months. More than $1,000,000 worth of asbestus was sold. There was paid besides $3,700 to Sherbrooke firms for supplies. From $25,000 to $50,000 were spent for machinery. This industry employs 1,500 men, who are paid $1 a day. It

consumes 200 tons of coal a month, amounting to $1,000, besides 200 cords of wood a month, amounting to $500. I say that this industry gives a considerable market to the farmers. What did the charitable Quebec Government do? This Government, which was to give to the country all possible protection, and favour all interests when it should get into power! Well, it imposed a tax of $3 per $100 on the asbestus quarried. This Government which was to give bread to the poor, in imposing such a tax, exposes him to the risk of having the mines closed. I, myself, sold a mine, and when in England I met the persons to whom I had sold it. They told me I had not deceived them, that the mine was as represented, but that if the thing was to be done over again they would not buy, because the Quebec Government had imposed that tax; and, they added, if only the matter was to stop there, but who can say that the Government next year will not impose an additional tax of $3. I say that this is not what the Quebec Government had promised to do. This industry is still in its infancy, and instead of imposing this tax it ought rather to have given a premium per ton in order to help its development. I say that the Government of the Province of Quebec should give a premium of $1 per ton, not to the mines already opened and in full operation, but to those that are being opened. But more than this, Mr. Speaker: this same Government of the Province of Quebec imposes a tax of $150 on the companies for the privilege of keeping powder on the ground. This is arbitrary, and contrary to the interests of the province. The old Conservative Government had imposed a tax of $50, and never collected it. The Liberal party imposed a tax of $150, and collects it. Such is the party which is to save the country. I must say now that the farmer is protected enough. I proved a moment ago that what he consumes to-day he can buy cheaper than in 1873 and 1878. I will now establish that for what he has to sell the prices are higher than there were in 1873 and 1878. When I went home last week I met a farmer who told me he had sold his pork for $8 a hundred weight. I was astonished at this high price for pork, and asked him where he had sold it, and he answered that he had sold it at the mine. The current prices for farmers' produce are the following: Pork, $7 to $8 per 100 lbs.; butter, 15c. to 20c. per pound; potatoes, 50c. to 60c. per bushel; oats, 50c. to 60c. per bushel; hay, $8 to $10 per ton.

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation). You don't spare the miners.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation). Well, it is the farmers who sell, but if the miner had no work the half of those prices would still be too high. This tax on the mines has done immense harm to the Province of Quebec in paralyzing capital. It has prevented English capitalists from coming and putting money into the mines of the country. They are afraid of new taxes. Forsooth, nothing assures us that next year the taxes will not be $10 per 100. We have a good country. I have had the pleasure of travelling over a part of the United States last year—New England—Ireland, England, France, Italy, and I must say that Canada is as prosperous as any of those countries. Our constitution gives us great liberties. No country in the world has better laws than ours. We have good educational institutions, and yet some want to unite us to the United States. That country is represented to us as very prosperous. Well, there are more failures in the United States than in Canada; therefore, affairs are worse there. There were last year, in the city of New York alone, more than 60,000 persons working for 60 cents a day, and working fifteen hours a day. Here, in Canada, the workman is not treated in that way. His days are ten hours, and there is a movement to reduce it to nine. It is said that land in our country is covered with mortgages. I visited the United States, and I can say that in that country land is mortgaged for $\frac{1}{10}$. In the Province of Quebec the figure is only $\frac{1}{20}$. There are 23,000 persons in New York who were evicted for having no money to pay their rent. Do we see such a state of things in the Province of Quebec? Surely not. I am in favour of the policy of railways. The more railways we build the more prosperous the country will be. Such is the country to which we are wanted to unite our destinies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I pray to Providence that the Conservative party may remain many years yet in power, so that our children may grow—for I remember too well the years from 1873 to 1878. I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by thanking the hon. members on both sides of the House. Perhaps I have taken a little too much time, but I have done so in the interest of my county. I am in favour of protection for all classes and especially for the farmers, such as is given them by the Government; and if I was a farmer on a large scale I would ask to continue protection and to increase it. I hope that the National Policy of Sir John Macdonald will be continued for many years yet. We will all be faithful to the Conservative flag, and to the policy which insures the future of the country.

Mr. PROULX. (Translation.) At this late hour of the night I will not be long, for I perceive from the last speech which was delivered, and which no one could follow, that the hon. members are tired of this debate. I consider it my duty to express my views on the question which has been debated before the House for the last month, in order to show what motives will have determined my vote, and to prove to my county, which is an essentially agricultural county, my solicitude for its interests. It is with pleasure that I rise to support the motion for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which proposes a modification of the policy advocated by the hon. members opposite. This policy, as many have observed, which was intended to favour everybody, has done no good at all, and has reduced the country to a degree of poverty from which it will be hard for it to rise. Mr. Speaker, which is the class the most indispensable to the needs of the country? Is it not the farming class, which made the country what it is, and which every day brings forth life by cultivating the soil and in making it fruitful? The needs the most to be cared for are those of agriculture, which sustains life and produces our daily bread. His Excellency the Governor General said, at the opening of the session of 1878, that he saw with pleasure that the times had not been as bad in this country as they had in other countries. The country being more agricultural than manufacturing, that was the reason why

it had yielded enough to feed its population. This is a proof that our country is essentially agricultural, and in order to promote the progress of the country, it is absolutely necessary to protect this class indispensable to its prosperity. I say indispensable, for if agriculture is not successful, if it is not favoured, if it does not get justice, the country will suffer. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the policy advocated and carried out by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and followed by Parliament since 1878, is detrimental to the interests of the country in general, detrimental to the agricultural community, to those which it ought to favour and treat with justice as being a class indispensable for the country's progress, in order to put a stop to emigration which is becoming alarming. Is the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite calculated to remedy the evil? Is it calculated to foster industry, agriculture? Is that policy calculated to cure the disease which thins out our ranks, and makes us weaker every day? Mr. Speaker, during the last elections, what did we hear preached everywhere? In the County of Prescott, the electors were told: Mind the Liberals! Beware of annexation! They want to annex you to the United States! Mr. Speaker, I believe that should annexation come, the cause of it would be the policy inaugurated by the Conservative party, because it forces the Canadians to emigrate to the United States. They are forced by necessity and their wants to abandon their goods and their houses and go to the United States. Poverty is what forces them to go; because they cannot sell their produce at its proper value, and therefore cannot meet their obligations and pay their debts. Such is the reason why we see so many thousand Canadians go to the United States. It is not because they do not like the country that they leave it. The proof is that as soon as they have earned a little money they like to come back and see the natal village. I am of opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the policy followed by the Government since 1878, is the cause of the emigration from which we suffer, and the cause of this, that before long we will all be gradually annexing ourselves. There is to-day but a comparatively small number of Canadians in the United States, but before long, perhaps, it is my opinion, all the Canadians will have gone to the United States, forced by the circumstances. Mr. Speaker, where is the best market for Canada? I have here a very remarkable article on the position of the farmer, which I find in *La Sentinelle*, of Montmagny. Here is an extract of that article:

"Generally the farmer does not think enough of the nobility and importance of the position which he holds in society. Unfortunately it is to be owned that, until recent times, our rulers contributed by their inaction to inspire him with this discouragement which may become a cause of ruin for the agricultural industry. Counted until now as an inferior class of society, left without means of vivifying their minds by a sound and practical education, put thereby out of the way of protecting their interests in the councils of the nation, deprived then of the share of advantages enjoyed by the other classes of society, the farmers had come to despise a calling so little appreciated.

"This is what explains this unfortunate emigration which has already, to such a deplorable extent, thinned out our rural population. Man may do anything when hopes of victory or glory stimulate his ardour, but he also becomes powerless if he does not expect a success proportionate to the vigour of his efforts.

"Fortunately a government conscious of the all powerful influence of the farmer on the destinies of French Canada, has taken the reins of power. During the short space of four years, the Mercier Government has given a considerable impulse to agriculture, in calling the agriculturist to a participation of the public honours, in decorating the laureates of labour with the palms of merit. The rights and hopes of the settlers are protected by the laws which govern the Crown lands; rules of equal justice for all have taken the place of the frauds which used to be committed by those entrusted with the distribution of colonization funds. Communication has become easier, and less costly, owing to the improvement of the roads, and the construction of iron bridges; education is given gratuitously to all classes of society, finally the attention of the foreigner is drawn to our forest, mining and agricultural resources, by all the means at the disposal of an intelligent Administration, anxious to promote public interest.

"This recognition, tardy, but all the more creditable to those who show it now, of the merit of agriculture is the secret of the preservation of our nationality, our institutions, our customs, our laws shall be safely guarded where the French Canadian people is proud of its position in the political world, when it prides itself upon the role it is called upon to play in society, when it cherishes the country which its arduous labour shall have made fruitful, and when it is attached to the land of its birth, where rest all its hopes of a happy future."

Now you see, Mr. Speaker, that this newspaper, which is an authority, agrees with me in what I believe to be the cause of the emigration of our people to the United States. During the last federal elections I was somewhat struck by the fact that the friends of the Conservative party came into the County of Prescott, which I have the honour to represent, and promised restricted reciprocity. That is to say, they came and said to us, since 1878 until to-day we have had a policy which we thought was favourable to the farmers and the country in general, we have thought this policy was acceptable and calculated to favour all classes of society. But to-day we come and say we were mistaken. We come and tell you that the policy of the Government which has been adopted in 1878 is not the one which should have been followed and accepted as we have caused it to be accepted. Now, when the elections are over, we will give you restricted reciprocity, we promise you that a new treaty will be made between the Government and the United States, and you shall have the facility of disposing of your natural products. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary to-day that we should have the American market for the disposal of our natural products, it was just as necessary we should have had it since 1878 as to-day. Therefore, we have suffered through the adoption of the National Policy, the would-be aim of which was to promote our interests. If the American market is necessary for the disposal of our natural products, if the interests of agriculture require it, then we must have been suffering for the want of it. But will that promise be redeemed? After the fruitless trip of last spring, will another trip in the fall be productive of more good? I do not think so. The answer given by the Secretary of State of the United States is sufficient to make me believe that the promise made during the elections will not be any more realized in the month of October than it was just after the elections. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have a right to say that the policy of protection extolled and carried out by the Conservative party did not have even the confidence of that party, since they went back on it during the elections, promising to the people a treaty that they had already cried down. The Conservative party could not then have been sincere in what they had said; they could not have had any confidence in the policy which they had pretended was to be so good

for the country. Mr. Speaker, as a proof that our neighbours' market would be advantageous to the Canadian farmers, I made a comparative table of our farm exports to the United States and to England for 1890. These figures show that there would be much more sense in opening a market for our products in the United States than in going to Europe or China for such. I repeat it, and it is easy to understand, it is only common sense, that a market with our neighbours is preferable to a market several thousand leagues away. Here are the figures:

Exported horses, United States, in 1890		.....	16,118
" England	"	.....	125
Exported sheep, United States	"	.....	251,640
" England	"	.....	57,000
Exported barley, United States	"	bush....	9,939,745
" England	"	"	27,132
Exported hay, United States	"	tons.....	101,713
" England	"	"	10,408
Exported potatoes, United States	"	bush....	1,053,230
" England	"	"	
Total of agricultural products exported to the United States in 1890			$11,219,043
Total imports from United States into Canada.			5,343,120
Difference.....			$5,875,923

Well, Mr. Speaker, these figures show the importance of the American market. They show that the greatest part of our agricultural exports go to the United States. If we consider now the duties paid on our exports to the United States in 1890, we come to the following figures:—

Horses at $30 per head.....	$ 483,540
Sheep.....	62,910
Barley.....	149,091
Hay.....	406,852
Potatoes.....	263,307
Total	$1,365,700

This sum was paid by our shippers and went into the American treasury. If such a state of things is calculated to do us good, if, having to pay such high duties is calculated to enrich us, I understand nothing about it. It is for me an unfathomable mystery. I heard the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) and many other hon. members on the right, try to convince us that neither the consumer nor the shipper was affected by these duties; that it is a system that enriches everybody, while no one is the worse for it. Well, then, how is it that they tell us: If you accept free trade, you will be forced to accept direct taxation, seeing that, according to these hon. gentlemen, neither the consumer nor the shipper pays any duty? Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever is paid on our exports to the United States, and whatever is paid on the American exports into Canada, must surely be paid by somebody. What we pay every year on our exports, is so much that the American Government is richer by. The hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that such a policy is beneficial. It is surely an extraordinary pretension. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) tried to make us believe that the value of land has not decreased. I remember that fourteen years ago, properties which are next to mine, in my county and township, were worth from $7,000 to $8,000, and this year $2,000 could not be had for them. No price will be offered. What is the reason? It is because property does not pay. Go where you please, and you will see the finest farms, farms which cost $6,000 or $7,000, selling for half their cost. Why? It is because agriculture will not pay. Well, what can you expect? When hay sells at $4 a ton, when the stables are full of horses eating up the produce of the land, do you think that the man who has a family to support, and payments to meet, can easily do so? Such is the reasons you see so many Canadians leaving for the United States. If you should travel over the County of Prescott, as I did during the last election, you would find from a-quarter to a-half of the houses closed, doors nailed up. Where have the owners gone? They have taken the road to the United States. It is deplorable to see such a state of things, Mr. Speaker; but after all an honest man forced by circumstances, and under the necessity of earning a few dollars to pay his debts, has to emigrate. Now, Mr. Speaker, if one can find in the United States such opportunities to earn money which he will afterwards come to spend in his own country and meet his obligations honourably with, there must also be money there to pay for our produce, to help us cultivate our lands, to fertilize them, to re-people them, and give bread to a number of families that are in need. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the prospects of a crop are good, when land is ready to yield, joy fills the heart of everybody, travellers, merchants, professional men; because the harvest promises enough to meet the wants of our families. Therefore prosperity depends upon agriculture, since the appearance of a good crop insures easy times to the merchant; good crops mean that the merchant will be able to collect, mean that the farmer will have money with which to meet his obligations; contentment is with everyone and it is expected that the coming year will be one of ease and comfort. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the prosperity of the country depends largely upon agriculture, and I contend that the policy followed by the hon. gentlemen opposite is not such as to meet the requirements of the great agricultural family, whose prosperity is so necessary to the progress of the country. The hon. members on the right think that they can be unjust to and ill-treat a certain class of society to the benefit of another; these hon. members think that the farmers do not understand their policy; they believe that the ignorance of the farmers of this country will not allow them to understand the injustice done them. Well, the last elections have been sufficient to show how much there is in that. They have shown that they understand more than is thought, and at the next elections they will know how to reverse the situation, they will know how to recompense by their vote those who will have worked in their interest. Well, Mr. Speaker, I said when I began that I would not be long, and I will conclude these few remarks. I have given the reasons which will make me support the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. I believe that as long as intrigue will be rampant amongst the hon. members on the right, as long as undue speculations will be carried on for personal profit and party advantages, as long as an honest and open policy is not adopted by men entrusted with the government of the country, the country will remain as it is to-day, poor, depressed and hopeless of prosperity. Such are the reasons why I support the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, and the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition, whose talents and honesty inspire confidence throughout the country.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright :

That all the words after the word "That" be left out and the following inserted instead thereof:—" the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers, and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Burdett,
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Hyman,
Innes,
King,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mousseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson,
Yeo.—88.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monerieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—114.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Walsh,
Mr. McCarthy,	Mr. Préfontaine,
Sir D. Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. McGreevy,	Mr. Gibson.

Amendment negatived, and resolution agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the resolution be further considered at the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LAURIER. What does the hon. gentleman intend to take up at the next sitting?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bills relating to the Franchise Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 145) to further amend the Electoral Franchise Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister of Justice explain this section?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is to give until the 15th August, instead of until the 1st August, for completing the preliminary revision.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would that apply to the revision this year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 3,

Mr. BORDEN. I am informed that some of the revising barristers take the view that names that are on the old list shall be left off the new list. For instance, the names of farmers' sons are left off, unless they appear on the assessment roll for proper qualification. It seems to me that this would be manifestly wrong, and, as I have already spoken privately to the Minister of Justice about it, I would like now to get an expression of opinion on the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) to state that the revising officers are not disposed to allow the qualification of farmers' sons, unless their names appear with a sufficient qualification in their own right on the assessment roll. Of course if they did not so appear, that would prevent them getting on the list at all.

Mr. BORDEN. I refer to the names which are on the old list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They ought not to be struck off if the father has a qualification.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the hon. gentleman states to me, and as the newspapers of the county he represents allege, the point is, that the revising officer is now striking off, and has struck off, the names of all farmers' sons in the district who do not appear on the assessment roll. The revising officers compel a special application to be made to retain the name already on the list. If the revising officer chooses to be a very technical man there seems some ground for this action in the first clause of the Act to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise, passed in 1890. The revising officers argue from this clause, that a special application is necessary to retain the name on the lists, as well as to put it on in the first instance. My own impression is that this is a strained application of the Act. It seems to me that if the farmer's son is on the list, that it should not be taken off by the revising officer of his own motion, unless an application was made to strike it off. If the father's name is on the assessment roll, a son's name has a right to be on the electoral list, unless application is made by some person to strike it off. The revising officer can have no evidence before him to justify him in striking off the name, unless an application is made by some person who makes a declaration that the name should not be on the list.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think a difficulty would arise in this way. The revising officer must have some evidence that these people are entitled to go on the list. For instance, the assessment roll is the basis of first placing upon the list those who are entitled to go on by property qualification. If the names of a farmer's sons have appeared on the previous voters' list, it does not follow, as a matter of course, that they are entitled to go on the new voters' list. They may have left the residence of their father, or they may have left the electoral district altogether, and may not be entitled to go on the list. The practice in the Province of Ontario is this: Where a man has a sufficient property qualification to entitle his sons to go on the list, the amount of the assessment appears on the assessment roll, and the sons' names appear on the assessment roll along with that of their father. It seems to me it would be very dangerous to assume that all those whose names were on the last voters' lists as the sons of farmers, are entitled to go on the new list, simply because their fathers have the necessary qualification. It might be just as properly said that an income voter should be entitled to go on the new list because he was on the old list. The practice in my county is, that no income voter's name is put on the new list who has been on the previous list unless the assessment roll shows that he is sufficiently assessed for income to entitle him to go on the list; otherwise a new application must be made. If that is right as regards income voters, surely it would be equally right as regards the sons of owners or farmers, because these people do not go on because of any property qualification which they have of their own, but simply because they are the sons of owners having a sufficient property qualification, and are living with their fathers. Suppose between the time the last voters' list has been made up and the next revision they have left their fathers' home and become owners themselves, or gone out of the country altogether, surely it would not be argued that they would be entitled as a matter of course to go on the list because they had been on the previous list.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the assessment roll is simply one of the sources of information of which the revising officer is bound to avail himself of in making up his list. Of course there are mutations from year to year, such as mutations of ownership.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be shown by the assessment roll.

Mr. LAURIER. There may be mutations after the assessment roll has been made up. The revising officer takes the list as the basis on which he proceeds, as presumptive evidence that those whose names are found there are entitled to go on the list; and if that presumption is not justified by the facts, then it devolves upon the parties to show that any names found there are not entitled to go on the list. But until that is shown, the revising officer must take all the sources of information that he has, and apply them in making up the list,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The instance given by Mr. Speaker is a perfectly good one so far as the province from which he comes is concerned. He says that if any income voter's name does not appear on the assessment roll, the revising officer should strike it off the voters' list. That may be the case in the Province of Ontario, if that fact is evidence that the voter is not receiving the income. But it is not the case in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where neither the name of the income voter nor that of the farmer's son appears on the assessment roll at all. They are put on the voters' list in the first instance by virtue of a special application, accompanied by a statutory declaration that they are entitled to go on the list; and when that is done the presumption is that they are entitled to remain there, until the revising officer has evidence to justify him in striking them off.

Mr. CURRAN. This discussion brings up the question with reference to income voters, about which a great deal of difficulty has been experienced.

I know that some officers are striking off all the names of income voters and waiting for new applications to be made to have them put on again. There is something to be said in favour of that view also, because the parties on one side or the other have an interest in looking after the lists. But should the burden be thrown on them of striking off names, or should the burden of asking for a vote be put upon the man who wants to get his name on the list? If a vote is worth having it is worth asking for, and the whole burden of attending to the proper making of the list ought not to be thrown upon the sitting member or prospective candidates. The very discussion shows that some sort of rule ought to be made as to whether the revising officer should retain the names of farmers' sons or income voters, or strike them off until a new application is made; because there is a vast difference of opinion in various sections of the country on this subject. I think the revising officer in my district gave notice in the newspapers that all income voters would be struck off, and that a new application would have to be made to have any of them put on. Therefore, it is just as well that the law should be made clear as to whether farmers' sons, owners' sons and income voters will be obliged to make a new application or not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not think this discussion is quite in keeping with the section which we are considering. It simply provides that the name of a voter can be struck off the list with respect to one qualification, or that the revising officer can retain it. I think we can pass this section without any reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). It is true a different practice prevails among the different revising officers in the Province of Ontario with regard to the retention of income voters and farmers' sons. Some hold that all who apply to be put on the list in respect of income should get up a new declaration; others hold that they should not strike off any name with respect to income, but that that should be left to the different parties. I submit that the discussion is not in keeping with the section under consideration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is no doubt that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) has caught the intention of this clause. In fact, I suggested, to a member of the Sub-Committee, that a difficulty had occurred in my riding just as he has stated. It was a question whether the revising officer had power to retain the individual on the voters' list at the final revision, when there was an appeal to strike him off, if he was qualified under another form. It is for the purpose of obviating that difficulty this clause is introduced. With reference to the question raised by Mr. Speaker, I would remind my hon. friends from the East that the names are not finally struck off by the revising officer, but are, in the first place, put upon the list to be struck off at the subsequent revision. That, therefore, is notice to all the parties that if they do not appear before the revising officer, on the final revision, to protect their interests, their names will then disappear from the list. To come back to the primary principle of forming these lists, it would be almost simpler, so far as Ontario is concerned, if instead of requiring the revising officer to take the old lists he had simply gone to the assessment roll for the current year and taken from that roll an entirely new list, to be supplemented by the declarations furnished to him in addition to those he found upon the list. That would be much more simple. Then let the parties apply whose names are not on the list, because they will have to appear before him finally to preserve their rights. Now, if we retain the farmers' sons upon the final list without placing them upon the list, to be struck off where their names do not appear on the assessment roll, we would be discriminating in their favour against those who are on as owners, because the practice has been that when an owner's name does not appear on the subsequent assessment roll of property, the revising officer enquires into the facts and places that name upon the list to be struck off at the final revision, if there is no evidence to the contrary. I do not see how we can possibly secure a list that could be made fairly fresh and correct without adopting some such system. But the clause under consideration, I agree with the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), was intended for an entirely different purpose.

Mr. BARRON. I think the practice spoken of by my hon. friend is really the practice which has been adopted by the greater number of revising officers throughout Ontario. The revising officer does, it is true, look at the last Dominion list, but he takes the assessment roll, and if a name which is on the Dominion list is not on the assessment roll, he does not put it on the new list. In other words, the assessment roll is *primâ facie* evidence, and the revising officer goes entirely by it. With regard to leaving names on, such as income voters, farmers' sons, &c., unless there was some evidence to take them off, why, in a very few years you would have a tremendous list, because we all know the difficulty there is getting evidence to strike the names off, and unless the revising officer strikes them off by his own motion, by reason of their not being on the assessment roll, in a short time you would have an extremely long list of voters. I am speaking not only my views, but those of the revising officers of the county to which I belong. I confess that when I first gave consideration to the matter, I thought the proposal that the revising officer should strike off income voters of his own motion, was rather arbitrary, but on consideration I find it was right, for the reasons I have mentioned. The House will, perhaps, remember that there is an Act of Ontario which provides that farmers' sons may, if they see fit, not be placed upon the list as farmers' sons at all, but they are represented on the assessment roll, with their fathers, as owners of land, and then they go upon the Dominion franchise list, not as farmers' sons, but as owners of land. In consequence of this Act, there might be difficulty in preparing the Dominion lists. A person is put on the list as an owner because in the assessment roll he is so entered under the Ontario Act, whereas, as a matter of fact, he is not an owner, according to the Dominion Elections Act at all, but a farmer's son. Hence he will have asked to be entitled to vote under a qualification which, in point of fact, he has not got. In view of that Ontario Act, which was passed two years ago, it might be advisable for us to take some action. Many a farmer in a township, in the riding which I represent, has asked to have his son's

name entered on the assessment roll, not as farmer's sons, but as owners with him, and under the law the assessor is obliged to do that. This man will then be transferred to the Dominion list as an owner, provided the value of the land is sufficiently high to enable him to be placed on the list; and when he goes to vote as farmer's son, under the Dominion list, he will find himself entered with the qualification which he ought not to have. The clause five was put in the Bill by me, and it was I who proposed it to the Sub-Committee, at the suggestion of my hon. friend behind me. The former law provided that, in the preparation of the first list, the revising officer should not remove any name, if the party had a qualification other than that given him on the list, unless the name was contested. Now, that statute was repealed, and the law has stood up to the present, that only from the preliminary list could the revising officer change that man's qualification to the proper one, provided he had another qualification than that which appears opposite his name. The law to-day, however, will not allow the revising officer at a court to say: Here is a gentleman who comes, having given the fourteen days' notice, to be entitled to vote as an income voter, but it turns out, in the course of examination, that he has been only in Canada for the last eleven months and that twelve months' residence is required by law. It also turns out that, a week or two ago, he bought a piece of land which entitles him to vote; and the revising officer, if this Bill becomes law, will have the right to put this man's name on the list as owner, although he has not the qualification of income voter. It has been suggested, that, perhaps, this discussion is not justified by the section, but I would ask the attention of the Minister of Justice for a moment. This suggestion comes not from me, but from a revising barrister. If I may be allowed to go back to that clause without being out of order, it is substituting the 15th August for the 1st August. It has been suggested that the provision should be "up to, and not later than the 15th August," because the revising officer is always being bothered by being asked to receive declarations after the time fixed by the statute. The law says that he shall make up his list as soon as possible after the 1st August, and I would ask the Minister if he does not think it would be well to put in the words I have suggested to make the matter more clear?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would call the attention of the gentlemen who were on the Committee that reported this Bill, to the clause which is now under consideration. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) has, I think, correctly taken the point that the initial discussion of this clause had no bearing upon the clause itself, but the discussion arose on this clause, because it was necessary to bring the matter to the attention of the Committee, and it was as much applicable to this clause as to any other. I understand that this third section is one which it is intended to add to the existing law. If the existing law covers the point, as I think it so does, there is no need for the section, though I frankly acknowledge that the wording of the section is better than the wording of the existing law. Last year a clause was proposed by myself and carried, which forms section 6 of the Act of 1890, and it seems to me that it covers the very point which is sought to be covered by the present Bill. Section 6 reads as follows:—

"If it appears, on the hearing of any objection to any name on the original or a supplementary list of a polling district, that the name or qualification of the person whose name is objected to is incorrectly entered on such list, but that he possesses such qualification as entitles him to be registered thereon, the revising officer shall retain such person's name thereon, making the necessary corrections."

That means that a revising officer shall not strike off the name of any person that appears on the list, because he is not entitled to the particular qualification which appears on the list. If it appears that he has some other qualification, the revising officer will make the necessary correction. If John Smith is down on the list as an income voter, and he is objected to, he can go before the revising officer and say: It is true I am not an income voter, but I am a farmer's son, or I am a fisherman, or I am an owner of land. Then, under the section which I introduced last year, the revising officer would simply have to make the proper correction. That is the object of this section now. The provision in the Act is all right, but, if you add this section to the existing law, I do not think the revising officer will understand just what you mean. If you are going to adopt this amendment, you had better repeal the first part of section six. If it were proved that the name or the qualification was wrong under the present law, the applicant would be entitled to have it corrected. I suffered from the absence of this provision, and introduced this clause last year.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the old clause is better than the proposed amendment.

Mr. BARRON. This does not exactly meet the difficulty. If an objection is made and it appears to the revising officer that the name ought to be on the list on the ground of some other qualification than that which is mentioned, he can make it right; but what we ask the House to adopt is a provision that when a man asks for his name to be put on, he shall not be interfered with because of a wrong description of his qualifications. He gives fourteen days' notice, and there is no objection to it, and he says he wants his name put on as an income voter. The revising officer asks for evidence, the man is sworn, but it turns out that he has not the residential qualification which is required a year before he asks to have his name put on. He may have lived in Canada only eleven months, but it turns out that he has the qualification of owner. Then the returning officer says that, though he has applied to go on the list as an income voter, and is not qualified in that respect, he finds he has the qualification of owner and so puts him on. That is the case of an applicant asking to have his name put on the list. The question raised by my hon. friend is in regard to what is to be done when an objection is raised. What we are providing for is the case of a man who is not already on the list at all, but in regard to whom an application is made to put him on the list for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not read the clause in the sense which it is interpreted by the hon. gentleman. The clause says:

"The revising officer shall not, at the final revision, remove the name of any person entered on the list of voters from such list on the ground that the qualification of such person is incorrectly entered thereon, if it appears that such person is entitled to be registered on the list of voters as possessed of any of the qualifications set forth in this Act."

That has no reference to the application to be put on, but only to those whose names were incorrectly entered upon the list.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt about that. The law is quite sufficient as it stands. I prefer the wording of the statute of 1890, and would recommend the Minister of Justice to strike out this clause altogether.

Mr. BARRON. I confess that the Bill as printed is not exactly as it was intended when the matter was brought before the special committee, and it was certainly overlooked. The point which I made was in regard to a case of an applicant asking that his name should be put on for a certain qualification, and it might turn out that he had not that for another qualification. That should be provided for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is not adequate provision made for the revision of the list and the dropping off of the names of parties who are no longer entitled to remain on the list. Now, in the case of tenants, a man's tenancy may have expired and he may have gone elsewhere and another party have rented the same property. The other party has his name taken from the assessment roll and put on the voters' list along with the party who was tenant before him. If there is no formal application made to remove the name, it still remains on the list, so you have several parties entitled to vote on the same tenancy. It seems to me that the duty ought not to be imposed upon the member or upon any other particular party other than the revising officer, to see that those names are removed. I think a further provision should be made that the revising officer should see that where any party represents a tenant as having a right to go upon the list, enquiry should be made as to whether such tenant has a right to be put upon the voters' list.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is perfectly clear now that the section must come out. With respect to the object the hon. gentleman has in view, I think it will be met by a section in somewhat the following words:—

If, on any application to place a voter's name on the list, it appears that the applicant is not entitled under the qualification in his application, but is otherwise qualified, the revising officer may amend the application and add the name of the applicant on his real qualification.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. With respect to the notification of revising barristers of the extension of time to 15th August, I desire to ask the Government what steps will be taken to give the revising barristers the necessary notification?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the Bill passes this House to-day, all the barristers will be notified by telegraph at once.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no change in the Bill that will render it difficult for the revising officers to go on with their work after 1st August, without full instructions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think not. The revising officers are aware by public rumour that the time would probably be extended to 15th August. They have written to the department by dozens, and they have been informed that as soon as the Bill passed they would be notified by telegraph.

Mr. BARRON. I move "That clause 2 be amended by inserting before the words 15th August 'up to but not later than.'" As the law stands it does not prevent the revising officer receiving declarations after 1st August. The proposed amendment is suggested to me by a revising officer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the clause as drawn is correct. It is intended that applications should be made up to 15th August, but not later.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There can be no objection to the proposed amendment, but he would be a strange lawyer to interpret the Act as suggested by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron).

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As the law now stands the revising officers have no right to receive any declarations after 1st August. If the words suggested would make the clause more clear, there there can be no objection to inserting them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If a declaration is placed in the post office on the 15th August, would the judge receive that declaration when it reached him, probably the day after?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It must be received on the 15th August and not later.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then if it was posted on the 15th it is too late?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that the time should be extended to the 1st September. I understand that the revising officer of the constituency that I represent takes the assessment roll of 1890, and when the list is completed this year, we have a list of voters two years old at the time it is completed. It would be desirable to extend the time, so that we would have the list made in the year in which it is said to be made. I think it would be desirable to further extend the time, so that the judge can take the assessment roll in the year in which the list is made, for it seems to me very anomalous that the list made this year is made on the assessment roll of last year. I believe that this suggestion is an important one, and ought to be considered by the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The intention was that the list should be made on the assessment roll for the current year. We were informed in this House last year, and in the Committee this year, that the lists would be available for that purpose for the 15th August, and that being so it would be very undesirable to extend the time until the 1st September, because we should then have to change the time to complete the list beyond the 31st December, and there may be many by-elections before the next session of Parliament. I think the assessment roll is completed by the 1st August. It may not be distributed then, but the revising officers everywhere I know of make their own arrangements to have access to the list, and sometimes they have to pay a small sum in order to enable them to do that. They are certainly expected to make the preliminary list on the assessment roll of the current year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood from the clerk of the township in my county, that the list would be only completed on the 1st September.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think you will find that the extension of time to the 15th August will meet your objection.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If it does, very well.

Mr. CARPENTER. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is not correct. The assessment rolls in the Province of Ontario are all confirmed on the 1st July, and they are available after that date for the Dominion lists.

Mr. MULOCK. They are not printed.

Mr. CARPENTER. The preparation of the provincial lists takes place after that date, so that we have the use of them by the 15th August. That is the reason the extension of time was asked for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a point in connection with tenant voters. Suppose a man is a tenant in another constituency adjoining the one I represent, during the past year; if his tenancy ceases in that constituency, and he comes into the constituency in which I live, then, unless he is a resident of my constituency for twelve months before the list is revised, he cannot be placed on the assessment roll as an elector, and he is at the same time liable to be struck off the list in the riding he has resided in. On the contrary, in the case of an income voter, he can be put upon the list in any riding where he lives, if he has been a resident of Canada for twelve months. If he moves into a constituency he can be immediately put on the list, but the tenant has got to be a tenant in the riding for twelve months before he can be enrolled as a voter, even although he had been a voter in a county across the road, in which he was a tenant for years. I do not see why the same privilege should not be extended to the tenant voter as is given to the income voter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems to me from what I understand of the objection of the hon. gentleman, that it is adequately met by section 3 of the Franchise Act, sub-section 4, which contains the following provision:—

"Provided always, that a change or changes of tenancy during the year shall not deprive such tenant of the right to be registered on a list of voters, if such change or changes have been without any intermission of time between the tenancies, and if the several tenancies are such that would entitle the tenant to be registered on a list of voters had such tenant been in possession under any one of them, as such tenant, for the year next before the time aforesaid."

So that if he makes a change of tenancy, and is qualified as a tenant to be on the list, then he is entitled to be put on the list.

Mr. CASEY. Although his former tenancy may be in another county?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. In my section of the country the revising barristers interpret that clause in this way: If a tenant is a tenant within the municipality and occupies one house, and within a year moves to another house in the same municipality, his name would be struck off from the ward in which he lived before as a tenant, and put on the list in the other ward. They make that clause applicable only to a tenancy within the riding in which the man has been a tenant; but the other revising officer's list is not before him, and he is not in a position to know whether the man has been a tenant or a voter in another riding. They interpret the clause as referring to the riding in which he has been a tenant.

Mr. BARRON. With great deference to the Minister of Justice, I think he is wrong in this particular: I think the change of tenancy is construed by the revising officers and by the judges, and I think properly construed, as confined simply to the constituency in which the tenancy is when he applies to be put on the roll. If there is any doubt about that in the Minister's mind, he will see that the residential clause fixes it beyond any possible doubt. The change of tenancy undoubtedly must be a change in regard to property within the constituency itself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Act said so, I would change my opinion, but until it does I will not.

Mr. BARRON. It says that the tenant must swear that he has been a tenant within the riding for one year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That oath has been repealed, I think.

Mr. HENDERSON. If such has been the practice in the riding of North Victoria, it is not in the county which I have the honour to represent, for I know that our revising officer connects a tenancy in the neighbouring county with one in our county, following the practice laid down by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. JAMIESON. Without reference to the clause under discussion, I may say that I am aware that the view taken by the hon. member for North Wellington has been taken by more than one revising officer in the Province of Ontario; and although the hon. Minister of Justice is, no doubt, quite correct in reference to it, there would be no harm in making the law so clear that it would be perfectly understood by every revising officer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We might have to pass a separate statute for each revising officer.

Mr. CASEY. What my hon. friend from North Lanark has just said I think must carry considerable force. The question is not how the law should be interpreted, but how it is interpreted by those who carry it out; and if the revising officers have been reading this meaning into it, the law should be so constituted that they cannot read that meaning into it any longer. I want, however, to call attention to another point. I have noticed that very often the name of one man is mentioned two or three times in the same polling sub-division where he may own separate parcels of land. This may lead to abuse. There may be more than one person in the sub-division of the same name, and some person might come up and claim the right to vote after the real person had voted. I think that shouid be remedied, so that a man's name should not be entered more than once for one polling sub-division.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sure I shall bow with respect to the decision of the hon. Minister of Justice if he is fully satisfied in his own mind that the Act now provides that tenants can be put on the list in one riding after they have been tenants possessing the full privilege of the franchise in another riding. But I know that a great many revising officers do take the view that a man must be an occupant of a property in the riding for

twelve months before he is entitled to be placed on the list, though he may have been a good tenant in a neighbouring riding. But if the hon. Minister of Justice has come to the conclusion that the law is what he states it to be, I will bow to his decision.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think the hon. Minister of Justice will, on reflection, come to that conclusion. Whether such is the law or not, I know that some revising barristers do not so act, but hold that the tenant must have been a resident for twelve months in the constituency where he seeks to have his name placed on the list. I am quite sure that the hon. Minister of Justice, in reading carefully sub-section 4 of section 3 of the Act, will come to the conclusion that he is mistaken in the first view he took. It provides that the tenant voter must be the tenant of any real property within the electoral district and must have been in possession thereof for at least one year before his being placed upon the list of voters. It is not sufficient that he has been there for eleven months or for twelve months lacking one day. So that I think the hon. Minister of Justice will find that the conclusion he hastily arrived at is not the correct one, and that the complaint of the hon. member for North Wellington is well founded. I know that in my own district at the last revision, several applications of that kind were made, and I know that they were rejected. Now, there being a doubt on this point in the minds of some revising officers, we should remove that doubt by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quite agree with the hon. member for West Huron as to the construction of the law ; but I do not agree with him as to the policy of changing it. The jurisdiction of the revising officer is confined to the electoral district over which he has been appointed. If you give him power to consider matters arising outside of that electoral district, where are you going to limit him—to the adjoining district or to the province, or may the tenancy begin in Prince Edward Island, and continue in Ontario? To make the change suggested, would open up a great field of difficulty and trouble. I think the law as it stands is the only possible law that can be fairly and effectually carried out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the qualification being necessarily confined to the electoral district, I think the objection is well taken. The hon. member for North Wellington asked me on the spur of the moment, and I answered him from a reading of the proviso ; but I see that the first part of the sub-section says that the occupancy must be within the electoral district. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, however, that it is very undesirable to alter the law. Without taking the extreme case he puts, you might have a person coming from one part of a province to another part, and claiming the right to attach his two tenancies together, and if he offered proof, there might be no opportunity to contest that proof.

Mr. CASEY. It would not be continued tenancy if he came from another district.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It might be that he gave up one place on the first day of May, and on the same day took another.

Mr. CASEY. In that case, if the hon. Minister sees objection to changing the principle, I think the period ought to be very materially shortened, because it is rather too bad that a man should run the risk of being disfranchised just because he is moved from one county to another, despite the fact that he has been continually qualified, although not in the same place. It would be easy to get over the difficulty by shortening the time, say to six months.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not a question of residence, but of tenancy, and I think a year is short enough to give qualification.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see what difference it makes, or why a man should be disfranchised simply because he has moved from one place to another.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then you do not believe in the Ontario Act.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is capable of amendment in that respect, most decidedly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As the law stands, it sometimes produces considerable hardship. I know of two parties who lived in the County of Bruce, and who, just a short time before revision, moved into the County of Grey. They were tenants in Bruce and were struck off the list, and made application to be put on the list in Grey. Their application was refused, simply because they had not been tenants in Grey for a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to amend the phraseology in section 11 of the Act, so as to make it more clear. That section provides that the same revising officer may be appointed for more than one electoral district and may be appointed for a portion of any electoral district. It is absurd to say that the same officer may be appointed for several and a portion ; and to make the clause read better, I wish to substitute "a revising officer" for "the same revising officer."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose that sub-section 7 of the Act of 1890 be amended by making it read as follows :—

At the conclusion of the revising of the list, the revising officer shall, in open court, give notice of the time when and the place where he will proceed with the transcription, and shall not certify such list as correct before the expiration of the time mentioned, and such delay shall not be less than six days, during which the said list shall be accessible to the public.

In that section it is stated that the revising officer, after having held his court, shall, in open court, give notice to all parties interested that within a certain time he shall retranscribe and complete the list as revised in court. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) suggested to me that a delay should be given for that purpose, during which time the list could be inspected by the public, and I think this amendment will meet that view.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would like to submit to the House an amendment which has been asked by revising officers in the cities and towns. The re-subdivision of polling districts by the increase of names at each revision leads to a great deal of confusion, and work and reprinting which might be avoided. And as the present sub-divisions of polling districts are pretty well known by the electorate, it has been suggested that they should remain the

same. But if the number of voters would exceed 300, then the returning officer would have the right to make two polling booths in the same sub-division, placing the two as near as possible so as to prevent confusion and the unnecessary travelling of the electors. Suppose, for instance, in Halifax, polling district 15 had 250 electors, and after the revision it had 500 electors. The limits of the district would be the same, but in order to follow the intention of the Legislature, and the law that not more than 250 people should vote at the same polling place on the same day, that district would be sub-divided into two polling booths, situated near to each other, probably on two sides of the same street, and the voters' list would be divided according to letters, so that all those from A to L would vote at polling booth No. 1, and those from M to Z would vote at polling booth No. 2. I am sure that in cities and towns this would prevent the necessity of reprinting the lists to a very large extent, and it would not interfere with the liberty of the electors. Of course this would only apply to cities and towns, because in the rural districts, where the population is dispersed, it would not be right to cause the electors so much unnecessary travel. It has been suggested to me by several revising officers, and especially by the revising officer of Halifax, that a clause something like this should be inserted:

In all cities and incorporated towns it shall not be necessary to sub-divide polling districts or sections thereof by reason of the number of voters in such district or section exceeding 300, but in such case the returning officer in such district may make an alphabetical division of such voters so that the division may be as nearly as possible equal, and may establish two polling booths in such division; and where the number exceeds 600, he may establish three polling booths, and so on; and such portions of the said Act as are inconsistent with this provision are hereby repealed.

I know this would prevent the necessity of doing a great deal of printing, because, if all the names for the polling sub-division are to be reprinted, it would mean commencing the work *de novo*.

Mr. INGRAM. I am sorry to hear such a suggestion made. The returning officers do not know the difficulties we have to encounter. In 1887 in St. Thomas we had about 11,000 inhabitants, and twelve sub-divisions, and we never heard any complaint in regard to crowding the polling booths. At the last election there were seventeen sub-divisions, and there was a great deal of confusion. In fact, the electors had forgotten the place at which to vote. I would be opposed to increasing the number of polling sub-divisions without very strong reason, and I do not think the reason has been given. The object should be to prevent confusion as much as possible, and then every man knows where he has to vote. According to my experience, returning officers have not a practical knowledge of the working of the Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has misunderstood me. It is exactly what my hon. friend says should not be done that I want to provide against by this amendment. It is very puzzling to re-subdivide the polling sub-divisions, and, if we follow the Act, the revising officers are compelled to re-divide every sub-division that now exists. We desire to say that the polling districts that now exist shall remain, but if they include more than 300 voters, the returning officer may place two polling booths across the street, so that the electors may know where they have to vote.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the amendment of the hon. gentleman ought to meet the approval of this House. The object, I understand, is to preserve the old limits which are known to the electors and to avoid the confusion that may exist if, after every election, you have to make a new division. This is a very strong argument also against the Gerrymander Act. It might apply to counties as well as to polling districts, and the Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced we may remember in due time.

Mr. INGRAM. At present the returning officers are limited by 250 names on the voters' list. If I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, I am open to correction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I call the attention of the Minister to the effect of the clause which he is proposing, and that is to keep to the old lines. A very great difficulty arises, and every hon. gentleman must have known it in his own experience, and that is, the consecutive enumeration of the polling sub-divisions. Under the old municipal arrangement, the sub-divisions were numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and stopped there, but here you get up to 30 or 40 throughout the riding. If you are asked what part of the riding sub-division No. 20 is in, you cannot tell at once, and that is confusing to the electorate. You get a list and you say in polling sub-division No. 27, such and such things occur. Every one will ask: Whereis polling sub-division 27 or sub-division 10? Under the old list every one knows; they are either known consecutively or from the local names. Take, for instance, the municipality of Bentinck: there is Allan Park, which is a polling place, there is Hanover, there is Elmwood, and so on through the localities in that township, and every elector in the township knows where the polls are. But you take them by consecutive numbers and it is difficult to trace them. I would like, when the Minister was going in that direction, that he would adopt the old enumeration and the old boundaries for the polling sub-divisions as they exist in the local list. The Minister will see that they have an election every year for the council, and the limits of the old polling divisions are the ones that should be observed. I have known people who were accustomed to vote in one ward under the municipal list, go to vote for the Dominion and find out that they had to go five or six miles to vote somewhere else, or not vote at all. I hope the Minister will adhere to the old line and have the enumeration confined to townships consecutively through the riding.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Unfortunately in doing this we would do what we want to avoid, that is to say, we would begin a new system which would be puzzling to the electors. The numbering consecutively, I admit, puzzled me at first, but it has been done by a kind of consensus of the revising officers, who had adopted all through the country the system, which is not forced upon them by the law, of numbering all the polling divisions consecutively in the whole constituency according to the number of voters. I would not like to make a change which would be a new embarrassment, but I want, by my amendment, to keep the old lines, and we will

get accustomed to the numbers as well as we are accustomed to the old limits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You cannot do that, because you have the local elections every year. You have the Dominion elections every four years, although the Minister of Justice seemed to think we may have one sooner. I would suggest to the Government, who call themselves Conservatives, that they would do well to carry out the conservative idea, and allow electors to vote on the old lines in the old places. Making a change just for the sake of change, without consulting the convenience of the electors, is, in my opinion, calculated to create confusion.

Mr. SPROULE. The member for South Grey will see that exactly the same thing is done in the municipal voters' list. They have usually one to every 200 voters, and when there are more electors, the council make a change.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the proposition of the Secretary of State with regard to observing the old lines, and I am sorry to hear him announce that it is only to apply to towns and cities. In rural districts near to cities there are polling subdivisions that are largely increased in numbers, and there it becomes necessary on the part of the revising officer to make changes. Would it not be well to have a provision to extend to rural sections, where the number of votes exceeds 300, the provision to have two polling sub-divisions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with my hon. friend. The only difficulty was where to draw the line. We thought the best way was to limit that permission to incorporated towns and cities. The same observation was made to me by a revising officer, that in the suburban localities the population is very large, and the same reason would apply there. If there is a suggestion made to that effect I would not object to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. In several cases, even in my own riding, where sub-divisions have taken place great confusion has existed. I have known men advanced in years who really were not able to travel from poll to poll, and when they came to a poll and found their names on the list but some four or five miles away, they had to walk that distance or not vote at all. That is a great hardship. I think it would be prudent to make the provision applicable to rural districts as well as to cities and towns, and allow the revising officer to establish two booths, one just across the road from the other, and then if they found their names were in that polling sub-division they could go to the polling booth where their names belonged.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman did that he would be vesting power in the returning officers which might be used very harshly. If you had a partial returning officer he might appoint two booths two miles apart, and you could not tell what might be the result.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In some townships we have more sub-divisions than others. In South Grey the township with the smallest number of voters has the largest number of polling places. On what basis are the polling divisions arranged? Why should the smallest township have eight, and the largest one have only six?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are arranged for 300 voters as a maximum, and they cannot be more satisfactorily arranged otherwise. I move that the following clause be added to section 23 of the Electoral Franchise Act:—

In all cities and incorporated towns it shall not be necessary to sub-divide polling districts or sections thereof by reason of the number of names of voters in such district exceeding 300; but in every such case the returning officer of the electoral district including such cities or towns, may make an alphabetical division of such names of the voters so that the number of each division may be as nearly the same as practicable, and may establish two polling booths in such district or section, and where the number exceeds 600, three polling booths, and so on in the same proportion.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that in the first line the word "all" should be struck out as not necessary.

Mr. DICKEY. The amendment says the returning officer "may" divide. In that case, if left to his discretion, he could hold one poll for 600 voters. The revising officer may or may not sub-divide. But if he does not sub-divide, the returning officer must. We should use the word "shall" instead of "may."

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would ask the Minister whethe he could not extend the provision, which I understand is now proposed with reference to cities and towns, to some parts of the rural districts where the number of voters is very numerous? If you have small polling divisions you have to make a great many lists. But if the same power was given to the returning officer which I understand is given to him in cities and towns, it would be a great convenience. I speak particularly of Algoma and Parry Sound, where it is very difficult sometimes to arrange districts for voters' lists in such a way as to suit the convenience of voters. But if the returning officer had discretion to making the polling places within the district for which a certain number of names are provided, the public convenience would be served and I do not see that any harm could arise.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will have the opportunity of bringing up his subject again, because a clause will have to be inserted in the Election Act to give effect to this section respecting returning officers, and the hon. gentleman's suggestion might then be taken into calm consideration.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following letter, which he had received from the acting Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General's:—

OFFICE OF THE
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
OTTAWA, 29th July, 1891.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Mr. Justice Strong, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Friday afternoon, the 31st instant, at 3.30 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. J. JONES,
For the Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
&c., &c., &c.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the Order for third reading of Bill (No. 44) to amend chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the safety of ships, be discharged, and that the House again resolve itself into Committee. He said: The House will recollect that this Bill generally adopted the English law in regard to the carrying of explosives on passenger steamers, and in fact it prohibits the carrying of explosives. But a case has been brought to the attention of the department since the Bill passed through Committee, which renders it necessary that we should assimilate the Bill somewhat to the American law instead of following so closely the English Act, as this Bill did. This is necessary to meet such a case as the following: On certain waters, especially in the interior of this country, there are no regular passenger boats whatever, but freight boats carry passengers incidentally, and under the provisions of this Bill none of these vessels which are called freight boats could carry the explosives necessary for the large mining operations, and in that way great injury might be inflicted. I find that in order to meet these cases, the American Act on this subject provided that, under the inspection of officers of the Government, a vessel that is engaged in carrying freight and passengers occasionally or incidentally may, on precautions being taken and inspection of the ship being made for the carrying of explosives with great care, be permitted to carry such explosives. I, therefore, propose to add the following clause to the Bill:—

Notwithstanding any provision in this section contained, the Minister may grant a permit to any steamboat engaged chiefly in the carrying of freight and only incidentally in the carrying of passengers, and which is specially fitted for the carriage of explosives, to carry explosives on such terms and conditions, and in such manner, as is specified in said permit, and if any of such terms and conditions are not fully complied with, this section shall apply as if such permit had not been granted.

Motion agreed to; Order discharged, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. STAIRS. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine, if the Bill as now amended will prevent the carrying of passengers in the small coasting vessels in the Maritime Provinces, which may sometimes carry explosives? As the hon. Minister knows, the small coasting vessels in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick carry all kinds of freight, and no doubt sometimes explosives which could not be carried in a safer manner.

Mr. TUPPER. That provision applies to all Canada.

Mr. STAIRS. Will that allow passengers to be carried in these vessels I refer to?

Mr. TUPPER. No vessels carrying explosives can carry passengers without obtaining a permit, and the permit will not be granted unless the inspector ascertains that all necessary precautions have been taken to prevent danger and loss of life to passengers.

Mr. STAIRS. Does not the amendment only apply to steamers?

Mr. TUPPER. It applies to all vessels registered in Canada.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 85) to further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Tupper.)

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. TUPPER moved concurrence in report of Committee of the Whole on the following resolution:

That it is expedient that an annual grant of one hundred and sixty thousand dollars be made, to aid in the development of the sea fisheries, and the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152), to amend chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to encourage the development of sea fisheries, and the building of vessels.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOCAL JUDGES IN ADMIRALTY—SALARIES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the salaries of local judges in admiralty, as such judges, shall be as follows:—The local judge of the district of Quebec, $2,000 per annum; the local judge of the district of Nova Scotia, $1,000 per annum; the local judge of the district of New Brunswick, $1,000 per annum; the local judge of the district of Prince Edward Island, $800 per annum; the local judge of the district of British Columbia, $600 per annum; the local judge of the Toronto district, $600 per annum; and that each such judge shall be paid such travelling allowance as the Governor in Council from time to time determines.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like the hon. gentleman to explain what is the principle upon which he arrived at these amounts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These are the salaries provided by the law at present, except as to the judge of British Columbia, who receives no salary now. There is also this exception, that the amounts are increased by adding the sums which the judges have been receiving for a number of years past in the shape of fees. By the Admiralty Act which we adopted, we abolished the system of the judge being paid by fees, and in Quebec there is no addition, because the fees were abolished some time ago. I consider that the salary in Quebec is twice what it ought to be, but I propose that it shall remain as it is fixed by law now, during the incumbency of the present judge. I think the Imperial Act obliges us to do that, and I feel that it is only right to do it in any case. Then, the other salaries are, I think, a fair remuneration as they stand for the work done. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the salaries are at present $600, and the fees slightly under $400, and we simply add the fees to the salary. In Prince Edward Island the salary is $400 and the fees very trifling, probably only $50 a year, and we have made an addition of $200 to the salary. We have not thought it proper to make any change in British Columbia, because no fees are allowed there; and the salary in the Toronto district is also left as it was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So far as Quebec is concerned, I think the salary of $2,000 is entirely beyond reasonable bounds. The work there is not nearly as great as in the Province of Nova Scotia. Practically it is next to *nil*, and unless we are compelled by statute to continue that salary, I think, now that the matter is being considered anew, though we ought to err on the liberal side, yet I do not see why $2,000 per annum should be paid for trying a few cases, because I understand that the judge is not occupied for more than two or three days in the year. It seems outrageous to pay such a salary for the trial of two or three cases. I will not say that the salary for the Prince Edward Island judge is excessive. If it stood on its own merits, apart from the surrounding circumstances, I should be disposed to say that it is high enough; but looking at the very low salary voted there hitherto, I do not think this is too much, not merely for the work the incumbent discharges as judge of the Admiralty Court, but as a supplement to his salary as chief justice. With regard to the judge at Toronto, I would like the hon. Minister to explain whether the returns from that district justify the continuance of this salary. I understand that the judge there occupies three or four positions, and that the aggregate of his various salaries amounts to $6,000 a year—in other words, that he receives as much as the chief justice of Ontario. There may be circumstances to justify that allowance, but they are not before Parliament, and it is just as well that we should have them. I suppose the salaries for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are not unreasonable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the Quebec salary, that is the sum fixed at the present time by the Act respecting the judges in the provincial courts; so that I think we can hardly reduce it during the incumbency of the present judge. With regard to the extent of business done, during the last three years there have been twenty-two cases disposed of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Were those cases instituted in the court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Just instituted. Out of a dozen cases instituted, perhaps only three come to trial.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the number instituted. In Halifax, during the last three years, there have been thirty-five cases; in St. John, nineteen; in British Columbia, one, and in Prince Edward Island, five; and in Toronto there have been thirty-seven cases during the past five years. It is true that the county judge of York holds several positions, and he is a very hard-worked officer, indeed; but the salaries are not all provided by us. The same is true of several other County Court judges in Ontario who are receiving emoluments higher than those of the Superior Court judges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret that the return brought before Parliament does not show, in addition to the number of cases instituted, the number of cases tried. I am not going to raise captious objections. I see what the hon. Minister says is correct, that the salary of the judge in the Quebec district has heretofore been $2,000, and I suppose we cannot cut it down. When a new judge is appointed, we will be told by him that the same salary ought to be continued; but I wish to enter my protest against setting a precedent of voting a similar sum to the successor of the present judge. The hon. gentleman says that we do not pay the County Court judge at Toronto all that he receives. We pay him $2,400 as County Court judge, $1,500 as revising officer, and $600 as Admiralty judge. I believe that he also receives $1,000 as a Surrogate judge, and that he gets arbitrator's fees in addition. All this may be right or wrong, but I think we should have the particulars. The hon. Minister says that in Quebec twenty-two cases have been instituted during the past three years. I think I shall be speaking within the bounds when I say that not more than two cases a year have been tried.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there will be no objection to providing that the salary shall be during the incumbency of the present judge.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) further to amend chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the judges of the provincial courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MASTERS' AND MATES' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said: We went over most of the provisions on the last occasion in committee, but a couple of sections were held over. The definition of inland waters and minor waters was not considered sufficiently clear, as the draughtsman had adopted the old rule which prevailed. I propose now to substitute for sections (*h*) and (*i*) the following, which I think will be found to be accurate definitions:

"Sub-section (*h*). The expression 'inland waters of Canada' means all the rivers, lakes, and other navigable waters within Canada except salt water bays and gulfs on the sea coasts, and includes the River St. Lawrence as far eastward as a line drawn from Father Point on the south shore to Point Orient on the north shore.

"Sub-section (*i*). The expression 'minor waters of Canada' means all inland waters of Canada other than Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron, including Georgian Bay, Lake Superior and Lake Winnipeg, and includes all bays, inlets and harbours of or on the said lakes and bays."

Mr. EDGAR. I think that these definitions were certainly required.

Mr. TUPPER. The other section which stood over was section number 3. Several hon. gentlemen, especially the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, I regret, is not in his place, challenged the principle of that clause. I in vain suggested that, as I was not introducing any new principle, and as the principle he quarrelled with is in the present Act, it would be inopportune to make an amendment. I wish to say, in addition, that the inopportuneness of the occasion for making that kind of amendment is better illustrated by referring to the main Act, for if that be touched in the sense the hon. gentleman desires, we would have an incongruity, since this Bill relates to inland waters and minor waters, and in the main Act the

deep sea certificate is still outstanding. It would be a pity to introduce a principle as regards inland and minor waters, when we are dealing simply with a matter of form and not with a question of principle. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) argued that another feature of the main Act should be changed, and that we should not require a domicile in this country for three years in the case of an American citizen in order to entitle him to a certificate. Under the present law, the successful applicant for the position of master or mate must either show that he is a British subject, or, if he is not a British subject, that he has been domiciled three years in the country and served on a British ship. A British subject can show service on any ship, and with this domicile his application is in order, but a foreign subject must show domicile and service on a British ship. The hon. gentleman said we should abolish that requisite of domicile, and I urged in reply that our neighbours in the United States went much further, and not merely insisted upon a requirement of that kind but would not permit a British subject to take command of an American ship, and that until reciprocity was obtained in connection with coasting arrangements, for which we held out a standing offer, this law should remain as it is. The hon. gentleman said I was wrong in my view of the law of the United States, and it was more liberal, and that a British subject could obtain a certificate, on passing the necessary examination, and be appointed master of a ship or engineer on a steamboat. They spoke with a great deal of positiveness, particularly the hon. member for Lambton; and I suggested that the matter should stand until I looked into it. I find that the hon. gentlemen are entirely astray and that I was right, and I would ask the attention of the House while I point out that, in the case of the master of an American ship, he must not merely sign a statement of his intention to become an American citizen, but must go further and prove that he is a citizen of the United States. His certificate expressly states that he is a citizen of the United States. Number 4,171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States may be referred to in this connection. Section 4,071 and section 4,131 of the United States statute may be referred to in regard to masters and mates, and it will be seen that a man must prove that he is a citizen of the United States in addition to proving his efficiency to command. With reference to the employment of engineers, I find that, in 1874, six months' residence was required in the United States, but that law has now been repealed, and the present law requires, even in the case of engineers, that they shall be by birth or naturalization citizens of the United States. So careful are the authorities on the other side in regard to this, that in the instructions given to the inspectors it is stated:

"Inspectors will, after the receipt of this circular, refuse to issue original or renewed licenses to any officer of a steam vessel, except upon evidence satisfactory to themselves that such persons applying to them are citizens of the United States by birth or naturalization."

And further, it is provided that all officers of vessels of the United States must be citizens of that country; but, on a foreign voyage, an officer below the grade of master may have his place filled by an alien until the return of the vessel to their ports. That country has adopted this principle in a more rigid form than we have. I trust this clause, which is only introduced to harmonize with the other provisions of the Bill, will be accepted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the amendment to the interpretation clause compel the captains of ferry boats to take out certificates?

Mr. TUPPER. That makes no change in the present law. This is in order to sanction the practice which has prevailed since 1883.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS, PIERS, &c.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Act respecting Government harbours, piers and breakwaters.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. This Bill is merely designed to increase the ability of the Government to collect the tolls on goods landed at Government wharves. Cases have occurred where, the moment the goods left the wharf, the remedy of the Crown went as well; so this is intended to create a lien on the goods for the tolls.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has given his personal attention to this, but it strikes me as going a little too far. You want to secure the payment of the tolls to the Government—that is right enough. You want to make the owner of the goods or the consignee liable for those tolls—that is right enough. But you make the shipper or the consignor liable for those tolls. I do not see why you should do that. If a merchant in Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John or Halifax ships goods, why should he be liable for the payment of the tolls? It should be quite sufficient that the consignee, the owner of the goods, should be made liable. I do not even know that the owner of the vessel should be made liable, but certainly the consignor should not. What is the special reason for this?

Mr. TUPPER. There is no special reason except to make the provision as wide as possible. The goods are liable for the tolls.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But they are the property of the consignee?

Mr. TUPPER. The Crown wishes to hold the goods until they are paid for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the consignor ceases to have any interest in them. The consignee is liable. Why should you make the person who sold the goods liable for the tolls and fees?

Mr. TUPPER. In the event of the title not passing, or the non-acceptance of the goods by the consignee where they are not delivered, or where he refuses to take charge of them, then we have recourse on the consignor who has the goods in his possession.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have got that sufficiently under the word "owner." You have it *in rem*, and you have it further in the word "owner."

Mr. TUPPER. I agree to strike out the words "and the consignor or shipper."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman makes the vessel liable

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; she is liable for the tolls.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You make this a debt recoverable at any time. The vessel is liable at any time, it is a lien which passes with the vessel, I suppose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; this does not give a lien.

Mr. TUPPER. The lien is on the goods.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

GRANTS OF LAND TO VOLUNTEERS—REBELLION, 1885.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That whereas the persons hereinafter mentioned and described, being "members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and Half-breed outbreak," within the meaning of the Act passed in the session held in the 48th and 49th years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 73, as amended by the Act passed in the session held in the 49th year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 29, have not as yet received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted, and the time within which, under the provisions of the said amended Act, they might have received the same has elapsed; and there may be other persons in the like case; it is desirable that authority should be given for the granting to such persons, notwithstanding anything in the said amended Act contained, of the bounties thereby contemplated.

2. That, notwithstanding any limits of time in the said amended Act prescribed, the Minister of the Interior be authorized to grant free homesteads or scrip to the persons hereinafter mentioned or described, upon warrants, in favour of such persons respectively, issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence, as provided in the said amended Act: provided that any person in whose favour such warrant is issued, or his duly constituted substitute, shall, within six months after the date of the issue of such warrant, select and make entry for the two quarter-sections to which he is entitled thereunder, and shall thereafter perfect such entry and reside upon and cultivate the lands so entered for in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the homestead provisions of "The Dominion Lands Act."

3. That any person may, in lieu of such land, take scrip as provided by the said amended Act, but that any person choosing to take scrip must notify the Deputy Minister of the Interior of his choice within six months from the issue of the warrant in his favour.

4. That all the provisions of the said amended Act shall, so far as the same are applicable, extend and apply to grants of land and scrip issued under the foregoing provisions.

5. That the foregoing provisions shall apply to:

(*a*) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Regina Volunteer Company;

(*b*) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Battleford Home Guards;

(*c*) Walter William Phelan, of Regina, a scout actively engaged during the outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority;

(*d*) The following members of the troop of scouts known as the Steele Scouts, that is to say:—James Rolland, Frederick Rolland, William Rolland, John Whiteford, R. E. Steele, G. M. Steele, W. Chamberlayne, Peter Nelson, George Beatty and John Calder;

(*e*) Such other persons as hereafter establish to the satisfaction of the Minister of Militia and Defence that they were respectively, within the meaning of the said amended Act, members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in the Indian and Half-breed outbreak, and that they have not received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In explanation of these resolutions I may state that the object is to authorize the issue of lands or scrip to the persons whose names have been favourably reported upon by the Department of Justice, as well as to others whose claims may be subsequently established. The law at present is as follows:—"Claims for scrip under the provisions of the statutes in that behalf to the volunteers and others who were engaged in suppressing the rebellion." By chapter 73 of the Act of 1885, the Government was authorized to grant to each member of the enrolled militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in suppressing the Indian and Half-breed outbreak, and serving west of Port Arthur, a free homestead of two adjoining quarter-sections, provided that the grantee should commence to reside upon and cultivate the homestead within six months from the 1st of August, 1886, and should thereafter comply with the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act with respect to homesteads. That Act further provided that in lieu of the land to which a militiaman was entitled he might accept scrip for $80, and that all grants of land or scrip should be made by the Minister of the Interior on a warrant in favour of the person entitled, issued by the Minister of Militia. By chapter 29 of the Act of 1886 the class of persons entitled to scrip or lands under the foregoing Act was enlarged, and was declared to include every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of any irregular force raised for the purpose and actually engaged in bearing arms in the suppression of said outbreak, other than as a home guard for the protection of property at or near their place of residence. It also included every scout actively engaged during the said outbreak whose services had been certified to by competent authority, and four other classes not necessary to be mentioned for the purpose of this report. I can state that these Acts expired six months after the 1st of August, 1886. It turned out that numbers of persons entitled to benefit under these Acts were deprived of such benefits in consequence of their claims not being recognized prior to the 1st of February, 1887. Many of those claims were investigated and dealt with in the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice. The object of these resolutions is, as I have explained, to authorize the granting of land or scrip to persons whose claims have been investigated by the Department of Justice and recognized as claims for which the Government are responsible, and to provide for any further claims which in the future might be satisfactorily established before the department, so as to be entitled to recognition under this Act.

Mr. OUIMET. May I ask the hon. Minister if he has received a letter from me regarding the claims of certain volunteers, who, within my knowledge, served the country faithfully during the rebellion and to whom scrip has been refused up to date, although reports show they are fully entitled to it? I do not see that they are included in the resolutions. I wrote to the hon. Minister calling attention to the omission, and I should feel very much obliged if he will tell me if it is his intention to amend the resolution so as to include those half-breeds from St. Albert and Saskatchewan who served in the Edmonton district. They are about 49 in number. I need not repeat what

I have already stated in the report. Those men were enrolled, took the oath of allegiance and served this country under orders from the commanding general of the division.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that I received the letter which he addressed to me, putting forward, as he has already done on former occasions, the claims of the volunteers or the military organization to which he refers. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I tried, between the time I received his letter and the introduction of these resolutions, to see him, I should like to have seen the hon. gentleman; but it happened that he was away, and I had not an opportunity of doing so. I understand that the last clause covers the case, the words being:

"Such other persons as hereafter establish to the satisfaction of the Minister of Militia and Defence that they were respectively within the meaning of the said Act members of the enrolled militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in the Indian and half-breed outbreak, and that they have not received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted."

The hon. gentleman knows that when the letter which he addressed to me arrived at the department, these resolutions had been already introduced, and it would have been necessary for me to have given a new notice and changed the resolution completely, but I think any claim which can be hereafter, in the words of the resolution, "established," will be provided for by the resolution now introduced.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think this is perfectly satisfactory. The resolution does not read just as the hon. Minister has explained. The hon. gentleman has recited a number of different Acts which apply to the matter. He has also told the House that the reason for the introduction of this resolution was that a certain number of volunteers who had served in the North-West had not received their scrip, because they had not applied within the time indicated by the Act. These people to whom I refer have applied during the last three or four years, and, I may say, even longer ago than that. I think the Department of Militia came to the conclusion that they had no right to their claim. In clause 5 it is said that the foregoing provisions shall apply to corps that are named. I do not see why it should not be possible for the hon. Minister to include in the number the St. Albert Mounted Infantry. It appears that the services rendered by these people were services which certainly were equal to those of the other corps mentioned—equal, if not superior. I have no objection to the present resolution. I think it is quite fair that the country should pay this little tribute to men who served during the rebellion. I am quite willing to say, moreover, that if a larger number of people in the North-West Territories had volunteered as these people did, and more especially if half-breeds had been induced to join that movement, and those I knew in Edmonton and Calgary were only waiting a chance to take up arms on behalf of the Government of Canada, to protect their own property as well as to maintain the peace of the country, it would have been of great advantage to the country. The Edmonton half-breeds were enrolled under instructions from Major General Strange, and they performed their duties faithfully and effectively and preserved peace and order in all that region. The moment it was known that the half-breeds had taken up arms against the Indians, the Indians from that moment kept quiet, and certainly the result was very satisfactory and of general advantage to the country at large. If such example had been followed in other parts of the North-West Territories, the rebellion would have been, in my humble opinion, quieted in a much shorter time and at a very reduced expense. So I would press the claims of these people. I do so especially because they are half-breeds and not knowing all the nice distinctions that can be made in the interpretation of a statute, they are quite surprised and complain very bitterly that, after having sacrificed their own leanings and taken up arms against those whom they consider, after all, their kindred, the Indians, they have not yet received justice. I hold they should receive scrip at once, for their right to it can no longer be disputed, and the Act now before the House should include those claims. This would prove a source of great satisfaction to those people, and in the future it may be a source of satisfaction to the country when it is known among the distant half-breeds that the Government of Canada are always able and ready to reward any services done by them for the Government and preservation of the peace of the country. I hope the Minister will see his way to add the corps I have mentioned to those enumerated in the resolution. I may answer at once the objection he has made, that it would require a new notice to add a corps to those now mentioned in the resolution, since the last part of the resolution is general, and the authorization of the Crown covers all cases similar to those specially mentioned before. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will entertain my demand to add the St. Albert Mounted Infantry Company to the corps that are mentioned in the resolution. It will be an act of justice if the Government do so, and further, it will be an act of good policy in showing these half-breeds that the Government do acknowledge and reward all the services rendered by them.

Mr. DAVIN. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Militia on his bringing forward this resolution. It is an act of justice, an act of tardy justice. The Committee will remember that in 1887 I brought forward the claims of the very persons who are mentioned in this resolution, and of others not mentioned. I brought the matter forward from my seat in Parliament, and my contention at the time was resented and my motion was negatived. I brought it forward again in 1888, in 1889 and in 1890; and the result of pressing it on the attention of the Government was that a reference was made to the Deputy Minister of Justice to enquire into these claims. The Deputy Minister of Justice met Mr. White, together with my colleagues from the North-West and myself, and we went into the claims and studied the Acts, and no sooner had the Deputy Minister of Justice looked at the claims of those that I had represented here, and looked into the Acts of Parliament, than he had no hesitation in saying that more of these claims came within the law and that they were just. I may say in general to this Committee, and I want it to be put on record in this House, that sometimes—that at this present minute, I believe—I am pressing some claims that are looked upon, as the French say, with *défiance* by the Government, just as those claims of mine which I formerly made

and which are now acknowledged, were looked on with *défiance*. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to impress this on the House of Commons, and on the public of Canada, that I made claims here which were pushed aside with a waive of the hand, and if I had not pressed them year after year, they would never have been acknowledged. The argument I make in this connection is this: That when a member of Parliament with the responsibility which belongs to his position, presses strongly a claim, and when his reputation for justice is at stake, and his character before this House is at stake; it is very probable that he has probed the foundation of the claims he makes, and finds that there is good ground for them. Now, Sir, as I say, the Deputy Minister of Justice no sooner looked at the Act of Parliament, and at the facts that we were able to place before him, than he at once came to the conclusion that, in regard to some of the claims I put forward, they were clearly within the Acts and clearly demanded that justice should be done in reference to them. We went over a long array of cases. He rejected some claims that I had to press, and I am not going now to express an opinion on that. But I may say this: that I have the utmost confidence—nothing could be stronger than the confidence I have—that that reference of these claims was carried on in an impartial spirit, and that justice has been rigidly done. I doubtless would prefer that some of the claims I put forward had been admitted, but I will say here honestly, that, having, the Acts of 1885 and 1886 in my hand, I could not insist on these claims which were rejected. The only claims I insisted on were claims that clearly came within the four corners of the Acts of 1885 and 1886. Now, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Minister of Militia that he has brought forward this resolution, and that we shall have an Act passed that will do justice in the premises, to my clients, if I may call them such. With regard to the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), I may say, that I think the manner in which he has put it, on the grounds of justice and of good policy, is one well worthy of the consideration of the Government. I know something about the Edmonton district and something of the services rendered by these people, and the claims of the persons mentioned by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) are well worthy of the consideration of the Government. His argument, from the point of view of policy, is a good one, and if the Government will recognize the services of those people, you have no idea, Sir, of the impression it will make upon the half-breed population of that country. You have no idea how accurately they come to know of what takes place in this very House. Men who have never read a newspaper, some of them who cannot read a newspaper, if you visit them 120 miles south of Regina where they have no regular post office, you will find that two months after this House has prorogued, they are perfectly familiar with what has been done here. The way it happens I suppose is, that intelligent men among them are accustomed to read the papers and familiarize them with what occurs. I congratulate the Government and the Minister of Militia on bringing forward this resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. On looking over this resolution, I regret to find that some claims which I brought to the attention of the Government at various times, in connection with my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), of the scouts of the North-West during the rebellion, whom I thought were fairly entitled to consideration under the old Act, are not provided for in this resolution. So far as I could judge when going over these cases with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), it appeared to both of us, that they were fairly entitled to consideration. I forget the names of all, but one was named Robert Kells, and they were employed under Major Macdonald in somewhat the same capacity as the scout under Major Steele. These men were on the prairies constantly, either on horseback or on foot, and their duties were of a similar nature to those performed by many who come under the provisions of this Act. I think they got as little pay for their services as others, and I do not see why they should not receive recognition. I believe it was the influence of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and myself, with some others, which led to the reconsideration of these cases, the result of which is to be found in this resolution. But I regret to find that Major Macdonald's scouts, whom we considered equally entitled to consideration, have been left out entirely. There may be some technical grounds why they did not come within the provisions of the law; but I understood, when the law was amended some years ago by the late Mr. White, that it was intended to cover their cases. When that amendment was under consideration, I crossed the floor of the House and suggested to Mr. White that if the provisions then proposed did not cover their cases, it should be made to do so; and the assurance given to me was that it was intended that those and similar cases should be included. But afterwards it was found that there were some technical objections in the way. When their cases were submitted to the Minister of Justice, I thought provision would be made for them, and I think it is to be deplored that they are not included in this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend has properly stated what our efforts were; but the difficulties in the way were such as the Deputy Minister of Justice, placed as he was in a judicial position, did not see how he could get over. The reference placed him in this position, that he had to decide whether certain persons came under the Acts of 1885 and 1886 or not, and he was limited by that reference. I went over every case with him, and I do not think he omitted a single case that could properly be brought within the recommendation which he had to make to the Government. But the case is different with the Government now. The Deputy Minister of Justice has made his report, which in my opinion is in entire accord with the law and the facts; but now that that report is in the hands of the Government, it is proper for them to consider whether, when they are dealing out this act of justice, they should not include those scouts in whom my hon. friend and myself are interested. For instance, there are the scouts known as the Moose Jaw scouts, of whom there are not many, and also the scouts south of Maple Creek, of whom there are not many either. Some of those scouts were employed in the middle of the war, some of them after the war was concluded, and some of them I think were employed the whole time, but

could not, in the opinion of the Deputy Minister, be said to have been placed in a position that might be described as one of engagement in the warfare. But this has to be remembered, that those men actually were in danger of their lives, A desperate half-breed, or a band of desperate half-breeds, escaping down to the frontier or coming up from the frontier to join the rebellion, might kill those scouts, if they met them. So that properly it is a question for the Government to take into consideration, whether those scouts should not be brought within the scope of this resolution. My hon. friend who has last spoken and myself are deeply interested, and have friends who are deeply interested, in some of those persons, and, when a healing measure, as well as a just one, is being brought forward, I think it would be well that they should be considered. It might even be well if some of the teamsters who risked their lives should also be considered. There are teamsters who were actually engaged in battle, and, although they were paid for their work, yet, considering that their lives were exposed, I think it would be well that the Government should consider their cases. I congratulate the Government that they have brought forward this resolution, and I think they may very well consider whether it would not be good policy to extend the bounds of the Acts of 1885 and 1886 in the directions suggested.

Mr. DENISON. The last speaker has suggested that the teamsters should be included in this measure. That, I think, would open a very broad door to claims of all kinds. We all recollect that during the rebellion it became a common subject of conversation in this part of Canada, what large sums were paid to teamsters—from $8 to $10 a day; and we heard a great many stories at the time about jobbery and corruption in connection with those payments. We must admit that they were well paid, and it would be simply absurd for this House to talk of giving them grants of land in addition. With regard to the scouts, a similar difficulty stands in the way of including them. I understand that a great many men went out scouting on their own account, and brought in information which they thought would be useful to the authorities, while others were sent out by the authorities. If you admit the claims of these scouts, many of whom I know were obtained with difficulty and were therefore very well paid, you will have the self-appointed scouts putting in their claims. If you admit their claims, you will have these self-appointed corps also putting in claims, and in addition you will have the home guards. We have some already on these resolutions. No doubt it may be quite proper to give grants to some of them, and no one is more inclined to act fairly to all those engaged in doing good service to their country than I; but we ought not to allow ourselves to be imposed upon by everybody who may think he has a claim on the country, because he may have been sitting in his own house with his rifle by his side, and have been styled "home guard." If you look into many cases of home guards, you will find that they were composed of men who remained at home in their own villages, and no doubt continued their daily avocations, but who had rifles, either of their own or handed to them, and who called themselves "home guards." I think the hon. Minister of Militia would make a great mistake if he did not scrutinize very closely into claims of that kind. We have had certainly a strong warning note from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who suggested just now that teamsters should be paid.

Mr. LAURIER. I am ready to endorse the hon. member for Assiniboia in his statement that the Government may be congratulated on their intention, but I do not think our congratulations can go any further. I do not think we can congratulate them at all upon the performance of the object they have in view. Their object, as I understand it, is to widen the circle of rewards which have already been granted under the law to those who aided in suppressing the rebellion of 1885. Well, someone said at one time: "la province est assez riche pour payer toutes ses gloires;" and Canada, though not in a flourishing condition, is still able to pay all those who have earned a reward in suppressing the rebellion. The provisions made in that respect seem to be ample already. The amended Act of 1886 provides that every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of any irregular force, raised by authority and actively engaged in suppressing the rebellion, every scout so engaged, every person regularly appointed to the medical staff, every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of the enrolled corps, shall be entitled to a reward. This is a pretty numerous class, and I understand that what the hon. member for Assiniboia wants, in pressing the claims of those he calls his clients, but whom I may perhaps call his electors, is to bring them within the four corners of the Act, This was, I suppose, also the task of the Deputy Minister of Justice in investigating whether or not the claims of the applicants for reward, which were pressed by my hon. friend, came or did not come within the provisions of the Act. The report has been placed in my hands by the courtesy of the hon. Minister of Justice, and it is, I presume, the result of an investigation into the claims which were pressed on the favour of the department by my hon. friend, and, as I assume, some of those whose claims were so pressed were found to come within the Act and others were not. What is the object of the Bill? I cannot see what its object is. Is it to provide that the parties whose claims are here mentioned shall come within the Act, though they go beyond the Act? It seems to me if the provisions we have made are not sufficient, if other parties than those mentioned in the Act are clearly entitled to reward, the Act ought to be extended, but it ought to be extended upon some principle or rule and not merely with reference to individual claims. If the Act has lapsed, then a provision should be made to revive it. The resolution is restricted to specially mentioned corps and individuals. Do these militia men come within the provisions of the Act?

Mr. MACDOWALL. They do.

Mr. LAURIER. Then all that is required is to extend the time and render the Act applicable. By passing this resolution you create invidious comparisons. You create the impression that the corps and parties mentioned do not come within the Act. Take the St. Albert volunteers, to which the hon. member for Laval alluded, and the Macdonald scouts, alluded to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the Moose Jaw scouts, mentioned

by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Do they or do they not come within the Act? If they do, there is no necessity to have new legislation, but simply to revive the Act which has lapsed; but as I understood the claim put forth by the hon. member for Laval, the St. Albert volunteers do not come within the terms of the Act. If they do not and have done good service, the Act might be extended so as to include everybody who has done good service towards the suppression of the rebellion. There is no disposition on the part of this House to deal with these men in any but a generous manner, or to fail in extending the gratitude of the nation to all those who helped restore order. If the terms of the Act are not sufficient to cover all those who actually did good service, they might be extended so as to accomplish that purpose, but if the sole object of the hon. gentleman is to revive the Act because the time has lapsed, it seems to me the resolutions are altogether too long.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no intention to enlarge in any way the circle of persons who are entitled to the bounty granted under the Act the hon. gentleman has just cited. But the circumstances under which this investigation was made are these: The persons who are enumerated in these resolutions were among a large number who claimed the bounty under the Act; but, in consequence of circumstances which appeared to throw doubt on their claims, their claims were held in abeyance and no scrip was awarded them. Investigation was made, and the report the hon. gentleman has had the opportunity of perusing establishes that, although, apparently, in the first instance, these persons were not entitled to the scrip, they came within the provisions of the Act, and their claims should be fairly acceded to. The provisions of the resolution furnish ample illustration of the difficulties which occurred in administering this bounty. For instance, there was a provision in the Act that home guards should not participate in the grant, but one of the companies engaged in suppressing the rebellion happened to bear the name of home guards, and from their very name it was perhaps properly assumed that their duties and services were such as did not come within the provisions of the Act. Nevertheless, although that apparent proof was against them, or the presumption was against them, when the evidence was taken by the officer appointed to make the enquiry, it was found that, although the troop was organized as home guards, the services they rendered were services of a nature which it was intended to compensate. Thus, take the case of Walter William Phelan, of Regina, who was a scout actively engaged during the outbreak. His services were not certified to by competent authority at that time. They have been certified by competent authority since then, but in the meantime the Act had expired, and it is necessary to make a provision in regard to him. The same thing is true in regard to the Battleford Home Guards. No doubt it would have been sufficient to introduce a resolution and afterwards a Bill founded upon it, simply extending the time during which the Minister of Militia could administer that bounty, but in the meantime these particular claims had been established to the satisfaction of the Government, and it was thought proper to state the manner in which the power of the Government was to be exercised, and also to take a general power to extend the operation of the Act so that the Minister of Militia might deal with the cases, some of which have been submitted to him, and some, perhaps, such as those the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has referred to have not been submitted yet. Under the last of these resolutions, the Minister of Militia will have power to make the same investigation in regard to other cases as has been made in the cases named in the preceding resolutions, and, if he finds that those claims are established, the same rule will be applied to them. Take, again, the case of Steele's scouts. The whole body of those scouts did not perhaps come within the provision of the statute, but it was found that some members, namely, those who are enumerated here were entitled under the Act, so, while it was perhaps unnecessary to specify those who were ascertained to be entitled to the bounty, it was thought better, perhaps, to give full information to the House as to the persons to whom the bounty was to be applied after the investigation, and to intimate that our policy was to investigate further claims such as the member for Laval has referred to. Both classes of cases will be dealt with fully, the cases of those whose claims have been investigated, and of those whose claims have not yet been investigated. This will give an opportunity of having them investigated under the provisions of the Act which it is proposed to pass.

Mr. LAURIER. I would then ask the Minister of Militia if he will state to the House what is the hitch which has hitherto prevented the Regina Volunteer Company from participating in the bounty?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to return my sincere thanks to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who congratulated me on this tardy measure of justice we have introduced, and also the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who was a little more reticent in his congratulations. The reason why the Regina Home Guards, of which he has just spoken, was not included in the bounty was because it was considered as a home guard, and it is under these resolutions, if they can establish their claims to the satisfaction of the Department of Militia, which will be submitted to the Department of Justice, they will get their bounty. I see nothing in the resolutions which can prevent them from benefiting from the new legislation which we are now endeavouring to introduce. My hon. friend, the gallant member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), spoke about the claims which were submitted to the department and which more than once were brought to the attention of the Minister. I can say to the hon. gentleman that these claims were submitted to the ordinary tribunal, which was considered to be an advisory board that the Minister of Militia could rely upon to settle these claims. These commissioners were appointed to settle these claims arising from the unfortunate outbreak in the North-West. When these claims were submitted to that board, they were not considered to be claims that should be recognized. We have been enlarging the legislation so as to make it apply more generously perhaps to the different claims which have been submitted to the department, and I consider that under this last resolution:

"Such other persons as hereafter establish to the satisfaction of the Minister of Militia and Defence that they were, respectively, within the meaning of the said

amended Act, members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in the Indian and half-breed outbreak, and that they have not received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted."

It is within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Militia, acting upon the advice of the Department of Justice, to investigate these claims and to see that they shall be properly recognized. I think it comes within this resolution, which has been introduced for the purpose of meeting the very claims the hon. gentleman has spoken of. This is a measure which is practically ending the difficulties which have arisen from the different claims which were submitted shortly after the outbreak. I do not wish to be drawn into a discussion of the troubles which took place, but shortly after the outbreak we had a commission appointed which investigated every claim which was submitted to the Department of Militia. These claims, after the investigation and upon the advice of that board, were decided upon by the submission of a report of the Minister of Militia to the Privy Council, and every claim was settled by an Order in Council. Some of those claims did not come within the reach of the statute as it was originally passed. Subsequently, the provisions of the statute were enlarged so as to cover other claims which were not contemplated when the measure first came before Parliament, and now we are adding to this, after the investigation by the Department of Justice, every claim which is mentioned here. The leader of the Opposition wished to know why some other corps should not be included in this resolution. The reason is very easily understood. It is because the claims which are mentioned here have been submitted to the Department of Justice and reported upon. We left a door open so that ample justice at any moment might be accorded to those who had submitted their claims to the Department of Militia, or whose claims had been submitted by the Department of Militia to the Department of Justice. We introduced a resolution that any further claims could be dealt with under the generous provisions of that resolution, after being investigated by the Department of Militia and the Department of Justice. Now, I do not see that we can go beyond that. My hon. friend the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has spoken of men who have rendered great service, and I must recognize with him the manner in which every Canadian responded to the call of duty. I can say, moreover, that I have tried, according to the best of my judgment, to take in every claim that was submitted to me; I have tried to do ample justice. Where any doubt had arisen, or could arise, these claims were submitted to the Department of Justice, which is the legal adviser of every department, and I abided by whatever decision that department arrived at. Now, I think that, by the last resolution, we are leaving the door open for giving fair-play and for investigating any claims that may arise, and for dealing properly with them, in the same way as these claims which were mentioned in the resolution have been dealt with, because they have been thoroughly investigated and reported upon, as was stated by my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Justice. The report has been annexed to these resolutions, and I believe it has been placed in the hands of the leader of the Opposition by the Minister of Justice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. LAURIER. Before I depart from this branch of the subject, I wish to say that I do not think the hon. gentleman has rightly apprehended my question. The Minister of Justice stated a moment ago that the object of this resolution was not to enlarge the scope of the Act, but merely to revive the Act so far as necessary to apply this provision. The provision of the Act should have been applied long ago, because the Act is already enlarged. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he investigated the claims of, for instance, the two volunteer companies which are here mentioned, that is to say, the Regina Volunteer Company and the Battleford Home Guards. I asked him a moment ago if he could tell me what had prevented him from dealing with these claims. He did not answer at the moment, perhaps it escaped his notice. But what I want to get at is this: The hon. gentleman, I see, has investigated some of these claims and has reported upon them, and he is ready to apply the provisions of the Act at once to the companies I have mentioned. So far so good. Now, my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) also brings up the claim of another volunteer company, as I understand, the St. Albert Volunteers. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) also brings up the claims of another corps, the Macdonald Scouts. Then the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) also brings up the claims of another corps, the Moose Jaw Scouts. These claims have not been dealt with. I only wish to ask the hon. gentleman at this moment if he can tell us if there is any special reason why these corps were not included in the bounty? Was it because there were any doubts as to whether they came within the scope of the Act, or what was the reason?

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to two of the questions the hon. gentleman has asked, I can satisfy him. The Regina Volunteer Corps comes strictly within the Act and the reason originally given by the Department of Militia for not entertaining these claims was based on a misapprehension arising out of a telegram received from the Mayor of Regina who happened to be the colonel of the Regina Volunteers. He telegraphed as mayor of Regina for arms for the Home Guards, signing himself D. L. Scott; he was also in communication with the Department of Militia as Colonel Scott of the Regina Volunteers. A confusion arose in the Department of Militia between the Regina Home Guards, which did not come within the provisions of the Act, and the Regina Volunteers, which came strictly within the provisions of the Act. The Regina Volunteers were organized under the Militia Act; they appeared in the General Orders, they were put on active service, they were liable to be called out at any minute. Therefore, the Deputy Minister of Justice, when he looked at the facts, saw that they appeared in the *Gazette* of the 11th April, 1883, that they had been organized for active service, and he saw at once that they came within the Act. I may say that a not unnatural mistake was made in the Department of Militia in confounding the Home Guards with the Volunteers, and I remember having a good many conversations with the Minister of Militia and with his officers about a telegram they produced. This, in fact, astonished me at first, but when I enquired into it I found that this telegram about the Home

Guard was sent by D. L. Scott, in his capacity of mayor of Regina. As I say, the Home Guard does not come within the Act. Now, the Battleford Home Guard, as a home guard, would not come within the Act. I may say that that clause here about the Regina Volunteers is declaratory, the clause about the Battleford Home Guard is enacting, because you cannot bring the Battleford Home Guards, as home guards, within the meaning of the Act. But what about these Battleford Home Guards? They actually engaged in suppressing the rebellion, they actually fulfilled all the conditions contemplated by the Act, and nothing is more proper than that they should appear here and be rewarded for their actual services, as contemplated by the Act. I do not see that there is anything for my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, to quarrel with.

Mr. LAURIER. I quarrel with nothing.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I think there is nothing even to criticize from an adverse standpoint in the resolution. We have a clause here declaring that the Regina Volunteers come within the Act. All the volunteers, except the Regina Volunteers, have got scrip. Application had been made for scrip immediately for them; no condition had been omitted. But I do say this, that the mistake made by the Department of Militia was a natural one, arising out of the confusion of Mr. Scott as mayor, telegraphing to that department on behalf of Mr. James, captain of the Home Guards, and Mr. D. L. Scott, as colonel of the Regina Volunteers, at the head of a company coming within the four corners of the Act, and ready at any moment for active service.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the phraseology of these resolutions. In resolution 1 it is stated that "whereas certain persons hereinafter mentioned and described shall receive scrip," and says, "they being members of the enrolled militia." Then we have to look at the last resolution to find out who are the persons answering the description given. Several corps are mentioned and persons named. In the first resolution there is also a statement that there may be other persons in the like case. It is, therefore, proposed to enact a law that will enable the Minister of Militia to grant scrip not only to the persons mentioned in these resolutions, but to others in a similar position. To what does the word "persons" refer? Does it refer to the Regina Volunteer Company, or the Battleford Home Guards, or to Walter William Phelan. I should like to ask the Minister if there has been any adjudication in the case of Phelan and others?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Has it been given to the public?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not suppose so. I have introduced this resolution upon the report which has come to the Department of Militia from the Department of Justice. I would not be absolutely certain, but I think the report of the Department of Justice must have come to us after the report of the Department of Militia was published. Every case has been investigated by the Department of Justice and reported upon.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not doubting it. I am merely suggesting that we should know some of the facts in regard to the persons. We are not only dealing with the case of Steele's Scouts, but we are laying down a precedent on which a claim can be submitted from every other person who may be in a like position. If there is any other person in the service who has the same sort of claim as James Rolland, or any other person mentioned in this resolution, the Minister of Militia will have to deal out the same sort of justice to those unknown persons.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is intended by the resolution, after proper investigation has been made.

Mr. MULOCK. That being the case, the House ought to have information as to the facts of these particular cases which are to form precedents. We are declaring that persons are entitled to scrip when we know nothing about them. We are adopting a judgment which has not been given to the public, and we are declaring that it shall be a precedent and sufficient warrant for the Minister to give a similar bounty to anyone else who may come within the wording of that clause. I am not arguing against the proposition, but only urging a proper course of procedure. I rejoice with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) at even the tardy justice given by the department. I wish, however, to have the matter proceeded with regularly, and I hold the judgment of the Department of Justice should be laid on the Table, in order that we can ascertain the facts that warranted the department in coming to its judgment. I do not view with favour the practice of handing over everything from Parliament to the departments. We want to know what we are delegating to the Minister of Justice or any other Minister, and I think the Minister of Militia will not think that an unreasonable request.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The report of the Department of Justice has been communicated to the leader of the Opposition, and I can tell my hon. friend that before the second reading of the Bill the whole report, which is printed, will be laid on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the length of the report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A dozen printed pages.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be possible to lay down in the Bill a policy which should be followed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Resolution 1 states that there may be other persons in a "like case." This does not mean in the like case of Mr. Phelan or Mr. Rolland, but the words "like case" merely mean to be "members of the enrolled militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and half-breed outbreak" within the meaning of the Act, who have not yet received the land or scrip. The resolutions further say that the undermentioned persons have not received their land or scrip, and there may be others in the like case.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the only meaning I can give to the words.

Mr. MULOCK. The first clause refers to persons enrolled in the militia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a recital that the persons undermentioned were persons enrolled in the militia and were actively engaged under the meaning of the Act, and were entitled to the bounty and have not yet received it. It recites that there may be other like cases of persons so enrolled.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand that the case of the St. Albert Mounted Infantry has not been submitted to the Department of Justice and reported on. Am I correct?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. OUIMET. Then I take for granted that the case may be reconsidered, and that a decision may be given on the case before the third reading is taken.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman may also perhaps permit me to tell him, that the cases that have been submitted to the Department of Justice were cases in which an application was made to the Department of Militia, to re-open cases which had been decided, like the case of the St. Albert Corps.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think any final adjudication has been made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have been asked to give some information, and I should like to give it, if my hon. friend will let me do so. I say that the cases that appear in this resolution are cases which have been submitted by the Department of Militia to the Department of Justice——

Mr. OUIMET. I understand all that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—upon an application made by the parties interested to have the cases submitted to the Department of Justice.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand that but just talk of my own case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am talking about the hon. gentleman's case, because I am telling him that his case, or the case of the volunteers of St. Albert, was submitted like all the other cases to the commission. It was reported adversely upon, as the hon. gentleman well knows. No application was made to submit that case to the Department of Justice, or to re-open it, and, consequently, like any number of other cases, it remains in the position in which the commission had decided it, and no reference had been called for to the Department of Justice, as in other cases.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is so busy in his department, and has so many of these cases before him, that I can understand the hon. gentleman might have forgotten this one, but I have seen the record a few days ago, and it has not been referred to the Department of Justice, although two new applications have been made by myself. I understand that the case has not been finally adjudicated upon even by the hon. Minister himself. I think I saw in the record, and I would be very glad to be corrected in that if I am wrong, that the last Commandant of the Militia has reported favourably on this case. The hon. gentleman will remember that the real difficulty in this case was in the antagonism that has existed, and that has been a matter of great difficulties for his department, between General Middleton, when he was Commandant of Militia, and General Strange, who was in command of the Alberta district. If this case was not looked favourably on at the time, it was on account of that, and if I remember aright, the last report of the late Major General of Militia was favourable to the renewed application of these people. That is the reason why I say, that if that case has not been referred to the Department of Justice, it might be referred at once. I am quite sure that the claims of these people come within the Act, and I think that they might be placed on the list at once, and before the third reading of this resolution takes place. I say again, that it would be a matter of policy, more especially when this case comes up before the House, that this particular case, concerning the half-breeds of a very important district, where they are very numerous, should be dealt with and decided on at once. I shall be sorry if it is going to be refused, but for my part I shall have done my duty. After examining the record very closely myself, and knowing the facts personally, as I was present there at the time, I say that their case comes, not only within the spirit, but within the letter of the Act. I hope that the record will be referred at once to the Department of Justice, that justice shall be done them immediately, that it shall be done before this resolution is disposed of, and before it goes to the North-West, that these people who are only home guards, and who remained at home, although subject to be called for duty, have had their claims granted; but that those other persons, who left their homes to serve their country, are allowed to remain without their claims being adjudicated upon. I insist again as a matter of policy, and in the interest of the Government, and of the country, that this case should be disposed of at once, and that justice should be done to these men.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman must see that unless these resolutions are passed, the case of the St. Albert Company would be perfectly hopeless, because there would be no power under which we could act. I may call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the last resolution, which to my mind has been included in these resolutions, for the purpose of meeting such cases as the case which the hon. gentleman has just been discussing. The hon. gentleman has stated that he has seen the record. I have seen the record also, and the hon. gentleman will find that this case was submitted to a commission which was appointed for the purpose of settling the North-West claims. Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes this case to be submitted to the Department of Justice, as the other cases mentioned in these resolutions, I have no objection to submit it.

Mr. OUIMET. I wish it to be submitted at once.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall be only too happy if the Department of Justice permits me to carry out the views which have been expressed by the hon. gentleman. I have no manner of doubt, that he is perfectly right; but I wish to point out that these cases which are mentioned here, are cases which have been investigated.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not object to them.

Sir ADOLHE CARON. The case which the hon. gentleman referred to is a case which has not been in-

vestigated in the manner in which the other cases have been. I have no possible objection to this case being submitted to the Department of Justice, and if it comes back to my department with as favourable a report as the cases which are mentioned in this resolution, I shall be most happy to carry out the hon. gentleman's wishes. I must tell the hon. gentleman, however, that I think it would be fatal to every claim which has been submitted, to object to the passing of these resolutions, because I do not see how we can act, unless Parliament gives the department the power of acting, under a Bill which will be introduced upon the resolutions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that this is rather an unusual form in which to proceed with legislation in Parliament. There are certain provisions in the hon. gentleman's resolution which refer to persons by name, as persons who are entitled to come within the provisions of this Act. If we were to come down to Parliament and say that certain charges had been considered by a judge and jury against a person, and that he had been found guilty of committing certain offences, and that we were seeking to confer upon the Executive the authority to send to the penitentiary certain persons named in the Bill, it would be regarded as a very extraordinary kind of legislation. It is the business of Parliament to lay down general propositions of law, and it is the business of the Executive Government to apply them. Whether the principles embraced in the Act formerly passed by this House apply to the cases of Walter William Phelan, James Rolland, Frederick Rolland, or any of the others named here, I do not know. The House has not gone into the investigation of this matter, or considered the claims of these parties. The Government may have done so, and may have found that these parties are entitled to come within the provisions of the law as it stood. But that is not a legislative Act; that is an administrative Act; and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to seek legislation in the ordinary way, and then deal with the cases of these parties under the law and on his responsibility as a Minister. But to ask the sanction of Parliament in these individual cases is certainly a very extraordinary proceeding—one which, so far as I know, has never been adopted before. Under our constitutional system it is not the business of Parliament to discharge executive functions. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues are appointed for that purpose, and they ought to perform them, or if they are unable to do so, they ought to ask us for the necessary powers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that the hon. gentleman's objection is that we are seeking to get Parliament to delegate its powers to us. The very reverse is the case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is so accustomed to raise that objection that I thought he had done so now, but it may have been only the echo of the past that I heard. In this case we took great pains to avoid that course by stating to Parliament exactly what we proposed. It has already been stated to the Committee before the hon. gentleman said in his place that temporary Acts were passed entitling these parties to this bounty. Those Acts having expired, and it having been found that these parties would have been entitled to claim the bounty on a petition of right, according to the state of the case, which we have ascertained, we ask the authority of Parliament to meet their claims; and in case there should be others, as it is claimed there are, who are equally entitled to the bounty, we ask Parliament to give us power to give that bounty without limit of time. But having ascertained the existence of these claims and their validity, we thought it was only proper to state to Parliament what they were, and to take specific authority to deal with them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not admit the soundness of the principle just enunciated by the hon. Minister of Justice. What we ought to do in matters of this sort is indicated by the law as it was. The hon. Minister of Justice says that the claims of certain parties were adjudicated upon and their merits ascertained; but that the law having expired, the Government have no power to make payment to them, and that there may be other cases. Well, all it was necessary for the Government to do was to submit to Parliament a measure stating that whereas certain parties by such a measure were entitled to certain claims, it is necessary that the provisions of that law should be continued, and then the Government would possess the power of continuing to deal with those cases. Some of these the hon. gentleman says have been investigated. The Government knows their merits; we do not know. If we acted upon the rule indicated by these special sub-sections, the hon. gentleman would have required, in the first Bill submitted to Parliament, to have given the names of all the parties whom it was intended to compensate, and Parliament would be called upon to investigate and decide as a legislative act whether those parties were entitled to compensation or not. Now, the Government did not proceed in that way; they never do, nor does Parliament ever proceed in that way. Parliament confers on the the executive government of the country an enabling power to do justice; but what are the merits of A, B, or C, Parliament does not decide. It leaves that to the Executive Government in the discharge of its functions. If we were to adopt a different policy, we might as well say that an Executive Government would be unnecessary apart from the legislative bodies, the executive functions of the Government being performed by the two Houses of Parliament. That is what is done in this particular case. We are asked to assume the responsibility of saying that the parties named here are entitled to compensation under particular propositions of the law as if those propositions were still in force. The Minister of Justice may be able to say that, because he has investigated the claims of the parties; but nobody else is, and I do not think he should shift this responsibility from the shoulders of the Executive Government by naming the parties in the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Upon the hon. gentleman's own argument, there would not have been the slightest impropriety or the slightest constitutional irregularity in the original Bill to have declared the companies, the regiments and the persons to whom it applied. It would then have stood like an ordinary Supply Bill, which is passed every year, though it would be limited to the administration of this fund. But the difficulty of doing that at that time was that the claims had not been ascertained; they had to be investigated afterwards. Since then, the bounty has been distributed,

but it is ascertained that fifteen or twenty persons at most, and one or two corps, are entitled to the bounty under the terms of the original Act: and we ask the authority of Parliament to meet those claims, just as in a Supply Bill we ask Parliament to meet a claim which we think is founded on such evidence as we have found to exist. I admit, however, the passage of the resolution would have been facilitated if we had been less particular than we have been.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the hon. Minister of Justice in this case is doing justice by the House. He is asking us to declare that certain persons named have certain rights, and we know nothing about the merits. The hon. Minister knows the merits of these claims, or he would not ask us to endorse them, but it is not wise to endorse in blank in this or any other case. It is the duty of the Government to assume the responsibility. I think the proper thing would be for the Minister to recast the resolutions and revive the legislation which has lapsed, and under that take power to deal with these cases, and deal with them as he has dealt with others. When, under the original Act, power was conferred by Parliament upon the Executive to adjudicate upon the claims of the volunteers, no volunteers were named, but it was left to the Minister of Militia to apply certain principles in order to find out what individuals came within the Act, and he, as administrator, made the necessary investigation. The mere fact that that law has lapsed does not make it necessary to adopt a different course. The principal thing is to revive the law and give the power which the Minister would have had but for the lapse of the law.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I told the hon. gentleman that before the second reading of the Bill, I would lay upon the Table the report from the Department of Justice. Now, if to facilitate, as the hon. gentleman seems anxious to do, the passing of these resolutions, he wishes me to read the whole report, I have a copy of it here and will be happy to do so, but I am afraid that will take up considerable time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Read us the first volume of Clarendon's history of the great rebellion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am afraid the hon. gentleman would find a good many remarks which were made by the hon. gentleman himself and his friends, altogether in favour of the manner in which the Government behaved on that memorable occasion. If the hon. gentleman will consent I will place the report upon the Table, and send it immediately to the hon. gentleman, so that there will be no time lost at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I form no part of the Administration, and it is not my duty to look into this report. The hon. Minister of Justice may consider this is a proper way of conducting public business, but I entirely dissent from that view. It is not the duty of a Parliament to go into the details of a report, and Parliament was never asked to do such an absurd thing before. The hon. gentleman holds the report which he says is most voluminous, and when he proposed to read it to Parliament the proposition nearly convulsed the hon. Postmaster General with laughter. The proposition was so absurd that the hon. Minister's own colleague could not view it seriously, and he asks us to endorse that report, either with or without its being read—the one proposition is as absurd as the other. We are asked to discharge the duties of the Department of Militia. If that is the idea of the department, then as a department it is no longer necessary. When a department comes to delegate its duties to Parliament, Parliament will proceed in its own way to find the facts and draw the necessary conclusion. At present it does not occupy that position. We have, we will suppose, an efficient Minister of Militia in control, and I decline to read the report. If the Minister thinks it is his duty to read it he will perhaps do so.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) misapprehended, I think, the laughter of the Postmaster General. He thought my hon. friend the Postmaster General was laughing at the Minister of Militia, whereas, as a fact, he was laughing at the hon. member for North York. And is not the hon. member for North York and even the hon. member for Bothwell in a somewhat ludicrous position? Both of them object to the Government coming here and taking Parliament into their confidence so far as to declare that a certain number of persons will come within the provisions of the Act. The hon. member for Bothwell would be quite content if the Government took the power it is about to take, and then, in the rooms of the Minister of Militia, without saying a word to Parliament, give the scrip to the persons mentioned here. In the name of common sense, what is it that disturbs the soul of the hon. member for Bothwell and my hon. friend for North York? Is there any dreadful precedent being established? Is there any harm done? These persons mentioned here have certificates from their commanding officers, which were placed before the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. How do you know that?

Mr. DAVIN. Because I placed the certificates myself.

Mr. MULOCK. Who else knows it?

Mr. DAVIN. What I want to point out is this: that the Government have declared that they have adjudicated on the claims mentioned and found them valid, and that, if other persons establish their claims, they also would be acknowledged. The hon. member for North York and the hon. member for Bothwell would have no complaint to make, if no names were mentioned, but power taken and the scrip given without a word being said to Parliament. But the Government has taken Parliament into its confidence, by mentioning the names, and there ought to be no objection to that. There is a very good reason, probably, why those names should be given, and it may have struck the framer of the resolution that it was desirable to show Parliament how very little was the area over which the distribution of scrip, under the provisions of this resolution, would extend. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell is accustomed, and it is greatly to the instruction of this House, because he is a well-read man, on large and small occasions to soar into the highest regions of parliamentary practice, and he has not lost this opportunity. And what has been done? To compare great things with small, if the commander of an army wins a great victory and it is intended to reward him, does the Imperial Government come down to Par-

liament with a general resolution asking for certain powers to reward an individual or individuals in a given way? Not at all. They ask powers, just as are asked in this resolution, and give the names of the persons who are to be the beneficiaries of their bounty. This is comparing a large case with a very small one; but I maintain that the hon. member for Bothwell is fighting for a shadow. He cannot show that the least wrong is done, and, under those circumstances, to delay the passing of these resolutions, as my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) are endeavouring to do is, really—if I may say so without losing that politeness for which I believe I have got a character in this House—is almost trifling, so I think this resolution should be allowed to pass.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I do not at all agree with my hon. friend who has just addressed the Committee. Now, what was done in the Bill as it originally stood? Did the Government come down to the House and present a whole array of names, and say that John Smith and James Jones and all the other parties are entitled to compensation under the resolutions they submitted to the House?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What about pensions?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With regard to pensions, we adopt a general proposition and leave it to the Administration to apply it. That is precisely what I suggest here. Let me call the attention of the Committee to this fact. In all cases, as Mr. Gladstone on one occasion said, the House of Commons is a very bad executive or administrative body. That is not its function. Its functions are entirely legislative, and it is the business of the Government, to whom the administration of public affairs is entrusted, to carry out the law and to give effect to its provisions; it is the duty of the Government to pay the parties who are entitled to be paid and to do so on its own responsibility. It is the right of this House to review every act of the Administration in the discharge of those duties. What is the position of the Government in regard to this particular matter? These parties are named here; we are asked to vote these sums; we are told that the report of the deputy Minister of Justice has been laid before the House; and next year we may discover that these payments have been improperly made, that these parties were not entitled to receive these moneys. What would be the answer of the Minister of Militia if this were brought up next year? He would say: This is your act and not ours; it is not an executive act, but a legislative act; it is a part of a law of Parliament; here are the parties named in this law; by your law, for which you are as much responsible as I am—for as members of Parliament we all stand on a footing of equality—you decided that these parties were entitled to receive these payments; you assumed the responsibility in the matter. That is how the matter stands, and I am rather astonished at my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who claims to be an admirer of the English system of parliamentary government, undertaking to make so radical a change as that which is suggested here. It seems to me that all these provisions might be dropped out. The hon. Minister can carry this through and found his Bill on the general provision, and he can pay these parties just as well as he can pay those parties whose claims have not yet been investigated. We are not concerned here with the question as to whether he has investigated any particular claims or not. It is not a matter of any consequence to us that the claims of certain parties have been investigated any more than it is that certain other claims have not been investigated. Our business here is simply whether we approve or disapprove of the principle of granting compensation, as it was granted before, to those who deserve it, but we confer that power on the Government, and we hold them responsible for the exercise of that power, and that applies in regard to those claims that have been investigated as well as in regard to those which have not been investigated. The principle is clear and is well understood, and, as far as I know, it has never been departed from in the Imperial Parliament; the principle is one which we ought not to depart from here. I will say nothing more on the subject. The responsibility rests with the Administration, but I do not approve of naming parties in the Bill, or legislating in this way, and I do not admit that the Government has a right to shift the responsibility for its administrative acts to Parliament in this way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there is a very important point raised in connection with this discussion. It is quite clear that this Bill is proposed in order to please certain individuals who are in a position to draw certain amounts with the sanction of Parliament, without submitting to Parliament the evidence upon which their claims are based. If we are intelligently to deal with the names mentioned in this resolution, and are to sit in judgment upon them, we should have before us printed every item of evidence in connection with the whole question of these persons being placed in this Bill and participating in its advantages. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) tries to impress upon the House, that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is too much disposed to criticize items of magnitude and small items on the ground of parliamentary usage. If my hon. friend had thought for a moment that we live under a system of parliamentary government, under which every Minister is responsible for the acts of his department, I think he would not have criticized the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell as he has done. This is asking Parliament to consent to a principle to which we should not quietly consent. If we are to deal with these names and allow these persons to become participants in the advantages proposed in this resolution, we should have all the evidence and every item connected with the claims they present, and under which they expect to participate. Why should we be asked to deal with names without having before us the evidence which has been laid before the Deputy Minister of Justice? Eliminate these names and give the Government power to deal with them, and then afterwards, if the parties are placed in a position they should not be placed in, the Government will be responsible, and we can sit in judgment on their acts. That is the point my hon. friend finds fault with. I am surprised that an old experienced parliamentarian, a man who claims to be, and in fact is, almost acknowledged to be an authority upon questions of parliamentary usage, like the hon. member for West

Assiniboia, should endanger his reputation by making the very wild and unparliamentary statements he has made in the House on this occasion. I think he did himself a grave injustice, and I hope he will see that it is in his interest, and in the interest of his record, to get up and promptly withdraw the statement he has made.

On resolution 5,

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Militia if he will be good enough to give us the merits of the case of Walter William Phelan, of Regina, whose services have been certified to by competent authority?

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Minister of Justice replies to that, I may say that Walter William Phelan has been certified to by Colonel Otter as having been a scout actively engaged in the suppression of the rebellion.

Mr. MULOCK. We require the official report of the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman wishes me to read the report?

Mr. MULOCK. Certainly; and whatever evidence you have to lay before us.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON:

"The claim of Walter William Phelan of Regina. The question is here whether Phelan was a scout actively engaged during the outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority. There is no doubt that Colonel Otter was in command of the Battleford column, and that William White, at present of Moosomin, was the transport officer in connection with such battalion. The latter officer certifies that Mr. Phelan was employed by him during the Rebellion of 1885 in the transport service of the North-West field force, in connection with the Battleford column, and was a portion of the time employed as a scout accompanying the convoy of 150 teams from Swift Current to Battleford after the capture of the teamsters by Poundmaker. Mr. White's certificate is confirmed by Colonel Otter in writing endorsed thereon.

"Colonel Panet, the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, in his letter of the 23rd April, 1889, to the Department of the Interior, states that the services performed by Mr. Phelan do not appear to be of such a nature as to entitle him to a scrip certificate. I am unable to agree with the Deputy Minister in this view."

This is the expression of opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice—

"I am unable to agree with the Deputy Minister in his view. No question is raised as to the truthfulness or good faith of the transport officer's certificate, or of Colonel Otter's confirmation thereof. They were, in my judgment, the 'competent authority' mentioned in the statute to certify to Mr. Phelan's services, and he, therefore, comes specifically within the provisions of section 1*b* of the Act of 1886. He is, in my opinion, clearly entitled to scrip."

Mr. MULOCK. Whose opinion is that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Militia.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to read the certificate of William White? I understood the Deputy Minister of Militia had relied upon that as one of the evidences upon which he formed his judgment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON:

"The following persons, James Rolland, Frederick Rolland, Wm. Rolland, John Whiteford, R. E. Steele, G. M. Steele, E. Chamberlayne, A. McNichol, Peter Nelson, George Beatty and John Calder, claim scrip for their services on the ground that they were scouts actively engaged during the outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority. A. McNichol has already received a homestead under the statute of 1886 for this service, and I have only to deal with the other eleven claims.

Mr. McMULLEN.

"The report of the Department of Militia and Defence upon the suppression of the Rebellion of 1885, and particularly the appendices of General Middleton and Major General Strange, commanding the Alberta Field Force, show that Major Steele who, for the time being was a recognized officer of the military force, organized a troop of scouts to co-operate with the military force, and that these men, along with the Mounted Police, were in active service during the rebellion."

If the hon. gentleman is not quite ready to give me his attention——

Mr. MULOCK. I am giving all my attention to the hon. gentleman.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON:

—"The papers show that seven of these claimants served through the whole of the rebellion, and that John Whiteford, George Beatty and John Calder, the remaining claimants, were present as scouts and under fire at Frenchmen's Butte and two other skirmishes. They further show that all these men received pay from the Department of Militia for their services.

"General Middleton, in his report upon the case, dated 27th November, 1889, states as follows:—'They claim under sub-section (*b*) of 49 Vic., Cap. 29, which reads as follows: 'Every scout actively engaged during the said outbreak whose services have been certified to by competent authority'; but it must be remembered that scouts who performed special duties received a rate of pay for their services far in excess of that given to soldiers, and that unless specific and valuable services are shown in each case, entitling them to it, they should not receive scrip in addition. There are no such certificates in any of these cases, nor does it appear how long, nor in what way they earned what they claimed. They should, I think, produce evidence from competent authority for the special services rendered by each. Some of them appear to have performed other services during a portion of the outbreak, but in none of them are particular services and duties given. I have no personal knowledge of any of the men or of their alleged services, and although Major Steele certifies that they were scouts belonging to his corps, I think they should produce proof of services sufficient to warrant the demand they have made.'

"I do not think that General Middleton had sufficiently considered the section of the statute which he cites. The right of the claimant for scrip depends solely upon this question: Were they scouts in active service during the rebellion? The fact that they received greater pay than regular soldiers does not affect the question, nor is it necessary that specific and valuable service in each case should be shown apart from ordinary scout service. I need not discuss the question as to whether, in the event of the claimant having performed acts of active scout service, within the meaning of the statute, they should produce evidence in the shape of a document 'certified to by competent authorities,' as I consider Major Steele, who was their superior officer, and personally acquainted with the character of the service, is such competent authority, whose certificate, if given in good faith, it is the duty of the Department of Militia and Defence to recognize. But the services of the claimant are not evidenced by Major Steele's certificate alone. There is a certificate from the Adjutant General's Office attached to the papers, which shows that each of these men received pay for these services. Jas. Rolland, a private, as a courier and as a scout courier; Frederick Rolland as a private of the St. Albert Mounted Rifles; Wm. Rolland as a scout, and as a guide to Major Hutton; John Whiteford as a scout; R. E. Steele as a scout and courier; Geo. M. Steele as a scout; W. Chamberlain as a scout; Peter Nelson as a scout; Geo. Beatty as a scout, and John Calder as a scout and courier. I have no hesitation in recommending that these claims receive the statutory recognition for their services."

Mr. MULOCK. Whose certificate is that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. I want the certificate of Wm. White.

Sir ADOLHHE CARON. In the report I have submitted to the House are the documents of every individual case adjudicated upon.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Militia has simply read the opinion of the Deputy Minister of

Justice. That opinion purports to be based on certain facts and evidence. For example, it says at the beginning that the Deputy Minister has read the certificate of the competent authority, one Wm. White, and he says that that authority, together with the endorsement by Colonel Otter and some opinion expressed by Colonel Panet, gave him the information on which he made the report. The report of the Deputy Minister in no way binds this House, and I decline to accept the report of any Deputy Minister on facts not laid before Parliament. The Minister is bound to lay before the House the facts of the case, so that members themselves may decide. The Minister sees exactly where he has landed himself. He has not given us the evidence. Did the Deputy Minister's report deal with the case of Phelan?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, I want the certificate of the competent authority on which the Minister bases his report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no information contained in the certificate, and nothing turned on anything which the certificate contains. The claims of these people were investigated by the departmental board that sat on the claims, and their decision was given. The question raised in Phelan's case was this: They belonged to a corps called Steele's Cavalry. They were actually engaged as scouts. There was no dispute on that point; but the question was whether their services were properly certified or not. There was no dispute as to what their services were, as to what the certificate was. There was no information contained in the certificate; the question was simply whether Mr. White was the proper officer to certify. That question being submitted to the department, the Deputy Minister of Justice declared that in the opinion of the department Col. White's certificate, endorsed by Col. Otter, that these men had actually served as scouts, was sufficient to entitle them to be considered as properly certified. We did not derive any facts from the certificate itself.

Mr. MULOCK. There could not be a more absurd example of legislative action than that which we now witness. The fact that the Minister of Militia has not come here with the proper evidence to submit, shows the absurdity of the case. I will not detain the Committee longer, but enough has come out to warn the Government against the course they have pursued. The Minister has not had much to do this session, and he might have had these resolutions properly prepared, and even if he had decided to submit them in this form, he should have come here prepared with a case to back them up.

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE CASE OF MR. ARNOLDI.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I see it stated in the press that departmental action has been taken by the Minister of Public Works with respect to Mr. Arnoldi. Will the Minister state to the House whether that is true, and if so what action has been taken?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Arnoldi's case was brought before Council. It was decided he should be suspended. He has been suspended.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What does suspension involve, because we do not quite understand it? Does it practically mean dismissal, or merely that he is suspended, pending a decision to be arrived at in future by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Suspension means that an officer ceases to come to the office or attend to his ordinary duties, and he is without pay. The matter will have to be decided later on by the Council.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then it is not equivalent to dismissal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not dismissal, but suspension.

Mr. MULOCK. It will be within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen that yesterday it came out in evidence that Mr. Arnoldi has been presented with a pair of bronze dogs, which had not paid duty. Later——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is discussing proceedings taken before a Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I am going to ask a question, and I am simply making a statement in order to make my question clear. It is stated in the press to-day that Mr. Arnoldi had duty paid on them yesterday, on a valuation of about $500.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not in a position to answer, in the absence of the Minister of Customs. The question can be asked later.

Mr. MULOCK. At what stage?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At any time.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 105) respecting the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Bowell.)

SHIPPING OF LIVE STOCK.

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

That it is expedient to pass an Act respecting the shipping of live stock, and to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint inspectors under the said Act and determine the remuneration to be paid them out of the fees which the Governor in Council may establish to be paid on live stock shipped on any ships carrying live stock.

Motion agreed to; resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 154) respecting the shipping of live stock. He

said : I may say in explanation of this Bill that last year there was introduced into the English House of Commons a Bill proposing to prohibit ships carrying live stock across the Atlantic, and ships carrying deck loads of lumber, from entering British ports. The measure excited considerable alarm in this country, as it threatened grave danger to one of the important industries of Canada, an industry which has grown with great rapidity since 1874. In that year, it appears, there were about 64 head of live stock, all told, shipped from Canada to Great Britain : in 1879, there were 20,588 ; in 1884, 53,962 ; in 1889, 60,000 ; and in 1890, no less than 120,000 ; so that to prohibit the shipment of live stock would have done incalculable injury to this country. Shortly after the introduction of that Bill there was a departmental committee organized under the president of the British Board of Trade, Mr. Chaplin, and to that committee the Bill was referred, and the views of the Canadian Government were invited on the subject. At once the various parties interested—the shippers of live stock, the shipowners, and the underwriters—took a very quick and active interest in the subject, and I had the benefit of their information and advice touching the condition of that business. I then caused to be held an exhaustive enquiry on the subject, and the evidence taken in that enquiry has already been laid before this House. Those interested in the trade—the shippers, the owners of shipping, and the underwriters—attended that enquiry at Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec, and gave us all the information there was to be had. The main point brought out appeared to be, that while there had been a loss of cattle in transit while crossing the ocean, that loss had been confined almost exclusively to those vessels known as tramps—vessels coming to Canada occasionally for cargoes, and not belonging to any regular lines. The regular lines, the Allan, the Dominion, the Beaver and the various other Canadian lines engaged in this trade, were able to present and did present a splendid record, not only at the enquiry in Canada, but also in Great Britain. It was shown that they had taken the necessary precautions, in their own interests, and in the interests of the trade, to secure the comfort of the animals in their passage across the ocean and to see that the ships were fitted out tight, staunch and strong ; but an unfortunate case occurred, that of a vessel known as the *Linda*, in which great loss took place while crossing the ocean, the cattle being swept overboard in great numbers. That case was discussed at great length in England, and evidence was given concerning it, giving rise to an unfortunate and false impression respecting the supervision of the shipments of cattle at Canadian ports. This vessel, the *Linda*, did not belong to any of the regular lines, but was known as one of the tramps The provisions of the law last year, under which this Government were enabled to exercise any supervision over the shipment of live cattle, are to be found in the Act relating to contagious diseases of animals, in the Revised Statutes, and the Order in Council, under that Act, gave the only power that could be exercised with reference to such shipments. But that Act, as its name indicates, related almost exclusively to the health of the animals and their condition at the port of shipment, with the view of preventing any diseased animals from being shipped and of seeing that they were so placed on board as to prevent any likelihood of their catching disease in crossing, but their comfort and the fittings of the ship were questions not covered by the Act, and it is for the purpose of enabling the Government to see that, in every respect, the vessels engaged in this trade take the necessary precautions, not only to prevent the shipment of animals infected with contagious diseases, but to see that they shall be allowed sufficient space and enjoy ample convenience for their health and comfort and that the fittings shall be of such a character that ordinary storms would not carry them away and the animals with them, as has occurred on several occasions in the cases of vessels only temporarily engaged in the business, which were not provided with the proper conveniences for that particular trade, and with which the Government has not, under present legislation, been able to interfere. The Bill provides also that the expense of the inspection shall be met by a small tax on the animals shipped, and it is not expected that a fee higher than two cents or three cents per head need be imposed. The chief inspection so far as at present required, is really at the port of Montreal ; but, with the exception of the ports of Quebec and Three Rivers, there are very few other ports at present in Canada from which cattle are shipped. I do not think there will be much difficulty in seeing that proper regulations are carried out under the provisions of this Bill. There are about eleven clauses in it, but the sections I have not dealt with relate merely to the machinery necessary to have a proper survey, so that a vessel may not, after being loaded in Montreal according to regulations and obtained a clearance from that port, stop at Three Rivers and Quebec and overload or overcrowd at these ports. I may add that the legislation in England to which I have referred has met apparently with a sudden check, but the necessity remains as great as it was before for our adopting this legislation ; and I may say briefly that, independent entirely of the legislation in England, enough has been shown by the enquiry, in the opinion of those interested in the trade—the shippers, underwriters and cattlemen—to prove that additional legislation is required, but in England the Bill to which I have referred has been withdrawn. There was great opposition to the contemplated legislation in England from the shipping interests, as it proposes to clothe with very great powers the department known as the Board of Agriculture in England. At present under the Act relating to contagious diseases, which is administered in the Department of the Privy Council in England, a vessel which does not comply with the present regulations can be blacklisted and not permitted to enter a port on any other occasion with cattle. Take the case of the *Linda*. After it was discovered that animals had been badly stowed on that vessel and cattle lost in great numbers, she was scheduled and prohibited from again entering a British port with cattle, even though she should have complied with the regulations. The objection to the Bill was that, while it is proposed that the Board of Agriculture should summarily decide that where the regulations had been violated the vessels should be prohibited from carrying cattle again, it was neglected to provide that, on the vessels being fitted out in accordance with the regulations, the prohibition should be with-

drawn. We propose to have powers under which, as has already been done in the United States, in view of the same agitation in England and for the protection of their interests, instead of any imperative course being adopted, the department will be simply authorized to prescribe and enforce regulations for the carrying of live stock. We have gone very carefully into the question, and have also had the benefit of receiving the draft regulations prepared under Mr. Chaplin's supervision in England, which regulations will be put in force under the statute to which I allude in England, that relating to contagious diseases of animals, and these regulations will be put in force here as soon as this Bill becomes law.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the hon. gentleman able at this moment to state the general regulations which he proposes to adopt in regard to space and other matters of that kind?

Mr. TUPPER. The regulations have not yet been adopted by Order in Council, as the Bill requires after it becomes law; but, after consideration of the various interests and of the English regulations and the American regulations which are now in force, we have considered that it is advisable to observe uniformity as far as possible. Of course, it is obviously desirable that the fittings of a ship shall be disturbed as little as possible when she goes to an American, an English or any other port. As to the parts of the vessel which may be used, it is proposed that:

"Cattle shall not be carried on more than three decks. Cattle shall not be carried on the hatches or on any part of the vessel where, in ordinary course of navigation, they would interfere with the proper management of the vessel or would interfere with the efficient working of the boats."

By way of illustration, I may point out that, where the hatches are practically kept closed, with cattle underneath and hay and animals stored indiscriminately above, it becomes very dangerous. Then, as to space:

"Fat cattle shall be allowed a space of not less than 2 feet 8 inches in width and 8 feet in depth per head, and not more than four such cattle shall be carried in each pen. Store cattle shall be allowed a space of not less than 2 feet 6 inches in width and 8 feet in depth per head, and not more than five such cattle shall be carried in each pen. Each pen shall be provided with proper battens to prevent the cattle from slipping."

Then, as to the strength and description of fittings:

"Each pen shall be constructed of sound and well seasoned timber, the stanchions being not less than 4 inches in thickness in each direction," and so on.

Then, as to the passage ways, there is a discussion going on in regard to the width. Some propose a width of 3 feet, but the officers I have consulted seem to take the view that 18 inches would be sufficient for the passage way. That is a matter still to be considered. Then as to the matter of ventilation—and I may say that practically the regular liners now apply most of these provisions—it is proposed that:

"All enclosed portions of the vessel used for cattle shall be sufficiently ventilated (in addition to any ventilation obtained by means of the hatchways) by means of cowls or other proper means for the admission of fresh air, and shall be provided with proper mechanical arrangements, propelled by steam power, for the removal of the foul air."

This system is now, I believe, in vogue on our regular liners—

"Each deck (if enclosed) on which cattle are carried shall have separate and distinct arrangements for its ventilation. Proper and suitable arrangements shall be made to provide at all times adequate light for the proper tending of the cattle."

Then, in regard to the supply of food and water, I have not sufficient information to state the definite amount which will be required, but it is proposed to regulate the amount provided for each head of cattle, and this is the proposed provision as to the mode of securing the cattle:

"Every head of cattle shall be securely tied by the head so as to stand athwart ships."

The great point which has been discussed has been that in reference to space, and I think, under the existing law, we have dealt with that so that it is nothing new. I do not know of any dissatisfaction with our present regulations in that respect, and they are practically the same as those existing in the United States, that is a space of 2 feet 8 inches for fat cattle and 2 feet 6 inches for stockers.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the space allowed for the passages, 18 inches, is too little. A space of 2½ feet is as little as ought to be allowed for those passages. There is a good deal of danger when the cattle are too close together, because they may get forward with their horns and meet in the centre, and 2½ feet or 3 feet is the least space that should be allowed. Then, as to ventilation there should be sufficient ventilation in front, because that is where the greatest danger is. I shipped some cattle on one of the Donaldson steamers, and if the whole of the ports had not been opened, a large number would have been lost, and the reason was, that there was not sufficient ventilation at the front of the vessel to allow the foul air to get out and the fresh air to get in. In regard to the inspection, I should like to know if the owners of the vessels or the shippers are to pay for the inspection.

Mr. TUPPER. That is as broad as it is long. The tax will be collected from the ship, and no doubt they will collect from the shipper.

Mr. McMILLAN. It has become a great question with the shippers of cattle as to whether they would ship from Canada or from the other side, notwithstanding the difficulties which exist there, because the difference in freight is so great, and I think the burdens on Canadian shippers ought to be made as light as possible. I know that this season a great many cattle have been sent to Boston and shipped there, on account of the lower rates from that port.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope the competition will soon settle that question.

Mr. TROW. I agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) in reference to the question of space. Formerly, all kinds of stock were sent to the old country, but now it is not usual to send any stock unless it is of proper age and well fattened, because it costs as much to send a poor animal across the Atlantic as to send a good one. I am, however, surprised to hear the statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to shipping cattle from Boston and New York. That appears to me to be perfectly assured, because our shippers will not advocate taking that route because, if we send them by our own lines, the cattle become inured to hardship before they enter the sea by going down the rivers, whereas at New York they are at once plunged into the Atlantic at Sandy Hook and be-

come seasick, so that I think our people will unquestionably prefer our own lines to those going from New York.

Mr. SPROULE. I have received two or three letters complaining strongly of many of the regulations as they exist at present. They complain that the suggestions in the report made last year have not since been carried out. I notice that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is providing for some of them in his Bill, but I think others are not provided for.

Mr. TUPPER. I will explain to the hon. gentleman that there is no difference between Mr. Cunningham and myself with reference to the chief points in his letter; I have already explained to him that I was powerless to do anything until this legislation was obtained. As I explained to the House, the Order in Council contains the regulations; the Bill simply empowers the Governor in Council to pass these regulations.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood from the explanations of the Minister, that the Bill was not to contain these regulations. Of course, it is not necessary to say anything about it until the Bill comes down, and we see what power it gives to make those regulations.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me the regulations should be taken afterwards, when he asks for power. I understood the Minister to say, that he had not fully made up his mind as to space.

Mr. TUPPER. Only as to passage way, not space in the stalls. I am obtaining more information as to space in the stalls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister of Marine to say that we exported as many as 120,000 horned cattle?

Mr. TUPPER. Between 120,000 and 125,000 of horned cattle, and nearly all from Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman sure?

Mr. TUPPER. That is the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My impression is that our export of horned cattle was some 60,000 or 70,000.

Mr. TUPPER. 70,000 of this 120,000 were known as stock cattle, so I think my information must be right. The figures are given on page 56 of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry to which I referred. That mentions 123,000 head of cattle; it does not say they are horned cattle, but of this number 70,000 were stockers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather suspect that it must include sheep.

Mr. TUPPER. Sheep are mentioned afterwards. I think I am right, I will look that up; but that seems to confirm at first glance what I stated, that 70,000 of the 123,000 were stockers.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. There seems to be a misunderstanding about the number of cattle that has been shipped. Now, the number the Minister of Marine has given is the number that was shipped last year during the summer season. I suppose my hon. friend at my left is referring to the returns that are only enumerated until the 1st of July, last year.

Mr. TROW.

Mr. TUPPER. I was referring to the evidence taken last fall at the end of the shipping season, not to the trade return.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am satisfied the Minister is correct in the numbers that were shipped from the opening of navigation last year from Montreal until the end of navigation. Now, this Bill that he proposes declares that it is expedient to make regulations for the shipment of cattle from Canada. The reason why it is expedient is that last year a gentleman in England, a member of the English Parliament, was agitating for a Bill for the purpose of stopping our cattle from being shipped to England. Now, if he had succeeded in getting such a Bill passed it would have caused great loss to this country. We have not the same advantages for shipping dead beef that the Americans have, and we have not as good a class of cattle for the dead meat trade as they have. Our cattle are an inferior class to those that they slaughter in New York and ship to England. We should endeavour to make regulations and restrictions concerning the shipment of our cattle to England as easy as possible. This cattle trade is capable of being made very profitable to this country. Now, these gentlemen that were here last year and were endeavouring to prevent our cattle from being landed alive in England, had several objects in view, one of which was said to be in the interest of the sailors. Mr. Plimsoll, who took the most prominent part in this agitation, had paid a gread deal of attention in England to the welfare of the sailors, and he contended that the practice of shipping cattle on board steamers was attended with danger to the sailors in handling the vessel. Another reason for the agitation was the opposition of the agricultural interest in England to the shipment of live stock in Canada. The English farmers were very anxious to stop this trade in order that they might have a better home market for their own cattle. The third reason was that which came from the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Now, we have in Canada, as they have in England, humane societies, who believe they are acting in the interest of humanity by preventing dumb brutes from being ill-treated. It must be confessed that they have some reason for complaint, as our cattle are frequently landed on the other side in a very much bruised condition, and in an unfit state to go on the market. I have had personal experience in this matter. Some 13 years ago I took 450 head of cattle over in a steamer from Boston, which was the largest shipment of live cattle that had ever been made up to that time. I found in going over that a great many of our cattle were hurt for want of room, they were crowded together in short and narrow stalls, and were bruised on the hips and on the rump bones, and when they landed some of them had wounds on their hips as large as a man's head, and they had to be put out for a few weeks to pasture before they could go on the market. These cattle landed in that shape were not fit to be slaughtered. Cattle that arrive in England in that state ought not to be slaughtered until such time as they become sound again. In shipping cattle to England we need to give them wider stalls and more room generally, and if we did this and were able to land our cattle in England in a good condition for the market, not only would we be consulting our own interests, but the people of England would have no reason to complain

that the cattle suffered cruelty on the voyage. I hope the proposed Bill will receive the serious consideration of the House, and that every effort will be put forward to make the regulations as effective as possible, in order to obtain better provisions respecting loading and unloading and better accommodation on board. The American people were aroused on this subject at the same time as we were. They had a like investigation proceeding last fall in consequence of the Plimsoll Bill. On 6th June the United States Government passed regulations similar to that proposed, and they are still in operation, and I am satisfied from what I have heard in Montreal that American cattle are landed in England in much better condition than they were formerly. We should endeavour to get our cattle shipped as safely and have as comfortable accommodation provided for them as can be obtained at American ports. Cattle sent from American ports in vessels, many of which made more rapid passages than a great many of the vessels sailing from Montreal, reached England in almost as good a condition during the hot weather as do cattle shipped by a cooler route and later in the season. These regulations appear to act in a satisfactory manner and are the means of causing cattle to be shipped to England more safely and in a better condition than before. I believe this Bill will be the means of shutting off a great many cattle from going to England that should not go. The inspector will have power to regulate matters more or less in this regard. A class of cattle has been shipped which should not have been sent to England, as the animals were not fit. One cow in an unhealthy condition, leaving Toronto last year, in a shipment, was the cause of the delay of a whole shipment in England for several days. If we had a rigid inspection of every animal that was sent on board for shipment this would not happen, and the inspector would know whether the animals about to be sent on board were in a fit condition for the voyage or not. I am perfectly aware that the inspector in Montreal, Dr. McEachran, is a competent officer, one who will do his duty if the Government will back him up and give him the power he wishes, that he may insist on the regulations being strictly carried out. When the Bill comes up for consideration I will have an opportunity of explaining some matters in connection with it.

Mr. TUPPER. I desire to say to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I have found the exact information. It is even more extraordinary than I at first supposed. The Trade Returns do not give the information, but the figures are given by the secretary of the Live Stock Association. On page 229 of the report of inquiry on the export cattle trade of Canada there appears the following:—

"The export of cattle from this port has doubled itself in two years. There were 60,000 head of cattle shipped from this port in the season of 1888, and in the season of 1890 there were 123,136 head of cattle and 43,372 sheep. This is more than double what the trade was in 1888, and it represents an export trade of about $11,000,000 between Canada and Great Britain, and nearly $2,000,000 of that goes to the steamship companies for freight."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 104) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890 (from the Senate).—Sir John Thompson.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The fifth section reads:

"Section twenty-four is amended by adding the following sub-section:—

"2. If the drawee of a cheque bearing a forged endorsement pays the amount thereof to a subsequent endorser, or to the bearer thereof, he shall have all the rights of a holder in due course for the recovery back of the amount so paid from any endorser who has endorsed the same subsequent to the forged endorsement, as well as his legal recourse against the bearer thereof as a transferrer by delivery; the whole, however, subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the last preceding sub-section."

I propose to add the words:

Any endorser who has made payments shall have the like rights and recourse against any antecedent endorser subsequent to the first endorsement.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On re-consideration of section 3, I think we had better leave that out of the Bill. Section 17 of the original Act provides that if a Bill is drawn, and the drawee described incorrectly, he may accept by the incorrect name by which he is addressed, or he may, in addition to that, add his own signature "if he thinks fit." Now, section 3 would strike out the words "if he thinks fit," and it practically makes no change. It leaves the matter still at the option of the drawee, because the Act will read: "He may accept by adding his own proper name." This amendment will throw a doubt as to whether it was not obligatory upon him to add his own name, and I think it is better to leave the Act as it is.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

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

That it is expedient further to amend the Act forty-second Victoria, chapter four, intituled: "An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies," and to provide that Dominion lands may be granted to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the said company's railway, either from Cheadle station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to its terminus at a point in or near Township twenty-nine, Range twenty-three, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about fifty-five miles, or from the town of Calgary, in the district of Alberta, in the North-West Territories, to its said terminus in Township twenty-nine, Range twenty-three, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about seventy-five miles.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A year or two ago a charter was granted to the Red Deer Valley Railway Company granting power to run a line from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway called Cheadle, or from Calgary, to a point on the Red Deer River. There was also a land subsidy given for the line from Cheadle to Red Deer, a distance of fifty miles. This year the charter expired, but they have obtained an extension for two years more, and they have represented that it will be more in their interest to build their line from Calgary to Red

Deer, rather than from Cheadle. The object of running from Cheadle was because of the distance being shorter to the coal fields, but they found that their market will be an extensive one in Calgary itself, and they have asked for a land grant from Calgary to Red Deer, increasing the distance twenty-five miles.

Mr. LAURIER. There is correspondence, I presume, on the subject?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that the negotiations have been entirely carried on between the representatives of the county and the department. I do not think there is any correspondence on the subject.

Mr. LAURIER Is there no correspondence in reference to the change which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not quite sure about that. I know that there has been a good deal of communications, both last year and this, and it was intended to have passed this legisiation last year, but, inadvertently, it was overlooked when the Land Subsidy Bill came down. I think probably there may be some correspondence.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will bring it down.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes: I will bring it down if there is any.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of the Interior who are the promoters of this railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As far as I can understand, the promoters are the same as those who appear in the original charter, with the exception of Jos. Evans, who is dead.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman mind reading the names.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Daniel McFarlane, Joshua T. Johnston, Henry Percy Withers, and John Bain, all of the city of Toronto.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say what financial backing this company has?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was only lately—last spring—that it appeared to me they were financially in a position to go on with this work. Some six weeks or two months ago, at the commencement of the session, I had an interview with Mr. Alexander, who lives in Calgary, and who has operated largely there in building waterworks, buying property, and expending money in buildings, and with Mr. Osborne, who is the financial agent of a colonization company south of Calgary. He met Mr. Alexander in Calgary, who had been in communication with Mr. Bain in reference to the construction of this railway, and they informed me that $500,000 was on hand for the work, provided the legislation which had been agreed to could be carried out.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say whether any shareholders in this company have put any cash into the stock?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no information in regard to that at all, except that I understand that they represent that they have spent some $20,000 in surveys and preliminary work. I think Mr. Ick Evans and Mr. Bain went to England once or twice in the interests of this company.

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the hon. gentleman taken any steps to ascertain the truth of the statements made by Mr. Alexander and Mr. Osborne?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those statements were made to myself in my office.

Mr. MULOCK. How have they been verified—for instance, the statement that there is $500,000 available?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand that it is available. I took their word for it.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope that the other members of the company are men of greater capital than Mr. J. Ick Evans, who the hon. gentleman says was one of the promoters. He happened to be a resident of the city of Toronto, and we know something of him there. I believe he is now dead; but dead or alive, he was no financial strength to any company. Until he left the city of Toronto he occupied a very worthy position, but not one indicating that he possessed any degree of capital, namely, that of salesman in a retail store. He was very useful to hon. gentlemen opposite, because he was a great pusher and spouter, and that was the extent of his capital. We are asked to grant 6,400 acres a mile——

Mr. DEWDNEY. For 20 miles, in addition to the land for 55 miles already granted—75 miles altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. A pretty considerable grant from the public domain, to be locked up on the word of a gentleman from England, Mr. Osborne, and another from Calgary, whose only record, so far as we know, is that he took part in building some waterworks in Calgary. Has the hon. gentleman any acquaintance with Mr. Alexander?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps he could state what his financial position is?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I know nothing of Mr. Alexander's private affairs at all, except that I know he has spent a large amount of money, some $200,000, or it may be $300,000, in the neighbourhood of Calgary.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister and the Government to the importance of attaching some penalty clause to Acts making land grants or money subsidies to railway companies. We have been in the habit in the past of granting large subsidies to railway corporations without requiring them to show that they have the financial ability to go on and complete the work. I have always thought, knowing something of the manner in which gentlemen acquire railway charters and hold them for speculative purposes, that the Government should exact some guarantee from people who receive a subsidy either of land or money from the Government that they will carry out the conditions upon which it is granted. This company so far have done nothing. Last year they got a land grant for 50 miles, and now they are to get another for 20 miles. We are told that they have spent several thousand dollars. We have heard in the last few days how some of these men who get railway subsidies pay money to the company. They give notes, and the notes are paid out of the subsidy. There is nothing paid in cash. These men are simply speculators. I know nothing of the men connected with this company; but I know

that the Red Deer country is greatly in need of a railway, and these men have done nothing towards building one, although they have held the charter for years. There is another company, the North-West Central, which has been assisted by this Government, and which has come to this House year after year asking for extensions of time and land grants, and they have only succeeded in constructing 50 miles in some eleven or twelve years. Those 50 miles were constructed a year ago, but the road is not operated to-day, simply because there is some quarrel among the promoters themselves. I visited the department, and find that the Government can do nothing but ask those people to operate the road; there is no penalty whatever imposed upon them for neglecting to operate. I believe that there is another railway in New Brunswick to which a cash subsidy of $3,200 a mile was granted. One man got the money, built the road, and then refused to operate it, and I believe the Government can do nothing to compel him to do so. Now, when we are granting subsidies of land or money to these railway companies there should be some provision requiring them to operate the roads after they are built, or they should be required to make a deposit as a guarantee that they will do so, before this House gives them any portion of the public domain or any cash subsidy. In the case of the North-West Central, there is a double hardship to the settlers affected, because that road runs through a tract of country through which it was expected the Canadian Pacific Railway would be run. When the second hundred miles west of Winnipeg was surveyed the line was carried through the Oak River district, west of Rapid City, but it was afterwards diverted to the south. Then, the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway was projected to run through the same district. That company has changed its name several times. I believe the charter was granted first in 1879. We know the history of that railway. We know the story of the boodler boy Beaty, and all the disgraceful circumstances in connection with that railway, from beginning to end. I am not going to take time to say what the quarrel is which prevents that road being operated to-day, or who is to blame. The contractor, Mr. Charlebois, is at present on the other side of the Atlantic, and I understand that he does not propose to come to Canada until after this House rises. Last year, to my own knowledge, there were 1,000,000 bushels of grain and roots which would have been shipped over the 50 miles of that railway if it had been built, and the people were compelled to haul their produce from 10 to 40 miles to market, simply because that railway was not operated. The grading was done, and, I believe, well done, the track laid, and well laid, but there is not sufficient rolling stock on it and the road is not operated. I suggested in this House, and, if I recollect aright, divided the House on the question, that that company, on receiving their land grant, should be asked to put up $50,000 as guarantee that they would build the road and operate it, but the Government refused, on the ground that it was difficult enough for the company to get the money without such conditions. The fact is, we have chartermongers getting charters through the Railway Committee to build roads without any intention of building them themselves, and I contend that before we grant subsidies, either in cash or in land, we should have some guarantee from the company or some deposit to show that they will carry out the conditions of their charter.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman has said, but as regards this railway, the Railway Committee had it in their hands to cancel the charter if they thought the company could not go on with it. But, year after year, companies come before the Railway Committee asking for renewals of their charter; and, if the Committee believe they are capable of carrying out their charters, renewals are granted. In this case under discussion the company received a land grant for 55 miles, and are now only asking the difference between 55 and 70.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the grant for the 66 miles lapsed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not quite sure whether it has or not.

Mr. WATSON. If their charter has lapsed, the land grant is lapsed.

Mr. DALY. I do not intend to discuss this matter at length, because I put a notice on the Paper calling for correspondence, but I wish to endorse a great deal of what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the Great North-West Central Railway and the unfortunate condition in which it has placed those who expected the road to be in operation last year. Fifty miles have been built and equipped, both in passenger, baggage and freight cars, and there are three locomotives at Brandon; but, as the hon. gentleman has said, we expected to ship over a million bushels of grain last year over this road, but unfortunately, at the last moment, our settlers were disappointed. It appears that the contractor, Mr. Charlebois, entered into a contract for the building of 50 miles, and the contract provided that the railway, when built, should be certified to by the chief engineer of Government railways. The contractor completed the line, and a certificate was given by Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer of Government railways, yet the company would not take the road off his hands. The question in dispute was referred to Messrs. Shanly and Light, civil engineers of Montreal, and an award made unanimously in favour of Mr. Charlebois, but a year has passed and the company have not paid to Mr. Charlebois the money due him. The sub-contractors are also owed money by Mr. Charlebois, who cannot get paid by the company, and about $15,000 or $16,000 are due traders in the vicinity of Brandon. Only the other day a petition was presented from the Board of Trade of Brandon in reference to this matter, and the people certainly desire that the road should be operated at once. I am not, however, going to move in the matter until my notice is brought before the House. This question is a burning one with our people, and we are determined, if this road is not operated next year, to ask that the company shall be declared to have forfeited all their rights. I think the charter provides that. I am satisfied the public are safeguarded by the provisions of the charter, and I draw the attention of the Government to the matter in order that they may communicate with the president, who is now in England, or the promoters, and see that they equip the road and operate it this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is sufficient to warrant the Committee in declining, if they can at all, to go on with the resolution before the House. I think the question put by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the capabilities of the company to go on should be fully answered before we proceed with this resolution. As has been truly remarked by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), we have been in the habit of granting charters to men of straw, and the result is, they have been obtained by promoters as matters of speculation, not with the intention of going on with the construction, but of peddling the charters around in order to make money. We should put a stop to that. The hon. Minister has stated that if the Railway Committee chose they could have stopped the renewal of the charter. That is true. I happen to be a member of that Committee, and cannot remember a single instance in which the Committee have refused to renew a charter when the company has presented satisfactory grounds for claiming such renewal; and that the question of a financial pledge of money being deposited as guarantee that the line will be constructed, has not, to my knowledge, been brought up in the Committee. I do not suppose any hon. member wishes to prevent the construction of this road, if it is a desirable one to build, but we should take precautionary steps to see, before we grant subsidies, that the road is not locked up in the hands of speculators who have not the backbone to proceed with it. Judging from what the hon. Minister has said regarding the financial standing of the men who hold the charter, is it quite clear he is not fully satisfied that they have the means to go on and build, and before we grant land subsidies we should be placed in possession of information sufficient to warrant us in believing that they have sufficient means to carry out their undertaking. Another point has been raised with regard to the subsidy already granted for the other 50 miles. If that has lapsed, the Minister should ask us to deal with the whole line, and not with the 25 miles at the tail end, and the latter, I presume, is the intention of this subsidy. I would like also to know whether it is the intention of the Government to give the land now asked for on each side of the track along the line or in any other section of the North-West, because in some sections, of course, we have very valuable lands, and it is highly desirable we should not part with enormous tracts of desirable farm lands to companies who intend locking them up for some time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The land is given to them immediately about the line of their railway. They have had since 1889 ten to twenty townships, I think it was, in alternate townships, and twenty townships were reserved in connection with this land grant immediately north of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the terminus of their road. Their charter was extended for a period of two years from the passing of the Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was that to commence the work or was it to complete?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The time for the expenditure of 15 per cent. on the amount of the capital stock, as required by the Railway Act, is hereby extended for a period of two years from the passing of the Act. It is the usual clause.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the resolution. I have always been in favour of giving assistance to construct the necessary colonization roads in the North-West, because I believe the future prosperity of this country depends very largely on the thorough development of the North-West. I rise for another purpose, and it is to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the absolute necessity of placing some maximum price at which these lands so granted shall be sold. It is within the memory of many hon. gentlemen in this House that when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) brought in a measure for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the prominent conditions in that measure was that the lands should be sold at a maximum price of $1 per acre to actual settlers. That was a wise provision. That principle hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have always adhered to. We have brought in resolutions at different times to fix a maximum price at which railway lands in the North-West should be sold. I need not point out the necessity for this. These railway corporations and others naturally endeavour to make the utmost out of the public domain granted to them. The result is that they sell lots here and there and hold the other lands for speculative purposes in hopes that the land will rise in value and increase the value of what they will sell at a future day. Any one who knows the necessities of farmers is aware how injurious this must be to the settlers. They are kept few and far between. They are deprived of all the advantages of neighbourhood, they are deprived of markets, they are deprived of school facilities, they are deprived of facilities for road-making—in fact, they are deprived of everything which is comprehended in close neighbourhood, and they are deprived of all this so that the soulless corporation may make money out of their industry. I think it is a grievous hardship, and, taking all things into consideration, I think it would be far better if the Government—heavy and large as our public debt is—had incurred fifty, or seventy-five, or even a hundred million dollars more of debt, and had never given one acre of land into the hands of the railway corporations, but had given them a money subsidy and had kept the land for the people. What is the result now? There is no limit to what these corporations may charge, and they fix the price according to the necessities of the people who have to buy. The settlers who want land within reach of the markets, within reach of railway facilities, or schools, or churches, and all the advantages of neighbourhood, have to pay whatever price the railway corporation chooses to exact from them. One would think the Government might have been warned by the experience of old Canada. I was born in it, lived in it, and know something of what I speak. I know that in the earliest days of this country some of the best lands in Ontario were handed over to the favourites of the Government, to retiring army officers, and others. I have known these men to hold these lands for over a quarter of a century. The lands were made valuable by the labour and blood of the poor settlers, and finally they were sold for about $50 an acre. Let me draw your

attention to the Canada Land Company with which we were cursed in western Ontario. The best of the lands in that section of the country were handed over to that company at a nominal price, and they did what the railway corporations are doing in the North-West. They placed a settler here and there, and sold him his land at $2, $3 and $4 an acre, but the lands in the immediate neighbourhood were held until they improved in value, and, after the timber had been taken off by the company, the company sold the lands for as much as $40 an acre without any improvements on them. One generation of the hardy pioneers of this country have gone down to the grave as the bond slaves of this accursed company. And yet the Government are doing the same thing to-day in regard to the North-West. They are giving this land to corporations in such a way that the settlers there will become the bond slaves of those corporations. I hope the Government will not make any land grant in future without providing the maximum price at which the land is to be sold.

Mr. WATSON. As to the rolling stock on this road, I have been informed that the cause of the delay is partly what has been stated by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). McDonald & Schiller, the sub-contractors from Mr. Charlebois, were unable to do anything until Mr. Charlebois got the money he claims from Mr. Codd. I am informed that Mr. Charlebois agreed to complete 50 miles for $1,000,000. The fencing was to be done, and the station houses were to be built, and the rolling stock was to be provided, but I am informed that there were only three old locomotives, one of them built about thirty years ago, and they were of no use. The company refused to accept the road from Mr. Charlebois, because they said the agreement was not carried out, and I am told that Mr. Charlebois agreed to knock off $75,000 from his contract price if they would accept the road. I also understand that Mr. Charlebois and Mr. Codd have agreed upon a settlement, and now all that is required is to have Mr. Charlebois and Mr. Codd in Canada to make a final settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the same Mr. Charlebois who was the contractor for the Langevin Block?

Mr. WATSON. Yes; it is the same Mr. Charlebois, and I am afraid we will not see him in Canada until the House rises. I hope the Government will take some steps to have that road operated. The present equipment is not sufficient. I believe they have only twenty box cars. I expect that 1,250,000 bushels of grain will have to be carried out of that country this year, and it is the duty of the Government to see, when they give large assistance in the way of a land grant, as they have given here for 450 miles of railway, that the people are properly served. I would like to see that road kept as an independent road, but if it cannot be kept as an independent road the Canadian Pacific Railway should get in there. I think there were to be some terminal facilities granted, and the company evidently expected to be able to operate the road, because up to March last they kept their tanks thawed out. But, evidently, they are not able to get Mr. Charlebois to turn the road over to them and complete his contract. If Mr. Charlebois has agreed to take $75,000 less on account of the road not being completed according to the agreement, it shows that Mr. Charlebois has been in the wrong, notwithstanding the fact that the Government engineer did give a certificate on which the company could draw the land grant, and having been enabled to do so, they have drawn the land grant, but, like many other roads, they do not draw the people's grain. This is a very serious matter for a large section of country, and the people have suffered great hardship on account of the road not being operated, even up to the present time, and I hope the Government will take some means to come to the aid of those people. The company assure me they are willing to go on and operate the road, and even to make a deposit to cover any difference between the company and Mr. Charlebois, because they are at a loss just now; the roadbed is already completed, and they might reap a very handsome profit on carrying the crop over even the 50 miles of road. I hope that the Government will put machinery in motion whereby that road could be operated this fall. It is a shame and a disgrace for the people of Canada that the Government are giving valuable franchises to a few private individuals for the purpose of speculation, and the people are not to be served after all the sacrifices that have been made.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the House might hear from the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) on this subject. It is a scheme that intimately concerns the riding he represents. Looking at the Act of incorporation, it is difficult for me to tell where this road is going to pass, and perhaps the hon. member will be able to give information to the House that the Minister is not possessed of.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Here is the plan, and you can see the route for yourself.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a matter that is of sufficient local interest to entitle the House to hear from the hon. member for Alberta.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). The hon. gentleman wishes to know exactly where this road is to go. The original charter, as he well knows, started at Cheadle station, the most northern point on the Canadian Pacific Railway in Alberta. When it was renewed in the Railway Committee this session the company changed their minds and wished it to start from the town of Calgary and go to a point on the Red Deer River where the coal mine is situated, about 65 miles from the town of Calgary, almost due north.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say who are interested in the enterprise?

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I understand that it has been turned over by the original promoters to Mr. Alexander and a company of English gentlemen. The original promoters were gentlemen from Toronto. Mr. Bain is the only one I have met of the original promoters.

Mr. MULOCK. The only name the hon. gentleman knows is that of Mr. Alexander?

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). That is the only one I know in the concern at the present time. He is a gentleman of large means, and has expended in the vicinity of Calgary, this last season, at least $300,000. I know that he handles an immense quantity of English capital; where he gets it I do not know, as I am not personally acquainted with his private affairs. They have a coal mine on the Red Deer River, and they require this road to operate this mine.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman know how much the company paid to obtain the transfer of the charter?

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I do not know anything about what the arrangements were, in any shape or form. There are no settlers along the line of the road from one end to the other, at the present time, not even on the Red Deer.

Mr. MULOCK. The information afforded by the hon. member for Alberta has supplied, to some extent, what was wanting. Now, there appears to be no reason why safeguards should not be imposed. The hon. member for Alberta has stated that the promoter, Mr. Alexander, is, he believes, possessed in his own right, or through those whom he represents, of large financial means, and therefore it is only right that we should require these guarantees. I think we cannot be too safe, we cannot be too careful, in avoiding the pitfalls that heretofore we have fallen into, and proper safeguards should be required and a system of forfeiture adopted, if necessary, in order to prevent wildcat schemes—not that I suggest this is one; I assume it is quite the contrary, and being, we will suppose, a good, sound, honest scheme, there is no reason why we should not adopt a precedent in a case such as this, which will be of service in dealing with other propositions that have not the claims this one has. Now, the Minister of Interior to-day has admitted, although he is the responsible Minister presenting this scheme for the consideration of the House, that he does not know, he has no knowledge whatever, as to the resources of the company. Before the useful information afforded by the member for Alberta, the Minister of Interior was not aware whether any one of the promoters was possessed of a dollar of money or could command a dollar of money. He has not of record anything to show what resources any of the promoters had. There is nothing to show that there is one dollar in the treasury of the company, or that it has a single claim upon any person to contribute anything towards the enterprise. We only have this much evidence before us now, that some gentlemen who originally obtained the charter have transferred it, I presume for a valuable consideration, to the present promoters. To that extent the enterprise already smacks of charter selling; to that extent there has been an abuse made of the charter itself, for I maintain it is no part of the duty of Parliament to issue, as it were, negotiable securities in the form of charters, so that people can come here and use their political influence on the floor of Parliament to obtain charters, and then go off and peddle them out for a consideration, making them more expensive to the purchasers, all of which moneys have ultimately to be extracted from the pockets of the people. That is the system that has been adopted, and if it is now in force let us put an end to it as soon as possible by requiring substantial guarantees. When I looked at the Act of 1889, to which the hon. gentleman referred, I was surprised that the Railway Committee under the circumstances granted a charter at all. The Minister must draw a great distinction between a grant and a charter. There is a certain idea of free trade in charters, and the Railway Committee, and the House, for that matter, are liberal to a degree in granting charters, even competing charters over the same route. But that is a very different thing from locking up large tracts of land for charters that are wholly speculative, so far as the promoters are concerned, and which may or may not go into existence by the original promoters succeeding in selling the charter to some English company or some other persons of capital; and, therefore, when the Minister to-day says that he is renewing this subsidy grant on the ground that the Railway Committee has renewed the charter he certainly has not a sound argument in support of his action. The company may succeed in getting a renewal of its charter, but there might be a dozen renewals over the same territory, and you cannot make the same grants over the same territory. Now, I would remind the hon. gentleman of the action of his predecessor in regard to land grants. Instead of granting land to a particular corporation, he will see that the Government took power to grant lands to such a corporation as, within a given time, completed the road under certain conditions, and in that way the company were able to go along and earn the grant by substantial acts. In this case you are excluding all competitors, putting tracts of land at the mercy of one particular company for a long time. Now, as this subsidy is going to be within the grasp of that company, instead of giving that grant to a particular company I submit that you would be acting much more wisely if you took power for the Governor in Council, if need be, to grant it to such a corporation as shall satisfy the Governor in Council of its ability to build the road within a certain time. Then you will, perhaps, accomplish what you have in view; otherwise, you are simply placing that land grant at the disposal of a few men, who will use it to make money for themselves; if they do not succeed in floating the company there is nothing lost. Heads I win, tails you lose. That is the position when you place a subsidy at the disposal of a company, which, so far as we know to-day, has not one farthing in its coffers or in the coffers of anyone else for them. I think, before further progress is made, the Minister should submit to the House the papers in connection with this proposal. He should apply to the promoters and require them to give the guarantees, and there should be conditions given here or in the Bill that will prevent the locking up of the land. It should not be locked up, at all events, longer than the next session of Parliament. I hope when we are next called on to deal with these grants there will be such a safe policy enunciated as was in force during the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when substantial guarantees were required from all promoters of companies before public lands were set apart for such enterprises.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Minister of Interior if it is not a fact that one of the objects of this Bill is to open up a coal region?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I shall feel it to be my duty, if the Minister fails to do so, to ask the House to fix a maximum rate on coal. In the past we have made land grants to companies for the purpose of building railways to develop coal regions. We have it within our knowledge what the results have been. They have been precisely as I predicted they would be when the land grant was given to the Galt company. They built a narrow gauge line, they were not compelled to carry coal for any

one else, and they have a practical monopoly of the whole coal region. It makes no difference if there are a dozen mines as good as the Galt mines in that region, because they cannot be operated, as the Galt company have a monopoly of the carrying of ceal from that portion of country. If we are giving a subsidy for the purpose of opening up and developing our natural wealth we should see that it is developed in the interests of the general public, not in the interests of a corporation, which is able to use its influence with the Government, first to secure a charter, and second to secure a land grant. The Government should seriously consider the advisability of fixing the maximum price at which the land should be sold. That country is being opened up by different railways, which have not only secured land grants, but cash subsidies, too. I should prefer, as a representative from the North-West, to see a cash subsidy granted instead of a land subsidy. Take the ordinary grant of 6,400 acres per mile. If the Government granted only $3,200 per mile that would be only 50 cents per acre for the land, and they could dispose of the land to actual settlers for a larger sum than the cash subsidy, actual settlers who are worth more to the Government than the petty sum they receive from the land, even when they sell it. I hope the Government will take into consideration the advisability of fixing a maximum rate, and of asking the company to put up a guarantee to compel the railway company within some specified time to dispose of the land.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me we have some experience in the past that may be of service to us in dealing with these great public interests, such as the public lands in the North-West. It looks to me as though we had a continuance of that vicious system which had its heyday of prosperity in 1882-83-84 in the granting of timber leases, pastoral leases and colonization grants. We had a number of men in Ottawa who applied for timber licenses, obtained an Order in Council for them and then hawked them about for sale. We have the same system continued in reference to railway charters. Charters—I do not know how many, a great many of them—for roads in the North-West, purely speculative, are secured, the men applying for and obtaining them, and subsequently obtaining grants of land, doing this purely as a speculation, without any intention of carrying out the work themselves, and hawking these charters about for sale, as timber limit leases were formerly hawked about for sale. The system is a vicious one, and I must protest against the rapidity with which we are granting portions of the public domain. We had a glaring instance of the viciousness of this system a few years ago. There was a Bill introduced, known as the Nanaimo Railway Bill, for the construction of a railway, less than 70 miles long, to run from Victoria to Nanaimo, within 3 or 4 miles of the shore, and that company received a land grant of nearly all the coal land in Vancouver Island. I protested against the grant at the time, but no one seemed to think it important. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Pope) insisted that the Bill was all right, and it was put through. That railway company has received as a grant to aid in the construction of the road a sufficient amount to pay for its construction five times over. The company profiting by the arrangement was partly an American one. It was a huge job, a swindle on the people, with no one, hardly, to protest against it, and the Bill was passed through with the connivance of the Government. The history of the construction of railways in the United States has demonstrated this fact, that in nine cases out of ten railways receiving land grants obtained more than was required and more than they were entitled to. Railway companies obtained their charters and received land grants long in advance of the time when the roads were required or when they were to be built, and had the United States granted no land whatever the railway service of that country would probably be just as efficient, just as fully developed, as it is to-day. We are going on here at this headlong rate, chartering railway companies in the far North-West, hundreds of miles in advance of settlement, making land grants and placing them in the hands of speculators. If anything is made, very well; if nothing is made, nothing is lost, as the promoters are putting no money into the schemes, but are simply putting in their time in furthering them. The Government is acting as their tool in this matter and promoting this spirit of speculation, and in nine cases out of ten the whole scheme rests in the form of a land grant given to the company, and they are schemes that should be thrown out of the House. In due time this country, if it requires railways in any particular part of it, will be provided with companies having ample capital to construct such roads. Just so soon as there is business to make a railway pay there will be capital ready to build it. There is a superabundance of capital seeking investment, and whenever it can be shown that there will be a satisfactory and safe return the capital will be forthcoming. Only show there is a chance that the railway will pay and there will be ample means furnished to build the road, and it will be unnecessary for the Government to squander the heritage of the people, as has been done in these various North-West enterprises. We should consider this whole question carefully, and these projects should only be authorized when the people want the railways, and then we should endeavour to get them on better terms for the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had a discussion on this subject many times before, and over and over again from this side of the House has the recommendation been made that the policy of fixing a maximum limit on the land grants should be enforced. I have heard a great many objections raised by speculators in railway companies benefited, but I have no hesitation in saying that the most gross injustice to a large section of Manitoba and the North-West has been perpetrated, and is likely to be perpetrated *de die in diem*, from the neglect of that straightforward business proceeding. I trust that the Minister of the Interior will not disregard the suggestion made from this side of the House, but he will see that precautions are taken that this grant, which I understand amounts to 480,000 acres, rather more than the area of two whole counties in Ontario, in some cases, or two whole ridings, will not be allowed to be locked up and rendered useless for purposes of actual settlement, as I know has been done in a great many other cases, and in no case with greater disadvantage to settlers than in a case of lands

placed under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway in southern Manitoba, where a system was adopted which was equivalent to banishing many thousands of settlers from southern Manitoba who desired to go there. I should also like to know from the Minister if he is in a position to give us the information how many acres of land in all have now been practically taken from the control of the Government and set apart for the service of railway companies within that which used to be called the fertile belt—that is to say, within a district of about 1,000 miles long and 400 miles wide, roughly speaking, extending from the frontier of Manitoba, or from the Red River, up to the Rocky Mountains. I dare say it will be in the mind of the Minister that some two or three years ago, in the course of discussions in this House, the hon. gentleman admitted then—and I do not think that he has gone back on his statement—that in view of all the lands that had been alienated in one way or the other that, practically speaking, if the policy of the Government to continue the free grants to actual settlers was gone on with we had almost entirely lost control of the fertile portion of these 400,000 square miles to which I refer. Now, Sir, my opinion has been, and it is, that we have practically fooled away an empire in the North-West, that we have done no good to ourselves, and that we have done no good to the people of Canada by the policy that has been pursued. It is a matter of notoriety, and it cannot be too often brought before the attention of the people of Canada and the members of this House, that whereas the people of the older provinces were induced to agree to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the solemn and continually-repeated pledge, given by the late Premier, given by Sir Charles Tupper, given by their organs all over the country, and made in every possible shape and way to the inhabitants of the old provinces: that out of the proceeds of the sales of the land in the North-West, on the last day of January of this year, $69,000,000 or $70,000,000 of assets would be realized. So far from that having been even approximately correct, we find to-day from our Public Accounts the management of the North-West shows a dead loss of nearly $2,000,000, instead of their estimated profit of $70,000,000. Under circumstances like these it is the bounden duty of this House, it is the bounden duty of every member here, to criticize closely these grants that are made. Now, Sir, I think that the hon. gentleman, before he proceeds further, ought to be able to lay on the Table of this House, from the archives of his department, some sort of rough map or sketch which would show us, even though it be very approximately, how far these grants of land have extended, and how much land is actually left to us. There is one point on which I think the hon. gentleman has improved on the old practice, and although I rather think that the system was introduced by his predecessor I am quite willing to give him credit for having carried out the good rule. As I understand, he has put an end to the checker board system, as it was called, and is proposing to give these lands in alternate blocks or townships, reserving every alternate township for the settlers. That, I understand, is the hon. gentleman's policy, and if we are to give these land grants at all I think so far he has done well. But, looking to the general results of the policy of the Government, and looking more particularly to the facts I have stated, and to the utter and lamentable fallacy of the pledges and promises which were made to the people of Canada with respect to the profits which were to be derived from the management of our North-West, I say, Sir, that the House cannot be too vigilant in criticising every one of these land grants, such as are now proposed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would like to say that I have already prepared a statement which I propose to place on the Table of the House, when another subsidy Bill, which I gave notice of yesterday, will be brought up for consideration. I have got that statement prepared, and I have also got a map which I propose to lay before the House, because I anticipated that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have renewed the application which he made last year and the year before in reference to this matter. I have a very complete statement with regard to that, and I will be prepared to lay it on the Table of the House. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is mistaken with regard to the policy of the Liberal Administration in reference to the construction of railways in the North-West. He said that their policy had always been to cause the construction of railways only when there had been sufficient people in the country to warrant such construction. I have a speech before me, made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in which he distinctly announces the opposite opinions. He goes very fully into the question, and he illustrates it by reference to the United States as having constructed their railways so as to induce population. His whole remarks are in the direction that in a new country railways should be built in order to give settlers a chance of settling on the line of railway. He refers to the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri and Kansas, and he gave the population of these portions of the States where railways were constructed, and what they were without railways, and he shows how rapidly the settlement progressed after the construction of railways. His whole argument was in favour of building railways in the North-West before settlement came in. Now with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson): As the hon. gentleman knows, the question came up last year in reference to the fixing of rates for carrying coal over the railways, and he was informed then, as I inform him now, that that matter is still in the hands of the Government, and that under the Railway Act the Government has power to fix the rates of freight over these several lines.

Mr. WATSON. The trouble is, that they do not fix them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have got the power now, and there is no reason why we should take the same power in this Bill. The question of fixing a maximum price for the lands was also threshed out last year. As I said then, I also say now, that it would have killed every railway enterprise in the North-West if we had adopted that policy. I understood the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) to state that the maximum price under the former Government was $1 per acre.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Excuse me; it was with reference to the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to one of the provisions of the Act.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. It appears to me that if a maximum price were fixed with regard to land along the railways that some other parties would come in and buy it at a cheap rate, and they would hold it in the same way as railways do now, and sell it at any price they like.

Mr. WATSON. I am of the opinion that it would be much better to kill a lot of these railway companies, if it would kill them, as the Minister of the Interior says, for I believe that they exist only for the purposes of speculation. I know certainly, and the hon. gentleman must have got sufficient evidence to-day in connection with the North-West Central Railway, to show that it has been in the hands of speculators for years. It is a road that should have been built years ago, because the country required it; but it was given into the hands of speculators and it was not built. The hon. gentleman also knows that a year ago a charter was promoted in this House by myself, which had the backing of a very strong company. I do not know whether he knows this or not, but I know it, and I am satisfied of it, that if that charter had been granted a year ago, during that same year at least 100 miles of that railway would have been constructed, and that without any land grant from the Government at all. But the Government refused to give a charter to that company, because some of their particular friends had another scheme on hand and objected to the charter. Notwithstanding the fact that this charter was fought through a sub-committee of the Railway Committee, and reported to this House, yet because another scheme, promoted by the particular friends of the Government, might be injured, this charter was not granted. These gentlemen knew that the road was to be built by the company for which the charter was asked, and because they thought that the road would be built, and that it would interfere with their speculations, the charter was referred back to the Railway Committee to be slaughtered there. That is the policy which the Government has adopted with reference to those railways. They do not appear to be looking for men who are good men and competent to build railways, but they look out for their friends, who wants these charters to hold them for speculative purposes. The names of the first promoters of the North-West Central Railway were apparently good names, but were they railway contractors? I think I have got their names here, and I will tell the House who they were. There was the Hon. Senator Clemow, A. Charlebois, Captain Murray, W. A. Allan and Mr. Bates. Anyone would say that these men were financially in a position to build a railway, but they never built a mile of the road, nor even turned the first sod, and they held the road until they got a large price as a bonus from English capitalists. They simply held it as a matter of speculation, and the result is that we have only 50 miles of that road built now. The road is tied up in a lawsuit between the contractors and the company, and is not operated, and they hold a large tract of country which is, I believe, scheduled by the Government purely and simply as a matter of speculation. Now, I am informed that the English company have put $750,000 in hard cash into that concern, and I do not believe that the gentlemen who originally got this franchise to build the road ever put a dollar into it, in the way of construction; but I believe, however, they sold it for a very large amount of money, the exact sum of which I don't know. Now, with this evidence before us, surely we should be careful before we proceed further in the same direction. If any company come here and show that they are *bonâ fide* able to build the railway for which they have a charter then the Government is justified in giving them some assistance to enable them to open up the country; but I do say that they should put up some deposit, which they would be compelled to sacrifice if they did not go on and carry out the arrangements agreed to in this House. The hon. Minister says that we have their promises. These gentlemen will promise anything and do nothing. With the evidence before us, we should ask this company for some security, as a matter of good faith, that they will go on and complete the work. But the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to give their friends large tracts of the public domain, which they can hold for years, and use their advantage to retard railway construction. We had the same thing happening in southern Manitoba. We had the Canadian Pacific Railway Company getting an extension of time for the construction of the South-Western Railway, and after that they asked for an extension of two years more. That road was promised to the settlers as far back as 1880-81.

Mr. DEWDNEY. By whom?

Mr. WATSON. By the Government and the company. The line was surveyed, and it was understood that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would build it; but it is only to-day that the people in that part of the country are getting the railway facilities that were promised them ten or twelve years ago. The Northern Pacific Company, I believe, offered to give a guarantee to the Government that they would construct 300 miles of that road into the Souris coal fields if they got the same grant as the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the excuse given was that the Canadian Pacific Railway company had received an extension of time in which to do the work. This practice is very injurious to the settlers, because they go in expecting a railway to be built, and after they have raised their crops they find that they are practically worthless, because it costs nearly all they can get for them to haul them to market. It must be admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite that mistakes have been made, and now is the time to avoid them for the future.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Marquette has done a great injustice to Charlebois & Co., whether unwittingly or not. He said that that company had not built a mile of the railway or put any money into it. I know that to be entirely wrong. The company were handicapped by a clause in the charter compelling them to settle the accounts of the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Co., and in the settlement of those accounts they paid $24,000 in cash. They paid the debts of the company to the amount of $50,000, at about 50 cents on the dollar, before commencing operations. Then, they graded 50 miles of the railway at their own expense, and got it ready for the iron—the ties were there—when, unfortunately, their financial aid seemed to desert them, and from that time they were unable to go on and raise the money. That is pretty good evidence that the company was not

bankrupt, and there were some grounds for the Minister to assume that they were financially able and would go on and complete the work.

Mr. WATSON. That was the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company—Beaty's Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. The hon. member is entirely mistaken. It was done after the charter was got by Messrs. Charlebois, Clemow & Co. They were the parties who raised the money, paid off the old claims, graded the 50 miles, and got the road ready for the iron.

Mr. WATSON. What I say is that they were not the people who held the charter while that work was done. I admit that they made a settlement of the claims, because a clause was put in the Act compelling the new company to pay the debts of the old. But the work was done under Beaty's Company.

Mr. DALY. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. It was the new company who settled up the old debts and built the 50 miles, and left the road ready for the iron; but the company did not furnish the iron, and the road could not be completed. Under the contract recently taken by Messrs. Schiller & McDonald the money was furnished to put the iron on, to purchase rolling stock, build station houses and equip the road. That was only to finish what had been commenced before.

Mr. DALY. I just want to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Marquette, who seems not to be informed correctly on this matter. It was Messrs. Charlebois, Allan, Clemow and others who built the 50 miles.

Mr. WATSON. From Melbourne to Rapid City?

Mr. DALY. That has nothing to do with the Great North-West Central Railway at all. The hon. gentleman's statement was that these men had put nothing into that road. I say that they built the road, and got sufficient ties there for 25 miles, and the road was in that condition when the present syndicate took hold of it and financed money for the rails, the stations and other equipment. In addition to that, they paid the $50,000 of debts which the hon. member for East Grey has mentioned, and were out of pocket in connection with the promotion of the road and other matters.

Mr. WATSON. This company entered into an agreement with the English syndicate before they built a mile of the road at all. That agreement was entered into in 1888, the road was graded in 1889, and it was not ironed until 1890.

Mr. SPROULE. No; they entered into it in 1890.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for Marquette is entirely mistaken. The arrangement was entered into in 1890. The hon. gentleman ought to accept my statement.

Mr. WATSON. I am willing to accept no one's statement about what I know. I say that that portion of the line between Melbourne and Rapid City was graded by the old Beaty Company, and when a charter was granted to the present promoters a clause was placed in the Bill, at my own instigation, for the purpose of protecting the interests of the people who had done that work, and that liability had to be met by the new company. The work was done by contractors whom the Beaty Company never paid, and the new company had to pay them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All this matter will come up again when it will be in order, but it has not the slightest relation to this question.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the statement which the hon. Minister of the Interior intends to bring down mention all the land grants, including those to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of the Interior has expressed no opinion as to whether the promoters of a company should show any financial standing before being given a charter. He does not appear to attach much importance to that feature of the case. Is he, then, in favour of granting subsidies to companies that exist only on paper? So far as we know, this company simply exists on paper. It is a purely speculative concern, which has succeeded in possessing itself of a charter without any intention of building the line, but simply of making money out of it. The hon. Minister has not ventured to express any opinion on that point. Are we about to enter on an era of charter speculation and to put our lands in the hands of speculators who will dispose of them if they can, and make money out of the scheme, or, if they cannot, let them fall back into the hands of the people. The hon. Minister should say what his views are on a question like this, as it is one of great importance and entitled to his serious consideration. With reference to rates, let me call his attention to the clause in the Railway Act. He has said that the Governor in Council has power to control the tolls on railways, and that if a railway, for example, having access to a coal region, should charge unreasonable rates, the Governor in Council may regulate them. But while there is a provision in the Railway Act which appears, on the surface, to give the Governor in Council power to reduce tolls, when you interpret that section in the light of railway practice and legislation, you will find that provision is absolutely a dead letter. The provision is to this effect: that the Governor in Council may reduce the rates, provided the income of the company be not thereby reduced to less than 15 per cent. of its capital, and the working capital is understood to include what are known as paid-up shares of stock; and inasmuch as, under our legislation, all shares now are practically paid-up by services, or in other imaginary ways, and not by actual cash, it follows that to-day the rates cannot be reduced so long as even the nominal capital does not yield a return of 15 per cent. This company, therefore, will, by some process of its own, call its capital paid-up capital, by assigning its stock to its shareholders and promoters in various ways, and until the company earns a net income of 15 per cent. on the amount of nominal capital, there can be no reduction of toll. The provision, therefore, of the Act giving power to reduce toll is wholly illusory; and if this company is to receive this aid for the construction of its line there ought to be a special provision entitling the Governor in Council to regulate the tolls, independent of the clause in the general Railway Act, which does not meet the case at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I stated very distinctly that I felt satisfied with regard to the

financial ability of the gentlemen who had come to an understanding with the present charter holders of this company. I stated that Mr. Osborn, the financial agent of the company here, was a man of good financial standing. I also spoke of Mr. Alexander, and stated that he had expended—and my statement was supplemented by that of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), whose word the hon. gentleman took, although he would not take mine——

Mr. MULOCK. You knew nothing about it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did know a great deal about it.

Mr. MULOCK. You did not tell us.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I said he had spent $200,000 or $300,000 in the neighbourhood of Calgary, to my knowledge. I stated that he had obtained capital to build the waterworks of Calgary, which are as fine as any in the Dominion, and that he had, besides, made large investments in buildings and in purchases of land and other operations in that country. I know of no company in whose financial standing I have greater confidence than this company.

Mr. MULOCK. Are you going to get a guarantee from this company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no authority for saying it, but am satisfied that they would not have the slightest objection to putting up any reasonable guarantee.

Mr. MULOCK. Before we come to the second reading of the resolution that could be arranged.

Resolution reported, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS—IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 153) further to amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir John Thompson.)

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 122) further to amend the Fisheries Act

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman has made very stringent provisions for penalties for the use of purse seines. I know there is a great difference of opinion on that matter, and, if the hon. gentleman has come to a determination against the use of purse seines on proper evidence, as I presume he has done, although I do not myself agree with what I understand is the general consensus of opinion on that subject among the fishermen, I shall not oppose the Bill. I formed an opinion on that subject some years ago when I was engaged before the Halifax Fishery Commission, but I would suggest to the House that the imposition of a fine not less than $50 and not more than $500, together with the confiscation of the vessels, is altogether too extreme a penalty. I do not know where the hon. gentleman took his clause from or how he justifies it, but I think, in starting a provision of this kind, the penalty prescribed is too stringent. If the hon. gentleman were to limit the punishment to a pecuniary penalty for the present I think it would be all right, and if, after a year or two, he finds that is not sufficient, I would not be averse to changing the Act in that respect; but in starting, I submit that the penalty is too extreme. A man may own a vessel worth $10,000, or $15,000, or $20,000. The crew may throw the purse seine without the knowledge of the owner, and, though the judge has an option as to the amount of the penalty, he has no option as to the confiscation of the vessel. And if you come to the conclusion that the mere use of the purse seine under any circumstances is to justify a penalty, and you attach to that penalty the confiscation of the vessel at large, then there is no reason for putting a penalty of not less than $50 or not exceeding $500. The very fact that you put the penalty at a low sum of $50 and the extreme penalty at $500 shows there may be very many cases where the full amount of the penalty should not be exacted. Now, in this case the judge may determine that the infraction is so slight, or the circumstances so palliative, that he would only inflict the $50 penalty, but the vessel must go, notwithstanding. I submit to the hon. gentleman that is not right, and that, at any rate, in starting out with this new provision of the Act, it is better to be content with inflicting a penalty, and make it run up as high as $1,000 if you will, but do not necessarily make the confiscation of the vessel follow the least infraction of the law.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's objections would be well taken if the circumstances were the usual circumstances in connection with the imposition of a new penalty. But I submit that if the principle of the Bill be correct, and when we consider the exceptional circumstances under which we are now legislating, the objection disappears. The scope of the Bill, the hon. gentleman will observe, is confined to Canadian waters, for the reason that I have on one or two occasions expressed. At present there has been no international legislation reached, although I may tell the hon. gentleman that the views of the Canadian Government and United States authorities do not appear to be at all antagonistic. It is expedient that there should be international regulations. At present, outside of the three-mile limit our vessels and foreign vessels may use the purse seines; and I would ask the hon. gentleman's attention to this feature in connection with the penalty of this Bill, that since there are no international regulations that will prevent our vessels fitting up with this seine and going into the waters outside of the three-mile limit, the provision of the Bill would be almost nugatory, for the reason that you cannot watch all these vessels—it is simply impossible; and unless the risk is exceptionally great the Bill might as well not become law. We proceed on the supposition and on the belief, after very careful enquiry, extending, I may say, down from 1877, and we have the unanimous testimony of the American authorities in favour of the principle of

the Bill, and the unanimous testimony of our own officers in favour of the Bill, all agreeing that there is a serious falling off, an extraordinary decline, in the mackerel fishery on our coast, as well as on the American coast. The falling off in the herring fisheries was extraordinary, and it is ascribed to fishing with the purse seine. The Boston Fishery Bureau, which the hon. gentleman knows well, after a careful examination of the statistics published by them, and the history of this mackerel fishery, ascribed its decline almost entirely to the use of the purse seine. I have the Fishery Reports made to Parliament year after year since 1877, since which time our fishermen have been asking for relief, and all go to show that the end of the mackerel fishery is near if this system of catching is to be permitted. It destroys not merely an enormous number of fish, but it interferes with the hook-and-line fishery. The hon. gentleman knows that this purse seine is happily, in our own provinces, confined to very few; only those rich men that are able to buy this very expensive seine are able to indulge in this practice, so dangerous to the mackerel fishery. The hook-and-line men throughout the provinces are petitioning for a remedy. Both they and their officers have pointed out that not merely does the seine scatter the schools and break up and turn the mackerel off from our coast altogether, but it takes in its grasp hundreds of barrels of immature fish, and it also prevents, to a great extent, the reproduction which is absolutely necessary for the continuance for that species of fish. It is only in that view that I would ask Parliament, if they approve of the principle of the Bill, to grant an extraordinary penalty, so as to prohibit the practice altogether, to secure that no man shall start out with the hope of being able to avoid this law, but he shall know that if he does avoid it an extraordinary penalty is attached. Taking the enormous extent of our coast line, taking the opportunities of these vessels, when they can start out legitimately, of not being interfered with, and of stating to any vessel that hails them that they are just about to proceed where their neighbours are going, outside of the three-mile limit, the law would be a dead letter; it would be useless to pass it, until international regulations are reached, and hon. gentlemen know that they take a long time. I do not quarrel at all with what the hon. gentleman said, because he confined it to the ordinary case of a statute relating to the fisheries within our control, and so on. And yet, as to that, our present legislation goes so far as to make a penalty in reference to ordinary offences of the Fisheries Act, and includes the apparatus, whatever that may be. Now, since the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, I would ask his attention to some of the very strong reports that have been made by our officers on that subject. I have already stated that in 1877 petitions against fishing with these seines reached the department, and have continued to come in from that time to the present. Commander Lavoie, who was the officer in charge of the *La Canadienne*, traversing our fishing grounds every season, an officer who was, I think, in the service at the time the hon. gentleman refers to, was very strong in his representations and reports upon the destructive nature of this purse seine, and he reported to the department continually as to the destruction caused by its use. Then, again, in New Brunswick we have the fishery officers for years past calling attention to the destruction wrought by this seine, and the result in the Baie des Chaleurs has been such that the apprehensions that have been entertained previously to 1886 by these officers and expressed to the department have been more than realized. In Prince Edward Island the officers represent that the reason the mackerel were growing, as they called it, very wary and shy, as compared with their habits in previous years, was the fact that the schools were broken up and alarmed by being pursued by this style of fishing engine. Finally, Lieutenant Gordon, I think it is, stated the different objections to this seine, and to those gentlemen who are not familiar with that fishing engine, so-called, only known in the deep coast waters, but not at all used in the inland waters. I will give in a succinct form several of the objections that are urged and sustained, as I will show, by the investigations of those who have been looking into the subject in the United States as well as in Canada:

"Purse seining is liable to the following objections:—

"1. When a seine is thrown amongst a school of mackerel or other fish the school is broken up and scared, so that what escapes from outside the seine enclosure is scared, and makes off to deep water for a refuge. This effectually destroys all chances of boat fishermen, who depend on hand-lines and ordinary nets for a share of the broken schools.

"2. When, for instance, a seine is thrown for mackerel, it encloses the fish of every kind within its great area, and the aggregate quantity of these varieties are frequently much greater than that of the fish sought to be entrapped, including the small, valueless fish as well as the large.

"3. When the seine is closed, and the work of taking out commences, all kinds of fish, large and small, good and bad, which are not of the grade sought, are thrown dead into the sea, thus polluting the bottom to an extent which repels living fish from its proximity. By this method thousands of barrels of herring and hundreds of quintals of cod, including bait and other fish, are destroyed, and boat fishermen, who are depending on them for a supply, are deprived of all participation in the catch.

"4. The large quantities thus destroyed in the seining process is far beyond the powers of nature to sustain by reproduction; consequently, the fishing grounds are being rapidly depleted of their tenants."

Lieutenant Gordon, in one of his reports, remarks:

"This purse seine fishing is, in one sense, like prospecting for gold or boring for oil, it being purely a speculative business, in which there still certainly remain a few prizes, but in which there are very many blanks; but each crew looks forward to making a big haul, and not to the continuous work which the hook-and-line fishing imposes on the men. As an instance of the prizes made, one vessel, the *Emma W. Brown*, of Gloucester, got one hundred and sixty barrels of sea-packed mackerel at a single haul of her seine, which, at the extraordinary prices which have prevailed, would mean a take worth nearly four thousand dollars, or, say, upwards of one hundred dollars per man.

"Another vessel, the *Mayflower*, of Gloucester, made a somewhat similar haul, but these were the only two fortunate schooners in the whole fleet; yet the effect of these two hauls was to keep many of the fleet down on our coasts for some weeks later than they otherwise would have been."

There are some statistics which are very effective, to my mind, in corroboration of the views of the various experts who have given their attention to this subject. The Fish Bureau of Boston, for instance, gives statistics of the mackerel importation for three decades, and they establish in the strongest manner the necessity of this legislation. From 1850 to 1859, total catch 1,864,915 barrels, yearly average 185,491 barrels. No. 1, 682,737 barrels, yearly average 68,263. From 1863 to 1872, total catch 2,452,265. From 1880 to 1889, total catch 1,618,603 barrels. Hon. gentlemen will see

that with more vessels and better vessels the catch has fallen off, and is steadily declining. On examination this was ascribed to the introduction of purse seines there, because with their introduction the quantity of the catch steadily declined with reference to that market. Take the first decade I gave. The take of No. 1 mackerel averaged yearly 185,491 barrels; whereas during the next decade, containing a period immediately following the introduction of purse seines, the average was 240,426 barrels, while during the last decade the catch fell to an average of 161,860 barrels. The case is so strong that legislation has already been passed in the New England States, whereas we have no legislation on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In this direction?

Mr. TUPPER. They have legislated in the direction of this Bill to this extent: In 1883 the Legislature of Maine prohibited the use of purse seines for taking mackerel within any bay or inlet not more than 2 miles wide, under a penalty of $200. In 1885 this statute was extended so as to include bays 3 miles wide, and the penalty was increased to $500. In 1888 Congress took up the subject, and passed an Act which prohibits the catching of mackerel, except with hook and line, during the period between 1st March and 1st June. Hon. gentlemen will understand that the necessity for this stringency is all the greater in our country, because we are simply on the eve of following the very bad practice of our neighbours in that regard, and it is much better we should legislate now than encourage any people to go into the business. There are exceedingly few in it now. The only district from which I have received any protest against this proposed legislation is from one county in Nova Scotia, and it is a question with the officers of my department as to whether the seines of the fishermen there are purse seines or not. The fact that a good purse seine is worth several thousand dollars is one reason why our fishermen have not largely used them. It is now that I would rather come down with the strong arm of the law and make the penalty such that no man would enter into the speculation and buy those seines, or fit out with those seines, knowing the law is stringent and drastic. It would be infinitely better that legislation should be passed and a comparatively small penalty imposed. Fishermen making a haul such as I have mentioned could afford to pay a penalty of $500 and run the risk, because in many cases, as I frankly admit, we could not guard the coast line so as to make the fishermen feel certain they would be detected. They would have a chance, first, of not being caught; and second, that if they were detected they might show that they were outside the three-mile limit and could not be interfered with. If the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had an opportunity of reading the appeals I have read and had seen the petitions filed in my department he would no doubt have been a warm advocate of this measure. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he does not go heartily with me in the proposal now before the House, for the reason that he is not yet of the opinion that these engines are so destructive. I have given him the reasons which have led me to arrive at these conclusions: (1) our fishermen unanimously want this legislation; (2) our officers, who are patrolling these waters constantly, are all of the opinion that the destruction caused by purse seines is enormous, and will yet tend to utterly destroy that valuable industry; (3) we have the United States authorities saying the injury has been great, as is shown by the statistics in the falling off of the catch. Under these circumstances, I cannot conceive how, in regard to the fisheries, and in regard to our mode of dealing with this question, we could have better evidence of the condition of affairs than I have presented. I repeat that this is the time to impose a penalty so large and severe as to prevent any speculative firm or individuals entering into the business in the hope that, the penalty being very small and the chances of evading this law being great, they might violate it. It would be, I think, wise in their interests, as well as for the fishing industry generally, that we should go as far as this measure suggests. I may say that there is not altogether a departure in this measure from the ordinary penalty in connection with violations of the Fisheries Act. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the severe penalties in reference to foreign fishing vessels under the Fisheries Act itself. Now, it is not that we desire to harass or unduly punish the American fishermen that severe penalties are provided. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that is not the object which induced this Parliament to say that a foreign fishing vessel violating our Fishery Act should be confiscated; but it is from the necessity of the thing. It is because a smaller penalty would induce foreign fishing vessels to venture into our limits and violate our laws; and unless this Parliament were prepared to vote an enormous sum of money it would be impossible to do anything like patrol our coasts, so as to secure our fisheries from poachers. However, we are now able to do a great deal in this direction with a comparatively small sum of money by the fact that the law is so severe; and the confiscation of the American fishing vessel is for the purpose of deterring and preventing vessels from violating our laws. It was never intended to make the owner of that vessel suffer, and to inflict punishment, or torture, or annoyance, or anything of that kind; it was simply from the necessity of the thing, and in order to prevent violation of the law, that the Parliament of this country was induced to go so far. We are now dealing with a most important subject, and if the law is to be complete, and if we are to prohibit purse seining, and to prohibit it, believing that it tends to ruin our fisheries, then I say we must make the penalty as severe as in the case of a violation of our fishery laws by foreign vessels. The hon. gentleman will see that under our Fishery Act the penalties provided are: "That all materials, implements or appliances used, and all fish caught, taken or killed in violation of this Act, or any regulations under it, shall be confiscated to Her Majesty," and there is a penalty as well? There is really no departure here from that, except that we are more explicit in the present Bill, and we name the material, implements or appliances to be seized, and in that sense we are legislating more definitely with those who might otherwise unwittingly offend, not knowing the risk or the penalty they would suffer. I again express the hope that the House will see that if the principle of the Bill is right the legislation will not be effective, and it will be impossible to accomplish what we desire if we stipulate a nominal penalty

or a penalty so small in comparison with the great value of the purse seines that might be seized, and the enormous catches made by them, as to make the law nugatory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Committee will remember that while I expressed a personal opinion with regard to the use of purse-seines, I stated distinctly that I yielded in my own opinion on this subject to the large consensus of opinion which appears to exist among the fishermen. I also distinctly stated that it was not my intention to oppose this Bill, because I believe the large majority of those who understand more about the subject than I do think, whether rightly or wrongly, that this purse seining must be stopped. Therefore, we may as well get down to the exact difference between the hon. gentleman and myself, and the Committee, understanding that this is a most important Bill—more important than the inattention given to it would seem to indicate—the Committee will see that I am not at all opposing a Bill proscribing the use of purse seines, but I am confining my criticism to the penalty which the hon. gentleman imposes for a breach of the law. That is the sole and only criticism which I offer on the Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman says that experience has shown that the mackerel fishery on the coast of the United States has very largely depreciated in value, and in the quantity taken, during the past three decades. Very well; that may be true. It is alleged by many fishermen that this is to be attributed in a large measure to the use of purse seines, but the hon. gentleman must see that Congress has never yet adopted that view. Congress has only legislated tentatively, and I urge this House now to adopt tentative legislation on this matter. Let us go by degrees; let us first try the effect of it. Congress has prohibited the catching of these fish by purse seines between certain dates, which include only three months in the year. That is a very late enactment and the effect of it has not been seen yet, but I do not understand that Congress punishes with the penalty of the confiscation of a vessel, such as we are attempting to provide here.

Mr. TUPPER. And for that reason they have not been able to prevent the use of the purse-seine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, I want to show that so far as the precedent of the United States is concerned, it is not at any rate a precedent for the penalty which the hon. gentleman seeks to impose. The legislation itself is not opposed by myself, or by any gentleman on this side of the House, so that we just come down to this one point: Is it prudent in legislating upon this question to provide that a vessel, and her tackle, and her appurtenances, shall be confiscated for a breach of the law? Let the hon. gentleman look at the facts. He says that he does not think that many of the fishermen in the Maritime Provinces are engaged in this purse seining. My hon. friend, the junior member for King's (Mr. McLean), whom I do not see in his seat now, has two large vessels fitted up with purse seines, and he has pursued the mackerel fishery with purse seines for years back. We must consider that we cannot prohibit, and do not profess to prohibit, the use of purse seines beyond the three-mile limit. The American fishermen will prosecute that fishery by means of purse seines outside of the three-mile limit, and so will our fishermen, if they find it more profitable. We are seeking to prevent this mode of fishing within the three-mile limit, and as the Americans cannot fish within that limit the proscription will, therefore, apply to Canadian vessels alone. Suppose that one of our Canadian fishing vessels, fitted out with purse-seines, and valued at $3,000 or $4,000, is fishing, properly, legitimately and legally, just beyond the three-mile limit, and it follows a school of mackerel immediately inside of that limit—it may be done unwittingly—and that is the principal point I am arguing against the Bill—but the moment it is done the owner of that vessel is in the hands of every seaman on board, and it will not be in the power of the judge to say that this illegal act was done unwittingly.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. I know he knows the law well, but I would point out that this being under the Fishery Act there is an express provision which enables a person in a case of that kind to obtain redress. There is the power to remit, in the Fishery Act, as the hon. gentleman will remember.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The power to remit on the part of the Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see very well how in a case of this kind the Minister could exercise the power to remit.

Mr. TUPPER. On the presentation of these facts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are coming now to the point at issue. Is it not better to vest in the judge who tries the case and hears the evidence the discretion as to the amount of the penalty he should impose. You can make the penalty from $50 to $500, or from $50 to $1,500, if you like. I do not object to the principle contained in that, but the very fact that you vest this discretion in the judge, as to whether the penalty shall be $50 or $500, shows that you recognize the important fact that there may be cases which justify the imposition of a heavy penalty, and other cases which call for the imposition of a low penalty. I particularly wish to call the attention of the Minister to this: that this Bill, while it gives the discretion to the judge to inflict a penalty of $50 or $500, dependent upon the gravity of the offence committed withdraws from him the right of saying whether the vessel shall be confiscated or not. He may say: You are only liable to a penalty of $50, but the confiscation of your vessel follows as a matter of course, and there is no discretion whatever invested in me upon that point. Conceding, as I do, for the sake of argument, the policy or the principle of this enactment, it is only at the very best a tentative measure. You do not know how it will work; you are not thoroughly satisfied that the real grievance will be struck at by this Bill; and I submit to the hon. gentleman that it would be prudent policy to so frame the Bill as to vest in the judge who tries the offence a reasonable discretion to punish the owner of the vessel with a fine of $50, or any other fine up to $1,000, or even $1,500, according to his opinion of the degree of culpability. But do not make it a necessary condition that under any and all circumstances the judge must confiscate the vessel, her tackle, apparel and appurtenances. One of these

vessels, fitted out with purse seines and all the necessary apparatus, may be worth $10,000, and that may all be confiscated in an hour if, for instance, one of the crew finds that the captain, in pursuing a school of mackerel unwittingly and without any intention of violating the law, has come within the three-mile limit, and says to the captain: "Pay me hush money, or I will bring an action against you into court." The second section of the Bill, referring to the sharing of the penalty, offers inducements to the crew to do that. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself will be satisfied to have power of remission vested in him as head of the department, because he will always be open to the imputation, as gentlemen occupying his position invariably are, of granting remissions to political friends and refusing them to political opponents. We want a tribunal established which will administer justice to all parties alike; we want to vest the discretion in the judge, the legally competent tribunal, to say whether the penalty shall be small or great. I am not going to haggle about a few hundred dollars one way or another; but do not make it a necessary condition that for every infraction of a law which you are going to try for the first time the vessel, and all her tackle and apparel, must be confiscated under all circumstances. That is my objection, and I humbly submit that it is a very valid objection. Then, we know that in many of these cases the vessels are owned in shares. The capital is supplied by capitalists who are not fishermen. One man puts in $500, another $1,000, another $2,000—the vessel may be owned by a dozen men—and they put a prudent captain on board. It is a very good maxim of the law that he is the agent of the owners and that they are to be responsible for his acts; but it would be a very harsh law which would say that for an unwitting violation of the law by the captain they should lose their property. This is a harsh, arbitrary law; the judge cannot get around it; he must order the confiscation of the vessel willy-nilly; and it is against that harsh provision that I urge my criticisms. The other clause we will discuss when we come to it. But I do urge the hon. gentleman, in starting this legislation, to take a prudent course. You must remember that this law is directed against our own people, and that the owners of vessels can be easily reached. They are not like American citizens, who may commit an offence and then go away. The hon. gentleman gave an instance in which the penalty against foreign fishing vessels is confiscation, and very properly so, because the owners are not in this country. It would be a perfect farce to make them liable to a fine. The remedy must be a remedy *in rem*, and must be directed against the vessel itself. I do not see that there is any great hardship in that. Now, I do not advance these criticisms in any captious spirit at all, but from a sincere desire to see this Bill work properly; and if you make the penalty more than it ought to be it will simply result in this, that the owners will be driven to bribe the witnesses to give false evidence.

Mr. TUPPER. I would much prefer that the hon. gentleman was an out-and-out opponent of the measure. He says he is not, but he would be a very much less dangerous opponent if he were, because by saying that he will not argue that the principle of the Bill is wrong he is endeavouring, in my humble judgment, to have it so framed that it will be absolutely inoperative. The hon. gentleman himself does not profess to believe in the principle of the Bill. He says: "For the sake of argument, I admit that it is right."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said I had formed a personal opinion which I saw was opposed to that of the great mass of the fishermen, and that I would yield my personal opinion to that of the mass.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly. I say that is the style of opponent who is the most dangerous. I would prefer that he should come out and say that he was opposed to the measure. However, his position is thoroughly candid. He says: "I have not come to the conclusion that purse-seining is so destructive as is commonly supposed, but I am willing to waive my opinion, as I know the fishermen desire this measure." Then the hon. gentleman proceeds with an arguement which, if it were adopted, would induce the House to postpone the introduction of the measure altogether. If we are not certain that this is a destructive means of catching fish why should we adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion and enact a penalty of $1,500 for using a fishing engine which may be a perfectly legitimate way of catching fish? The very argument the hon. gentleman made goes to show how convinced he is that we are proceeding in a wrong direction. He is not, I submit, a fitting judge, under these circumstances, of what the penalty should be. That is perfectly natural, as the hon. gentleman himself does not believe in the principle of the Bill, but merely waives his opinion in deference to the views of the fishermen; and he would not make the Bill as effective in its operation as people who believe the arguments I have advanced, that the purse-seine is the most deadly fishing apparatus ever invented or ever known on the coasts of the Maritime Provinces. He knows that. The fishermen everywhere will tell him that it is a curse to their industry, that they hate it as they do the devil, that they attribute to it the injury to the mackerel fishery; and their appeals are loud and emphatic to do away with it altogether. We have been spending a long time in ascertaining whether it is right or wrong. Since 1877 their appeals have been made. They have said: This thing cannot longer be tolerated. They have said: You take statistics every year; you profess to base arguments on them; you find, what is very extraordinary, that deep-sea fish, supposed to be able to withstand almost anything the ingenuity of man can devise for their capture and destruction, so far as their reproduction is concerned, are falling off more and more every year; your own officers tell you that the purse-seine is responsible for much of the falling off, and we ask you to put a stop to that practice. Then the hon. gentleman comes forward and says that this demand is so emphatic, almost unanimous, that he is unable to oppose it, and feels that it is wrong to stand in the way of the fishermen; but insidiously he asks that the Bill should be so framed that every capitalist—and it seems to be capitalists alone who enter into this business, because the purse-seine in itself is enormously expensive—may practically, with impunity, violate that law every day. The hon. gentleman does not pretend to point out that I have exaggerated the possibilities of avoiding the law.

He does not pretend that the opportunities for violating it are not extraordinarily great, that the means of detection are not comparatively small, and that, therefore, if there is a case in which we should exact heavy penalties this is not one. The hon. gentleman says that the Act of Congress to which I have alluded is no precedent. It is not, in this sense: that it has proved entirely ineffectual. It is like the legislation the hon. gentleman now advocates. It looks well on paper, it seems to denote a desire to stop the thing, but the result shows that the vessels do not observe that law. The result shows that the purse-seines have been increasing, until last year, when only one thing prevented their great use, and that was, that in the previous year there were so many purse-seines used along the coast, and steamers employed in connection with them, and they played such havoc with the mackerel, that this fish were not found spawning on our coasts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely, the hon. gentleman is not attempting to lead the House to believe that the Americans have been fishing with purse-seines in our waters?

Mr. TUPPER. I said on our coasts, and the hon. gentleman knows what I mean. He knows that the mackerel which are outside the three-mile limit are, in a few hours, inside that limit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Your Bill does not touch that.

Mr. TUPPER. I am talking about the Act of Congress, and I am pointing out to the House that instead of that Act, which the hon. gentleman wishes us to imitate——

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

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has appealed to that Act to show that Congress has only legislated tentatively and has only experimented with the evil. Well, Sir, you cannot play with the patience of our fishermen by beginning an experiment again. We have had the experiment, and we know the results; we know the condition of our fisheries. We have seen the results of legislation of Congress since 1888, and we know that legislation is ineffectual; and I say it is absurd to put a law on the Statute-book which we know will fall short of what we intend to effect. That is the argument I have made, that the opportunities of evading the law are very great; but if you make the law severe, if you give a fair warning to all intending violators, there will be a great deal more caution shown. The owners of those vessels, such as the $10,000-vessel to which the hon. gentleman referred, when they have to face the possibility of confiscation, will be more cautious than if they have to face only the possibility of paying a fine of from $50 to $500, at the discretion of the judge. Suppose the case came before a brilliant jurist, such as the hon. gentleman, who does not believe the law is right, who believes we have gone too far——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would that affect the opinion of the judges?

Mr. TUPPER. We know that judges are human, and if a case came before a judge who is of opinion that we had passed experimental, tentative legislation—legislation initiated by hon. gentlemen, who said it was only an experiment, and who said they were not satisfied the law was right, and that it would be well to put in the power of the judge this discretion, the judge would feel he had perfect liberty, consistent with his honour, to follow his own inclinations and to decide, Parliament having given him the discretion of imposing a fine from $50 to $500, that the smallest fine should be imposed. Nine judges out of ten, not feeling certain as to whether this law was right or wrong, would impose the lowest fine; and the owner of the $10,000-boat and the $7,000-purse-seine would simply go out and catch the fish wherever he could, and pay the fine, so as to get rid of all danger, and settle the matter once for all. We must, in dealing with a subject of this kind, in dealing with a scheme so expensive in itself and so wonderfully ingenious and deadly that it does the injury I have said by taking such an enormous catch at one haul, act in the most severe matter; and I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the present Act goes almost as far. In law it does go as far; in words I have shown the difference. "All the material implements and appliances used," is, I say, a phrase that could be construed to cover the language in that; and if the language was not here, that language I have used, being the general language applicable to the fisheries, would apply. The hon. gentleman says it is a most dangerous thing to impose so serve a penalty, involving the confiscation of a valuable vessel, or any vessel—for in the case of a poorer vessel a poorer man is affected, and the case is just as strong when the party pursued unwittingly went over the three-mile limit without any intention of fishing inside that limit. That is a possible case. I admit that our fishermen, in the pursuit of their avocation, are, of necessity, careless, as there is no object in ascertaining exactly where the three-mile limit ends or begins, in ordinary circumstances. But those cases are provided for, since, in the Fishery Act, it is provided that persons convicted of any such infraction may appeal, by petition, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who may remit the penalty and restore the forfeiture under the Act. There is protection at once; but in the meanwhile this Bill now contains a fair warning to fishermen, which is in their interest, as to the extraordinary risk they run. The hon. gentleman, in attacking this power of remission, used the argument sometimes used, and with which I have a great deal of sympthy, that we should put as little of that power of remission and of discretion, in connection with convictions, in the hands of a Minister of any particular department as possible, but that principle in reference to the Fisheries Act has never been seriously attacked in this House. Since that was made law no hon. gentleman has seriously attempted to repeal it, and it is only when party feelings runs a little high that insinuations are made; and, as far as I am aware, those insinuations have only been thrown out in reference to the fisheries bounty, and that has nothing to do with clause 6. As far as the lobster regulations are concerned, it is the first time since I have been in this House that I have heard any grievance expressed, either by petition or in any other way, that this power had been unfairly exercised, that there had been any remission of a fine on the part of anyone who had been convicted of a violation of the law, or a retention of the fine on the other side because of political influence. If any case of that kind could be shown I know that hon. gentlemen opposite would present it on the first occasion. That was a

necessary provision, because the hon. gentleman well knows that some of the fisheries officers are more or less inefficient, but they are clothed with magisterial powers, they can and do fine, and, therefore, this provision has been found necessary. This meets the only serious objection that the hon. gentleman can raise to this section. The other objections which he has put might come from anyone who was opposed to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think I am entitled to complain that that the hon. gentleman has not met or sought to meet the objections which I raised in what I think was a very fair way against this Bill. He has not attempted to meet the arguments I used, but he has impugned my motives in making those arguments.

Mr. TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has argued at length, and, if he will pardon my saying so, at almost wearisome length, that my arguments in attacking this Bill were not of the best. I repeat that, while I am not personally convinced that the injury caused by these purse-seines is as great as the fishermen believe, I am prepared to support the hon. gentleman in passing this Bill. The only point I raised was whether you were adopting proper penalties in the enforcement of this Bill. The answer given is that the hon. gentleman is afraid to trust the judges of the land, to whom we have voted large salaries to carry out the laws. He says that probably the judges will do wrong, but the fishermen know that there is an appeal to himself, and, therefore, he will rectify the judgment of the judges. It is simply a question of putting penalties on a breach of a new law. You are going to make illegal what has heretofore been legal. Does the hon. gentleman say that the fishing in mackerel, for example, has decreased in the last ten years?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; the returns show that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman can show that.

Mr. TUPPER. I think I can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I challenge him to do it. I assert that the boat fishing last year was the best for years back. But, admitting that, if a vessel worth from $5,000 to $10,000 goes out——

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me I will state that, in 1885, the Canadian catch of mackerel was 148,450 barrels; in 1887 it was 131,653 barrels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was it in 1886?

Mr. TUPPER. In 1886 it was 152,292. In 1888 the catch, which had been 152,292 barrels in 1886, dropped to 65,777 barrels, and in 1889 it rose slightly to 65,849 barrels. Then there is the fishing to which I also alluded, and which is germane to this question—that is, the United States catch off the coast outside the three-mile limit. That catch, which was 330,000 barrels in 1885, when fishing inshore, dropped in 1886, when they were confined to fishing outside the three-mile limit to 80,000, to 78,000 in 1887, to 40,000 in 1888, to 17,794 barrels in 1889 and to 16,140 in 1890. Or, taking both together, as the hon. gentleman asked if I would state or venture to tell the House that the mackerel fishing had declined—and he referred to the boat and line fishing, which has nothing to do with the case—the total of the United States and Canadian fishing of mackerel amounts to 478,450 barrels in 1885, 232,292 barrels in 1886, 209,653 barrels in 1887, 105,777 in 1888, 83,643 in 1889, and 116,140 in 1890, or, taking the first and the last, it was 478,450 in 1885, against 106,140 barrels in 1890.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What was the inshore catch in 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. Ninety thousand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) According to the statement of the hon. gentleman, we would imagine that purse-seining would do good to the fish. We know that the mackerel is a migratory fish. I repeat that you cannot prohibit the catching by purse-seines outside the three-mile limit. The question is simply whether the penalties you propose to inflict are reasonable or unreasonable, whether the want of confidence which you are expressing in your judges is fair, whether the House will leave it to the Minister of Marine to review the judgment of the court, or whether the judge should be left to decide on the penalties to be inflicted. I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to one point which he ridiculed. He says that we do not want to have a discussion on the question as to whether the penalty should be $50 or $500 in the courts below. That is the one thing which he leaves to the discretion of the judge, but he adds, that no matter whether the judge may consider the case one of unwitting violation of the law, and therefore imposes a penalty of $50, or considers it a wilful violation of the law, and imposes the penalty of $500, the confiscation of the vessel must take place in any case. If you go before the courts, and the judge says it has been an unwitting breach of the law, he may fine the party only $50, but the vessel is confiscated all the same. The prosecution, we will suppose, has been brought by a seaman on board who has a spite against his master; the judge may say: I will inflict the lowest penalty of $50, but I regret to say that although this has been unwittingly done, I am bound by the law to confiscate the vessel, with the tackle and appurtenances. Now, does that commend itself to the reasonable mind of any man in this House? I say, make your penalty so large that it will strike terror, if you please, into the hearts of those who will be disposed to violate the law. I say that if the owner of a vessel has to pay $1,000 for a single throwing of the seine it is a large enough penalty to impose upon any man, but to make it in all cases, no matter whether there is an accidental mistake, or a wilful violation of the law—to decree in all cases the confiscation of the vessel, with the tackle and appurtenances, is, I respectfuly submit to the House, a principle which, in a Bill of this kind, which you are introducing for the first time, one that is unwarrantable and unjust.

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman think that $1,000 penalty would prevent a vessel setting out with the purse-seine to catch mackerel?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly, I do.

Mr. TUPPER. Then, what harm will it do to add the confiscation? That will equally prevent it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will concede to me that the vessel will start out anyway, whatever law we may pass. As hon. gentlemen from Ontario may not thoroughly understand

this matter, I may say that purse-seining is carried on in waters beyond the three-mile limit, and not in waters in respect of which we are legislating. A vessel, therefore, will start out to carry on the purse-seining in deep waters, and she may drift within the three-mile limit, or follow a school unwittingly within the three-mile limit, or in certain cases she may come in willfully. Then, I say, put on your penalty, and let it be reasonable, ranging from $50 for an unwitting violation up to $1,000 for a wilful one, and that will be a sufficient penalty to attach, and no owner of a vessel should be mulcted in more. I say, again, make such a penalty that no one is likely to repeat the offence, but do not cruelly punish the owners of these fishing vessels for what may be an unwitting offence. There is no more precarious work in the world than mackerel fishing, there is no more precarious investment than an investment in these fishing vessels. The hon. member for King's knows very well that in Prince Edward Island a large number of men have invested their money in fishing vessels and sent them out, but it did not pay, and they lost their money. The hon. the junior member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean) has a large amount of money invested now in that industry, in vessels fitted with purse-seines. These men honestly invest a large amount of money in this precarious enterprise, and you ought not to impose an unreasonable penalty upon them, such as would be the absolute confiscation of the vessel under any and all circumstances. That is the only point I have been urging, and the Minister is not justified in trying to make the Committee believe that I am opposed to the whole Bill. I am giving him my full approval of the Bill, and I am assisting him in carrying it with my voice and whatever influence I have. I am only urging the hon. gentleman not to make the penalty so severe that it may result in this: that a dissatisfied seaman on board one of these vessels, if he finds that his master's vessel is unwittingly drifting into the three-mile limit, may say to the master: "Pay me so much hush money or I will have your vessel confiscated." That is what it may come to and what it will come to.

Mr. FRASER. I beg leave to say that I am in full sympathy with this Bill. I think there may be a good deal in what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has said, and, perhaps, as he has a strong opinion on the subject, the suggestion that the confiscation of the property might be left to the discretion of the court is worthy of notice. For myself, I would accept such a provision. But I am myself in favour of the Bill as it stands, even without such a provision as I have suggested. I admit that the business of seine-fishing is a precarious one, but the investment of capital in that business is like every other investment. The man who makes that investment is able to loose it. I come from a county which is, perhaps, more affected by seine-fishing than any other, and I know it has been an unmitigated and continual evil. In the County of Guysborough, according to reports I have received, during the whole of this season not much more than 50 barrels of mackerel have been caught, where formerly the fishermen in a single boat caught that much. I am thoroughly convinced that the decline is due to seine-fishing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has there been any purse-seine fishing?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are there any fish caught with purse-seines?

Mr. FRASER. Not very many inside, and I am going to give the hon. gentleman the reason. I felt so deeply on this subject that I saw the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when I came up here, and I was glad to know that his attention had been called to it, because there was great need of it. Now, so far as purse-seines are concerned, it will be remembered that purse-seining is the same within the three-mile limit as without, so far as the destruction of the fish is concerned, because it is well known that nearly ten times as much herring and small mackerel and other fish are destroyed as the catches that are made and saved in these purse-seines. Any captain from the United States will tell you the same thing, and the reason why I am in favour of a heavier penalty, if possible, is because I would like that, when the Government go to Washington in October, they should induce the American Government to agree upon an international law that the same confiscation should be made to apply in the waters outside the three-mile limit, to either a Canadian or an American ship engaged in that kind of fishing. I think it is not only destructive, so far as the inshore fisheries is concerned, and more destructive even so far as the fishermen are concerned, but it is destructive outside. Now, it must be remembered that so far as Nova Scotia is concerned there has been a mackerel fleet from Cape Sable and Canso to Louisburg. They begin about the 20th of May. The fact is, they prevent the mackerel from striking the shore altogether. The mackerel strike out generally about 20 miles outside; they do not come in at all, from the fact of these purse-seines being used. The fish appear to understand—if I may apply the word "understanding" to fish—they seem to know that a large number of fish are destroyed, and they avoid the localities where these seines are used. Another reason is, that the fish themselves keep away from the shore. It must be remembered that the inshore is the natural spawning ground of mackerel, and they are kept out and do not come in. Not only are the mackerel destroyed, besides being caught, but there is another evil effect. It must also be remembered that a vessel coming within the three-mile limit with a purse-seine will be larger than an ordinary fishing vessel, and will destroy not only the fishing but the nets of the fishermen. I believe that the waters within the three-mile limit is the natural fishing ground and farm for the fishermen who live on the shore, and no power should be given to any Canadians, Englishmen or Americans to interfere with those waters, so far as those local fishermen are concerned. I think you can inflict no penalty too severe on men who interfere with that fishing, and, therefore, I conceive, as most of the purse-seine fishing is done outside the three-mile limit, that this penalty will not be very onerous on purse-seine fishermen. These fishermen will not be found very frequently within the three-mile limit. A fisherman might unwittingly come within the three-mile limit, but it will be much more difficult to prove that he is fishing within that

limit than the Minister imagines. That fact must be proved by the prosecution, and it will be found that not very many come within it. So far as our local fishermen are concerned, I have come a good deal in contact with those of my county and I know something about them. There are no men in my county, and a large proportion of the people are engaged in fishing, who do not look upon purse-seine fishing as not only destructive to the fish but as tending to keep the fish away. During the last two years the fishing has been very bad in my county, and the people naturally attribute it to the purse-seine fishing. It is because my constituents are practically interested in this subject that I am glad the Minister had seen fit to deal with it, and I am glad he has not only done so as regards the three-mile limit, but also that, having that law on the Statute-book, the Government may be able when they go to the United States to show how advanced we are, and to argue during the negotiations that the Americans should, if they expect the fisheries to prosper, agree that purse-seines should be prohibited outside as well as inside the three-mile limit. I take this to be a strong point, that the penalty is severe because it will not strike very many people in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who will it strike? It will not strike the Americans.

Mr. TUPPER. It will prohibit the use of purse-seines within the three-mile limit.

Mr. FRASER. It will prevent the men who have purse-seines using them within the three-mile limit, and it will at least keep that fishing ground for our local fishermen. I am not anxious about the Americans, except so far as regards preventing them from coming near us at all—that is, within the three-mile limit. It was stated by an hon. member the other day, when speaking of the three-mile limit, that the Americans should be allowed to fish within those waters. I do not agree with that opinion, and I assert that they should never be allowed to fish within the three-mile limit. From the investigations I have made I do not believe they should ever be granted that privilege.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no question of the Americans fishing within the three-mile limit.

Mr. FRASER. If we have effective legislation it will prevent this purse-seine fishing within our limits. It is not very often that purse-seine fishermen will come within our limits, but it may occur occasionally. If a shoal of mackerel strikes inshore they are liable to follow it and use purse-seines within the three-mile limit. I want all the fish within that limit to be preserved for the fishermen who live on the shore. I believe the old modes of fishing were not only less destructive to the fish, but that the quantity caught each year gave better results to our fishermen. A few hundred barrels may be taken in a purse-seine and a liberal return given to the purse-seine fishermen; but if that quantity were taken by 100 or 200 fishermen the fishermen as a whole would be more greatly benefited. While I admit that the penalties in the Bill are severe, I cannot believe there are many occasions on which they will affect the men who know the law is in operation. But it will prevent purse-seiners coming within the three-mile limit and allow our local fishermen to fish undisturbed within that limit. I have, therefore, much pleasure in finding myself for once supporting the Minister and the Bill which he has introduced.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. gentleman has not touched the question at issue, and has made no reference whatever to the objection taken to the Bill by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). He has talked about the Atlantic Ocean, from one end to the other, about the three-mile limit, about fishing inside and outside of it, but he has not dealt with the subject of the penalties to be inflicted for the violation of the law. In my humble opinion the objection taken to the measure by the hon. member for Queen's is a reasonable one. The penalty for violating the law varies, it may be $50 or $1,000 fine, but no matter how slight the offence may be the ship is confiscated. This being a new measure, the penalty proposed by the Minister is extreme. That is the point at issue, and in that view of the case I agree with the hon. member for Queen's. With respect to purse-seines destroying the fish, that is altogether a matter of guess-work. If next week the catch of mackerel proved to be as large as it was ten years ago they would hold that purse-seines have not destroyed the fish. It is true we are all very wise about the fish and their movements. The Scriptures, however, tell us, you cannot tell the way of the fish in the ocean. When the fish do not happen to enter a man's weir or purse-seine he immediately says they have all gone. The Atlantic Ocean has a very large surface, and the fish are not always caught at the same place. Their habits and their haunts vary; but neither the mackerel nor the herring are going to be exhausted. With respect to the remarks made by the Minister as to the enormous amount of fish taken in purse-seines, I am satisfied that if herring are taken which are worth saving the fishermen make use of them. So it is with respect to cod. If they are sufficiently large to be marketable they cure them and put them on the market. The point is narrowed down to this simple question: Cannot you leave to the court, not only the adjudicating of penalties varying from $50 to $1,000, but the question of confiscating a vessel for an offence, however slight? I think the measure is extreme in this particular, and should be amended.

Mr. KAULBACH. I was pleased to listen to the utterances of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who has just taken his seat. He appears to thoroughly understand the habits of the fish and the interests of the fishermen, and I think we may look forward to the time when the hon. gentlemen will sit on this side of the House.

Mr. FRASER. If I thought that would happen, I would take back all I have said.

Mr. KAULBACH. The remarks that emanated from the hon. gentleman were almost exactly on the line of a letter addressed by me some time ago to the Minister with respect to the grievances of which he complains. We now find in Nova Scotia that the purse-seine fishery has been a serious injury to fishermen, that it has so depleted the fisheries along our coast so that in many instances the fishermen have been compelled to give up that industry altogether, and in other intances they had been compelled to look after the deep-sea fishery in consequence of the Americans coming to our shores, as they have hitherto done, and sailing through the nets of the poor fishermen

along the coast, and destroying them, or coming within the three-mile limit, where there have been no vessels to protect our fisheries, and taking the fish, so to speak, from their very doors. Now, we find that the mackerel fishery has decreased very considerably for some time, and that it has been gradually decreasing every year, except last year, as was shown by the statistics quoted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If I am correct in taking down the hon. gentleman's figures—I noted them as I accidentally happened to hear them coming into the House—in 1885 the catch of mackerel was 478,000 barrels, and in 1890, 106,000 barrels. My hon. friend beside me corrects me by saying that the catch was below the 100,000 barrels: that is a proof in itself that the mackerel fishery is decreasing.

Mr. TUPPER. In 1890 the catch was 106,000 barrels, both American and Canadian—90,000 barrels Canadian and 16,000 barrels American.

Mr. KAULBACH. In 1885 was it the collective numbers, American and Canadian catch?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes: 478,000 barrels.

Mr. KAULBACH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel satisfied that, in the interest of the fisheries of our Atlantic coast and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where the fish most frequent, this Act should be placed upon the Statute-books, it being a most prudent piece of legislation. We have an example set us by the Americans, who have found that the use of purse-seines has almost depleted the fishery on the New England coast, and they legislating to abolish it is well worthy of being followed in the interest of our Canadian fishermen. With regard to the penalty clause referred to by the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I may say that I think it is a saving and preventive clause, and should remain as it is. If I am correct in judging, it places a penalty of $50 minimum and a maximum penalty of $500, with the confiscation of the vessel and equipments, subject to such abatement in extreme cases as the Minister in his discretion may consider just and prudent. It is rather difficult to define the limit of the three miles, but I feel satisfied that the object of this Bill is not simply to secure the forfeiture of the vessel that is illegally fishing within the three-mile limit, but it is more particularly to abolish the use of the deadly weapon for the capture of the fish, the purse-seine, entirely. That is the main object of this Bill. I am to a certain degree speaking against my own interests in supporting this Bill, as I was interested myself in some of the vessels engaged in the purse-seining, but from the very moment that I found that legislation was being brought about by the United States to abolish this diabolical system of capturing fish I felt satisfied that I would forego my personal interests, and I advised my neighbours who where joined in partnership with me in the vessels to consent to a law of this kind. This penalty clause is, in my opinion, a saving clause, and it ought to be within the discretion of the Minister of Marine and his colleagues in Council to exercise such discretion as they deem prudent in regard to it. It would perhaps lead to a very great deal of dissatisfaction if it were left to a court, for they might discriminate in such a way as to lead to a good deal of litigation, whereas this provision in the Bill settles the matter in such a manner that I think it will be satisfactory to the public. I do not know that I should comment on this question further than to say that I believe the Bill will meet the approval of the coast fishermen generally, and I feel satisfied it will be concurred in by all others who have studied the interest of the fishery industry. The fishermen themselves will concur with me that it is wise and prudent legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call attention for a few moments to the point raised by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to point out to the House that this legislation was necessary, and he began by saying that the statistics in his department show a large diminution in the catch, which indicated that the mackerel fisheries were being depleted by the system of fishing that had recently prevailed. Now, if we look at the statistics that the hon. gentleman presented, it is pretty clear that they do not establish the proposition which he announced, and which he quoted to support. I could not help observing that when the hon. Minister came to the statistics for the years 1889 and 1890 he failed to read the statistics of the catch in Canada alone, but he read it in conjunction with the catch in the United States.

Mr. TUPPER. I gave both.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman gave both, when he could not help himself. After the hon. gentleman sat down I asked him what the catch was in Canada alone for these years, and he then gave it. I must again express my regret that the hon. Minister, occupying the position he does in this House, in undertaking to give information to the House on a question of this sort, should have recourse to such a proceeding. It seems to me most improper, because if the hon. Minister had felt that the statistics for these years would have supported his proposition he would have given them; but because they indicated an increase in the catch they were withheld, and quoted in conjunction with the catch of the United States. It has been stated by the Minister, and by my friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that the purse-seines had so injured the fisheries, I suppose by catching more than ought to be caught in one year——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—by destroying this particular fish; but how does that diminish the catch of the mackerel? Of course, my knowledge of the matter is altogether theoretical; but, so far as I know, the migratory fish are sometimes found away from certain waters for years, and afterwards reappear in great numbers; so that it is due to the habits of the fish rather than to the mode of catching them that the diminution in quantity in one year as compared with another is due. But I am not going to question the propriety of this measure. I think it would have been more satisfactory if a committee had been asked for, information collected and a report made to Parliament before legislation was sought. Then Parliament would have been proceeding intelligently. But at present we have only the information before us which the Minister has seen proper to give. Now, it is not to the principle of the measure that my hon. friend from Queen's objected; but he objected to the mode in which it was sought to enforce the law where there was a violation of it. I think, Sir, that objection was well taken; and it will be a matter of surprise

to me if hon. gentlemen opposite agree that it is a proper thing to place the whole of an important class of the population of this country under the control of a Minister of the Crown, and make them dependent upon him for the freedom in the exercise of their calling and the security of their property which they possess.

Mr. TUPPER. They are now in that position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is a condition of things that this House cannot an hour too soon remove. It is a condition of things that ought to be regarded as intolerable to any class of free men; and those who here claim specially to represent the fishermen ought to be the first to enter their protest against legislation of this sort. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do by this Bill? He provides:

"The use of purse-seines for the catching of fish in any of the waters of Canada is prohibited, under a penalty for each offence of not less than $50, and not exceeding $500, together with the confiscation of the vessel, boat and apparatus used in connection with such catching."

So that, in every case of conviction where there is a penalty attached, whether the amount be large or small, there must necessarily be confiscation of the vessel, and that must necessarily force the owner of the vessel to come before the Minister and beg, as a suppliant, for the repossession of his property. Every man who engages in fishing, and who is brought before a magistrate or a fishery officer, and convicted under this law, even if the official regards the offence as a minor one and imposes a fine of only $50, must submit to have his ship confiscated, along with the payment of that sum. He ceases to have property in the ship; all property in it is transferred to the party complaining and to the Government; and the person who makes the complaint, if he be an opponent of the Minister, may find that he is relieved of the moiety to which he is entitled, while if he is a friend of the Minister and the owner of the ship belongs to the opposite political party the ship may be confiscated, no matter whether the penalty attached be large or small. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that he cannot trust the judges. That is a very extraordinary statement on the part of a Minister of the Crown. But he asks the whole community to say that he may be trusted, that he will exercise an unbiassed judgment. Though the judge may be mistrusted, the Minister must be trusted; though there may be suspicions against the integrity of the judge, there cannot be suspicions against the fairness of the Minister; and every man who holds property in a ship knows that he holds that property by the sufferance of a Minister of the Crown, and that it may be transferred to some one else. We do not care whether we know much or little with regard to the fisheries. I wish to see an administration of the law by the judiciary of the country. I wish to see the penalties against the violation of the law enforced by the ordinary tribunals of the country; and I know no reasons whatever why the administration of the law with regard to property in ships engaged in fishing should be transferred from the jurisdiction of the courts to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or why he should be made the supreme appellate judge with regard to all matters of this sort. I quite admit that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as a maritime man, may be conversant with the interests of the fishermen more than one residing in the interior of the country; but this I do know, that in every portion of this country, if there is one thing more than another that the people appreciate, it is the security of their rights under the law of the land and the administration of that law by a class of men separated from political parties and amenable to the public opinion of the country, although independent of the Ministers of the Crown or of those who may be opposed to them. It is in the judiciary of this country that the people have confidence for the protection of their liberty, their rights and their property; and the hon. Minister proposes by this measure seriously to invade those rights by transferring from the judiciary of this country to himself the protection or preservation of that property. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) spoke in favour of a measure of this sort, but he did not meet the argument of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The hon. member for Queen's pointed out that you are by this measure transferring from the judges to the Minister the administration of the law. You are putting every person in this country who has property in a fishing vessel at the mercy of the Minister; you are simply making those persons his clients. You say you have 35,000 fishermen in the Province of Nova Scotia. I do not know how many people you have in that province who are the owners of property in ships; but I am not prepared to entrust those people with the franchise, with the rights of free men, and at the same time make them the bondmen of a Minister of the Crown. That is what you are proposing to do. That is what this Parliament ought not to do. It ought never to give its sanction or countenance to a measure of this sort. It is a monstrous thing for a Minister to come to this House and ask us to place all the property of the fishermen and the proprietors of fishing vessels in Nova Scotia, at the mercy of a Minister of the Crown. My hon. friend has said that you cannot interfere with men fishing with purse-seines beyond the three-mile limit. You have no jurisdiction over them, and you do not attempt to interfere with them. The decision of the court in England, in the case of Long *vs.* Rutledge, held that when you went beyond the three-mile limit your rights had to be determined by the Imperial Parliament and the law of the Empire, and not by the law of a particular colony; and it would be useless, if you had the power, to legislate with regard to the waters beyond the three-mile limit when you could not control the fishermen of other countries fishing beyond that limit. But within that limit you have the power. The fisherman may be very near the border line. The court may decide that he has come too near—that he ought not to have come so near. It may assume from the evidence that he has been just within the three-mile limit. The preponderance of evidence may favour the contention that he was, and the penalty may be made very little, only $50. But the confiscation of the vessel must be had all the same, and there will be an appeal to the Minister as a matter of course; and I will venture to say that there will be no penalty imposed under that law in which the party will not go to the Minister, if not to get rid of the penalty, he will to get rid, at any rate, of the act of confiscation. The hon. Minister will necessarily agree to that, for if the party has to pay $500 that will be regarded as adequate, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, without the

confiscation of the ship; so that I have no hesitation in saying that provision is designedly put in, to compel every owner of property in ships to become a suppliant to the Minister in order that he may get back the property taken from him.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman states what is not true, and he is also out of order in saying there is any design of that kind on my part.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not out of order, nor am I stating what is untrue. I am stating what is in the Bill. I am stating that the Bill provides for confiscation of the ship in every case.

Mr. TUPPER. You stated there was design.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say there can be, in my view, no two opinions upon that point. What can be the object of the Minister in attaching confiscation, where the penalty is $50, if it is not to force the proprietor to come to him as a suppliant in order to obtain the restoration of his property, which has been, if you will, improperly and unjustly taken from him. And is this House, representing free men, and I apprehend the fishermen of the country are free men, going to make these people the slaves of a Minister of the Crown? Why, Sir, the Emperor of Rome, in the palmiest days of its arbitrary power, would not venture to assert against the meanest citizen of the Empire the right which the hon. gentleman has undertaken to assert against the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I say that such a proposition is monstrous, and this House would be wanting in its duty to itself and in respect to the free men of this country if it would tolerate legislation of this kind.

Mr. TUPPER. The only excuse for this extraordinary excitement the hon. gentleman has worked himself into over this Bill is found, I think, in the confession he made to the Committee that he literally did not know anything about purse-seines, or apparently about the fisheries. Whether he made that confession or not, it is quite certain he does not understand the temper of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, if he thinks that sort of argument, which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) would not deign to use, no matter how much he might be impressed with the evil of passing the Bill, knowing, as that hon. gentleman does, the intelligence of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, will go down with them. I can only say to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that, if he thinks it will, the sooner he goes down to the Maritime Provinces and becomes acquainted with the people there the better it will be for him, and the fewer appeals of that kind he will make in this House. This idea of his of our taking the fishermen under control and making them serfs of the Minister of Marine is entirely new and unfounded, and only took rise in the excited imagination of the hon. gentleman, an imagination unduly excited through his having made several misstatements and extraordinary propositions in the argument he addressed to the Committee; and having worked himself into a passion, he endeavoured to find vent for it by charging me with perpetrating a gross outrage on the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So you are.

Mr. TUPPER. Let me tell the hon. gentleman who were those who brought to the attention of Parliament the dereliction, if I may so call it, on my part in not having done before what I am now attempting to do. Representatives of Prince Edward Island in past Parliaments called my attention to this, and petitions were received from the fishermen asking for this legislation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This legislation?

Mr. TUPPER. To prohibit the use of purse-seines.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is another matter.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was so weak in argument that he had to resort to that old argument of his, that old trick of endeavouring to rally his forces by appeals to their passions and prejudices, and by making statements that I must characterize as absolutely absurd, as applied to the fishermen. This is an extraordinary power, he says, which I am attempting to exercise over the fishermen. They are to become my slaves, forsooth. The pardoning power, the power of remission, is attempted to be introduced. I would point out to him that that power has been in the Act from year to year, that it was put there to protect these very men from the mistaken acts of fishery officers clothed with magisterial powers, that it was put there in the interests of men who might be fined improperly. Then the hon. gentleman says the sooner this power is taken away the better. Out with it, he cries, and proceeds in a most excited tone to discuss a Bill that is not considered so very dangerous by gentlemen more familiar with the subject, and who have undertaken to give their views in a calm and fair manner to the House. It is wonderful that this great constitutional authority should have felt compelled to have recourse to temper and passion in discussing a great constitutional principle, a great question of law, a great question of power, the jurisdiction of Parliament and the executive. Has he forgotten the very A B C of the legislation of this country? What has he to say about the powers of the Minister of Customs? Did he thunder in this House in reference to the confiscation of vessels, if caught in the act, and the punishment of owners for violating the Customs laws?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What did the courts say?

Mr. TUPPER. What did the hon. gentleman say by his vote and sanction, when he allowed this dreadful, this outrageous legislation, to be put upon the Statute-book without saying a word, or pointing out to the merchants of this country that they were to become the slaves and serfs of the Minister of Customs? What about the criminal laws? Has the hon. gentleman in his excitement forgotten that there is a pardoning power also, not in the judges, but given us over these judges, whom I have insulted because I said they were not acquainted with the subject of purse-seines? And I can repeat that I do not believe there is any judge in any of the provinces who would at present say he knows the first thing about them or has ever looked into the subject, as to the injury they may do our fisheries, except perhaps one or two. Yet the hon. gentleman insinuates that a Minister of the Crown has insulted the judiciary because he stated that in considering the question the judge would naturally take into consideration the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, that he would be influenced by the fact that we were not certain as to

whether the purse-seines did any damage, and that, under all the circumstances, he would decide that the punishment should therefore be nominal, the measure being considered by us as merely tentative. If the hon. gentleman is going to attack the principle involved in the Bill he should have the courage of his convictions. He should reform all the laws; he should take away from the Crown the power of pardon and invest it in the judges. Do we not stand in peril of our lives at present, according to this excited legal luminary, since we cannot appeal to the judge, in case of trouble, and ask for remission of the penalties imposed by the Legislature of this country? But the hon. gentleman was most unfair—I do not think it is unusual for him to be so—in reference to the statistics. He was not at all satisfied, and he thought he could hang his hat on a little peg. He was stretching out in a most disgraceful way for arguments, and after confessing that he knew nothing about the facts, he showed that he knew nothing about the law involved; and failing in both, he brought a charge of want of candor against myself—that, in giving statistics to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) I had carefully refrained from giving all the statistics. I did not pretend to do that. The hon. member for Queen's claimed, as I understood, that there had been no decline in the mackerel fisheries in the last ten years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You suppressed two years.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman again indecently and offensively repeats that I suppressed two years. The *Hansard* will show that. The hon. gentleman contradicts me now, being careless of the facts and of the feelings of any one who is contradicted; but that goes for very little with me from that hon. gentleman, except that I think it necessary to call attention to the unfair spirit which induced the hon. gentleman to resort to such a contention. There was no occasion to import temper into this discussion. The hon. gentleman said there was no reason for the fishermen to oppose this Bill, and, therefore, in the littleness of his mind,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TUPPER—with his Lilliputian spirit, the hon. gentleman was not willing that I should have the credit of introducing a Bill which would be so acceptable to the fishermen, so he said that, while the principle of the Bill was right, I was endeavouring to enslave the fishermen and to obtain a control over them which should not be allowed. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few more statistics. He seems to be hungering for statistics. I shall give him fuller statistics than I did, and, if I had known that he was so willing to receive more information, I would have given them to him before, instead of repressing them, as the hon. gentleman says. In the years 1888, 1889 and 1890 the catch of mackerel made by United States fishing vessels in the waters of the Nova Scotia coast and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is as follows:—1888, 83 vessels, 10,418 barrels, averaging 126 barrels per vessel; 1889, 62 vessels, 6,755 barrels, averaging 109 barrels per vessel; 1890, 64 vessels, 8,443 barrels, averaging 132 barrels per vessel. Then the Canadian catch, to which I have already alluded, in 1885 amounted to 148,450 barrels, against 90,000 barrels in 1890; and the United States catch in 1885 amounted to 330,000 barrels, against 16,140 in 1890. Yet the miserable carping criticism is raised that I did not give two years in the statement that I made, and that, therefore, I abused my position here. We will see who was trifling with the intelligence of this House or making an exhibition of the grossest ignorance when I show that the comparison is 148,000 barrels in 1885 against 65,000 barrels in 1888, and 90,000 barrels in 1890, while the American catch was 330,000 barrels in 1885 against 16,000 barrels in 1890, figures which I have already given. The hon. gentleman desired that I should compare the 16,000 barrels of 1890 with the 17,000 barrels of 1889. The facts show that in 1890 there was a slight increase in the total catch over 1889, but that is not satisfactory to anybody who examines the mackerel fishery, because, while the total catch was 106,000 in 1890 as against 83,000 in 1889, we find that in 1885 the total catch amounted to 470,000 barrels. I hope the hon. gentleman now appreciates the statistics that I have given. Hon. gentlemen understanding the mackerel fishery will find that in 1890 there were about 20,000 barrels more than in 1889, but there were several hundred more barrels caught in 1885. The gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces who are interested in the mackerel fisheries will not pretend that that fishery has not declined in the last few years, and that the work of those hardy toilers in the sea has not been performed with the worst possible luck in the last few years. I have spoken of the complaints which the hon. gentlemen have made, and have used these statistics for that purpose.

Mr. FLINT. Has the Minister received any information as to the mackerel fishing this year?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; and the mackerel fishery is improving. The reports which are before the House add to the strength of my contention in regard to purse-seines, and that is, that the purse-seines having broken up the schools of mackerel, as described by the experts, the purse-seines were laid aside. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I am alluding to official documents, and he ought to know that the purse-seines have not been used in the last year or two to the same extent by the fishing vessels—certainly not by the American vessels—as they were before. Lieutenant Gordon in his report of this year ascribes the temporary falling off and the temporary improvement in the mackerel fishery to the rest which the mackerel have received from the purse-seines not having been so much used. The fishery this year is better all round, I am glad to say. Coming back to the question, I am glad to find that gentlemen who have opposed the penalties in this Bill are those who say they do not believe in the principle of the Bill. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) waives his objection at the desire of the fishermen, but the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) says he does not believe in the principle of the Bill. Both those gentlemen quarrel with the penalties and say that they are too severe. Consequently, those who believe in the principle of the Bill cannot be very far astray when it is opposed by those who think we are going too far in advance. I submit that in view of the Customs law, the criminal law, the present Fisheries Act containing provisions for omission, the same as these other laws, we are not going a step in advance of the spirit of our Legis-

lature, so far as that power of omission is concerned. In reference to the penalty, we are not going beyond the spirit and the exact words of that Act relating to fishing by foreign vessels, or to the language which I quoted as the same construction in the main body of the Fisheries Act: All materials, implements or appliances used, instead of the vessel, boat and apparatus used.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I do not think it is necessary to add any further evidence to prove that these seines are destructive of mackerel fishing. The full reports made by the fishery officers, the universal opinion of the fishermen themselves, and the opinions of the representatives of the fishing counties which have been given in this House, ought to be sufficient to settle that fact. However, I will read an extract from a letter which I hold in my hand, written by a very intelligent fisherman who has been catching mackerel all his life, and who is part owner of purse-seines, and who comes from a portion of the Province of Nova Scotia where, perhaps, more mackerel are caught than anywhere else. He says:

"It is my candid opinion that purse-seining should be stopped, that it has done much to break up and destroy the mackerel fishery, and the great majority of fishermen are of opinion that it is only by an Act of Parliament that it can be stopped."

Such testimony, I think, is valuable. I would like, however, to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to this fact. I take it, from the remarks that have fallen from him, that this Act is only to be applied to the larger purse-seines which are used by schooners, and which cost a very large amount of money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not the law.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I do not think you apprehended what I said. I said I gathered from the remarks of the Minister that he intended that the Act should only apply to these larger seines. At all events, there is a description of seines used in the harbours much smaller than that, some of which cost about $500, and others costing as low as $125 or $200, but they are equally purse-seines; they are used in the bays and harbours to catch mackerel, and if it is not intended that the Act should apply to these smaller seines I think it should be made more explicit.

An hon. MEMBER. They are known as purse-seines?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). They are invariably called purse-seines, and this gentleman who writes me, and who is familiar with the whole business, speaks of them as purse-seines.

Mr. BOWERS. I have no fault to find with the Minister of Marine in trying to make the Fishery Act as good as he can, or trying to do the best he can for the fishing interest of the country; but I think myself he is a little too sharp in making this penalty include the confiscation of the vessel and the apparatus in connection with it. Take, for instance, one of our small vessels. They only cost $1,000, to $1,200, or $1,500, and it takes a man six or eight years to earn enough to purchase one of these vessels and pay off the incumbrance. Now, confiscating these vessels because sometimes they unthinkingly or unwittingly go inside the three-mile limit I think is rather hard on the owner, and it is not doing just the fair thing. I would like to agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—I think he is a pretty good man in his place, I think he is trying to do what is about right; still, I think he ought to be a little less severe. It would help him, and it would help the fishermen, too, if he would just drop out that last clause, and make the penalty $50 to $500, or $1,000, if he wishes. He told me the other day that he thought these purse-seines we had would not come under the denomination of purse-seines. I think they would. Last year there were probably $12,000 to $20,000 worth of purse-seines bought in Digby County. They are seines running from 10 to 12 fathoms, and sometimes 15 fathoms in depth, and 150 or 200 fathoms in length. I told him I did not see how he would get clear of calling them purse-seines. Last year, for the first time for about twenty years, the mackerel has appeared around our shores, and the people have bought from $12,000 to $15,000 worth of purse-seines, and that they should now be confiscated if caught rising them I think is a little hard. Last year they only caught enough mackerel to pay half or two-thirds the value of those seines. They still have them on hand, and this year I do not think there is going to be much purse-seining done. I would also call the attention of the Minister to this fact, that our principal bay in Digby County, is St. Mary's Bay, which is nine or ten miles wide at the mouth and is about a mile wide at the upper end. This three-mile limit would probably go up this bay some fifteen or twenty miles, as it is wedge-shaped. Now, it would be pretty difficult for the fishermen to keep within the three-mile limit or in the centre of this wedge. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that the people who fish within the three-mile limit live on the shore. The men down our way live on the shore and they own these purse-seines. Now, I am not saying that purse-seining is right; still I think there is a little misapprehension in regard to them. Down our way, where purse-seining has been resorted to and mackerel have been caught, the fish have all been saved. I believe that our Government could easily make an arrangement with the American Government to have an international law that would prohibit all outside purse-seining. It seems to me a little hard that the Americans should fish outside the three-mile limit and drive these mackerel inside, and that our men are then forbidden to take them. But although I am going to waive all objections to this Bill, still I am going to ask the hon. gentleman just to try and see if he cannot take off that forfeiture of the vessel and apparatus, because it is a hard law. Let him make the penalty all the way from $50 to $1,000, if he wants to. But I would ask him, in the name of the fishermen in Digby County, to try and drop off that forfeiture clause. It may never once be needed, there may never be a vessel forfeited; still, I think the clause ought not to be there. I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman quoting Lieutenant Gordon as a gentleman who understands these things so well, but a few days ago hon. gentlemen opposite did not think Lieutenant Gordon's word was worth anything in respect to the navigation of Hudson's Bay, when they were talking about ice in that bay,——

Mr. TUPPER. He was not talking about fish then.

Mr. BOWERS—now he knows all about fishing, the hon. Minister affirms, and I think his word in regard to Hudson's Bay was worth just as much as it is in regard to this fishing.

Mr. FAUVEL. We have heard several hon. members from Nova Scotia speak on this question, and as I represent one of the maritime counties of Quebec I beg also to say a few words upon the subject. I am aware that for the last two years the Quebec Board of Trade has made representation to the Department of Fisheries asking the department to put a stop to the destructive practice of fishing with purse-seines. I may add that as soon as the Department of Fisheries received these facts from the Quebec Board of Trade the department did not believe them, and they asked for further evidence. I may remark that the Quebec Board of Trade has, on several occasions, written to me in my county asking for facts concerning this style of fishing. I know that on the coast of Labrador the population is in a starving condition, from the fact that, having been accustomed to subsist on these fisheries, that these fisheries have so dwindled away by reason of this engine of destruction, the purse-seine, that the people are no longer able to procure a subsistence. I may add that formerly on the Labrador coast my firm had two large fishing establishments, and since these purse-seines came into use my fishermen refuse to go fishing on those coasts, stating that the time for fishing with hook and line had passed, and the purse-seines were reaping the benefit which they had formerly lived upon. I may say also that these engines are of a very deadly nature. They take fish small and large, and of all sorts, and the fishermen take out of the seines only what is required for the market, leaving the small species to poison the waters. I have been living for twenty-five years on the Baie des Chaleurs. Ten years ago we had any amount of mackerel in our bays; but for the last two years I have not seen one mackerel taken in our waters. I am pleased that the Minister of Marine has brought this Bill before the House, and I am sure that he will receive the support of the Quebec Board of Trade, which has at all times been alarmed at the depletion of these fisheries. I may say, with regard to the clause in this Bill concerning the penalty, I agree with the Government that some drastic measures must be resorted to, and I think that when this legislation comes into effect offenders against the law should not only be fined, but their nets and purse-seines should also be confiscated. Why? We have seen smuggling done in the lower St. Lawrence lately; and have not these vessels been taken and confiscated by the Government? What difference is there between smuggling contraband goods and smuggling with regard to the fisheries. I hold that these offences are identical. The fisheries in the Gulf are dwindling away; they must be protected, and the fishermen must also be protected. In doing so the Government will be conferring a benefit on the fishermen and also on the outfitters, because the fisheries will be continued as before. The fishermen will prosecute the mackerel fisheries, as did their ancestors, by hook and line. Let one and all have a chance to catch the fish. Let the poor man have the advantage to take fish at his door, and do not leave it solely to the capitalist, with a large engine of destruction. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. FLINT. I cannot help thinking that the Minister of Marine, who has charge of this Bill, showed a warmth rather disproportionate to the character of the discussion in replying to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), whose observations were certainly, although strong, and, perhaps, too strong, altogether of an abstract character. When referring to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries he did not refer particularly to the hon. gentleman who is at present occupying that office, but he referred to the office itself, and the power given by this House to the Minister for all time to come. It is to be regretted that the Government is not legislating on this matter under circumstances which would enable all members of the House who are interested in this question to discuss it more intelligently than they are able to do. To a certain degree this legislation is being introduced and carried through under what we might call a sort of panic. Although hon. members have criticised various provisions of this measure pretty severely they have all, apparently, decided to waive their views, whatever their views may be, as to the effect of purse-seines generally; yet the Government have not given this House or the country all the evidence that should be given before such drastic and important legislation should be entered into. Although I am willing to admit that, as regards the evidence presented by the Minister, the weight of evidence is against the use of purse-seines, as regards the effect on our inshore fisheries generally, yet it must not be taken for granted that all intelligent men interested in the subject agree with the evidence adduced by the Minister. There is no doubt that a large quantity of evidence can be adduced from parties interested in the fisheries antagonistic to the use of purse-seines in the fisheries, yet, at the same time, there is a large and intelligent minority who take a diametrically opposite view. It is only fair to make that statement to the House. I have been carried away to a large extent by the statements made on the subject, and no doubt the observations of an hon. gentleman with the experience and weight of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat are entitled to enormous weight. At the same time, there are other gentlemen with whom I have conversed who state in the most positive terms that in their opinion the damaging effect of purse-seines has been very much exaggerated, and there is reason to believe that the depletion of the inshore fisheries, which we all regret—the mackerel fishery particularly—has not been the result of the use of purse-seines to any very great extent. I agree, to a large extent, with the view taken by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), that we are not yet acquainted with the habits of migratory fish, and we are not prepared to say that the decline of the inshore fisheries, particularly mackerel, has been altogether due to the use of purse-seines during the last few years. It would have been much better had the Government, during the last four or five years this subject has been under discussion, and during which they have been receiving the full and able reports of their officers, asked this House to appoint a commission or committee to gather evidence on both sides, and see if we are not proposing to legislate to a large extent in the dark. However, I will not dwell further on this point, as it has been tacitly agreed, I think, that we shall

waive that part of the question in the discussion, and that the complaint of a large number of fishermen in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that the inshore fisheries have been depleted by the use of purse-seines, shall be admitted for the sake of argument. Let me, therefore, come to the provisions under which the Minister undertakes to minimize the so-called evil effects of the use of purse-seines. The point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is one that certainly should be regarded with much interest by hon. members. We are gradually becoming accustomed to the idea of placing a vast amount of power in regard to rescinding fines and penalties in the hands of Ministers of the Crown. If any argument can be made out in favour of the adopting of this principle it is in the case of the Customs Department. Yet, we are aware that there is a widespread feeling among thinking men that even this power has been carried too far, and the time has come when the question should be placed in review and new legislation enacted, and when persons who believe themselves to be aggrieved by the arbitrary rulings of the Customs officials, and even by the Minister of Customs himself, can have those rulings revised by some able and independent court. But leaving the Customs Department, where an argument can be made in favour of this principle if it can be made in favour of any of the departments, I believe that the principle laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should be accorded a very generous hearing in this House. Have we not gone too far in placing arbitrary power in the hands of officials, in making fines and forfeitures dependent on evidence which to them may appear to be sufficient, the only appeal from their decision being to the Minister, who is liable to be biassed in many ways? I know that many persons having complaints to present to Ministers are very timid of doing so and of expressing their political views while their petitions are pending. It should not be the case that parties having cases pending should be timid about expressing their views and even about going to the polls to vote. Such cases have, however, occurred in the country, and possibly the positions of the parties may be fanciful, but at the same time it places them in an embarrassing position. Now, although that is not a new principle in regard to the forfeitures placed in this Bill, yet in consequence of the large amounts that must be at stake by reason of the expense and cost of these purse-seines, I think the Minister ought to be prepared in Committee to make such amendments in this Act as would be more in accordance with the circumstances of the case. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated that this proposition is monstrous, and I agree that he is right in a large degree; but in addition to it being monstrous it is also illogical. Where the penalty is invariably the confiscation of the vessel, the boat and apparatus used in connection with the prohibited fishing, why add a paltry penalty or any other sum whatever? We have a penalty of from $50 to $500 in addition to the forfeiture of the vessel and her tackle and apparatus. I think that the forfeiture of the ship itself would be quite sufficient, without adding any penalty of from $50 to $500; or, if there is to be a forfeiture, I think the forfeiture of the seine itself ought to be ample in all cases, and not the forfeiture of the vessel. A purse-seine costs from $3,000 to $5,000, some of them more than that, and I should think that the forfeiture of the illegal article ought to be ample, and the Minister, under the law as it would stand if this provision were made, would have an opportunity to make certain remissions. I quite agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that the penalty is altogether too severe. Here we have fishermen engaged in a perfectly legitimate business as long as they are outside the three-mile limit, a business which this Legislature cannot prohibit under the present constitution of the country without Imperial legislation: and yet, in consequence of an accident, or even in consequence of carelessness which might be almost accounted wilful, if they come within that line they find themselves confronted with absolute ruin. There are provisions in the constitution of the United States, and I believe it is one of the principles of our constitution—at any rate, it is an understood principle—that too severe punishments are to a certain degree unconstitutional. Is this not an excessive punishment for any possible offence that can be committed under this Act? Is it not too severe a punishment that the whole property engaged, the vessel, the boats and the apparatus seized in this fishing, should be forfeited to the Crown? It is claimed that under this Act there is power left in the hands of the Minister to remit these penalties. It is upon this ground that I agree entirely with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I think the time is arriving when a determined stand must be taken against the further introduction of this principle of leaving discretionary power in the hands of a Minister. All these matters should be left entirely to competent courts to decide, leaving, of course, some power in the Crown to pardon, in cases where the offence may be of a *quasi* criminal nature. I think that the whole of our legislation on the fisheries ought be reviewed, and all of these cases, except very petty cases, should be taken before the courts, should be tried in the courts, and should be dealt with by judges of competent jurisdiction, who are removed from political bias and public clamour. I would not go as far as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in stating that the present Minister had a deliberate design of adding to his own power; but, at the same time, the tendency of this sort of legislation is to concentrate undue power in political officers, and that power, I think, should be limited rather than increased. I hope, as a result of the deliberation before this Committee, that some amendment will be made to this clause whereby the penalties may not be so extreme against offenders. I would suggest, as an alternative, that the purse-seine itself should be liable to forfeiture and not the vessel, or, if that is not accepted by the Committee, I would support the proposition of the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that the money penalty be increased from $50 to $1,000 or to $1,500, and that the forfeiture of the vessel be not included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I feel so strongly upon this point that I cannot allow the clause to pass without a few more remarks. The hon. Minister knows that in all the Bills he has introduced from his department into this House I have attempted to bring to bear upon them fair, just and legitimate criticism, and I have never offered any obstacle to legislation having for its object the benefiting of

our fisheries. I think the hon. Minister, and I shall say it frankly, was extremely unfortunate in the criticism he passed to-night on my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). There is no gentleman upon this side of the House, or in this Parliament, who brings to a discussion on constitutional questions a more ripe and varied knowledge than does my hon. friend (Mr. Mills).

Mr. TUPPER. Do you think he was fair in his criticism of me to-night?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it very rarely happens in this House that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in giving expression to his mature judgment, has ever offended any of the experienced members on the other side, strongly and effectively as he generally puts his arguments. I venture to say that my hon. friend the Minister, to-night, was not justified when he indulged in very violent and uncalled-for language in reference to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). My hon. friend to my left (Mr. Mills) presented his point effectively and with force, as he always does, and his points should be answered by argument and not by personal abuse. I venture to say that when the hon. Minister reads the *Hansard* he himself will regret that, as a young member of this House, he used the uncalled for assertions he did towards the experienced gentleman who spoke on a constitutional point of the very highest importance, and who spoke with a matured knowledge of the subject, as he generally does. I think I am voicing the opinion of the whole House when I say that there is hardly a gentleman in this House, called upon to address it as often as he does, who addresses the House as forcibly and at the same time avoids the use of improper language, as does my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He very rarely gets into personal wrangles: his remarks are generally good humoured, and I regret on this occasion that they were not received in the spirit that I think an hon. gentleman of the age and experience in Parliament of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a right to receive them. A young Minister in this House should accept argument and criticism with courtesy, especially when they come from a gentleman holding the position that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) does, and the hon. Minister was not justified in retorting in the bitter, sharp and uncalled-for manner that he did.

Mr. TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman leaves the personal question, would he give us a little evidence on the fairness to me, or his opinion on the conduct of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), since he thought it necessary to give his opinion on my conduct. As the hon. gentleman is dealing particularly with this subject, I call his attention to that portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), where he charged me, and said that it was a terrible thing for a Minister of the Crown to mislead the House by not being candid with it in quoting statistics.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. He now says "hear, hear." What does the hon. gentleman think about a charge of that kind?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has asked me to give my opinion. I was willing to part from the personal matter, but as the hon. gentleman has asked me to give my opinion I will give it to him. The hon. Minister challenged the assertion made by myself with regard to the mackerel fishery. I referred to the mackerel fishery of last year, and, rightly or wrongly, I said that the catch was better than the year before. The Minister controverted that position, and he rose in his place, and in order to show that the mackerel fishing was improving year after year he commenced reading the statistics for 1885, and read to 1887, but he did not read them for 1889 or 1890.

Mr. TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us whether he asked the statistics for the year before or for the decade?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was referring to the decade.

Mr. TUPPER. And I gave it from 1885.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, the hon. gentleman gave the quotations for 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888, but he did not give them for 1889 and 1890, because when they were read it showed it was against his argument, and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) contended that that was disingenuous, I beg leave to say that I shared in that opinion.

Mr. TUPPER. I gave my opinion on the man that made that statement, and I will give it again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the personal point: we will pass from it, because it is not worth while wasting time upon that. I want to come to the main point. The hon. gentleman justifies the imposition of this extreme penalty because extreme penalties exist in the Customs Act. Well, we have chosen to adopt an anomalous fiscal system, and as a necessary auxiliary of that system you adopt extreme and drastic measures to enable you to carry it out. You vest supreme and irresponsible power in the Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman who exercises that power may or may not exercise it arbitrarily or improperly. What my hon. friend questioned was the principle of vesting that power in a Minister, and I say that his position cannot be attacked. There is no politics in this matter. The hon. gentleman finds on this side of the House one or two hon. members supporting his Bill, and he finds on his own side hon. members who cannot support it. What does the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) say, in whose county there is one of the largest fishing establishments in Nova Scotia? He cannot support the Bill. He says: He will only support it on condition that it does not apply to the kind of purse-seines used in his county. The hon. gentleman dare not support the Bill. I tell the hon. Minister that if he applies the Bill to the kind of small purse-seines that are used along the coast of Nova Scotia he will find an explosion on the part of the fishermen such as would be raised if he attempted to interfere with hook and line fishing. All this goes to show that if you carry the Bill you must carry it with such moderate penalties attached as it will be practicable to enforce. I venture to say that never in the history of our legislation has power so extraordinary been vested in single officers as you propose to vest in them by this Bill. Who is to exercise this power? A judge of the Supreme Court or of the Admiralty Court? No; but a single fishery officer, or a justice of the peace, or a stipendiary magistrate, has the power, on the

oath of one credible witness, not only to fix a penalty of from $50 to $500, but to confiscate the vessel and all its tackle and appurtenances; and there is no appeal from his decision to the courts of the land. The only appeal that lies is an appeal, not to the legal judgment of the Minister, but to just such judgment as the Minister may give.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the appeal. The prosecution is not under the Fisheries Act, but under the Act relating to summary convictions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Act says:

"Persons aggrieved by any such conviction may appeal by petition to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who may remit penalties and restore forfeitures under this Act."

It has been held that in the face of that provision you cannot appeal to the ordinary courts in the land.

Mr. TUPPER. If you come to the Minister of Marine and exhaust that appeal you cannot go back and appeal to the courts, but that does not prevent you appealing to them in the first place.

Mr. FRASER. The very opposite has been held in Nova Scotia, that the appeal to the Minister does not prevent an appeal to the highest court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That may be the case in Nova Scotia, but that is not the case in Prince Edward Island. Look at the Act:

"Every penalty or forfeiture imposed by this Act, or regulations made under it, may be recovered or enforced on parol complaint, before any fishery officer, stipendiary magistrate or justice of the peace, in a summary manner, on the oath of one credible witness."

Now, I appeal to the Minister himself. He need not get into a passion about this. It is not a party measure, but it is more important than many hon. gentlemen suppose. It places property to the value of $10,000 or $20,000, or it may be $100,000 in a number of fishing vessels, within the judgment of a magistrate or a single justice of the peace on the oath of one credible witness. Can you parallel that legislation in the history of legislation in the Dominion of Canada? I say you cannot. It is unjust and unfair. If you pass this law, you pass it as a tentative measure. You admit yourself that you have not sufficient facts to come to a conclusion for all time. Then, I say, attach to it such reasonable penalties as you have a chance to impose. I lay this down as a general proposition: excessive penalties defeat their own object: the tribunal will not convict if the penalties are excessive. A single justice of the peace, a man not versed in law, not having that training to enable him to form a proper judgment, is not the man to pass judgment in a matter of this kind. I would invite the hon. gentleman to limit his penalty to a pecuniary one, and then provide that the cases may be tried in the Courts of Admiralty, where counsel can appear, and where the parties will get justice, and where an appeal will lie to the higher judicial tribunals constituted by this Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, instead of warning me not to get excited, forgets several things. He says he is a supporter of the principle of the Bill, though not on conviction; but he is to my mind placing the greatest obstacles in the way of carrying out this legislation. If the Bill is to become the flimsy sort of thing—and I use that term without a desire to offend the supersensitive feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are so easily put out—which hon. gentlemen opposite would make it: if it is to be denuded of the deterrent features referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, who do not believe in the principle of the Bill, I would as soon withdraw it altogether. But I wish to point out how far the hon. gentleman has gone to find arguments against this Bill. He says: You are going to have very valuable ship properties, of the value of $10,000 or perhaps $100,000—and he aggregates together a number of vessels to make up the amount—and you are vesting all this jurisdiction in a single fishery officer or a single magistrate. Why did the hon. gentleman forget that during all these years the fishing nets and the fishing boats of all the fishermen along our coasts, which are just as important and valuable, proportionately, to their owners, as the property of the rich man is to him, have been subject to the same jurisdiction? Why do you throw great protection and safeguards around the property of the rich men who are investing their money in these dangerous fishing engines—which are admitted to be deadly, and destructive of hook-and-line fishing along our coasts—and think it right to leave the property of the poor fishermen at the mercy of these officers? You raise no protest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Simply because, by unanimous consent, we have, in all our legislation, determined that trivial matters, amounting to trivial sums, may be safely left to one or two justices of the peace, while enormous amounts may not be left to their adjudication.

Mr. TUPPER. I am perfectly aware of the argument the hon. gentleman would make, but I say it is not a trifle. The interests of the fishermen are just as important as the interests of the capitalists who invest their thousands of dollars in this business. I do not quarrel with the principle that induced Parliament to put authority in the hands of the fishery officers, but I say that the checks on these officers are ample, and, if they are not, then I say that the interests of the poor fishermen are as much involved and at stake as those of the rich men.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What are those checks?

Mr. TUPPER. The reason was not given by the hon. gentleman for magisterial powers in connection with the administration of the Fishery Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was not because the offences were trivial, but because the penalties were trivial.

Mr. TUPPER. The penalties are not trivial. The penalties in the Fishery Act involve, besides a fine, the confiscation of the apparatus used—the instruments and materials, whatever they are, belonging to the fishermen. They are in no sense trivial. They may be his whole property for the season; and you granted these great powers to the officers from the very necessity of the case, and you threw around the citizen such safeguards that there never has been a serious complaint in this Parliament that the rights of the citizens have been unduly interfered with by the overseers. These safeguards are, that the officers act in consultation with the department, and, when they act without it, their acts are subject to review by the department or by the Minister for the time being, who-

ever he may be, upon the presentation of the facts of the case before him, without expense to the citizen. That is quite satisfactory; but, if that channel and that course of procedure is not acceptable to the citizen, then he has his rights before the courts. The decision of the fishery overseer is, in no sense, final, and the citizen may take one of the two courses. He may go direct to the Minister, or may take the appeal given to every other subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Where does the appeal lie from the fishery officer to the Supreme Court?

Mr. TUPPER. Under the provisions of the Summary Jurisdiction Act——

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) From the magistrate, but not from the fishery officer.

Mr. TUPPER.—the officer sits in the same capacity exactly as a justice of the peace and a magistrate. The hon. gentleman will surely not insist on his pretension, and he must for the moment have forgotten that such is the law, but I am certain that, on reflection, he will admit that I am right. The power of the fishery overseer is not final and not complete. For instance, take the powers exercised now: they are exceedingly great, but the House is aware that for years we have clothed these officers with these great powers, and the result has not been such as to evoke any expression of a desire for a repeal or a change of the law in that regard. There is no reason for treating this subject, I submit, in any other way than any other fishery legislation. The law is right or wrong. If the destruction be as great as I believe, and the supporters of this Bill believe, and the fishermen believe it is, you cannot make the penalty too severe, and the rights of the citizen are protected in this case, just as they are in any other case of the violation of the Act, the only difference being that the offenders in this case will be rich men, whereas the offenders in the other cases are, as a rule, poor men.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to occupy the time of the House in answering the very violent speech which the hon. member made a very short time ago. He accused me of being very ignorant, and very ignorant simply because he did not agree with me. In fact, the hon. gentleman would assign every one to the block of the dunce rather than the position of critic, who undertakes to criticize either the hon. gentleman's observations or any measure he presents, so that the hon. gentleman's pretense of extraordinary knowledge on this subject or any other he may discuss may not be disputed. I am not going to question those pretensions on the present occasion, although I am not to be supposed as acquiescing at all in them if I do not choose to take up the attention of the Committee with a discussion of his pretensions at present. The hon. Minister says that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) wants to make this a very flimsy Bill, such a Bill as he would not have submitted to this House or as he would not support; and what reason does he assign for assuming that my hon. friend would make this a very flimsy Bill? Why, the hon. member for Queen's says that the procedure for the enforcement of the law ought to be under the supervision of the courts, and the hon. Minister says the courts are not to be trusted, that the judges are ignorant, and that therefore the whole matter should be under the control of the Minister of Marine. Now, I submit to the consideration of this Committee once more that there is no reason for departing from the ordinary methods of administering justice in this any more than in any other case. Why should the ordinary judicial tribunals of the country be discarded and disregarded when we come to propose a law of this sort? Sir, I remember that one of the provisions of Magna Charta is that the judgment shall be according to the law of the land. It was then complained that the king undertook to enforce the law rather than his judges, that he undertook to administer it, and it was determined that that should be the case no longer. Another provision of Magna Charta is that excessive fines and penalties shall not be permitted. That is a constitutional principle. It is a part of the law of the land, and it has stood for several hundred years. What does the hon. gentleman propose in this Bill? He proposes that, in every case, whether the offence be a serious one or not, the punishment shall be, along with whatever fine may be imposed, the confiscation of the ship and all its outfit. Now, the ship may be worth $10,000 and the offence may be of the most trivial character. The magistrate or the party who sits in the first instance may decide that he will fix a minimum penalty of $50; but if he fixes any penalty at all it must be accompanied with the confiscation of the ship. Every member of this House must see that you are making a law, in the first instance, which, on the face of it, is an unjust, arbitrary measure, a measure that must entail injustice, and which, in every case, will necessitate an appeal from the fishery officer, who gives the decision in the first instance, to the Minister, who has the power of granting redress. My first objection to this is that it undertakes to make those who have property in fishing vessels, and those who are engaged in fishing, the menials of the Minister for the time being. The hon. gentleman says that I spoke warmly upon the subject. I did speak warmly, for I cannot contemplate the measure of the hon. gentleman without a feeling of indignation that any member of this House, whether he be a member of the Government or not, should propose to place a large class of the population of this country in such a position. The hon. gentleman, by fixing a penalty of $50, admits that the offence may be a trifling one, and yet, along with that admission on the part of the Parliament of Canada, he wishes also to impose the penalty of the confiscation of the ship and its tackle, which could not be justified unless it was an offence of the most flagrant character. What would you think if you proposed to attach the penalty of death to an act of simple trespass? Would it not be regarded as a monstrous outrage, as an attempt on the part of the Minister of Justice to bring every offender before him and make him dependent upon him as to the character of the penalty to be inflicted? What are you to say of an offence against this law to which, because it is trifling, you attach a penalty of $50, but along with that there may be the confiscation of the vessel, that may be worth $20,000—and that is what the hon. gentleman asks the House to vote. That is what he calls a vigourous and a drastic measure. No doubt it is a drastic measure. If the Government proposed the confiscation of the real estate of the people of this

country for an offence against the Customs Act, that would be a drastic measure; but my hon. friend who is in charge of the Customs Department would not be so far forgetful of the position of those who sent him, as well as the rest of us here, as to propose any such measure. The hon. gentleman says now: I am Minister of Marine and Fisheries; trust me: what may be done elsewhere does not matter; it will be made right as a matter of grace by me; you cannot trust the courts of the country, because they are ignorant men, who do not know anything about this, but you can trust me. Our judges try cases of a complicated character of which they have no previous knowledge. A judge tries a case of malpractice, and yet he is not supposed to be an anatomist or a surgeon, but he proceeds upon evidence, and I submit that, notwithstanding the pretensions of the hon. gentleman to great ability and superior knowledge, notwithstanding his pretensions to infallibility, the people of this country have more confidence in the courts than they have in the hon. gentleman. They know that the courts have not the same motive for distinguishing between a Conservative and a Reformer, whether he be the complainant or the party complained against, as would have the hon. gentleman or anyone who might succeed him in office. I submit that there is no justification whatever for a departure from the ordinary rules of the administration of justice, so as to take this matter out of the hands of the courts and put it in the hands of the Minister, when in all other matters you leave it in the hands of the courts. Why should you not leave it in the hands of the courts? The Minister of Customs has great powers—some which I think he ought not to have, as I pointed out when the Act was under discussion—but he cannot disregard the law altogether. The parties may go before the courts. The advice and opinions of the hon. gentleman as to the construction of the law may be overruled. You have in the Ayer's case one instance where the Supreme Court differed with the Minister of Customs; but the Minister of Marine now undertakes to guard himself against any such misfortune, for he provides by this measure that he shall be the ultimate court of appeal and that what he says shall be law. This is not done in England or under the common law. There, if a man is a complainant, and therefore entitled to a moiety of the penalty, the Crown may remit the penalty as far as the Crown is concerned, but not so as to take away the right of the complainant. That is not the position of the hon gentleman. A party may complain, and, if the hon. gentleman chooses to remit the penalties, the right of the complainant is gone altogether. The hon. gentleman tells us that this is consistent with our constitutional system, which, as British citizens, we are supposed to have imbibed, and as British freemen we are supposed to have some rights under, and yet he proposes to place the property of the people of Canada under the absolute control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FRASER. I think the discussion has taken a wider range than the Bill warrants. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that our legal rights are taken away by this Bill. That is not so. Our legal rights are not taken away, as the hon. gentleman can see, in the case of the Queen *vs.* Todd, where the Supreme Court in Nova Scotia decided that any person could appeal from the decision of any magistrates to the Supreme Courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there is no right given to the Appeal Court to alter or minimise the judgment.

Mr. FRASER. Neither should there be. The court will hear the whole evidence and decide upon it. This is not like a *certiorari*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the penalty is fixed by the statute.

Mr. FRASER. And so it should be; and if the Supreme Court finds that it has been rightly inflicted, the penalty will stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why does the hon. gentleman give the Minister power to do what he refuses to allow the courts to do?

Mr. FRASER. The appeal to the Minister is only a matter of clemency. Suppose the case went to the Supreme Court, and the court decided that judgment was right and the vessel should be confiscated. The Minister will not enquire into the case as to whether the judgment was right or not, but he will find whether there were some mitigating circumstances which could not be brought before the court. Now, I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we should have as few cases as possible come before the Minister or any Minister—I agree with that principle. The hon. member speaks as if there would be a large number; I would have him understand that a very small number of people would be affected by this law who are engaged in fishing, because, as I said before, the greatest part of the seine fishing is done outside the three-mile limit, and consequently that will not be affected. For myself, while I think I am as radical as most men, I do not see this is a violation of that principle, just because I feel and know that this is not only a nuisance, but the worst kind of a combination, and just because I would oppose any combination upon land, so I oppose this combination by sea, which is against men who cannot protect themselves, and I would strike at it in the strongest possible manner. Now, I do not see that all these troubles will arise, because any man who has a seine will know, when this Act is passed, what penalties are attached to it. This Act is passed in the interests of the fishermen, not in the interest of the man who is rich enough to get a seine and take a big haul; but if, after he knowingly commits an act which the justice of the peace, or the Supreme Court on appeal, considers to be a violation of the law, for one, I have not very much pity for him, and I do not think we are interfering very much with that kind of liberty that is going to build up this country when that man is fined. Now, no man respects the opinions of the hon. member for Bothwell more than I do, and no man learns more from it than I do; but I cannot see that there is any such violation of justice in this principle as he sees, nor do I look forward to all the trouble that he anticipates. I am ready also to admit that the Minister of Marine might, perhaps, sin in the direction of helping a political friend at the expense of a political opponent as much as I would myself, perhaps; I know there is a danger, and while I want the law so applied as to remove that danger, I am willing in the meantime—because this is an act in the interest of the many, and with the full

knowledge that the hon. gentleman is not going to be long in his present position, and that we will soon have a better man there—I am perfectly satisfied to support the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman must not be under the impression that there are two modes of appeal. He has heard that stated already to-night, and the Minister himself thought you could take your appeal to the Supreme Court, but if you do you have not got your appeal to the Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. I said that if he takes the appeal to me, in my opinion he would lose his appeal to the court, but that is not saying that if he appealed to the court he could not appeal to the Minister.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You stated the appeal to the Minister must lie from the magistrate.

Mr. FRASER. The Minister cannot exercise that power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the point for which we have been contending, that a man ought not to be sued before a single magistrate, an ignorant magistrate in the country, and have his vessel confiscated, and have to pay a penalty of $500 on the oath of one witness. I say there is no parallel to such legislation in the history of Canada or anywhere else.

Mr. TUPPER. The clause says "persons aggrieved by any such conviction may appeal by petition to the Minister of Marine who may remit the penalties and restore the forfeitures under this Act." The hon. gentleman will not say that an appeal will not lie after conviction by the highest court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; I do. That is a statutory law which must be construed according to its language, and the law says an appeal lies from such conviction, and the previous conviction to which it refers is not a conviction obtained on appeal, but before a stipendiary magistrate or a justice of the peace. But if the hon. gentleman and I differ on a point of law, it is not a bit of use discussing it. Now, I am not discussing whether the Bill is right or necessary. I start with the assumption that I believe in the Bill, and I think the Bill should be passed. The point we are discussing is, whether you have attached improper penalties to the Bill, and improper machinery and improper officers for the collection of the penalties—that is the whole point. I am willing the Bill should be passed, and I am willing that penalties ranging from $50 up to a $1,000, if the Minister thinks necessary, should be attached; but I say that if you put a penalty up to $1,000 you should take the case before a tribunal competent to decide upon amounts of that magnitude. I say that if in addition to the $1,000 you confiscate a vessel worth $10,000, including the tackle and the appurtenances, it is a monstrous piece of iniquity and injustice to let it be done before a single magistrate on the oath of a single witness. I am afraid that some of my friends are allowing the fact that the body of the fishermen are in favour of some measure being passed, to carry away their good judgment and lead them to consent to legislation which will be a curse to this country if it is ever attempted to be carried out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) And a disgrace to the nation.

On section 2,

Mr. TUPPER. I wish to insert the words "pecuniary penalty" so as to make it read "the moiety of every pecuniary penalty."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to ask the hon. gentleman to let this matter rest on this new proposition. It involves a very important matter. The intention of the hon. gentleman was, I take it, that the penalties prescribed by the old Fishery Act, which are very small in their character, and relate to the catching of trout, salmon and little things like that—his intention is to make it more effective by allowing the informer to receive part of the penalty. Now, we are asked to pass a law the violation of which involves the confiscation of a vessel that may be worth $10,000, and it is proposed to give the informer one-half that. I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to consider this point. We know what has been the effect of vesting such power in Customs officers; there has been a clamour from one end of the land to the other against the exercise of that power. We know that some members of the Customs Department have been enable to fatten and get rich by virtue of that power, and I say this legislation vests in an informer the right, not only to prosecute, but to receive one-half the penalty, one-half the value of that vessel.

Mr. TUPPER. But I told the hon. gentleman that I wished to insert the word "pecuniary" before "penalty."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That minimises my argument very much. At the same time, I would still press upon him whether it is judicious to allow the informer to receive one-half the pecuniary penalty. I think it is very serious, even to that extent, and it is worthy of being argued.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has fought this keenly. There is not a man who has listened to the debate to-night, no matter what he may think of the arguments *pro* and *con*, who is not familiar with every point that has been raised as to that clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What about giving the informer half the penalty?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman alluded to it. I gave an expression of my opinion, and there was a general expression of opinion given before purse-seines were talked of.

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

Mr. TUPPER. Those members who were present and heard the discussion on a former occasion will remember the remarks made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who held that the proposed change in the law will infuse fresh spirit into the officers who have the carrying out of the fishery laws, as to prevent the laws being a dead letter?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me say that the amendment made took a great part of my argument. We pay a very large amount of money for maintaining a fishery force to patrol our waters and prevent encroachments. These men are appointed to prevent the Americans from coming in, and to carry out our fishery laws. Why, then, do you propose to allow these officers to share in the penalties, when it is their duty to carry out the law, and they are paid for doing it.

Mr. TUPPER. I will explain the reason. Parliament will not grant a sufficient sum of money to enable the staff of fishery officers to be paid adequately, as are the officers of other departments. This would involve an enormous appropriation, which the country is not yet ready to make, and which no Government would ask. We therefore propose to offer this inducement, to render the officers more energetic in following up offenders against the law. In regard to purse-seines, my argument is very much stronger. I would not allow a measure to pass into law if I thought it would not prove effective. From my experience of the fishery regulations, I know that vessels scudding about our coasts will be difficult to follow and watch, and it is necessary that we should impose very heavy penalties, and offer large inducements to our fishery officers to prevent wrong being done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have already called the attention of the Committee to the provisions of the common law with respect to the imposition of fines and penalties. The hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill to secure the confiscation of the vessel in every case, and he secures the administration of the law through other tribunals of the country. If a vessel was two miles and 759 yards from the coast she would be subjected to a fine of at least $50, and the confiscation of the vessel and all her outfit besides. There would, of necessity, be an appeal to the Minister in every instance.

Mr. GILLMOR. It strikes me as very singular that the Minister of Marine should be offering this measure for the protection of the great body of the fishermen, and declaring that they all desire the Bill, and yet he is obliged to offer bribes to the officials to carry out the law. It appears as if the fishermen themselves want to violate the law. All this goes to show that the fishermen do not wish this measure. I am, in fact, opposed to the system of offering to officials part of the fine imposed in each case. It is a wrong system, in the Customs as well as in the Fisheries Department. If this measure is in the interests of the fishermen generally they will not violate the law, and if it is argued that they will violate the law, that is evidence they do not want the measure, especially if they require an official to watch them.

Bill reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.45 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 31st July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That all the original correspondence between the Department of Public Works and the Finance Department with reference to the security for the construction of the Kingston graving dock, and also the accounts of S. & H. Borbridge, R. S. Montgomery, F. Thompson and E. Chanteloup, as set out in the report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the year 1887-8 on page F—2, and for the year 1888-9 on page F—67, and all letters, receipts, papers and vouchers in regard thereto, be produced forthwith for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GIBSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a paragraph in yesterday's *Empire* respecting my conduct as a member of this House with regard to the vote taken the day before yesterday. The paragraph is as follows:—

"Mr. Gibson, of Lincoln, refused to vote because of the manufacturing interests in his constituency, which would be ruined by the adoption of his party's policy."

This paragraph, Sir, is untrue. It is entirely contrary to the facts. On the contrary, I was elected on the trade question. I did my very best to get here, but was unavoidably detained, and had I been here it is needless to say I would have cordially and loyally supported the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to know when certain information, which I asked for, with respect to the horses stationed at the Experimental Farm, will be brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is down. My impression is that the papers were handed me and that I laid them on the Table, but if not I will bring the papers down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will send and enquire in the clerk's office he will ascertain whether they are down or not, because no notice is given in these cases.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was an Order of the House made for a return giving all the names of the different employés in the Department of Public Works. The Order was made a month ago. Is there a prospect of that return being brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire about it. I suppose they are preparing it.

WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. GERMAN. I must again remind the acting Minister of Railways and Canals of an Order of this House for a return of the extra men employed on the Welland Canal during the election.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid that the hon gentleman was not in his place, or he would have known that return was laid on the Table some days ago.

DISMISSAL OF J. R. GRAHAM.

Mr. BARRON. I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect the return relating to the dismissal of Mr. J. R. Graham, fishery inspector in the County of Victoria? At the time, the Minister gave me to understand he was not dismissed, but the Government organ

in the county said he was, and it was on that statement I moved for the return. I would like to have the return to see whether I was right or not.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not know that was the object of the hon. gentleman, or I would have brought down the papers long ago. I am under the impression that I explained to the hon. gentleman that I could bring down some of the papers, but supposed he would prefer to have them altogether, and as there was an investigation proceeding, I would wait until I could bring all the papers down. If the hon. gentleman desires, however, that the papers be brought down as they are, I will bring them down at once, but if he prefers to have the whole, together with the report, that will take a few days longer.

Mr. BARRON. If I am acquainted with the facts, and I think I am, there was no investigation at all; and since the matter has been referred to, it is quite true, if I am informed correctly, that the fishery inspector did send in his resignation.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entering on a discussion. I am perfectly prepared to discuss the matter, but that is out of order now.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no discussion now.

Mr. BARRON. Will the Minister kindly give me all the papers down to the present?

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, if they are ready.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER moved further consideration of the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 23rd June.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought it was stated last night—I do not know whether the Minister of Finance was here at the time or not—that the Government were going on with certain Bills, and would take this up later.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said we might take up some of these Bills, but that this would be the principal business to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that it would be better to take these item by item.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, that would be better.

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 9, 10, 400, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423 and 431, in Schedule "A" to the said Act: and to amend the Act 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 39, intituled: "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 126, 127 and 128, under section 1 of the said Act: and to amend the Act, 57 Victoria, Chapter 20, intituled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 148, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165 and 166, under section 10 of the said Act,—and to provide otherwise by enacting that the following rates of duty be substituted in lieu thereof:—

1. All molasses and (or syrups N.O.P., including all tank bottoms and) or tank washings, all cane juice and (or concentrated cane juice, and all beet-root juice and) or concentrated beet-root juice, when imported direct, without transshipment, from the country of growth and production:

(*a*) Testing by polariscope, forty degrees or over and not over fifty-six degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon.

(*b*) When testing less than forty degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon and in addition thereto, one-fourth of one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

(*c*) And in addition to the foregoing rates, a further specific duty in all cases of two and one-half cents per gallon when not so imported direct without transshipment.

Item agreed to on division.

2. All cane sugar or beet-root sugar not above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, all sugar sweepings, all sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, all melado and or concentrated melado, all molasses and or concentrated molasses, N.E.S., all cane juice and or concentrated cane juice, N.E.S., all beet-root juice and or concentrated beet-root juice, N.E.S., all tank bottoms N.E.S., and concrete, when not imported direct without transshipment from the country of growth and production, five per cent. *ad valorem*: provided, however, that in the case of cane sugar produced in the East Indies and imported therefrom *viâ* Hong Kong, such rate of five per cent. *ad valorem* shall not be exacted if transhipped at Hong Kong.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to add after the word "Hong Kong," the words "or Yokohama." The same principle applies to each.

Mr. LAURIER. What principle is that, please?

Mr. FOSTER. That the importation of sugar from the East Indies *viâ* Hong Kong or Yokohama by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers and railway shall be considered a direct shipment. There is a considerable trade growing up in the East Indies *viâ* that route. If we allowed that to come under the general provision of this clause, it would be a discrimination against this sugar if it were transshipped. I also wish to add after the words "East Indies" the words "and countries to the east thereof."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that cover? Does that cover all the Java sugars?

Mr. FOSTER. And the Philippine Islands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the Australian sugars?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there would be a double transshipment there. The purpose here was to provide for the East Indian sugars and those of the Philippine Islands. There are direct lines of communication between those places and Hong Kong and Yokohama.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It struck me that Queensland sugars might very properly come in under the same provision.

Mr. FOSTER. This is all the prospect we have at present of trade coming in that way. If afterwards it should be found that this should extend to Queensland or the other Australian colonies, an addition could be made to the provision.

Item, as amended, agreed to on division.

3. All sugars above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, and refined sugar of all kinds, grades or standards, and all sugar syrups derived from refined sugars, a specific duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is the intention apparently that refined sugar of all kinds, no matter what the number is, shall be subject to this duty.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention in regard to all sugars above No. 14 Dutch standard.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to have that point clearly understood. In the American tariff, if I am correct, and I think I am, all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard and colour, pay half a cent a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). All under No. 16 come in free. But as I understand this resolution, that will not be the case with sugars under No. 14

with us. A refined sugar, if it is even under No. 14, will have to pay the duty of $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. This exactly follows the old tariff; it simply makes a difference as to the free and refined on the Dutch standard No. 14, for all sugars.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister does not quite catch my point yet. Raw sugar under No. 14, by this clause, comes in free, but not all sugars under 14; if it is a refined sugar and under No. 14, it has to pay $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent a pound. That differs from the American tariff, which lets all raw, and all refined sugar under 16, come in free.

Mr. FOSTER. Under this all refined sugar would pay $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No matter how low the colour?

Mr. FOSTER. No matter how low the colour.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why the duty upon refined sugar is placed at $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent a pound? I suppose the object of the framers of the McKinley tariff was to afford ample protection to the sugar refining interest of that country, and one-half a cent a pound was the degree of protection which it was supposed the refining interest would require, and that would give them the absolute monopoly of their own market. The refiner attempting to import sugar must be at a disadvantage of half a cent a pound. Now, it strikes me that that amount of duty ought to have been sufficient in Canada, but in place of contenting ourselves with $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent a pound, we put on a protection of $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent. It strikes me the duty is too high, that the profit which the refining interest is able to make under the operation of the tariff, is an exorbitant one. The half a cent itself is a very high duty under the circumstances, where the Government professes to give free sugar to the consumers.

Mr. FOSTER. We discussed that point pretty fully in the course of the debate on this resolution, and the amendment which followed. However, I may state that there is a very considerable difference between our country and the United States of America, as regards the habits of the people; consequently the position in the different classes of sugar is not the same. My hon. friend will find, if he enquires into the subject, as I have no doubt he has done, that in the United States the people use a very much better grade of sugar, that is, they use a larger proportion of the higher grades, the granulated, and consequently it was with reference to that largely that the higher, No. 16, was taken. In our own country the larger consumption pays duty on the yellow sugars, and if we had raised in this country the standard to No. 16, it would practically have allowed in, say three-fifths at least of the whole consumption of refined sugar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be a very great benefit to the consumer, and no injury in the slightest degree to the public.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend might with equal fairness say that it would be a still greater benefit to the consumer if we took off the duty entirely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And so it would.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a double object in our tariff which has been, while giving a very large reduction to the people upon the item of sugar, to keep the protective principle with regard to the refining of raw sugar in our own country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hold in my hand a sample of Jamaica sugar cleaned, which will no doubt rate 16 Dutch standard. Now, I contend that it is an injustice to the consumers of sugar in this country to exclude an article of that standard, and compel those who would use that class of sugar either to buy a worse and inferior kind, or else buy refined. The hon. Minister has already informed the House that he went to Jamaica for the purpose of trying to secure an interchange of trade between that Island and this Dominion. The man who brought this sample of sugar to Canada came from Jamaica with the view of establishing a trade in this country in that very commodity, and securing in return commodities, the products of this country, that would be used in Jamaica. When he came here he was surprised to find out that the tariff recently issued and sanctioned under the resolution brought in by the Minister of Finance, shut out from Canada the very commodity that he supposed was entitled to come in and be placed upon the markets of Canada. The tariff has raised the standard to about $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent a pound. Now, I say that if the Minister of Finance is sincere, if the Government are sincere in their efforts to extend trade relations with that island, and in accordance, no doubt, with the statements he made and the inducements he held out when he was there, he ought to have amended his resolution so as to admit that grade of sugar. I can understand the reasons why he declined to do that. It is not because this country is going to lose seriously in revenue, but it is simply because it is going to take away from the refiners the advantage they have under the tariff of refining a very large additional amount of sugar other than what they would refine had he admitted No. 16 Dutch standard. I would like to ask the Finance Minister who, under that arrangement, would reap the benefit? Would not the consumers of this country reap the benefit, and at the same time his treasury would not suffer one farthing in revenue? I say it is an outrage to exclude from this country that class of sugar, when the Finance Minister boldly announced to the people of that country: Come to Canada and we will open trade relations with you; we will give you the advantages of sending us certain commodities, and we will ask you, in return, to take certain things from us. They come along with the article of sugar, a standard product, a cheap product of their Island, and they ask that they should be permitted to send that sugar here free, and they are met in the face with $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent duty upon it, if they send it to Canada, while it is admitted into the United States free. They have nothing to do but cross to the United States and they find that the tariff of that country will admit that article into the United States market, while our own tariff will not admit it here. Now, the Finance Minister says the reason why he is driven to take this course is because he finds the people of Canada, if he admits a commodity of that kind into this country, will use a very large percentage of it, and consequently, as a result of that consumption, the raw sugar would not be imported in anything like the amount it would be if you ex-

cluded that sugar. Then I say he is striking at the liberties and the rights of the consumers of this country, and he is imposing upon the consumers the use of the refined sugars, in order to bring into the coffers of the refiners an annual revenue sufficient to satisfy their greed. That is virtually what it is—it is sufficient to satisfy their greed that he does this, and not in the interest of the consumers of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Finance——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood we were to have the privilege of discussing these resolutions as if we were in Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: that was the arrangement.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Finance Minister failed to answer the enquiry I put to him as to the reason for making the duty $\frac{2}{100}$ of a cent a pound. The duty, as I pointed out, in the United States is half a cent, which is considered ample there for the protection of the refiners. I imagine a duty of $\frac{2}{100}$ of a cent a pound would protect the refiner if he could import the raw product from abroad free from duty. I asked why the Government saw fit to impose a protective duty of $\frac{2}{100}$ of a cent for the benefit of the Canadian refiner, when the United States find a duty of $\frac{2}{100}$ of a cent a pound ample to give protection to American refiners. We give a protection of over 50 per cent. greater than is given by the United States in this respect. That is a feature of the Government's policy upon which we are entitled to have an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. That has already been explained.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do I understand that the Minister of Finance refused to answer my question? I believe he answered the question of the hon. member for South Brant, that the provision respecting sugars over No. 14 would admit kinds of sugar different from those admitted into the United States; but the hon. gentleman did not answer my question, as to why the Government had imposed a duty 50 per cent. higher for the protection of the refiners than had been imposed by the Government of the United States for a like purpose.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Customs has seen this sugar, I believe?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I have not, however, tested the sample yet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I presume that sugar would be classed by him as a refined sugar.

Mr. BOWELL. No. I just enquired from my deputy what he would consider this sugar to be. He thinks it is one of the centrifugal sugars that passes through one of the manufacturing establishments where manufactured. The hon. gentleman will notice that while it is not granulated it is crystallized to a certain extent. It would be rated as No. 16. It would bear duty if imported into Canada. If imported into the United States it would pass through the Customs free.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that this sugar, having passed through a refining process, would, if under No. 14 in colour, be permitted to come in free?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly, if not the product of a refiner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the hon. gentleman sure that the interpretation is right?

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite satisfied it is.

Mr. STAIRS. Is the sugar to which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is referring, a Jamaica sugar?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. STAIRS. A Jamaica sugar under No. 14 certainly would not be a refined sugar. No Jamaica sugar would be a refined sugar, no matter how bright in colour.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that a refined sugar?

Mr. STAIRS. No; I think it is not a refined sugar. If it is a sugar from Jamaica it is not a refined sugar. There are no refined sugars received from Jamaica.

Mr. BOWELL. I am just informed as to what I thought was the correct ruling of the department. In the past, as under these resolutions would be the case, any sugars under No. 14 in colour, no matter from what country they came, were admitted free, if the product of a sugar factory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If so, the wording of this clause is not correct.

Mr. STAIRS. It is practically the same wording as was adopted under the late tariff, under which no difficulty arose. All importers of sugars will understand the wording of the tariff. A refined sugar is one that has been refined by filtering through bone black. None of the Jamaica sugars are passed through bone black, and therefore this is not a refined sugar technically. There will be no difficulty in regard to determining the point raised by the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a point in it. The gentleman from Jamaica who brought this sample has asked, and been told, that even with respect to a dark sugar under No. 14, that it would be subject to duty because it had passed through a certain refining process. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is aware that in the matter of molasses the department have ruled that on going through a certain process they become syrups. I think the Minister will admit that that has been the ruling of the department in days gone by. It is important that we should know from the Minister that sugars from Jamaica, if under No. 14 in colour, but having passed through some process of manufacture, call it refining or what you will, will be admitted free.

Mr. BOWELL. That sample would.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is well that we should know it, because I understand that this gentleman from Jamaica was very much disappointed with the decision. He came here hoping to promote a trade, and he was utterly discouraged at the way in which the sugar tariff was framed, and he said it was no use attempting to do anything with this country. I may have misunderstood the hon. member who had a conversation with him. If it be true that sugars under No. 14, although they have passed through that process, can come in free, it should be publicly known.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that, if I understood the Minister of Customs correctly, the intention of the Government would be

fully met by altering clause 3 so as to read "all refined sugars under No. 14."

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid I did not make myself as clear as I should have done. There are certain qualities of sugar made from the beet which come in sometimes from Germany and other countries, and are really the result of refining the better classes of sugars. They go through a certain process of refining. In that case the sugar would be dutiable, although it would be under No. 14. But sugar, that is the product of the manufacture of sugar which has not gone through any refining process, if under No. 14, will be admitted free.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister should explain if he means, by a refining process, what the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) says is a refining process.

Mr. BOWELL. A refined sugar is a sugar that comes from a refinery and that has gone through some refining process. This, however, is a sugar that comes from the plantation or where it is manufactured direct from the cane. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would certainly open the door to the admission of all that class of sugars coming from the refineries which is termed low yellow, and which is now flooding the United States to an enormous extent under their law, and it would certainly do so here if the provisions of our law were similar. I do not know the gentleman to whom the member for Brant referred when he spoke of a gentleman from Jamaica: but I know there has been a planter or an agent from Jamaica in this country, enquiring into the question of the sugar tariff as between that Island and Canada; and I know, further, that that gentleman's whole transactions are with the United States, and that he has thrown as much cold water as he possibly could on the idea of opening out trade relations between Jamaica and this country. When our agent was in Jamaica and conversed with this gentleman, he declared that trade could not be done with Canada; on enquiry, it was found that probably his opinion was based on the fact that all his interests were in another direction, hence we can understand the position of the sugar planter or dealer who would assume, in coming to Canada, that the tariff was not sufficiently wide to admit his sugar into the country free. The result of this tariff upon the Jamaica sugar dealers and refiners is a question, of course, that will have to be settled in the future. I might say, however, that there is one reason why the protection—I am speaking now purely from a protective standpoint—there is one reason why the duty should be a little higher in Canada than it is in the United States. It costs more to lay down raw sugar in Montreal, and in Canada, than it does in New York. The figures that I have before me give the following result. Take the prices of sugar, as they existed about a fortnight ago, and you can lay sugar down in New York at about $3.37½ per hundred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The short or long hundred?

Mr. BOWELL. The short hundred; per 100 pounds. While it costs to lay it down in Montreal, $3.56, just 18 cents more; the difference being in

insurance and in freight, although they are purchased in the same market.

Mr. LANGELIER. I understand there is some question as to the introduction into this country of sugar from Jamaica. I received a sample which has been shown to the House which came directly from, I think, the largest firm of sugar producers in Jamaica, the firm of Lascelles, Demercado & Co. These two samples have been treated at the Customs-house as sugar above No. 14 Dutch standard, and, therefore, chargeable with the full duty on refined sugar. As a letter I have now in my possession explains, that sugar is not refined at all.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

Mr. SPEAKER,—

His Honour, Mr. Justice Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber. And having returned, Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company (Limited), and to change the name thereof to "The Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company (Limited)."

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an indenture between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.

An Act further to amend Chapter eleven of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons."

An Act to amend "An Act to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank."

An Act to incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Shipbuilding Company.

An Act to incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.

An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.

An Act amalgamating the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Renfrew Railway Company, under the name of "The Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company."

An Act to provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with "The Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890."

An Act respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company (Limited).
An Act to incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Bristow.
An Act for the relief of Mahala Ellis.
An Act for the relief of Isabel Tapley.
An Act for the relief of Adam Russworm.
An Act to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.
An Act respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.
An Act further to amend "The Electoral Franchise Act."
An Act respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company of Canada.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. LANGELIER. I was about to quote from a letter giving information from the firm of Lascelles, Demercado & Co. The letter states:

"Mr. Charles Demercado, of the firm of Lascelles, Demercado & Co., of Kingston, Jamaica, learning that the sugars from the Islands were admitted free into Canada, left Jamaica in all haste in order to offer the sugars produced by his firm. On his arrival in Ontario he discovered that the sugars from Jamaica, which are manufactured with greater care than those of Cuba, in what are called vacuum pans and dried with the centrifugal apparatus, could not enter Canada without paying duty. The Customs officers told him that his sugar was above 14 degrees Dutch standard, and consequently did not come within the class of sugars exempt from duty. He explained to them his firm's mode of manufacture in order to show that the sugar was not refined; though made more cleanly than the sugar from Cuba, it did not require to be refined in order to be put on the market for consumption. It was useless for him to discuss the question, the law is there which practically excludes the sugars of Jamaica. Mr. Demercado has arrived at Quebec, and has explained what I have just been telling you, to several persons. He says that the sugars of Jamaica enter free of duty into the United States, where they admit free all sugars under 16 degrees Dutch standard."

Then the letter goes on, referring to the hon. Minister of Finance after his visit to Jamaica:

"The first thing he does is to give all the benefit to the product of a Spanish Island which buys nothing from us, and to exclude the product of Jamaica, because it is too cleanly manufactured. You may easily imagine the disappointment of Mr. Demercado, who relied on the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Foster and Mr. Adam Brown, in his hope to sell his sugar and purchase codfish. The firm is one of the most influential of Jamaica, having branches in New York and London. It intended to establish an agency in Montreal."

I understand that there is no dispute of the fact that the samples of sugar which I have now in my possession have been refused free admission into Canada. It is admitted by the Customs officers that the statements of Mr. Demercado are correct—that these sugars are not refined, but that in their raw state they contain too large an amount of saccharine matter to be admitted free. That is the contention of the Customs officers, and I must state at once that Mr. Demercado and the gentleman who writes to me do not complain of the action of these officers. They admit that under the Customs law it is impossible for this sugar to be admitted free, because it is over 14 Dutch standard, which, however, is admitted free into the United States. But everybody can see the effect of this law, not only upon the prospect of establishing trade relations with Jamaica, but upon the interests of the consumers of Canada. If that sugar were admitted free, I am informed that it could be delivered to the consumers at from 2½ to 3 cents per pound, and everybody who examines it can see that it is very good grocery sugar, which would sell in immense quantities in Canada if admitted free. But with the full duty on refined sugar against it, it cannot be introduced into this country. The result is that the consumers will have to purchase sugars refined in this country and pay the duty to the refiners, whereas, if they could get this sugar, which is just as good for all practical purposes as the sugars produced by the refiners, they would pay no duty at all. With regard to the effect on trade relations with Jamaica, the letter shows very clearly that this gentleman wanted to establish trade relations. He wanted to buy some of the products of our fisheries in exchange for his sugars: but seeing that he could not import sugars into Canada, he gave up the idea of establishing trade relations and left the country in disgust. As the letter says, it seems extraordinary that the advantage should be given to the Spanish Islands, who have no trade connection with us, over a British colony with which it was expected trade relations would be established; and the only reason I can see for this is that it was done to protect the refiners. That was the explanation given to me by several parties to whom I showed this letter. It is quite clear that the refiners had a hand in the making of the new tariff. If the tariff had been arranged to promote the commercial relations of the country and suit the consumers, it would have included in the list sugars as high as 16 degrees, as is done by the tariff of the United States. But the effect of lowering the standard to 14 degrees is that this Jamaica sugar, which would have been sold to the consumers of this country at a low price, will be replaced by sugars sold at a high price by the refiners of this country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid that I misled the House a few moments ago in speaking of the difference in the price between sugars coming *viâ* the St. Lawrence and those coming *viâ* New York. What I intended to say was this, that sugar from Cuba could be laid down in Montreal, *viâ* the St. Lawrence, at $3.56 per 100 lbs., including the price paid for the sugar, freight, insurance, and the other incidental expenses connected therewith, but that the same kind of sugar from the same markets could be laid down in New York for $3.37½ per 100 lbs., being 18½ cents per 100 lbs. in favour of the New York route. That is one reason why the Government, in framing this resolution, gave a higher rate of protection to the manufacturer than is given by the tariff of the United States, and I think it is a very good reason. The Government desires to have it understood that that was done with the object of assisting those engaged in the trade in Canada, in order to have the trade carried on to as great an extent as possible *viâ* the St. Lawrence by our own ships, and in order that the sugar might be manufactured in Canada, while the protection is not sufficiently high to enable the manufacturers to exact too large a profit from the consumers. Now, the difference between the price in Canada under our tariff and the price in the United States at present, is as between 4⅛ and 4⅝. Granulated sugar has been sold in Canada since the tariff

resolutions were introduced, at 4½ cents, and the same character of sugar has been sold in New York at 4⅜. The difference between the price the consumer would have to pay in Canada and the price he would have to pay in the United States if he imported from New York, would be the difference between 4½ and 4⅜, plus the freight and insurance from New York to Canada: so that when the facts are known it will be seen that the refiners are not those cormorants they have been represented to be. The difference is so small that the advantage derived from the manufacture of the article in this country, instead of in a foreign country, is, I think, sufficient justification for the course we have pursued.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the difference of freight between landing in New York and the St. Lawrence?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say anything about the freight. I said that the sugar was laid down, including the price of the sugar in Cuba and the freight and insurance and other incidentals, in Montreal, since the introduction of the tariff, at $3.56, while from the same market it could be laid down in New York at $3.37½. Those figures were given by those in the trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who supplied the figures as to the difference between New York and Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. From some of the traders.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Refiners?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think traders would give these figures. The information given me differs materially from that of the hon. gentleman on that point.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not see really the difference. If a refiner imports the sugar direct from Cuba to Montreal, he certainly should be considered a trader, as well as the man who would purchase it to bring it into the country for sale to the refiner. They would be both precisely in the same position.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Quite correct, and that was a little wise precaution which my hon. friend took. By terming the refiner a trader, no doubt it would sound better. No doubt he is strictly accurate in speaking of the refiner as a trader, but the fact the hon. member for South Oxford wanted to get at was whether it was a person interested, such as a refiner, who gave the figures. I have heard no argument addressed against removing all the protection the refiners have. Whatever views may be entertained with reference to that matter, no one has demanded that the refiners should be without protection, but the Government are asked what justification is there for giving an amount of protection in this country greater than what is given the manufacture in the United States? That is a fair question. It is taking the Government on their own ground, assuming their ground is correct, that it is desirable to protect the refiners in order to have the benefits accruing from their business; but we ask why should not a protection, which is considered ample in the United States, which hon. gentlemen tell us incessantly is a much higher protected country than this, be considered sufficient here? The hon. Minister has given the reasons. He says there is 18½ cents difference on the importation of raw material against the Montreal refiner as compared with the New York refiner. If we grant that, there would still be 12 cents protection per 100 lbs. given over and above that. I would like to ask the Minister this question. He heard the hon. members for Halifax (Messrs. Stairs and Kenny) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) basing their quotations on the price of refined sugar at Halifax, and I do not know whether the figures the hon. Minister has just quoted are the Montreal prices or the Halifax prices.

Mr. BOWELL. It is the Montreal price.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). These gentlemen quoted the Halifax price and reduced the amount by saying it was a quarter of a cent lower there. There are refineries at Halifax. What advantage has the port of New York in laying down raw sugar over the port of Halifax?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not looked into that point, but I suppose there would be just the difference of the freight from Halifax to Montreal, and the difference between the freight from Cuba to Halifax and from Cuba to New York.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The difference of freight as between New York and Halifax would be very slight, not more than 3 cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Wood) says from 3 to 5 cents; but it must be remembered that the refiners in Halifax and Moncton are very much further from the western market than the refiners at Montreal and New York, and they pay an additional freight on the refined which the Montreal refiner pays on the raw.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And we are to pay the bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says it is very low to Montreal on this raw sugar, but it is very much higher west on the refined sugar.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). It is a greater distance.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; but the hon. Minister, in comparing the figures to-day, spoke about the prices in Montreal and New York. I am not prepared to admit that his figures are exactly correct.

Mr. BOWELL. I would not say they are to-day, as I got them about ten days ago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think probably the granulated would be 4⅝ in Montreal, but I speak subject to correction; and the point the Minister makes in taking 4⅜ at one point and 4½ at the other, is that the consumer would have in addition to pay the freight from New York. But he loses sight of the fact that one-half, at least, of the inhabitants of the Dominion, can import from New York at about the same freight as from Montreal, so that his argument has no value whatever. But taking that extra freight from New York, which I do not understand, there is still a protection of 12 cents per 100 lbs. to our refiners over that enjoyed by the refiners of New York. The hon. Minister says it is desirable to give that protection, in order that he may promote direct trade by the St. Lawrence. Very well, but the Minister can promote direct trade by so arranging his tariff that these sugars from Jamaica may come in free, and then we would

have the benefit of their direct importation *viâ* the St. Lawrence. We might as well have the benefit of direct trade over the St. Lawrence route, by bringing in raw sugar from a British island as bringing in raw sugar from Cuba or any other portion of the world.

Mr. BOWELL. You mean to the refiners.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I mean for the dealers. If the hon. Minister would apply his provision that raw sugar imported direct from the place of production may come in free, to the Jamaica sugar, he would secure all the benefit of the trade by the St. Lawrence, and would develop a trade with a sister island, under the same flag, at the same time. I have heard no argument at all. The whole question, as it has been discussed, seems to me to point to the fact that the Minister is seeking to give an undue amount of protection to the refiners. As I said before, no gentleman on this side, whatever may be his views on the question, has argued that the refiners should be left without any protection, but they do hold that if the United States, which hon. gentlemen opposite say is a most highly protected country, think that half a cent is ample protection to their refiners, and admit sugars, whether refined or raw under 16 Dutch standard, free, certainly the same rule ought to be applied to Canada. Why should it not? If a comparison is made with sugars in England, it will be found that the difference is far greater than it is between the sugars in the United States and Canada, because the refiners over there are availing themselves of the protection they have, and I thought that, perhaps, after the discussion that took place in this House, it had been so clearly stated by members on this side and on the other side of the House that the refiners could live and make an ample profit with less protection, that the Minister would have been prepared to yield on this point and to fix his tariff at the same rate at which it is fixed by the Americans, who are essentially a nation following out the principle of protection. The Minister heard the member for Halifax point out that the refiners in Canada were not only able to produce, but were actually producing and selling sugar 14 cents per 100 lbs. less than the Americans. If that is the case, why do they want a protection of 80 cents per 100 lbs. against the Americans? The hon. member laid it down distinctly and corrected my figures in that respect, and you will find it in his speech, that the Canadian refiners were selling sugar at 14 cents per 100 lbs. less than the American refiners. What reason is there to give a protection against these same Americans of 80 cents per 100 lbs., when, according to the argument of the hon. gentleman, not only can the Canadian refiners hold their own against the United States on equal terms, but they could take possession of the American market and find an unlimited demand for their sugar there? The Minister heard his argument, and I think it would behoove him to give an answer better than that which the Minister of Customs has given as to why this protection is so excessive. We have before us an official statement, or one which may almost be regarded as official, that in giving this excessive protection to the sugar refiners by fixing the standard at 14 instead of at 16, the hon. gentleman is destroying what would be a good trade, what the Minister of Finance went to Jamaica to promote, and which no one would desire to discourage if it would have any beneficial result; but Canada, after having expended money to exhibit her produce there, after having sent a commissioner there, finds the result that, instead of there being a *bonâ fide* attempt to establish a trade, the same Minister of Finance who was the commissioner to promote this trade, who boasted what would be accomplished by his mission, and what a grand thing it would be to develop trade with these islands, introducing a tariff which he is told distinctly will shut off any possibility of trade with that Island to which he went and to which he made overtures for the development of our trade. How far is the protection to the sugar refiner to go? Is it the $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent a pound which the consumer will have to pay, or is the consumer also prepared to sacrifice the whole of a probably profitable trade which can be maintained between the Island of Jamaica and Canada? Maintaining the present tariff means not only the cost to the consumer over what they ought to pay under any legitimate protection, but it means also the total destruction, or rather the prevention, of a trade which would be profitable, I believe, both to Jamaica and to this country. How far is the whole trade and the interests of this country to be sacrificed, not for the interest of the sugar refiner, but for the excessive protection of the sugar refiner? If this is put at No. 16, we have testimony that trade will spring up with Jamaica which is shut off entirely if the number is maintained at the present standard. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance, who is anxious to promote trade between Canada and that Island, as is shown by his going there as a commissioner, should give some explanation of this. In the exportation of these sugars from Jamaica to Canada, the trade by the St. Lawrence and the Maritime Provinces in the way of return cargoes will be maintained, but they will be sacrificed if the hon. gentleman maintains the tariff as it is now.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Customs gave as a reason for the imposition of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent on refined sugar that raw sugars were imported into Montreal for $3.56 per 100 lbs., while they were received in New York for $3.37½, or about 18½ cents per 100 lbs. less than in Montreal. On that account the Government proceeds to impose a duty of 80 cents per 100 lbs., or more than four times as great as would be necessary to equalize the rate with that paid by the American refiner. This is protection with a vengeance. The American refiner has only half a cent a pound to pay, and that is more than ample to protect him. The Canadian refiner is at a disadvantage of about 20 cents per 100 lbs., and in order to make that up, he is given a protection of 80 cents per 100 lbs. That enables him to charge from 50 to 60 cents per 100 lbs. for his refined sugar more than is necessary to meet the competition. The refiner at the present time is charging from 4¼ to 4⅜ for granulated sugar. For yellow he is charging 3⅝, while in the United States he is charging $3\frac{5}{16}$ for yellow and 4¼ for granulated. If the Government had contented itself with a duty of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent or $\frac{3}{16}$ of a cent a pound, it would have given to the refiner ample protection, if he was contented with a reasonable profit as a competitor with the refiners in the United States or in Scotland. The

question simmered down is that, according to the statement of the Minister of Customs, in order to compensate the refiner for an extra cost in freight charges of less than 20 cents per 100 lbs., as compared with the New York refiner, he has to receive a protection of 80 cents per 100 lbs., and the consumer here is to be placed at the mercy of the refiner to the extent of at least half a cent per pound.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is another point to which attention has not been called. The hon. gentlemen opposite, in the initiation of their policy declared that it was their desire to protect the manufactures of Canada against the competition of foreigners dealing in the same commodities or manufactured goods. In this case, admitting that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite should be properly carried out, their aim should be to protect the Canadian refiner against the refiner in the United States and the refiner in England. Now, what are they doing in this case? They are not only protecting the refiner against the refiner in the United States and the refiner in England, but by the change they have made in their tariff they are producing a market for the refiners of Canada. They are saying to the consumers of Canada: You shall not have the raw material, we are not only giving the sugar refiners of Canada a protection against competition with the refiners of the United States and England, but we are going to exclude raw sugar so as to compel you to consume refined sugar. Now, that is virtually the position they are taking in this change in the tariff. The Minister of Customs shakes his head, but he cannot get over the difficulty. The Finance Minister admitted the fact a few moments ago, so the Minister of Customs need not shake his head. The Finance Minister has announced to the House that if this class of sugar from Jamaica was admitted, the result would be that a very large number of people in this country would use that sugar, and it would seriously limit the market for refined sugar. He says that in the United States all the people are very large consumers of refined sugar, and they do not consume such a proportionate quantity of yellow sugars as our Canadians would do had they the opportunity: and in order to prevent them from having that opportunity, not for the purpose of revenue, but to close out an article that they would, as a matter of choice, use, the Government shut it out in order to compel the people to use the fine sugars and protect the refiners of this country—that is virtually the position they take on this question. Now, that position is not taken in connection with one single item produced in this country except sugar. I defy the Minister or any member of the Government to point out another article that is produced in this country concerning which they take the same stand as they do with sugar, that is, to shut out by the tariff a commodity that the people of their own free choice would use, in order to make a market for the commodities of the manufacturers in the sugar industry. I say it is a gross injustice to the poorer classes of this country to deprive them of their free choice when it is not for the purpose of raising a revenue, because we get no revenue from it, the revenue goes into the pockets of the refiners of Canada, and not into the treasury of the Minister of Finance. I say when it is not done for revenue purposes it is a gross injustice to the poorer classes who would prefer to have this raw sugar from Jamaica, which is a desirable commodity, and would be largely used by the people of this country; but in order to prevent their free choice in the use of that sugar, he shuts it out by this arrangement and compels them to use refined sugar, so as to give the manufacturers of this country a little more to do in that way.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not quite follow the argument of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I know that there is at least one class of unrefined sugar which is admitted free of duty, which is an exceedingly fine kind of sugar, and a very cheap kind of sugar, and that is the Cuba crystals. That is, I fancy, as pure an article of unrefined sugar as can be found anywhere, and that is admitted free of duty, and we can buy that sugar to any extent we please. I was very much interested by the remarks of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), because I observed, I thought, a change in the hon. gentleman's view of questions of this kind, which I had not noticed before; I observed a care as to the manufacturer that I had not noticed before. I hope the hon. gentleman has been reading a little more extensively of English free trade literature than a good many of his colleagues on that side of the House seem to have done of late years. Under the protective policy which has been pursued in this country for the last thirteen years, we have succeeded in reducing the price of sugar to a point which we did not dream of a few years ago. Hon. gentlemen tell us, Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do whatever with the protective policy; they tell us that simply by a law of nature production is becoming cheaper year by year, and that it is because sugar all over the world has become cheaper that we get it cheaper here in Canada. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen how it has come about that sugar all over the world has become cheaper? I would like to go a little deeper down into this question than that superficial view of it taken by these hon. gentlemen: I want to know why sugar all over the world has become so much cheaper? I say it has become cheaper partly, no doubt, by reason of the progress that has been made in the process of production, and by the improvement of the machinery. But how has it come about that there has been so great an improvement in those respects? If hon. gentlemen will consider the matter a little, they will remember that this improvement has come about by reason of protection, by reason of the greatest and most strenuous policy of protection, probably, that has ever been known in the world. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the Emperor Napoleon established the beet-root sugar industry in France, which was built up by a policy of protection, the most stringent, perhaps, that was ever adopted by any nation in the world. The result of that policy has been such a fierce competition in the markets of England that the price of sugar in the English markets has been pulled down by reason of that protection in France, which was subsequently followed in Germany, in Austria, in Belgium and Holland, and in Russia eventually. The result has been, as I have said, that by reason of this policy of protection, the price of sugar in free trade England has been reduced. Free trade England said that it was altogether a fallacious policy, they said it was even worse—it was a wicked policy, to force the poor continental consumers to pay so much more for their sugar by

reason of this policy of protection. The result has proved to be not only that the continental consumer did not pay more for his sugar, not only that the continental consumer got his sugar cheaper, but that the English free trade consumer got his sugar a great deal cheaper, too. Not only has this been the case, but the pressure of this competition of protected sugar has been so great that free trade England has been damaged to such an extent in her own markets by this protected industry, that refinery after refinery has been closed in England, that the greatest distress has occurred in that country, that the industry of manufacturing loaf sugar has ceased to exist there. Only a short time ago the Government of England was besieged by deputation after deputation of starving men and of those who employed them; on one occasion, I believe, a deputation representing no fewer than 250,000 people waited upon the Prime Minister of England with reference to this matter, and, pressed by these deputations, the Government of England at last felt that it was necessary to interfere between the consumer and the cheap sugar in the interest of the producer, and to endeavour to induce the continental Governments who had been pursuing this policy of protection, to hold their hands and to withdraw the bounties they had given upon their refined sugars. There was a convention held in Europe to which representatives were sent from free trade England, and an arrangement was entered into by the Government of England for the protection of the manufacturers of England, and for the protection of those whom they employed: an arrangement was entered into with the Governments of Europe for the purpose of inducing those Governments, so far as possible, to withdraw this bounty by means of which the consumers of England got their sugar so much cheaper. With the permission of the House, I will read a sentence or two from an authority which I think hon. gentlemen opposite will not gainsay in respect to this matter. The work I hold in my hand is "Sugar Bounties, the Case for and against Government Interference," and it is a work published by the lecturer on political economy in University College, Dundee, and in Queen Margaret's College, Glasgow. That is a pretty solid authority for hon. gentlemen opposite. If it is necessary that I should prove this gentleman to be a thorough free trader, I will read a few words to show that he is. Referring to the policy of the country, he says:

"It is perhaps not out of place to ask: what is our National Policy? The battle of free trade was fought out in the days of our fathers. The youngest generations have accepted the name of it, without much attempting to grasp the great arguments that Cobden and Bright and Villiers made familiar on every platform. Of late there has been a slight reaction against it. But the reactionists have proved so weak in debate, and so evidently partisan in interest, that they have served only to settle us more firmly in our convictions, that nothing can be said for protection that was not said forty years ago, and confuted then."

There can be no doubt that a gentleman who can shut his eyes as to what is going on in England as to fair trade at present is a pretty solid free trader. I will read what has been the effect of competition on the English market. He says:

"The extraordinary stimulations of productions have the effect on prices that might have been expected."

This is referring to sugar bounties.—

"Cane sugar, which before 1870 ruled from 24 shillings to 25 shillings per hundred weight (Demerara crystals) and down till 1883, had scarcely ever gone beyond 22 shillings in 1884 to 15 shillings, and has varied since then from 15 shillings to 16 shillings."

That is under the competition of the protected sugar.—

"To a great extent the competition was a healthy one, and did good. It stimulated the West Indian planters out of any lethargy into which a tropical life may have tempted them. They sought the aid of chemistry and mechanical skill in all ways: built new factories and introduced economies of coal: improved machinery to an extent that for some years kept engineers busy; procured from India coolie emigration, securing at the same time cheap rates for rice—the staple food of the labourers. Thus they cheapened their productions so much that some raw cane sugar is still sent into this market in spite of the bounties. The total cost of productions has been lowered since 1879 by £5 to £7 per ton. But this cannot go on definitely. Everything that skill and capital can do seems now to have been done."

That is to say, that the competition, as I have said, of this protected sugar had the effect of lowering the price of sugar all over the world. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to understand that the policy of protection produced that result the world over, and when they say that sugar has become cheaper the world over, they will kindly remember that it became cheaper through the agency of a protective policy. There has been a good deal of conversation from time to time as to the number of hands employed. I want to mention what this free trader says of this point. Speaking of the hands, he says:

"Along with the sugar industry go a good many subsidiary trades such as coopers, engineers and the large amount of shipping formerly necessary. Greenock, for instance, a town of 70,000 inhabitants, and with a municipal debt of £2,000,000, has only about 2,000 men directly employed within the walls of the sugar houses, yet almost the entire population is dependent on the prosperity of sugar."

That is to say, although 2,000 are directly employed, 70,000 people in that one town, this free trade authority, this professor of political economy, says, "or," in his own words, "almost the entire population" is dependent on the prosperity of sugar, although only 2,000 are employed directly in the industry, showing what a very widespreading interest it is. While there are 2,000 men employed in the industry itself, you find the people affected are in the proportion of 70,000 to 2,000. This free trader makes some other very interesting remarks in the course of this little work, and one is:

"It is much more important to the workingman that he should have a steady wage than that he should have a cheap loaf."

That is a very interesting statement for us to hear in the Parliament of Canada. It is a statement which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will lay to heart, because it is not such a statement as we have been in the habit of hearing from that side of the House. On the same subject he says:

"And again—if everybody is not sick to weariness of the argument—continuity of employment is of infinitely greater importance to the wage-earner than cheap food."

Then we have an argument which I could not imagine how a free trader and professor at Glasgow and Dundee could present. It has been looked on as a kind of heresy by hon. gentlemen opposite, but here we have this old friend, whom we have met so often in this House:

"An Irishwoman lately went into a shop in Liverpool and asked the price of eggs. 'A shilling a dozen.' 'Indeed, sir,' she said, 'I could get them in my own country for sixpence.' 'And why don't you go to your own country and get them,' said the shopman. 'And where would I get the sixpence,' was the answer."

Our old friend that has been so often ridiculed from

the other side of the House appears in the work of this free trader, and he remarks :

"This is the position in a nutshell. If our workers cannot find employment and earn wages, it matters little to them that bread is sixpence the quartern loaf and sugar twopence a pound."

Again, he says :

"Indeed, the statement that the interests of the consumer is paramount is a sophism. You cannot separate the interest of producer and consumer, because they are to the extent of say three-fourths of the nation the same individuals."

I find, on page 47 of this little work, this remarkable statement from an authority that hon. gentlemen opposite will scarcely gainsay, in reference to this matter of cheap sugar. He says :

"The interest of the consumer, however, is not the only interest to be considered. Mr. Gladstone, whom no one ever suspected of the heresy of protection, has spoken strongly on the subject: 'My desire is that the British consumer should have both sugar and every other commodity at the lowest price at which it can be produced, without arbitrary favour to any of those engaged in the competition; but I cannot regard with favour any cheapness which is produced by means of the concealed subsidies of a foreign state to a particular industry, and with the effect of crippling and distressing capitalists and workmen engaged in a lawful branch of British trade.'"

This gentleman, commenting on that statement and upon a similar statement by Mr. Mundella, says :

"There is a very strong statement involved in this. It is that, however advantageous it may be to have cheap sugar, that is not the only consideration; that the interest of the producer must be attended to, although the whole community should pay dearer for its sugar."

That is the statement made by a professor of political economy at Dundee and Glasgow. He further says :

"Under the ægis, then, of these great champions of free trade we may assume henceforth that it is allowable, according to the principles of free trade, to do something for the sake of particular producers, although it should involve that the consumers slightly suffer."

That, I think, is a statement which hon. gentlemen opposite should consider. It is something that must seem rather heretical in the eyes of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson); but, nevertheless, it is one given by an authority of his own school. I think I may say that my hon. friends opposite are ten years, just about a decade, behind in the free trade literature of the mother country. Now, with regard to another favourite axiom of hon. gentlemen opposite; I have just one quotation to read, and then I have finished with this little book. We have heard a great deal about buying in the cheapest market, and it has been laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite that that is the thing that should be done. Whatever else happens we were to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. What does this professor of political economy tell us about that? We have heard from the opposite side of the House, time after time, that that is the cardinal principle that lies at the foundation of free trade, namely, buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear; that is sound doctrine.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I may mention for the information of the hon. gentleman, who was not in the House when I began my remarks, that I am quoting from a professor of political economy of Glasgow and Dundee, a very pronounced free trader, and this is what he says on that subject which has been cheered so enthusiastically by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. He says :

"Nor is it the case that the cardinal principle of free trade is, 'buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market.' That is a maxim which belongs to no particular school. It is part of the general common sense of the commercial world, which requires no teaching; but it is so often impossible, and even immoral, that it cannot, by itself, be adopted as the cardinal principle of any policy."

So that when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that their policy is to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has cheered that principle, I have got to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) that according to this high authority in the mother country, a free trade professor of political economy of Glasgow and Dundee, that principle is pronounced to be so often impossible and even immoral, that it cannot by itself be adopted as the cardinal principle of any policy. Now, it is quite clear that it is immoral, and any hon. gentleman who considers the question for a moment will see that it is so. It must be immoral to look only to cheapness. Suppose, for example, that by encouraging a cheaply produced commodity, you are encouraging the slave trade. By purchasing a cheap commodity in the cheapest market, you may be the cause of assisting slavery and the slave trade, which otherwise would fall to the ground; or you may encourage the sweating system which we have heard so much about in connection with free trade. It is quite clear that what this eminent professor says is true : That the principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, may be, if carried out to the letter, an immoral principle. I am glad to have called the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this, and especially the attention of the leader of the Opposition. I am afraid, perhaps, that I have been wearying the House with my quotations, and certainly, if I had any remarks of my own to make I would not dream of intruding on the good nature of the House any longer. But I have something to say which is very much better than anything I could say myself, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will allow me to say it. I just wish to read a few words from a speech which was delivered by the representative of free trade England, at this conference, in reference to the sugar bounties in Europe. This is a quotation from a speech made at Greenock by the representative of free trade England, at that conference, and, with the permission of the House, I will quote briefly what he says. I think it bears so very remarkably upon our own condition here that it would be a pity the House did not have the benefit of it. In the first place he says :

"The facts which I have brought before you to-night prove that no country, however intelligent and however industrious, can hold its own against unfair competition."

Now, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, whether it is fair competition that we, in Canada, should have our young industries placed at the mercy of the "rings" of the United States, formed for the express purpose of killing our industries.

Mr. LAURIER. That was the German competition in sugar he referred to.

Mr. McNEILL. To foreign competition. He was referring to the sugar bounties at the time, and to the unfair competition of France and Germany. He was referring to the protective policy

of Germany and France. I have been referring to that in my remarks, but the hon. gentleman was not present at the commencement of my address. I have been pointing out that that competition, under protection, has reduced the price of sugar all over the world, and that it is by a protective policy that the price of sugar has been reduced. He goes on to say:

"To-day the bounties on sugar and on shipping, destroy one industry, and do much to cripple another: to-morrow may bring bounties on iron, coal and cotton manufactures. Where, then, would be our home industries? We should be compensated, says Sir Thomas Farrer, by buying foreign goods cheaper than our own."

That is what we are told here time after time from the other side of the House: That we shall be compensated for the destruction of our industries by being enabled to buy foreign goods cheaper than our own.—

"The ship-building yards of France, Germany and Italy would be busy, while the clang of the hammer would no longer be heard on the Clyde and on the Thames; the furnaces of Belgium and France would burn brightly, while those in England and Scotland would be dark and cold; the mines of Germany and Bohemia——"

He does not refer to Nova Scotia here, but to Germany and Bohemia.—

—"would supply us with our coal, now supplied by the hardworking and stalwart miners from our own pits: and the looms of Saxony and Switzerland——"

Not the United States.—

—"would be busy at work while the factories of Great Britain were closed and their hands idle."

These words, as my hon. friend will see, might readily be employed to suit our case by using "Canada" for "Great Britain" and the "United States" for those other countries. He goes on to say:

"Would Sir Thomas Farrer and doctrinaires of his stamp then dare to console you with the statement that bounties were only bad things for the countries giving them, and that you must bear in mind that bounty-fed coal, iron and cotton goods were given to you cheaper than you could produce them? It is to check an existing evil, and to prevent the possibility of further disaster that this convention has been signed, and it will, so far as Her Majesty's Government is concerned, be carried out in its integrity. To allow the continuance of the system would be to ignore facts—to shut ones eyes to consequences, and by inaction and cowardice to jeopardize the interests of the greatest commercial empire in the world, and to ignore the first and guiding principles of statesmanship—namely, the supreme interest of the realm and the people."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to add any words of my own to that. I would only say, that I am not perpetrating a huge joke on the House, and that I am not quoting from the speeches of Sir Leonard Tilley, or Sir Charles Tupper, or my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I am quoting from the representative of free trade England, as to what he had to say in reference to the fact that foreign competition was destroying British manufactures. I have just got to say this: That the very same argument, word for word, which he applies will apply in reference to the policy which is advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite: which is, that we shall take down our protective walls and let in the goods of the United States to be slaughtered in our markets as they were before, and to kill out, as this authority says, not only the sugar industry but one industry after another in this Canada of ours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I congratulate my friend the Minister of Finance on the very useful interpellation of the hon. gentleman from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I am quite sure that this agreeable little digression will help him amazingly in getting through with the item under discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all for your benefit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt for our benefit: I fully appreciate that. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken was good enough to hint that we for the past ten years had been oblivious to what he was pleased to call free trade ideas in England. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman appears to me to be a very fair brother to Rip Van Winkle in the ideas he advances, which might very well suit the middle ages, and which were no doubt in vogue in those days, but which are about as much in accord with the light of political economy to-day as the inventions of the middle ages would be with the industrial system of to-day. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that this question was exhaustively gone into in the English House of Commons by English commissioners, as he may or may not know, and that this result was brought out very clearly, that the introduction of free sugar into England, and the extent to which English manufacturers were enabled to avail themselves of the benefits of free sugar, while it may have injured to a certain extent one particular industry, developed a great number of other industries to such an extent that six or seven men were employed in the new industries for one who was interfered with in the old. As for the morality of the question to which the hon. gentleman refers, if there is one act more immoral than another which a Government or a Parliament can commit, it is to take advantage of a majority—obtained to an immense extent, by the contributions of these manufacturers themselves—to perpetrate a legalized robbery to the extent of $2,000,000 a year on the whole people of Canada for the benefit of a dozen manufacturers like Mr. Drummond & Co. That is what has been done under this resolution: and there, if you choose, is immorality, and immorality of a very high degree. I would like to know, when this clause—which I believe was not drawn by the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance, but which, I believe, was elaborated by a refiners' committee—when it was accepted by the Government from those people, did they obtain from them any information as to what it costs on the average to manufacture sugar? I remember, when that question was investigated in England, it appeared to be established there that the absolute cost of manufacturing sugar in England would not, in all probability, exceed, at the time the investigation was made, something like $\frac{3}{16}$ or $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound—in other words, that this sugar could be refined for about one-third or thereabouts of the protection which is asked to be given to these refiners. We are asked to fine the whole people of Canada $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound, while I believe, if the matter were thoroughly investigated, it would be found that $\frac{3}{16}$ or $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound, in a proper manufactory with proper appliances and conducted on a sufficiently large scale, would be quite sufficient to give a fair living profit to the refiners, and that the rest is sheer plunder.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not want to speak too often on this subject, but I will try to confine myself to the item under discussion. I

shall not attempt to answer the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has gone into a general discussion on the trade question. When it was understood that there was to be as great freedom of debate, with you in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, as in the Committee of the Whole, I think it was understood at the same time that that freedom should be limited to the particular item under discussion at the time. If we depart from that understanding, and go into a general discussion on the trade question, I think we shall not be able to get through. The point we are discussing is whether the item in the tariff arranging the sugar duties is in the best interests of the country. I was discussing the question from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite, who take the ground that they ought to give protection to the sugar refiners. I was attempting to show that, from that standpoint, the tariff as arranged, was not only not in the interest of the consumer, but was not necessary to the existence or even the well-doing of the refiner, but that it was fixed on a basis extravagantly expensive to the consumer, and consequently gave an undue advantage to the refiner. Now, I am about to read, not from a free trade authority, but, following the example of the hon. gentleman opposite, and giving him an authority which he himself recognizes as an authority, I will read from the *Canadian Manufacturer*, which is the organ of the Manufacturers' Association, and which I think the hon. gentleman will admit is issued in the interest of protection to manufacturers. When I say that Frederick Nicholls is the chairman of the executive and when I read as its first editorial that "what Canada needs and expects and demands is a faithful adherence of the spirit of the National Policy," the House will see that I am dealing with the Ministry on this question from the standpoint of the protectionists themselves; and we will see how they view this arrangement of the sugar duties by the Minister. This journal states:

"When Mr. Foster announced that hereafter all sugar not above No. 14 Dutch standard would be admitted into Canada free, and that hereafter, as far as sugar was concerned, we should have a free breakfast table, all Canada threw up its hats and hurrahed. Those who threw up their hats had nothing else convenient for the purpose, and it was done because they supposed that all sugar not above No. 14 Dutch standard could be used on the breakfast table."

The hon. member for North Bruce is telling us something about Cuba crystals coming in, and the hon. Finance Minister tells us that he uses No. 14 on his table; but here is what the *Canadian Manufacturer* says in reference to it:

"But there is not a breakfast table in all Canada whereon Dutch standard sugar was ever used, or could be used. That article is not suitable for any breakfast table, and it is unfit for use until it is refined. The refiners, however, get a profit out of it, the protection being at the rate of 80 cents per 100 lbs. So we do not have free sugar for our breakfast table after all."

Now, the hon. member for North Bruce might give his attention to his practical point which we are discussing, and not run away to the general trade question.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman will allow me. I have got some of this crystal Cuba sugar here, and I would like to show it to him. I would be glad to use it, I know. It is delicious sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does the hon. gentleman believe——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. McNEILL. I believe in what I see, and taste, and touch, and handle, you know.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will not do, then, for the hon. gentleman to form his opinions from the leading organ advocating the policy which he has been lauding as essential to the well-being and protection of Canada. Now, here is another article in it, in which it takes the ground that we should give a bounty for the production of beet sugar, which the hon. gentleman has been talking about. I am not giving this as my own view or committing myself to it; but this journal gives one or two figures which have been contradicted in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I commend the article to their attention. I commend some of these figures to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), and to the hon. member for North Bruce as well:

"Finance Minister Foster proposes to give to the Canadian sugar refineries $6 per ton more protection than American refiners have under the McKinley tariff. This means that they will be able to rake in $720,000 per year extra out of the Canadian consumers. And still Mr. Foster shudders at the idea of encouraging the production of sugar in Canada. If he would offer a bounty for the production of beet sugar, and if under that bounty the Government had to pay as much as $720,000 per year for such production, that money would be distributed among fifty thousand or more Canadian farmers, mechanics and workingmen, while now he proposes to distribute it among four concerns giving employment to only about 650 men. This is not according to the ethics of protection."

I read that article to show the hon. gentlemen opposite, who talk about the thousands and thousands engaged in our sugar refineries, what the official organ, if I may so call it, of the protectionist party, states in reference to that matter; and I have read it also to show that, when they speak about extravagant figures having been used on this side of the House, an organ of their own party, makes out the amount taken from the people greater than I stated it was, though I said they were able to take even more by the way the tariff was arranged. They themselves put it at $720,000 a year. I want to know if the hon. Minister thinks it is wise that all this money should be given to these four concerns, which employ 650 men, at the expense of the consumers of Canada and at the expense of discouraging and killing off what we might hope would be a profitable trade between Jamaica and this country, giving employment to our fishermen, developing our own route, and opening up a trade for the Maritime Provinces? It is well this point should be put before the hon. Minister. He will see I do not put it on the ground of wiping out the duties at all, but simply on the ground that in that country, where hon. gentlemen opposite say protection is carried to an extreme, one-half less protection is given than here; and when the results are such as pointed out in their own organ, some explanation is required.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). What the hon. member for Brant is specially drawing the attention of the House to is the difference between he duty imposed under our tariff and that imposed under the McKinley Bill in the United States. The hon. Minister of Customs referred to the difference in the cost of freight from the sugar-producing countries to the chief ports in the Dominion and the port of New York in the United States; and that difference, a difference of about 18 or 20 cents,

according to the figures given us, accounts for a part, at all events, of the difference in the duty we impose in this Dominion. There was another consideration, however, which, to my mind, should influence the Government, and which, I infer from the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Finance, has influenced them in imposing a higher duty than is adopted in the United States; and that is the difference in the character of the two markets, the market in the United States and the market in Canada. From what knowledge I have of these two markets, I believe the demand in the United States is largely for a different class of sugar than is required in Canada. In Canada the demand has been, in the past, for about one-third granulated sugar and two-thirds yellow. Our refiners at present are importing raw sugar and manufacturing in about that proportion; and from the raw sugar they are able to supply all the demand there is for granulated sugar, and at the same time to supply this large demand for yellow sugar and to give a good quality of yellow refined sugar. I think, if a comparison is made between the qualities of yellow sugars sold in Canada and those sold in other countries, it will be found that, on the whole, the average quality of ours is better than that of the sugar in the United States or Great Britain. Now, the effect, in the first place, of adopting the tariff of the United States, by making all sugars up to No. 16 free, would be to bring in this very class to which the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) referred, this vacuum pan and centrifugal, which would compete in our market with the high class yellow sugars we manufacture at present. What the effect on the refiners would be, it is difficult for me to say; but it would have this effect, of very seriously crippling their industry. They have not sufficient demand to enable them to devote their attention to manufacturing a larger proportion of granulated, and if they could not supply this large demand for yellow sugar, their industry would be seriously affected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would be the effect on the consumer? There are more of them than refiners.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not think it would give them any cheaper sugar. If they used a larger quantity of raw sugars, vacuum pan or centrifugal, instead of yellow refined Canadian sugar, there would have to be a higher price charged by the refiners on the granulated used, to make both ends meet. So that I do not think anything would be gained to the consumer in the cost of yellow sugar, but the consumer of granulated would have to pay a higher price. There is another reason why, in Canada, we should have a higher rate of duty than they have on refined sugars in the United States. It is well known, I presume, to the hon. gentleman, that in the old country, in Scotland at all events, where there is demand for a large proportion of high-priced sugars, granulated, powdered, Paris lumps and that quality of sugar, there is a large proportion of the very low grades of yellow refined sugar made, and it requires a duty equal to the duty we have here to keep that low grade of refined sugar out. I believe it is desirable, in the interests of the consumer, to keep that low grade out. It is a very poor quality of sugar and very unwholesome, and it is desirable to keep it out altogether if we can, just as we prevent the oleomargarine from being imported to be used instead of butter. Under our present tariff, keeping in view the qualities of sugar which are saleable in our own market, our refiners are able to supply the demand for granulated, and at the same time this great demand for yellow sugar, and they are able to give the consumers both the granulated and the yellow sugars at prices which correspond very nearly with the New York prices. I took down the figures the hon. gentleman himself gave. The difference in granulated between Montreal and New York is only $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent on granulated, and only $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cent on yellow, so that the price at which our refiners furnish this, compared with New York, is very little more than the difference of freight at present between Montreal and New York. So that, however correct the hon. gentleman's theories may be, the practical effect of our duty is to give the consumers of Canada granulated sugar at the cost of granulated sugar in New York with the freight added, and at the same time to supply the large quantities of yellow we require large quantities at the same comparative price, and we are giving a very good quality of both. I think the practical effect of the tariff which has been adopted shows that it is well suited to the wants and to the trade of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have risen but that the hon. gentleman opposite made an appeal to me in reference to this question, and, also, because I desire to touch particularly on one point, that is, as to the West India trade. One could not but be somewhat amused at the bland and surprised face of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) when he actually discovered that we were giving protection to refiners. It would naturally strike a spectator in the gallery that we had never done so before, but at half-past five o'clock the hon. gentleman woke up to the fact that we were giving protection to the refiners. The hon. gentleman has somewhat changed his base since he spoke before on this subject, because I then understood him to desire free sugar altogether, but now he says that these bloated monopolists, the refiners, ought to have a fair protection, but that this is giving them an unfair protection, and he wants to know why we do not make it the same as it is in the United States, $\frac{2}{16}$ of a cent less than our proposal. The hon. gentleman is gradually coming round, and no doubt the extracts which were read by my hon. friend from Bruce have had their effect upon him. I noticed that they had a very marked effect upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who said, in terms not very complimentary to the country or to this House, that the people had been bought up like sheep in shambles, and that the sugar refiners had invaded the offices of the Minister of Customs and myself, and had dictated the terms of this resolution. The statement in the one case is as gratuitous as in the other, and without any fuller foundation. Let me inform the member for Brant that the system of protection in Canada was adopted in 1878, and we have continued it up to the present time in 1891, and that we propose to keep it on the Statute-book. Our principle is that the raw material shall, as far as possible, come in free, and that the manufacturing shall be done in

the country. Since 1879 we have had a tariff on raw and refined sugar, and we have given a protection to the refining industry in Canada. We have discussed the question here and in the country, and I am willing to leave it to the country to decide at any future time. We, to-day, give the refiners less protection than we did, and we have removed three millions and a-half from the consumers. We propose to keep $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent as a fair protection to the refiners on the clear grounds of our policy. So much for that. In the next place, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has anticipated me, and stated to the House some reasons why the duty should be somewhat higher here than it is in the United States of America. I am willing to leave this matter to the country. Whatever my hon. friend may state about this immense burden of $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent, I know his object. When the Government took off three millions and a-half from sugar and made that amount a present to the people, the Government did something for which the country would naturally be grateful, and now, at the end of the discussion of this matter, the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite is to try to minimize the effect of the Government policy. I am willing to let the people work it out practically and I have nothing to fear for the Government or for its policy in this respect. My hon. friend is very fond of quoting the United States tariff, and he says that the United States only charge $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent to the refiner, or $\frac{1}{10}$. Is he not aware that, after the 1st January, 1892, that may be no longer the amount of the duty, and that it will not be the amount except in regard to those countries which give a reciprocal return to the United States? After that date, on this very class of sugars above No. 14, the United States duty will not be $\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent, but $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound. A good deal has been said about the gentleman who went to Jamaica and could not get his sugar in at the same rate as other countries could. The proposition we made to Jamaica and the other West India Islands was not that we would take off our tariff without getting something in return, but that we would sit down with them and have a trade policy adopted between the two countries giving equivalent advantages to both. We are willing to give them advantages on their staples coming into Canada if they give us similar advantages on our staples. They have not yet agreed to do that. They may agree to it in the future, but, until they do that, there is nothing inconsistent in our providing that they should pay on their staples coming into this country in the same way as other countries do. The same proposition which we have made to the West India Islands remains in essence to-day, and we are prepared to sit down with them and agree upon a reciprocal scale in regard to articles on which reciprocal differentiation shall be made, in order to stimulate trade between the two countries. However, that is not yet arranged. I may repeat for the information of my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Paterson) that we have had a protective policy since 1878, and that it has included protection for the refiner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was aware of that before. I differ with the Minister of Finance that now they are giving less protection than before. I contend that they are giving more. That question was clearly argued out in this House, and I simply now point it out to the Finance Minister. I ask him if he thinks that he dealt fairly with the House in the statement he made as Finance Minister as to the position of the sugar refiner in the United States, and as to what it might be in 1892. I leave it to the House if the statement of the Finance Minister was not designed to lead the House and did lead the House to believe that it might be possible that in 1892 the United States refiner might have a protection of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound. Does the Finance Minister not know that that is not so? Does he not know that if that comes into effect, the raw sugar of the refiner will be taxed too? and that his protection is only the difference between the refined and the cost of the raw? He knew it, but he did not tell it to the House: but he gave the House to understand that while the United States were now only giving $\frac{1}{4}$ a cent a pound protection, perhaps it might be, after 1892, that they would give $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. On the same grade of sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what he gave the House to understand. I leave the other statements of the Minister to be considered in the light of that one.

Mr. STAIRS. I appreciate very highly indeed the manner in which the hon. member for Brant has discussed the question before the House, and I may also say the manner in which it has been discussed by other hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the hon. member for Brant has been fair and straightforward from beginning to end. But still, if I understood the statement of the Minister of Finance, it was not exactly the way that the member for Brant put it, although I may have been mistaken. As I gathered from the statement of the Minister of Finance, the point is, that at a given date, if certain countries do not avail themselves of the privilege of entering into reciprocal trade relations with the United States, the latter country may put on a duty of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents on most of their sugar. Take, for instance, Jamaica, which has frequently been mentioned this afternoon; if it does not make a reciprocity treaty with the United States its sugar will be taxed the $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents, while in the case of Cuba, for instance, which has entered into reciprocal trade relations with the United States, their sugar will go into the United States free. Therefore, to a certain extent, the sugar refiners of the United States will have the benefit of that $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents of protection against those special grocery sugars which have been mentioned here this afternoon as going into the United States from Jamaica.

Mr. FOSTER. There is the raw sugar of the Louisiana product.

Mr. STAIRS. Yes; and very likely there will be no duty on the raw sugar of the Manilla product, which is a very large one, and goes into the United States to a very great extent. I said that I appreciated the manner in which this question has been discussed by the hon. member for Brant this afternoon; but there are one or two observations that I would like to make, with the permission of the House, relative to the protection that has been given under this tariff in Canada, and that given under the Mc Kinley tariff in the United States, of which we have had very full explanations by the Minister of Cus-

toms and by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). There are one or two things which it is worth while for the House to consider in connection with this question that have not been pointed out by either of those gentlemen. The hon. member for Westmoreland referred to the competition—he put it this way—which the Canadian refiner will feel from the low grade of raw sugar coming from the United Kingdom, though there was nothing in his remarks to show the House why that competition was of an exceptional nature. The same thing will apply to competition in low grade yellows from the United States. Now, let me remind the House that the circumstances of this refining industry in England and the United States are very different from those in Canada. In both these countries the markets are very much greater; the output of the refineries, I suppose, in some cases is tenfold greater, perhaps more, in those countries than in the refineries of Canada; and the demand, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Westmoreland, in both the United States and England is, to a larger extent than in Canada, for the high classes of sugar. This, as he pointed out, leaves the low classes of sugar to be disposed of, and hon. gentlemen know that in the United Kingdom these low grade yellow sugars are often sold at a very much lower price, proportionately, than the price at which they can be produced, because they are to a certain extent a waste product that has to be got rid of. The same remark applies to the same classes of sugars from the United States. The production of all classes of sugars in Canada must be very much smaller than it is in those countries; I do not know the exact difference, but our production can hardly be one-tenth of what it is in the United States. If these low grade refined sugars come into Canada duty free the refiners of the United States would have had a chance to market their surplus products here, although it might be but a very small percentage of their total output, and, at the same time, it would very slightly affect the refining industry in the United States, and the sale of the low grade sugar of the United Kingdom and the States would seriously injure the Canadian refiners, as it would prevent them selling their yellow sugar. Now, there is another point that I think ought to be brought out before this discussion closes, and that is in connection with the criticism made on this tariff by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it would affect the proposed trade with Jamaica. The hon. Minister of Finance has referred to that, but there was one thing in connection with it that he did not state. There are large quantities of sugar in Jamaica—I mean large in proportion to the whole sugar production of the world—but there are large quantities that, even under this tariff, can come into Canada, and have been coming in, under the old tariff for years.

Mr. FOSTER. And from Barbadoes.

Mr. STAIRS. Yes, they are coming in at present from all the West India Islands.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Grocery sugars?

Mr. STAIRS. Refining sugar. My point is that we can have a trade with Jamaica with refining sugars. There is a large quantity of refining sugars made in Jamaica—not large in proportion to the whole production of sugar in the world, but large in proportion to the quantity of sugar used in Canada. I know that the refinery at Halifax frequently buys cargoes of Jamaica sugar which are brought there as return cargoes for the fish that go out to Jamaica from that port. This trade can go on just as well under the tariff as it exists to-day as it did under the tariff that existed before. My hon. friend opposite shakes his head; but I think I am right in my statement of facts. I know for a fact that a few weeks ago a purchase of about 500 tons of sugar, not for refining purposes, was being negotiated between Jamaica and a house in Montreal; I am sure that 200 tons of that purchase was concluded, and I think it likely that the whole of it was concluded, so that shows that sugar is coming into Canada for consumption from Jamaica at the present time. Now, in reply to one remark that was made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I just want to point out for the information of the House that the difference between the cost of raw sugar and the selling price of the refined sugar in the case of one refinery spread over a period of two years—the two years, if I remember aright, ending the 31st of December last—was only 60 cents per 100 lbs., so that considering the cost of refining, and the interest on all the plant, and the refiners' profit, I think the House will see that up to that date, when there was a greater protection to the refiners than at present, that refinery, at least, could not have taken any very excessive or exorbitant price for refining sugar in this country.

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

After Recess.

ONTARIO EXPRESS AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved second reading of Bill No. (151) respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This Bill was introduced out of its usual course by consent of the House. It is a Bill, likewise, out of the usual order, inasmuch as it does not seek the incorporation of the company, but seeks to revive a charter which had expired, and to remove doubt as to the validity of the organization of the company. A Bill of that character ought to be carefully considered, and an opportunity afforded to any person interested to present any opposition that may exist with respect to it. I propose that the Bill should stand on the Order Paper until this day week. This announcement will give any person an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. Minister having taken that position in regard to that Bill I have no objection to a postponement of one week or six weeks for the reason he has given. I have never seen a Bill treated in this way, when there was no objection to its principle and no substantial opposition was offered. There are many precedents for this legislation. I should like to compromise, by asking the Minister to allow me to move the second reading on Monday night. I would, however, ask the Minister to allow the second reading to be taken, and afterwards any person who wishes to oppose the Bill can appear before the Committee. I am satisfied that if the Minister were familiar with the facts, he would admit that there was great urgency for this legislation. I hope the hon.

gentleman will grant either one or the other of these requests.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Bill were read the second time to-night, it would not finally be passed any sooner than if it were read the second time this night week. I think there need be no apprehension but that there will be ample time to get the Bill through, if such a Bill should pass.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If there is no substantial opposition I suppose the Government will give an opportunity to move it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will be an opportunity every Monday and Friday for the rest of the session. The proposition I have made is with a view to publicity. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before a final conclusion is arrived at I wish to offer a few words in reply to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). That hon. gentleman, when addressing the House, attempted to defend the action of the Government in excluding sugars of No. 16 Dutch standard. He said if they were admitted, two-thirds of the sugar consumed in Canada would be of the raw kind produced in Jamaica, and only one-third of refined sugar. The hon. gentleman further said, that it would seriously increase the cost of refined sugars. The result is that in order to reduce the cost of refined to those who use nothing else, those who use the grocery sugars have to submit to an increased price. This fact directly aims at the resources of the poorer classes, and tends to cheapen the refined sugars for the richer classes. That is the only conclusion to be arrived at from the hon. gentleman's remarks. It is, that in order to keep down granulated sugars at present prices, or at lower prices, you must exclude grocery sugars or the kind we would receive from Jamaica. To that point I want to direct the attention of the House. Another point submitted by the hon. gentleman was that a portion of the raw material, and it is a very limited portion, comes from Jamaica for refining purposes. If we extended our Customs Act to No. 16 Dutch standard undoubtedly we would bring in a very large quantity of sugars, but the Minister of Finance in carrying out what he conceives to be the mandate of the electors in favour of protection shuts out these sugars. It is rather amusing that the hon. gentleman not only grants the refiners protection, but in order to secure entirely the Canadian market for them, he places an Act on the Statute-book that virtually prohibits the importation of this grade of sugar that would be very desirable to a large class of consumers. He has abandoned the principle of prohibition in liquor and adopted the principle of prohibition in grocery sugars, in order to give the refiners the absolute control of the market. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) said we can refine that particular class of sugar that would take the place of the Jamaica raw sugars if imported. No doubt, but the people would help to pay $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent for it. It is quite clear that the Minister of Finance is not acting to benefit those who purchase and pay for these commodities, but in the interest of hon. gentlemen who sit behind him and are largely interested in the refining business. That, no doubt, is the reason why the hon. gentleman has taken this action.

Item agreed to on division.

4. Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and, or corn syrup, a specific duty on one and one-half cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does this amount to when reduced to *ad valorem* on the average value?

Mr. FOSTER. I think about 45 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you call the value of any glucose?

Mr. FOSTER. About 3 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is 50 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. It formerly went under the different grades of the sugars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that a very heavy proportionate duty?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, a pretty heavy duty. We have given the advantage to cane sugar and the like of that, and this is not of so good a quality. I think it can stand the duty. I wish to add to the end of that:

Or any syrups containing any admixture thereof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman had any special reason for practically barring out that description of sweet, because I take it that will be the effect of the clause. It is very much out of proportion to the duty he inflicted on the others.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the duty is a little lower than the old rate would have been. The reason for adding the amendment is, that they are bringing in syrups of a lower grade and they strengthen them with glucose. That is an adulteration and interferes with the classes of better syrups which are let in under the first clause practically free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What you practically want is to prohibit the use of glucose?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a portion of that glucose used in confectionery, and we have manufacturers of our own for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to ruffle my hon. friend's susceptibility to ask who suggested these things, but he himself is not *au fait* of all the little details of the trade, and in considering these emendations he may be hitting parties that he does not know. He is making a very great discrimination against this, which as far as I remember, did not exist under the old tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. The old tariff rate was higher than the present on this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the sugar rates were higher than the present rates. If I understand this, it is very nearly treble the rate on the fine sugars, and that seems a very high proportion indeed. The point I want to call his attention to is, that in this new change which he is making, he is discriminating heavily against this article. That may be all right, but I would like to know if the thing has been considered.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been considered, and the only objection would be from confectionery makers.

The article is made in our country and they are quite willing to get it from our own factories.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

7. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, thirteen cents per gallon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does that increase?

Mr. FOSTER. Three cents, about equivalent to the increase on the malt.

8. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon) twenty-one cents per gallon.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. If these resolutions go through to-night, I may have something to say in reference to these two items a little later. I said just a moment ago that this was supposed to be about an equivalent to the increase of malt. I think, however, there are some points under consideration at the present time which will induce a little change in this. If so, I will have to go to the Committee of Ways and Means, with a resolution to that effect.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act, Chapter 32, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Customs," by repealing section 94 thereof, respecting the refining in bond of sugar, molasses, or other material from which refined sugar can be produced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will you please explain what the effect of this clause is?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to add to that: "and so much of section 245*a* as relates to the warehousing of such sugars as may be refined in bond." This refers to the powers under which regulations were made as to refining sugar in bond; and, of course, as the raw material now comes in free, the clause of the Act relating thereto is repealed.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

On resolution 4, beet-root sugar,

Mr. FOSTER. I find that this section is not quite regular in the way it was introduced, and I will move that it be disagreed to, and will introduce a new resolution on the subject later. It refers to beet-root sugar.

Resolution disagreed to.

On resolution 5, item 7,

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to move disagreement to the item referring to cigarettes.

Item disagreed to.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister know what is the difference between the Excise duty on these articles and the Customs duty?

Mr. BOWELL. The proportions are just the same.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs and Excise on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the twenty-fourth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one.

Provided, however, that nothing herein shall be construed as exempting any sugars now held to be in bond for refining purposes, in any bonded premises connected with, or occupied in whole or in part, by any sugar refinery, which may be found on examination of the stock in such premises to have been removed therefrom, from payment of the duty properly payable thereon, under item number 419, in schedule "A" to the Act, chapter 33, Revised Statutes, which shall continue in force as regards such sugars, until proper entry thereof and payment of duty thereon has been made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They could not have been removed in any way, could they?

Mr. BOWELL. In the clause of the tariff which we have just repealed permitting the refining of sugars in bond, sugar was always considered in bond until the entry was made and the duty paid; and this was to prevent the possibility of sugar which had been taken out of bond, and sold previous to the coming into force of the Act, being put into another bonded warehouse and exemption claimed from the duty. Under the Act, the refiners had the right to have bonded warehouses all over the country, we holding a sufficient quantity in the refineries to meet the full amount of duty payable upon the periodical settlement that took place, and we were fearful that a large amount of the sugar which had been refined and really gone into consumption might be claimed to be ostensibly in bond; or it might be allowed to remain in the bonded warehouse, although actually sold before the tariff came into operation. If that were allowed, all sugar would have to be, in the settlement, considered as a portion of sugar in bond at the time.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the object is that in the case of all sugars, whether refined or in the process of refining, or raw material, those holding them in bond are required to pay the full duty under the old Act before the sugars are released?

Mr. BOWELL. No; just the contrary. If sugar was legitimately in bond, whether refined, partially refined, raw or in process of refining, it would be exempt from the duty; or in other words, the refiner might have a thousand barrels of refined sugar in his premises and he would be allowed to cancel his bond just in proportion to the quantity that the refined sugar would bear to the raw sugar. The object of this clause was to prevent their claiming exemption from duty upon sugar which had actually been sold, but which was ostensibly in bond.

Mr. McMULLEN. I fairly understand the hon. gentleman now; but is he satisfied that, prior to the change in the tariff, sugars, which were virtually sold into the hands of retailers in Montreal and Toronto, were not rebonded; that is, placed back in the hands of the refiner, who rebonded them pending the action of the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. We have no knowledge of anything of that kind, but we have knowledge of this fact, however, that in the case of sugar and spirits which have paid the duties, the parties who held them claimed they were entitled to the same rights as the refiner, who was allowed for the sugar and spirits he had in bond. This claim, of course, we could not recognize; if we did, we would have to recognize the claims of every merchant who held a duty paid gallon of molasses or a pound of sugar.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood that such a thing did take place, that is, that the refiners, having the privilege of putting in bond refined sugar and taking out a proportionate quantity of unrefined, were allowed to rebond the refined and withdraw the raw. I have been informed that, in certain cases, large stocks, or even very extensive stocks, which were in the hands of retailers in Montreal and Toronto, were rebonded for the purpose of giving retailers the anticipated advantage by the change of duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned that, and I shall instruct my officers to enquire into it. But I cannot conceive it possible, because under no circumstances are importers or manufacturers permitted to rebond goods or articles of any kind after the entry has been made and the duty paid. If the duty had not been paid and an actual *bonâ fide* sale had taken place, what the hon. gentleman has said might possibly be done, but it could not be done without the knowledge or the connivance of the officer, and I do not believe any collector would permit any such evasion of the law to take place.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is the collector in a position to decide whether the sugar taken to a bonded warehouse to be bonded has been previously in the hands of the retailer, unless there is some mark or stamp put on the sugar when taken out of the bonded warehouse? I do not know of any stamp or mark being placed on every barrel when removed from the bonded warehouse.

Mr. BOWELL. Where to?

Mr. McMULLEN. Into the hands of the wholesale dealers.

Mr. BOWELL. Then it could not be taken back. If it were removed from the refinery into a private bonded warehouse, it would be placed under lock and key of the officer, and consequently could not pass out of his hands unless there was an understanding between the refiner and the party to whom it was sold. If it went once to the warehouse or shop of the retailer or elsewhere it could not come back into bond.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It must have arisen from the permission given to the refiner to place refined sugars in a wholesale warehouse; but, as I understand, it would be then placed under the custody of the local officer, and stock would have to be taken of that when the change of duties was made, and whatever sugars had been taken out of that lot would be subject to duty, but what remained in bond and was so certified to by the local officer would be free from duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) is correct. The misunderstanding may have arisen in the way he suggests. As I pointed out a moment ago, the law and the principle that governs the bonding of sugar is altogether different from that which governs the bonding and control of any other goods. If a merchant imports sugar, it is put into bond, placed under lock and key, and he is not allowed to take a pound of it out until entry is made and the duty paid, and then a warrant is given to the officer who is called a locker, who upon receiving such warrant delivers the goods upon which the duty had been paid. Under the clause which has just been repealed, which has been in force for twenty years, a sugar refiner refined in bond under no surveillance whatever, except that he had to make a full statement of the amount of sugars that went into his refinery or the warehouses surrounding it, and at the end of the week or month, as the case might be, entries would be made of the sugar that had been sold, first ascertaining the amount he had on hand, so that he would pay the duty on the balance. The case referred to by the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) must have arisen in the way suggested by the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). The refiners had bonded warehouses in Hamilton, London and nearly all the cities in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and I found that we had no power to prevent that. I looked at the law and found that, while they held a sufficient quantity of sugar in their bonds to cover the amount of duty due by them, they had a right to send the sugar where they pleased. The only difficulty we could have thrown in their way would be to demand a settlement every day or every night. Instead of that the practice has been that the officer would go in when they least expected him, once a week or once a fortnight, or once a month, and take stock, and, if they had not the quantity in the warehouse or the refinery, say, in Montreal, they must show that they had it in Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford or some other place, and they would not be asked to pay the duty on that until it was sold. I have asked for the repeal of this clause, so that, if the Parliament of Canada should see fit to place a duty on sugar in future and to grant the permission to manufacture in bond, the refiners should be placed in the same position as my hon. friend opposite would be if he imported 1,000 barrels from a foreign country and placed them in bond, and pay the duty whenever it was taken from bond, whether he has sold it or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask if manufacturers are permitted to sell sugars in bond to the wholesale men and transport them in bond?

Mr. BOWELL. No; that has never been done. One of the refiners, after the introduction of the resolution, made the same enquiry of me. He said he had sold sugars for delivery after the anticipated change in the tariff. Then, I said, you will have to pay the duty, and he paid the duty though he had not delivered the goods.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) founded on resolutions 1, 2 and 6, to amend the Acts respecting the duties of Customs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill is intended to put the Auditor General in the same position in which he was placed by the original Act, in regard to the matters which are here dealt with. In 1886 at the time of the revision of the Statutes, it has since appeared that an important change was made, which took away from him the power to promote and remove in his own office. As it seems to have been agreed upon at the time of the passage of the original Act, on both sides of the House, that that officer was to have certain independent powers, and as this power was taken away in the consolidation, I think inadvertently, and certainly without the notice of the House, it is proposed to put him back in the same place, with the same powers he had before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a very proper modification, and I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman has proposed it.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to add another clause to the Bill:

This Act shall be construed as if it had been passed at the date of the coming into force of the Revised Statutes.

That leaves the matter exactly as it would have been.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 122) further to amend the Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I objected very strongly to some of the provisions of this Bill last evening, and I object to them still. The question raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was not as to whether such a Bill was necessary, but it was whether the penalties by which this measure was to be enforced were proper penalties to adopt. Sir, the hon. Minister last evening said that the Crown had the power to pardon, and that because the Crown had the power of pardoning in certain cases, therefore the Minister, the head of a department, ought to be entrusted with the attributes which are in certain cases entrusted to Her Majesty or Her Majesty's representative. Anyone who will take the trouble of looking at this Bill will see that it is not the exercise of the prerogative of mercy that is conferred upon the Crown by this Bill—nothing of the sort. Under what circumstances does the Crown exercise this power of pardon? We know very well that every law is imperfect, and when, in the administration of the law, there are mitigating circumstances for which the law does not make adequate provision, there is a reference of the matter to the Crown for the purpose of pardoning the offender, or of commuting the sentence, or of mitigating the severity of the punishment. But, Sir, that question, when so referred, is considered by a law officer of the Crown. He applies well settled rules and principles to the consideration of the subject, and he advises the Crown with regard to it. I believe that it has always been the practice in this country to refer the subject to the whole Council, it is considered in Council, and the advice or the opinion which has been prepared by the Minister of Justice is discussed in Council, and a recommendation is made to His Excellency upon the subject. In England, I believe this power is exercised by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. But, Sir, it is nothing of that sort that is done under this Bill. This is not an exercise of the pardoning power, it is not a question where the Crown is asked to interfere in mitigating the sentence of a court. There is no provision made by the hon. gentleman for the proceedings before an ordinary tribunal. You do not entrust to the judges of the County Courts in our province—I do not know to what extent the rule is applied elsewhere—trial of a case where there are more than $400 involved, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to entrust to a fishery officer, a man without any legal training, a man without even the legal standing of an ordinary magistrate, the trial of a party under this Bill for an offence charged against him, and with power to confiscate property that may be worth ten, or fifteen, or twenty thousand dollars; and there is no redress provided in the case except by an appeal to the Minister, and the Minister, in his capacity as head of a department, will exercise power in this matter of mitigating the punishment that has been awarded. Now, last evening I called the attention of the House in Committee to the fact that no matter how trifling the offence is, the Minister provides by this Bill, and the House is asked to sanction it, that there shall be confiscation of the ship and its outfit in every possible case. It may be that the offence is of a very trifling character, it may be that there is some doubt as to whether there has been really an offence against the law at all, and yet the hon. gentleman provides that in that case there shall be a confiscation of the vessel, and he provided, as the Bill originally stood, that one moiety of the pecuniary penalty imposed, and the ship and its outfit should go to the party who made the complaint. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman instituted a comparison between the powers of the Crown to pardon offences or to mitigate the punishment, and the provisions of this Bill in another particular. Why, Sir, the Crown has no power to pardon an offence so as to take away the right or interest of the informant. The Crown cannot mitigate the punishment in that respect; the right of the party is absolute from the moment that conviction is had by an ordinary judicial tribunal. But the hon. gentleman provides by this Bill that although a complaint may be made, and even though there may be a just cause for conviction, yet the Minister may have power, as head of the department, to remit the penalties and to deprive the party who has made the complaint or taken the trouble to enforce the law, of any right to compensation whatever. Now, that is the provision of the Bill as the hon. gentleman has presented it to the House. As it is now amended, except in so far as property in the ship is concerned, the informant is entitled to the moiety of the pecuniary penalty if the conviction is allowed to stand, but if the Minister chooses to interfere and to remit the penalties, then the party is deprived of the moiety to which he would otherwise be entitled. I say that it is an improper thing, it is wholly contrary to the spirit and principle of our constitutional system, that any Minister should be vested with the extraordinary powers which the hon. gentleman, by this Bill, undertakes to arrogate to himself. It is, in my opinion, a most improper piece of legislation in this particular. There ought to be something like an apportionment of the punishment to the offence that is committed. The hon. gentleman does not admit anything of that kind. He provides that although the pecuniary penalty may be as low as $50, and the pecuniary penalty is made small because the offence may be trifling, nevertheless it must be accompanied by the confiscation of the ship and its outfit. I think that is a most improper provision. I hold we ought to leave the interpretation of the law, and the judicial enforcement of the law, to the ordinary judicial tribunals of the country. The hon. Minister said at a former stage of the proceedings of the House on this Bill that the courts were not to be trusted. I have no hesitation in saying that the Minister calumniated the courts. The court is competent to investigate the evidence, to consider the case, to

pronounce judgment upon it, and I have no doubt whatever that there is no judicial tribunal in the country which would not be trusted with more implicit confidence than the arbitrary interference of the Minister and the exercise of the power which he undertakes to retain to himself by the provisions of this Bill. We ought to be under the government of the law. I said, last evening, and I repeat, that it is an old principle recognized in Magna Charta, that there ought not to be undue penalties provided by the law. There should be some relation between the offence and the penalty the law undertakes to impose, and there is no such relation in the Bill submitted. The hon. gentleman knows right well that whether there is any injury at all committed in consequence of purse-seining is still a disputed question. There is no certainty that any injury follows in consequence of the use of seines of this sort. It is, however, in the opinion of a great many that injury is inflicted. The hon. gentleman has proceeded to legislate on that assumption. He has taken sides on a question not yet settled. He asks the House to take sides upon it, and it seems to me the hon. gentleman will have gone quite far enough if he provides penalties in proportion to the offence committed and leaves the enforcement of the law to the ordinary tribunals, instead of undertaking to take charge of the matter by this arbitrary proceeding, and placing very extraordinary power, as he does by this Bill, in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the time being, whoever he may be. I object to legislation of this sort. I object to it because it makes a large class of the population dependent on the Minister. It places them in the power of the Minister; he may be vindictive against parties who are politically opposed to him. It may be such a party is an offender, but he will apply to him an amount of punishment that he will not mete out to a person who is a powerful political friend. There is serious danger of abuses of this sort, and our whole constitutional system proceeds on a principle utterly at variance with the principles which are set out in this Bill. I enter my protest against legislation of this sort, as being at variance with the principles of our system of government, inconsistent with the rights of freemen, inconsistent with that protection which the law is intended to give, and that equality which the law is intended to maintain between all portions of our people in regard to the protection of property under the law—I say in all these respects the Bill is objectionable and ought not to receive the sanction of this House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I confess that last night when I took objection to the details of this Bill, admitting the principle to be a good one, I was much surprised that the Minister was so persistent in his determination to refuse to amend it. There are three objections which I made to the Bill. The first was the penalty, which I think altogether excessive and cruel; the second was to the court where the penalties are recoverable, which is in no sense an efficient court; and the third was to the granting of a moiety of the penalties to the informer. As regards the penalty, we are creating a new offence by this statute. We are declaring that to be illegal hereafter which heretofore has been legal, and every vessel continuing to fish with purse-seines, which could pursue that fishing heretofore outside of the three-mile limit and inside the three-mile limit, is now compelled to forego the right to fish with purse-seines inside the three-mile limit. There was no objection taken to that proposal on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen held it to be a debatable question, but we were willing to consent to the Minister, if after thoroughly studying the subject, he came to the conclusion, on the contradictory evidence before him, that a law should be passed prohibiting it, passing the proposed law and we were willing to lend him our assistance. The Minister said: I will not only impose a penalty varying from $50 to $500 in the discretion of the justice, but in every case I will confiscate the vessel, tackle and appliances; I will not leave any discretion in the hands of the court to determine whether there is any palliative feature of the case, whether it has been a wilful breach of the law, or a breach of the law by chance—I will leave no discretion in the hands of the court, but I will in every case confiscate the vessel, tackle and appliances. It is a cruel, unjust and arbitrary penalty; and this was not denied last night, and cannot be denied now. I venture to assert that there are not a dozen hon. members, I care not whether they sit on the opposite side of the House, or what their political proclivities may be, who would defend such a monstrous proposition as this, that an offender, charged for the first time with a violation of this law, shall be punished, not only with a pecuniary penalty of even $500, but with the further penalty, in the execution of which the court has no discretion, of the confiscation in every case of the vessel, tackle and appliances. One would suppose, in a case of this kind, where these extraordinary penalties are imposed, the greatest care would have been exercised in selecting the tribunal before which prosecution could be instituted. One would suppose that where these enormous powers are vested in the judiciary, some court would be selected, known for the experience of its judges, and their knowledge of the law, so that by no possibility a mistake could be made. What is the fact? The hon. gentleman entrusts the carrying out of this Act not even to a court of record. The other day we reconstituted the Court of Admiralty, and we provided large salaries to the gentlemen who fill the positions of admiralty judges. Why? Because it was declared that a special court was necessary to deal with marine cases, and because, in cases of collision between vessels, and in all marine matters, it was thought better to have them heard before judges specially trained in these matters, and even their decisions are made subject to appeal to the Supreme Court. Why did not the Minister take advantage of the constitution of the court, and provide that these penalties should be recovered there? I take it, that it will surprise every hon. gentleman that so far from going to any Admiralty Court, or any court of record, the hon. gentleman declares that the confiscation of vessels must take place before a single justice of the peace, or a fishery overseer, who is not a justice of the peace, and who may be a man who has never been in a court of law. I have established my proposition that a more unparalleled piece of legislation has never been attempted to be carried in this House. Who would deny it? We know the qualification of a justice of peace, and he is satisfactory, he is capable of administering the oath to school trustees in his district. If you give him civil jurisdiction you are careful to limit it to

$25 or $30, and if you go beyond that, you send the party to the County Court; but here, you are placing cases which will amount in value to $15,000 or $20,000 in the hands of a justice of the peace, an untrained lawyer, not even constituting a court of record. Where is the record that the vessel is condemned and confiscated? Where is the record of the condemnation to be, when a single justice condemns her? Sir, one would suppose that if a valuable property like a ship is to be confiscated to the Crown, that the proceedings, at least, would be instituted in some court of record, where there would be a record to show the condemnation; but there is nothing of the kind here. I say, Sir, that not only the legislation of this country but the legislation of the mother country, affords no parallel to such legislation as we have here. Why, in the mother country, when they legislate on matters corresponding to the subject we are now legislating on here, they refer the matter to the Admiralty Court, and to an admiralty judge, a trained judicial officer in evidence of this kind, and thoroughly competent to decide in such cases. Here you thrust this authority upon a single justice of the peace, and how is the action to be commenced and concluded? Why, Sir, it may be carried out on the oath of a single witness, for that is enough. A sailor who has fallen out with his master, and who has a grudge against the captain or owner of a ship, can go before a single justice, and on the evidence of that sailor it is competent for the justice, if he can be found, to confiscate the whole vessel. But, the hon. gentleman says, you have your appeal to such mercies as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the time being may choose to exercise. Sir, I say that is not an efficient or proper tribunal to which to refer people whose property is confiscated in this way. Surely when the courts of the land are established to try cases in this country, and when the Crown steps in and seeks to confiscate the property of the subject: the least the Crown could do—or if the Crown does not do it, the Legislature should take the responsibility upon themselves—the least they could do, is to give the subject the power to have the case tried before a proper tribunal. But even that is not a bad enough principle in this Bill. The hon. gentleman offers an inducement, by giving one-half the pecuniary penalty, to a man to lay information against the owner of the vessel. I think, with all due deference to the Minister, that this inducement is in the nature of a bribe. I think that it will work very harshly and cruelly, and I think that in all probability the Minister will find, on reflection, and in the working out of the Act, that he has to a large extent defeated his own object. We discussed this question thoroughly last night, and I will not take up the time of the House further than to say that the proposition that exceessive penalties defeat their own object, is an axiom that will be admitted and is known to every person who has a knowledge and practice of the law. This penalty is unjustifiable; nobody can defend it. It is monstrous and unjust that a vessel can be sacrificed for, it may be, an unwitting offence against the law, which the captain may commit against the wishes and even the orders of the owner. Your penalty is excessive, your court is improper, and nothing can justify this provision in the Act. Why are not such cases brought to the Admiralty Court, where the owners could have some security that the laws of the land can be administered and listened to, and why do you give power to the informer to go before, perhaps, an ignorant justice of the peace, to condemn a man in a penalty and confiscate his property? This legislation is unjust, and I would say to the hon. Minister—if I would not use too harsh an expression—that he is acting with a stubbornness in this matter which will not reflect any great credit upon him. He should have acceded to the reasonable amendments we asked to be inserted in the Bill. We offered to pass this Bill, and there would not be a word said about it, if he had struck out the penalty of confiscation and allowed the offenders to be prosecuted before the Admiralty Courts as established. The penalty is excessive, the court is improper, and the payment of a moiety of the pecuniary penalty is a wrong one.

Bill read the third time, on division, and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 116) to further amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved:

That resolution 5, reported from Committee of Ways and Means, 23rd June last, and agreed to this day, be incorporated in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1, sub-section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of this?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object is that when an application is made for a distillery, or a brewery, or a manufactory of that kind, certain portions of the premises are designated as a bonding warehouse and disputes may arise as to what part of the premises may constitute a bonding warehouse. It is simply to decide what portion shall constitute a bonding warehouse. By this clause we constitute that portion signified by the plan sent into the department with the application.

On section 2, sub-section 3,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object of this section is to avoid a difficulty which has already occurred in some cases of prosecution. For instance, there was a case in Montreal in which the information was laid before one justice of the peace and tried before another in that city, and on that ground we failed to obtain a verdict. This is a clause drafted by the Deputy Minister of Justice to get over that difficulty.

On section 3,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the change?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Only a slight change. There seemed to be in the old Act an authority, implied at any rate, for any person bottling spirits to use the name of the manufacturer on the label, and thus perhaps give a character to an article not fit to be placed upon the market. By this we provide that before any label can be used, it must be submitted to the department and approved of.

On section 4,

Mr. LAURIER. What is the change here?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The amendment to the schedule is a far-reaching one. The whiskeys made by Canadian licensed distillers are made under the direct supervision of the department. They are known to be pure and wholesome, so far as alcohol can be wholesome, and Parliament has from time to time given the Government power, not only to see that no deleterious matters are introduced therein, but to offer the best of inducements to the distillers to eliminate all those elements natural to the grain from which the alcohol is distilled: firstly, a refund is authorized to be made of $1.30 per gallon in respect of all the fusil oil and other noxious ethers separated from the alcohol by the process of rectification; and, secondly, a remission of duty is allowed within specific limits in respect of the loss by evaporation during a term of two or more years of enforced maturing. The public health is thus safeguarded as far as it is possible by legislation to do it, that is, in respect of spirits produced in our licensed distilleries. The high duty, however, added to the increased cost of withholding spirits so long after manufacture from the market adds perceptibly to the cost; hence the price to the consumer is enhanced. The tendency is, of course, to restrict drinking, but the greed of unprincipled men demands the production of an article which they can sell cheaply, and this demand is met by reducing duty-paid highwines by water and adding to its apparent strength and piquancy by adding all manner of poisonous ingredients. The department desires to reach these people, and the schedule has been enlarged so as to include all spirituous liquors put up by compounders and others. To reach them further, the words "by wholesale" have been struck out, so that the Act is not confined to wholesale or retail dealers. The penalties are also increased, imprisonment is added, and confiscation is make more general and sweeping.

Committee rose and reported.

COMPOUNDERS' LICENSE FEES.

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

That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, and to provide that the person in whose name a license is granted to act as a compounder shall, upon receiving such license, pay to the Collector of Inland Revenue the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the object of increasing this license fee so much?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is true that the increase is very large, from $50 to $150, but this is a very profitable business and the license is still lower than it is in many other businesses.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would it not be more equitable to have some regard for the business that is done? A license fee of $150 might be very heavy for one doing a small business while it would not be for one doing a large business. Would it not be better to adopt a sliding scale?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It might be well to consider the whole question, but it is not on the volume of business that fees are imposed but on the investment of capital. Here is a business which does not require the investment of any capital or any plant of an expensive character. We have not yet heard of any complaint as to the increased license fee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You have not made the increase yet.

Resolution reported.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 141) to amend the Copyright Act (Sir John Thompson) was read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of the Bill. He said: The Act we passed last year gives power to the Exchequer Court to decide as to the validity of a copyright if the suit is brought by the Attorney General of Canada on the relation of the party affected, but this allows the suit to be brought by the party, though the Attorney General may not be a party to the suit.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 142) to amend the Patent Act (Sir John Thompson) was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act (Sir John Thompson) was read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to state to the Minister the objection I have to this provision, which I would be very glad if he would consider. I think the provision is liable to abuse which gives power to the returning officer to give a certificate to two electors to represent the candidate in any other poll than the one in which the electors are supposed to be registered. Now, the elector who applies to the returning officer for this certificate is not obliged to make any affidavit at any time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You mean the candidate applies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, or the elector either, who goes to the returning officer with an appointment from the candidate. He simply asks for a certificate from the returning officer that he may act as agent at another poll. Well, he gets that without any affidavit of any kind, and the consequence is that very often great frauds are perpetrated. I know very well that in the last election I ran, twenty or thirty men were brought in and scattered around with these certificates in eighteen different polling districts in the city. They got these certificates alleging that their names were so and so; they came into the polls, they did not stay two minutes—it was only a mere form—they did not stay one minute; they said:

I am here to represent so and so, and they polled their votes and walked out. Now, the object of the section was to appoint a *bonâ fide* agent who was to be a *bonâ fide* representative of the candidate, and to remain. Now, a dispute came up as to the meaning of "during the day." Well, we did not mean during the whole day, we meant during any part of the day, and so the consequence is that if you want to get in a lot of voters, they will be sure to be questioned if they vote where they are registered, and so to avoid the difficulty of giving them certificates, let them go to another poll, nobody knows them there. I was going to suggest to the Minister that he limit the number to one. I mean if John Smith comes there you do not swear him that he is John Smith on a certain poll, he is not bound to say where that is. There may be 65 different polling districts in the electoral division, and he presents his certificate to the deputy returning officer and says: I claim to vote. I will simply swear I am entitled to vote. I want to amend that oath by adding to the foot of it "I am duly registered as a voter for polling division No. — for this electoral division." I want the means to identify that man.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand the law now, when the returning officer grants a certificate to a voter to vote at any other polling sub-division than the one in which he is recorded as a voter, he is bound in that certificate to mention the polling sub-division where he is entitled to vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He ought to.

Mr. SPEAKER. He does as a matter of fact, and that is made part of the voters' list at the polling sub-division were he goes to record his vote, and he can be sworn just as any other elector upon the list in that polling sub-division.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If a man, appointed by a candidate as his agent at District No. 20, goes to the sheriff he is not bound to take an oath. He says, my name is John Smith, and you will find it on that list, and the sheriff grants the certificate without knowing that man. I want to provide in the oath that when he goes to vote he is to swear that his name is on a particular list. Nobody can object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has got to take the same oath that any other person has to take, that he is the person named on the voters' list.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; the deputy returning officer at the poll where this man claims to vote has not got a list for any other district than that one.

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly, but this forms part of the list. My hon. friend will find this to be the case, that the certificate that is granted to the agent forms part of the voters' list for that polling sub-division. It is added in point of fact to the list for that polling sub-division.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) My opinion is that he ought to be sworn before the returning officer gives him a certificate at all; he ought to swear that he is a voter on a certain list.

Mr. DICKEY. That would be very inconvenient.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I do not see any inconvenience in the returning officer exacting an affidavit from the man, and let that affidavit accompany the certificate.

Mr. SPEAKER. A difficulty will arise in this way: Suppose the candidate wanted to appoint an agent whom he would have to bring 20 or 30 miles to the returning officer to make that affidavit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then it could be made by an agent. Let the man who is to be appointed, or somebody in his behalf, swear that he is a voter on a certain list. At any rate, if we do not do that, then I would press upon the Committee to provide that when he votes he shall swear that he is duly registered on some list.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there can be no objection to the Minister of Justice including that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was going to suggest, also, that I think one would be quite sufficient for each polling place. If you send out a lawyer or a lawyer's clerk to represent you at a certain poll, you can send as many as you like from another place, but you cannot send two voters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is very desirable there should be two.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman had 50 or 60 votes polled against him as I had, he would not want more than one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend is confusing two things. It may be very proper to provide that there shall not be more than one non-resident.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; the hon. gentleman said one legal man who is your representative.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that there shall only be one person holding this certificate from the sheriff. I know it is absolutely essential to have two representatives at the poll; but this provides that the returning officer shall not grant certificates for more than two agents for each candidate at each polling district. I suggest that he shall not grant a certificate for more than one agent.

On section 3,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why two weeks?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The idea of the Committee was to overcome a difficulty that seemed to have arisen from the fact that adjournments were made to extend over too long a time, and it was desirable to establish some limit. Two weeks was considered a fair one, especially in the large constituencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If this is to be added to clause 62 will not a conflict arise?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is to provide for cases of ballot boxes being returned, but ballot papers not being enclosed in them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the time is altogether too long.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Minister of Justice intends that, immediately on the close of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall at once hand over to the returning officer the ballot boxes with their contents, I do not see why more than one week should be allowed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is, first, a provision that there shall be a delay of one week, in order to get in the ballot boxes. This provides

two weeks in case the ballot boxes do not contain the necessary information.

Mr. WATSON. One week should be sufficient. I have, probably, as large a county as any hon. member, and one week would be sufficient. In the case of Algoma, and one or two other constituencies, the elections are held at different times and longer notice is given, and they could be made exceptions in this particular. At my last election there were three delays. The first was because a ballot box was not returned, which was due to carelessness on the part of the returning officer, as it might have been received at Portage the day after the election. At the end of one week, when the declaration was to be made, it had to be postponed because a ballot box was missing. When the box came in, it was found, on being opened, that two deputy returning officers had not made the declaration as to the contents of the box. Another week's delay occurred. I do not think the candidate should be kept in suspense longer than is necessary; and no time longer than necessary should be allowed, as it increases the danger of the boxes being tampered with. The shorter the time after the election in which the declaration is made the better.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should not like to change the Bill in any important particular in such a thin House, and in the absence of so many members of the Committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would be better to repeal section 62, and let this section stand, as there might be conflict between them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is very desirable that every precaution should be taken against the possibility of mistakes which would render it necessary to delay and postpone from time to time the declaration. There should be a greater degree of responsibility on the part of the returning officer for the conduct of his deputy. He selects the deputy, and he may select a man on account of his political proclivities and political activity, and at the same time one who is altogether incompetent, without the necessary literary knowledge, without being properly qualified to discharge the duties. The law should be amended so as to hold the returning officer strictly responsible for his deputy. It is also very important that the returning officer should be a man of some standing, and who is possessed of a certain amount of property, so as to make him responsible for the proper discharge of his duties. To take a man without property or position and appoint him returning officer, and at the same time enact penalties which will not affect him, except that of imprisonment, is a most unwise and improper proceeding. We require to have purity of elections, and the men appointed to conduct them should be men who would minimize mistakes and wrong-doing. That is not, I am certain, the case under the present law. It is most desirable that there should be greater responsibility on the returning officer, and he should be a person having some status or qualification which would make him amenable to the law which imposes penalties on returning officers. I think the Bill requires further consideration in these particulars.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would greatly facilitate a prompt declaration being made, if the hon. Minister would provide that the deputy returning officers shall immediately at the close of the poll, return the ballot boxes to the returning officer, and if they neglect to do it they should be subject to a penalty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not know there was any other practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Oh, yes, there is. I mentioned it before.

Mr. McMULLEN. The returning officer in my riding went around to pick up the ballot boxes in each place, and it took him a week. In one case the person went away from home to the mill or to the town, and left the ballot box in the house, not knowing what day the returning officer would come for it; and the returning officer had to break open the door or the window to get the box. It should be provided that the deputy returning officers should, immediately at the close of the poll, send the ballot box to the returning officer.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the practice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is the almost universal practice, but it is not done in some cases.

Mr. BARRON. I know that the practice the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) complains of, prevails in some counties in Ontario, and it is in consequence of the wording of the section which says:

"The ballot box shall then be locked and sealed and delivered to the returning officer or election clerk."

I had occasion once to advise a returning officer during an election, and I know whereof I speak. The returning officer, with a view to get the mileage expenses, sometimes interprets that clause to be that he himself should go to the deputy and take the delivery in person. The result is, that a great delay is occasioned by the returning officer travelling a great distance to get the mileage and depriving his deputy of it. It might be well if the hon. gentleman who has raised the point should add a clause to the effect which he has stated, when the Bill comes up for further discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that this clause requires further consideration and amendment. It should be provided that it shall be the duty of the deputy returning officer, in each polling division, to grant a certificate to the scrutineers or the agents of the different candidates.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is the law now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The law now is that they may do so if it is asked for. It ought to be his duty to make such certificates, and if there is no representative of the candidate there to receive the certificate, he should enclose it to the candidate so that these certificates will be forthcoming in case the ballot box is lost. The law now says that the returning officer may summon the deputy returning officer, his poll clerk, or any other person, and I suggest that it should be made to read so as to include the agents or scrutineers who represent the different candidates. We ought to take every possible precaution against every possibility of fraud, and the best evidence is the certificate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The giving of a certificate is a most important thing, but I always found that this was all right. The law cannot be made to provide for the neglect of the agents or the candi-

date. The candidate should be there himself or his agents, and the deputy returning officer must give a certificate to any elector who is representing a candidate, if it is asked for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose the ballot box is not forthcoming, and no person has demanded such certificate, where is such information to be had? The candidate may not be in the country at all, but may have been nominated by persons who have obtained his assent. I say that no matter whether the candidate or his agent asks for his certificate or not, it should be the duty of the returning officer to prepare and forward such certificate, so that there can be no person returned except the person who has obtained the majority of the votes.

Mr. DENISON. I cannot see the object of that, because that is his duty at present.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is not.

Mr. DENISON. It is his duty to make the return, and if there is no one present to whom to hand the certificate, he will send it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let him mail it in a registered envelope to each candidate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Bothwell wants that made compulsory which is now permissive.

Mr. WATSON. In my election there were some polling sub-divisions where there was not an agent of a candidate at all, and if the ballots were lost there would be no way of tracing the vote. What the hon. member for Bothwell asks is that the deputy returning officer shall make a statement of the poll, and that if there is no agent of the candidates there, he will send a statement of the poll in a registered envelope to each candidate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If that is approved, and if it is to be carried out, you must put in a provision allowing the deputy returning officer something for it, or it will not be done.

Mr. WATSON. That will be part of the expenses. It certainly will not cost very much. I see that this section speaks of "the deputy returning officers whose ballot boxes are missing, or any other person having the same." I claim that the ballot boxes should not be allowed to go out of the possession of the deputy returning officer, until they are placed in the hands of the returning officer; I do not think anybody else should have them. I think also that a provision should be made that the returning officer shall deposit the ballot boxes in some place of safe-keeping after he receives them until he makes his declaration. I know that in my own case the ballot boxes were kept until the date of the declaration in a place where almost anyone could get at them—in a room in the post office, with nothing between them and the public but a common pine door. When those boxes arrived at Portage la Prairie some of them were unsealed and a great many had the locks knocked off, and they were practically open to the public; and we were very much alarmed, because there were persons there who had trifled with ballot boxes previously. I think the returning officer ought to be required to store the ballot boxes in vaults or similar places of safety.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When we get everything so perfect as the hon gentleman wishes, we shall have everything so tight that there cannot possibly be an election. My hon. friend will see that his suggestion does not refer to this clause at all. I think there is no objection to the clause.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sub-section 2 of section 58 provides that the ballot boxes shall be locked up and sealed, and then delivered by the deputy returning officer. I would propose that that be amended by inserting after the word "delivered" the word "forthwith."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we will put in something like that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to make a suggestion before passing on to another clause which the hon. Minister of Justice will perhaps consider before the Bill again comes up. Several hon. members have spoken about the difficulty that exists with respect to the ballot boxes from the time they come in, sealed up by the deputy returning officers, until the returning officer gets them. But there is a greater difficulty. After the returning officer gets them and before he opens them, it is not provided that they shall be kept in any place of safety: and all the frauds that have been committed have been committed during that period of time. It is very difficult to know how to get over this difficulty; but I would suggest this amendment:

Sub-section 1 of section 60 of the said Act is hereby amended by inserting after the words "returning officer" in the first line thereof the following words: "between the times of the receipt by him or his election clerk of each of the ballot boxes and the opening of the same at the place, day and hour appointed by his proclamation, shall take every precaution for the security of such ballot boxes, and for preventing any other person than himself and his election clerk having access thereto, and shall immediately upon the receipt of each such ballot box seal the same under his own seal in such a way that the box cannot be opened without such seal being broken, and this he shall do without effacing or covering the seal of the deputy returning officer thereon, and such returning officer."

I think it desirable that the returning officer, when he receives these ballot boxes, should put his own seal upon them, so that when the day of declaration comes they shall be found having both the seal of the deputy returning officer and that of the returning officer.

Mr. BARRON. I propose to ask the Committee to amend section 56, sub-section 3 of the Dominion Elections Act. That section provides that all the ballot papers indicating the votes given for each candidate respectively, shall be put into separate envelopes or parcels, and those rejected, those spoiled, and those unused shall be put respectively into separate envelopes or parcels, and such envelopes and parcels, being endorsed, shall be put back into the ballot box. I propose to provide that such envelopes or parcels shall also be sealed with wax by the deputy returning officer and be initialled by the agent, if present, across the flap thereof, and be then put into the ballot box. The Committee will see that there is nothing to prevent the envelopes being tampered with under the law as it is, as they are not sealed.

Mr. DENISON. I attended one of the ballot booths during the last election, and the returning officer seemed to have difficulty in getting through what he has to do as it is. There are sufficient forms and ceremonies to be gone through to puzzle

a Philadelphia lawyer. As far as I could see, the thing seemed to be well hedged in as it is, that the fewer complications we make the better.

Mr. McMULLEN. My experience at one of the polls is that the ballots were put into a box without the envelopes being sealed, while a little screen which had been used was actually put into an envelope and sealed up.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Disputes arose as to whether the affidavit should be entitled, and lawyers find that technical disputes in these matters are those which operate to set aside the object of the Legislature. I would suggest that the following words be inserted after the word "affidavit" in the first line of sub-section *a* :—"which need not be entitled in any manner or cause."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to call the Minister's attention to a serious objection to the original clause which we are now amending. A recount has become a rather important business, and you must get an order from a judge appointing the time and place for the recount within four days after the declaration. I do not object to the time, because it is right that these things should be done promptly, but you must serve the order upon the candidate or his agent within four days, and, if they are not in the district, you have lost your chance of a recount. There is no power given to make a substituted service. I suggest to the Minister that sub-section 1 of section 64 should be amended by inserting after the word "be," in the 45th line thereof, the following words :—

Which said notice may be served upon the said candidates or agents either personally or by such substituted service as such judge may when appointing the time or afterwards direct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The last five lines of sub-section *a* of this Bill deals with that matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; that is only in case you are driven to apply to the court for what is equivalent to a mandamus. That is when the County Court judge refuses to go on with his count, and you apply for a mandamus to compel him to do so. But the main section does not provide for substituted service, and if the candidate or his agent is not in the country, you cannot go on at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know the intention of the Committee was to provide for that case.

Mr. BARRON. No doubt the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) thought that was done which was intended to be done by the Committee, because the proposal was one which I made to the Committee, and the Deputy Minister of Justice took it with the view of incorporating it in the measure. As the hon. member for Haldimand has said, it was intended by this section to provide for that very thing which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) proposes.

On section 7,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I dare say this clause will render unnecessary in the vast majority of cases any further steps, but the law was intended to make provision for what is contained in this clause, and yet we have had candidates representing the minority of the voters returned to this House, and a contested election trial has been generally found necessary to seat the candidate having the majority of votes. In the old Parliament, it was the practice to amend the return where the minority candidate had been returned, and to throw upon the candidate having the minority vote the responsibility of contesting the election. Take the instance of my hon. from Queen's, N. B. (Mr. King). He received a majority of the votes. The returning officer seemed to think he had admitted the hon. gentleman to be a candidate improperly, and he refused to treat him as a candidate at all and returned his opponent as if he had been elected by acclamation. It seems to me that, in a case of that sort, it is a simple question of arithmetic as was stated by Lord Esher in the Bangor case; it is simply the duty of the returning officer to add up the numbers, to allow the candidate having the majority of votes to take the seat, leaving it to the other party to contest the election if he sees fit. This clause will no doubt prevent a large number of abuses of this kind, but there have been many disputes in regard to the law of Parliament in that particular, and I think we should remove any doubt by declaring that it shall be the right of the House of Commons to summon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the Bar of the House and to amend the return in accordance with the number of votes polled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think in the case the hon. gentleman has in his recollection, the power of Parliament to do that is not disputed, but the wisdom of doing it is denied.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice, I think, will find this to have been the case: that it was maintained that that was one of the powers that Parliament had relegated to the courts by the Controverted Elections Act, and that is what I think Parliament has not done, because it is simply a question of calculation. There is no question of law at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has relegated that question to the courts so far as to give the courts apparent jurisdiction. All we contended was that it was not sound policy to resume the exercise of any functions with regard to a matter in which petitions would apply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I want to say that our contention was that it was never the intention of Parliament to part with power in that respect, that is, to relegate to the court a question that involves nothing more than an arithmetical calculation, and it is not in the interest of the candidates or of Parliament that parties shall be put to the expense of a controverted election, when there is no point involved beyond the question of simply adding up the votes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quite agree with what my hon. friend says, but I do not think the English language can make the law plainer than it is now. You will always find men like the returning officer in the case I mentioned, who will violate the plainest provision that you can put upon the statute. The law is perfectly plain, that he is simply to add up the numbers; and the power of this Parliament, in the case to which my hon. friend refers, to make that right which he made wrong, never was disputed by any constitutional authority in this House worth listening to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend will remember that the seat was not given to my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King). There is no doubt as to what the duty of the returning officer was. It is not a question as to the duty of the returning officer; but the returning officer has neglected his duty, he has violated the law, and the question is, how is my hon. friend to get his seat? I wish it simply to be declared that Parliament shall, in that class of cases, order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to amend the return. Now, my hon. friend knows that that is not done. It was argued by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), it was argued by every hon. gentleman on that side of the House when that matter was in controversy, that the question ought to go to the courts, that it was the intention to embrace cases of that sort within the Controverted Elections Act. Now, I say it was not the intention to embrace cases of that sort in the Controverted Elections Act, and I wish to remove any doubt in this matter by declaring that, where it is simply a question of arithmetic, where the returning officer has failed to return the candidate having a majority of votes, this House shall order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to appear at the Bar of the House and to amend the returns in accordance with the facts.

On section 10,

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the Minister to consider an amendment to clause 58 in the original Act. After reciting the important duties that are imposed upon the returning officer and his clerk, I would suggest that there should be some such clause as this added:

Whensoever it shall be proved before a court of competent jurisdiction that the ballot box or its contents has or have been tampered with during the time when such ballot box or contents was or were in the legal possession of the returning officer, election clerk or deputy returning officer, then such returning officer, election clerk or deputy shall be liable to the fines or penalties, or both, provided by law for such an offence, unless such returning officer, election clerk or deputy returning officer, as the case may be, proves to the satisfaction of such court that such offence was committed without his knowledge and connivance, or not through his own act.

The wording of it has been somewhat altered by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) with whom I had a conversation with regard to it. We know that in an ordinary civil case if any property is left to any other person in charge, the person with whom it is left is obliged to return that property in the same condition in which he received it. Now, I propose that if a ballot box is proved to come into the possession of the returning officer perfectly sound and all satisfactory, then the onus is upon him of showing that while it has been in his possession nothing has been tampered with. If it is proved that it has been tampered with, then the onus is thrown upon him of proving that he is not the guilty party.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will suggest to the hon. member that it would be proper for him to give notice of his amendment, and have it printed in the proceedings.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid you would not get anybody to act as returning officer at all.

Mr. BARRON. It is very simple. You place the ballot box in the hands of a returning officer in a perfectly safe and sound condition. He is responsible for it; he must deliver it up in an equally sound and proper condition. If he does not do that, surely the onus ought to be upon him to show why he does not do that which the law says he shall do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When this Bill gets through the Committee, containing all the amendments that have been proposed, there will be one more unhappy being in the constituency after an election, than the defeated candidate.

Mr. BOWELL. Take the large number of deputy returning officers in the hon. gentleman's own district which runs away back into the free grant region some hundreds of miles. The deputy finds but one or two rooms in the house, he has to stop there all night, and during the night someone breaks in and tampers with the box, and the deputy knows nothing at all about it. Then the hon. gentleman proposes to compel him to prove who it was that did the mischief.

Mr. BARRON. There are no such people in my riding; it is only in your riding that they are to be found.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). All the different amendments that have been proposed to-night are in the custody of the Minister of Justice, and he will be held responsible.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.30 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) founded on Resolution 3 reported from Committee of Ways and Means, and agreed to by the House on Friday last, further to amend the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JOSEPH DUGUAY, EXCISEMAN.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. MIGNAULT) asked, What were the duties discharged by Joseph Duguay, exciseman, since the suspension of work at the manufactory of cigars, &c., at Baie du Fèvbre, where he resides, in virtue of which duties he was enabled to draw a salary of $500 a year, up to 30th June, 1889?

Mr. COSTIGAN. During the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1889, cigars were packed and excised. During the last fiscal year no manufacturing operations were carried on although license was taken out and stock of raw material is still on hand. In view of the fact that no operations were carried on last year, the department will not grant a license for current year, and Mr. Duguay will be retired.

BARRIE POST OFFICE.

Mr. BARRON asked, What is the name and address of the contractor who built the Barrie Post Office? What was the sum inserted in the contract for the erection of said post office? What was the amount of such person's tender? What was the amount paid such person for extras on said post office? What was the total cost of the work? When was the work completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The name of the contractor is William Toms, of Ottawa. The sum inserted in the contract for the erection of the said post office was $25,000. The amount of this tender was $25,000. The amount paid for extras on that post office amounted to $2,586, additional work for post office fittings, $2,750, finishing rooms on south side of attic, $670; the total cost of the work being $30,988. The work was completed on the 17th May, 1887.

FRASERVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. RINFRERT (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) (translation) asked, 1. To whom was the contract awarded for the building of the post office at Fraserville? 2. What is the amount granted for that undertaking? 3. When should the building be completed under the terms of the contract? 4. Are the Government aware that the work has been stopped repeatedly and that, in fact, the building has not yet been roofed in? 5. Will the Government take steps to compel the builder to fulfil the terms of his contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member I may state: 1. That the contractor is Alfred Lortie. 2. The amounts voted are as follows:—Estimates for 1889-90, $2,000; for 1890-91, $8,000. 3. The 23rd June, 1891. 4. Yes. 5. Last week an officer was sent to inspect the works and report; the report is now under consideration.

MAILS FROM CALGARY TO EDMONTON.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, Who was the contractor for carrying the mails from Calgary to Edmonton in the years 1887, 1888, 1889 and 1890? How many trips a week does the contract provide for? What is the distance from Calgary to Edmonton? How much was paid each year for carrying such mail? Were tenders called for, for the performance of this service? Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. The contractors for carrying the mails in the years named were Messrs. Leeson & Scott. The contract provided for one trip per week each way. The distance is 198 miles. Each year between the 15th of August, 1885, and the 11th of November last, the exchange of mails between these points was carried on under the contract for the service between Calgary and Fort Saskatchewan (weekly), Battleford and Fort Pitt (fortnightly), Battleford and Swift Current (weekly), for which the sum of $20,061.86 per annum was paid. Since the 11th of November last the exchange has been made under the contract for the weekly service between Calgary and Fort Saskatchewan, for which $8,537.37 is paid. Tenders were not invited for the performance of this service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The mail service in the North-West Territories was begun in 1877, an arrangement having been made with Mr. J. McKay for a trip every three weeks between Winnipeg and Edmonton at the rate of $10,000 per annum. This service remained in operation until the Canadian Pacific Railway reached Portage la Prairie in December, 1880, when the exchange with Edmonton was started from that point, the frequency remaining the same. Mr. J. W. McLane was the contractor, and the rate of payment was $23,134.82 per annum. As the railway extended westward, the distributing point for this service was successively Brandon on the 16th of October, 1881; Oak Lake on the 1st of July, 1882; and Troy (now Qu'Appelle Station) on the 17th of September, 1882, the rate of payment for the service from the last point being $15,765. On the 1st of June, 1883, an arrangement was made with Mr. McLane for a service between Edmonton, Stobart, Prince Albert and Troy, the frequency of which was weekly as far as Prince Albert, and once in three weeks between Stobart and Edmonton. The rate of payment was $24,152 per annum. On the 1st of November, 1883, this service was divided into two, namely, between Prince Albert and Troy, weekly, for $7,900 per annum, and Edmonton and Stobart, fortnightly, at the rate of $10,500 per annum. The contractor for both these services was Mr. R. Elliott. On the 1st of January, 1884, both contracts were transferred to Messrs. Leeson, Scott & Stewart. The service between Prince Albert and Troy remained in operation at the same rate until it was suspended on the opening of the Prince Albert branch railway last year. The service between Edmonton and Stobart was replaced in May, 1884, by fortnightly services between Calgary and Fort Saskatchewan and Fort Pitt and Stobart, Messrs. Leeson & Scott undertaking these two services for $11,000 per annum. In June, 1885, Battleford was brought into connection with the railway at Swift Current, and the service now stood fortnightly between Calgary and Fort Saskatchewan, Battleford and Fort Pitt, Battleford and Swift Current, and the rate of payment was $13,061.85 per annum. In November, 1887, the services to Fort Saskatchewan and Battleford from the railway were made weekly and the rate of payment increased to $20,071.86. In November, 1890, the utilizing of the Prince Albert Railway for mail purposes made it necessary to enter into a fresh arrangement with Messrs. Leeson & Scott for the weekly service between Calgary and Fort Saskatchewan, and the rate of payment was fixed at $8,537.37 for this service.

Mr. CHARLTON. The last portion of the sixth question has not been answered—why were tenders not asked for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been a continuous arrangement since 1877, made by the Postmaster General.

MAILS FROM CALGARY TO FORT MACLEOD.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails from Calgary to Fort Macleod? 2. Who had such contract in the years 1887, 1888 1889 and 1890? 3. Were tenders called for, for the perform-

ance of such service? 4. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not? 5. How many trips a week does the contract provide for? 6. How much was paid each year for the carrying of such mails? 7. What is the distance from Calgary to Fort Macleod?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Mr. W. H. Ford. 2. There was no such mail service during the years mentioned until the 1st of July, 1889. In 1887 and 1888 there were two services covering part of this route, viz., between Calgary and Musquito Creek, and Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek. These services were both performed by the Stewart Ranche Company. On the 1st of July, 1889, a contract was made with Mr. W. H. Ford for the service between Calgary and Fort Macleod. This contract is still in operation. 3. Tenders were called on the 23rd of November, 1888, for services between Calgary and Musquito Creek, and between Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek, and at this time two tenders were made in the regular way for the service between Calgary and Fort Macleod. As these were lower in amount than the tenders for the existing service which covered only part of the route, one of them was accepted. 4. The two tenders received therefor, were equal. 5. One trip per week each way. 6. $1,200 per annum ever since this service came into existence. 7. 102 miles.

CLAIMS OF ADDISON McPHERSON.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Has a man named Addison McPherson, or anyone for or through him, preferred any claim on the Government for alleged losses sustained during the rebellion in the North-West Territories? 2. If so, who preferred such claims? 3. When were such claims preferred? 4. For what amount, and what is the nature of the claims preferred? 5. Have such claims been assigned? If so, to whom and when? 6. Has the assignee made any claim on the Government? If so, when, and for how much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. A man named Addison McPherson made a claim on the department for alleged losses sustained during the rebellion in the North-West Territories. 2. The claim was made by Addison McPherson. The claims were made in 1885. 4. The amount of the claim is $1,592 for carting powder and shot, horse hire and loss of waggon. 5. These claims were assigned to William George Conrad and Charles E. Conrad, trading as I. G. Baker & Co., on the 14th February, 1891. 6. The assignee made the claim on the Government by petition of right received in the Department of Militia and Defence, on 17th June, 1891, for $1,592.

THE BRANDON *MAIL* IN THE PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. WATSON asked, 1. How many copies of the Brandon *Mail* are taken by the public departments, Ottawa, and how many copies elsewhere for which the Government have to pay? 2. How much was paid by the Government or the departments last year for the Brandon *Mail* received at the public departments, Ottawa, and how much per copy received elsewhere? 3. How much was paid the proprietor of the Brandon *Mail* last year for other services? 4. What was the amount of the account rendered for the Brandon *Mail* received at the public departments, Ottawa? 5. What was the amount of account rendered for such other services?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That question was on the Order Paper last week for several days but it was dropped in the presence of my hon. friend, and consequently I dropped the answer also. But so far as my memory serves me, the Brandon *Mail* received from all the departments last year, $21.10 for subscriptions; and from all the departments for advertisements, $382.81. The paper at Selkirk published the voters' list for $181.84. This is my recollection, and I believe I am right, of the facts which were furnished to me the other day by the Printing Bureau.

MR. H. H. PELLETIER.

Mr. AMYOT asked, In what years has Mr. H. H. Pelletier been employed in the Department of Militia since 1880, and in what capacity and at what salary each year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Henry Pelletier has been given employment in the military stores of Quebec, under Paymaster Lt.-Colonel Forrest, from the 28th November, 1888, at $1.50 per day; and from 22nd December, 1890, at $2 per day, until the 23rd July, 1891, upon which later date he was discharged.

CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Has any order been issued requiring civil servants to remain in the building in which they are engaged, from the hour of their arrival in the forenoon to the time of leaving in the afternoon, without any recess for lunch? If that order or any order in the same direction has been issued, what has been the cause of the order? Is it made to apply to the lady civil servants as well as male servants? Is the order a permanent or temporary one?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been no new order issued. The order referred to is the standing order, and it applies to all the clerks. In regard to the time for lunch, it is well understood that if a medical certificate is submitted by a clerk to the head of the department, and it is found satisfactory, some time is given for lunch.

DREDGING SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR.

Mr. PERRY asked, At whose recommendation was the dredge *Prince Edward* sent to dredge Summerside harbour, at Prince Edward Island? How long is she ordered to remain there? Is she ordered to finish all the dredging required before leaving?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The necessity for dredging alongside the railway wharf at Summerside harbour was brought to the notice of this department by the chief engineer and general manager, owing to there not being sufficient depth of water to allow the new steamer just put on the Prince Edward Island route to lie at the wharf to load and unload, and the dredge is now at work making the required berth. The time for the dredge to remain is not fixed.

HARBOUR MASTER AT TIGNISH.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is Benjamin Gaudet still acting as harbour master at Tignish, P.E.I.? If so, has he made a return of the money he collected for the year 1890? Is said Benjamin Gaudet to be continued in that position any longer?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Gaudet is still harbour master at Tignish, but the sub-collector of Customs is holding an investigation into the affairs of his office as wharfinger, under oath, by Order in Council. Mr. Gaudet was appointed on 22nd April, 1890, and has made no return of any collections. His remuneration is $100 of fees collected. Mr. Gaudet is also wharfinger at Tignish, to which office he was appointed 5th September, 1888. He has made no return of wharfage collections to the present time.

POSTMASTER AT BRAMPTON.

Mr. BAIN (for Mr. FEATHERSTON) asked, Has any person been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Wm. Elliott, late postmaster at Brampton, Ont.? If so, who has the appointment? Is it permanent, and what is the salary? Who is caretaker of said post office, and what is the salary of such caretaker?

Mr. HAGGART. No appointment has yet been made to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Wm. Elliott. Mr. W. C. McCulla is in charge of the Brampton Post Office. The salary attached to the Brampton Post Office is $1,300, with $20 extra for forward duty. The name of the caretaker of the Brampton Post Office building is not known to the Post Office Department, nor his salary.

GRAVING DOCKS.

Mr. ALLAN asked, Was a promise made prior to the 5th March last that a dry dock would be constructed at the town of Amherstburgh by the Government? If so, is it the intention of the Government to carry out such promise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not aware that any promise was made, either before or after 5th March last, that a dry dock would be constructed at Amherstburgh by the Government. The hon. gentleman will remember there is a statute under which dry docks may be built and receive certain aid from the Government under certain circumstances.

TAY CANAL.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. How many vessels passed through the Tay Canal last year; the names of the vessels and tonnage? 2. How much has been received by the Government last year for fees or lockage on said canal, and how much from all sources? 3. Does the Government still keep a dredge employed in cleaning out and deepening the canal, or has such dredge been so employed, and if so, when and how long? 4. Was such dredge purchased by the Government? If so, where, from whom, at what price, and who negotiated the purchase of such dredge? 5. Has the Government employed a diver and gang of men at any time in cleaning out the channel of said canal? If so, when and how long were such diver and gang employed and at what cost? 6. Have complaints been made to the Government or to the department that the said channel or canal is too shallow to permit of the small class of vessels passing through the same to pass with safety; or is the Government aware that such is the case? 7. Have complaints been made to the Government or the department that such small vessels have frequently grounded in said canal and been thereby damaged, or is the Government aware that such is the fact?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. The total number of vessels passing through the Tay Canal from 1st October, 1890, to 30th June, 1891, was 75; the total tonnage, 5,831 tons. The particulars are as follows:—Steamer *Jno. Haggart*, 59 tons, 24 trips, total tonnage 1,416. Steamer *Jno. Haggart*, rebuilt, 117 tons, 21 trips, total tonnage 2,457. Steamer *Harry Bate*, 144 tons, 12 trips, total tonnage 1,728. Steamer *Geraldine* and skiff, 15 tons, 7 trips, total tonnage 104. Steamer *Firefly*, 8 tons, 4 trips, total tonnage 32. Steamer *Ranger*, 8 tons, 4 trips, total tonnage 32. Scow (no name), 30 tons, 2 trips, total tonnage 60. Skiff (no name), 1 ton, 1 trip, tonnage 1. 2. The amount of tolls on vessels and freight collected from 1st October to 30th June, 1891, was $58.81; receipts from other sources *nil*. Total receipts $58.81. 3. The dredge is not now employed on the Tay Canal. It was so employed for the season 1890 and part of 1891. 4. At Perth, Messrs. Wm. Davis and Son, $6,000. The late Chief Engineer, Mr. Page. 5. Yes. About 2 months, at a cost of about $200 per month. 6. Complaints were made to Mr. Wise, the superintending engineer, that detached boulders and stones were left in the rock cuts by the dredge. The same class of vessels can pass with safety through the Tay Canal as navigate the Rideau. 7. No complaints have been made that vessels are frequently grounded. When a strong wind has been blowing, vessels have drifted on the sides of the canal and have sustained slight damages.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—COAL SUPPLY.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Have tenders been called for within the last six months for the supply of coal for the Kingston Penitentiary? 2. When were such tenders called for? 3. How many tenders were received by the department, or the lowest? 4. The amount per ton for such coal, soft and hard, specified in each tender? 5. Who were such tenderers? 6. Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why? 7. How many tons of each kind of coal did the advertisements for tenders call for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1. Yes. 2. June 30th, 1891. 3. Three tenders were received, as follows:—John Gaskin, egg $4.60, soft $4.65, chestnut $4.60, smiths $4.75. J. R. Crawford, egg $5.19, soft $5.24, chestnut $5.10, smiths $5.29. Jas. Swift, egg $4.58, soft $4.70, chestnut, $4.72, smiths $4.78. The lowest tender reported to me was accepted. No quantity was specified in the advertisements.

CRIMINAL LAW BILL.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked. Have any moneys been paid for the drafting of the Criminal Law Bill, and, if so, how much and to whom?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House voted the sum of $250 to C. A. Masters for assistance in drawing that code, as will be seen on page 1638 of *Hansard*. That was the only payment made.

RATES FOR CLERGYMEN ON THE I.C.R.

Mr. BARRON asked, 1. Is it the regulation that ministers of the Gospel and clergymen travel upon the Intercolonial and Government Railways at a reduced rate? 2. If so, what is the reduction? 3. Is the reduction confined to the Province of Quebec, or is it available to all such persons residing elsewhere than in the Province of Quebec? 4. What official has authority to grant a certificate for reduced rates to clergymen, if such are granted? 5. Is Mr. Stocking the agent of the Intercolonial at the city office in Quebec? If so, is the Government aware that he has declared that the privilege of reduced rates is confined to the clergy of Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. Yes. Tickets are issued at reduced rates to travel on the Intercolonial railway to ministers of the Gospel and clergymen. 2. Half a regular first class fare. 3. No. The reduction is not confined to the Province of Quebec. It is available to all clergymen in Canada who applied for, and hold a clergyman's certificate, signed by the chief superintendent and general passenger agent of the Intercolonial Railway. 4. The chief superintendent and general passenger agent of the Intercolonial are the only officials authorized to issue such tickets at reduced rates. 5. Mr. Stocking is not the agent of the Intercolonial at Quebec. The Government is not aware of, nor responsible for, anything that gentleman may have said.

EXTENSION OF THE TAY CANAL.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Has the Government entered into any contract with any person or persons for the extension of the Tay Canal to or near Haggart's Mill, Perth? 2. If so, who are the contractors, and where do they reside? 3. Was the contract let by tender? If so, when was the contract entered into? What is the contract price? When is the contract to be completed? 4. What is the estimated quantity of excavation? 5. How much clay? How much rock, and if crib work is required, how much? 6. In the construction of the said extension is it necessary to remove the stone bridge across the River Tay? If so, is it to be replaced by an iron bridge, at what cost? 7. In the construction of said iron bridge has it been found necessary to purchase some land to make room for the new bridge? If so, at what cost? 8. Are the works now in course of construction? 9. Was there any petition or request by any person or persons or body corporate for the construction of said extension and bridge? If so, who were such person or persons or body corporate, and when was the same preferred? 10. Were engineers instructed to make surveys, &c., of such extension? If so, who were they? When were they instructed and when did they report? 11. Has the construction of said works diverted the main branch of the River Tay from the old channel? 12. Has the construction of said works made it necessary that the mill known as "Haggart's Mill" should be closed? 13. Pending the construction of said works and during the period that the said mill be closed, is it the intention of the Government to make compensation to the owner of said mill? 14. Have any sum or sums per month or otherwise been agreed on as such compensation? If so what is the sum per month or otherwise?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. Yes. 2. Mr. John O'Toole and resides at Ottawa. 3. Yes, let by tender. Contract entered into 26th January, 1891. Price, $18,466. To be completed 1st November, 1891. 4. 14,100 cubic yards excavation. 5. 13,100 cubic yards clay, 1,000 cubic yards rock, about 50 lineal feet crib work. 6. Yes, it is necessary to remove the stone bridge. It is to be replaced by an iron bridge. The Government builds the masonry, at a cost of about $6,000. The corporation pays for the iron superstructure at a cost of $4,000. 7. Yes, at a cost of $1,500. 8. Yes. 9. Yes, by a deputation of the mayor and members of the corporation of the town of Perth, who waited upon the late Minister of Railways and Canals for that purpose. 10. Mr. Wise, the superintending engineer of the Rideau Canal. Instructed 22nd July, 1890. Reported 15th September, 1890. 11. No. 12. Yes. 13. No. 14. No sums have been agreed upon for such compensation.

MAIL SERVICE *viâ* GODERICH.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Did the Department of the Postmaster General receive from the inhabitants of St. Helen's and vicinity a petition praying that the mail to that place be conveyed *viâ* Lucknow, instead of *viâ* Goderich? 2. At what sum was it stated in said petition such mail would be carried by the former route, per year? 3. What sum is now paid for carrying such mail to Goderich? 4. What is the distance from Goderich to St. Helen's? What is the distance from Lucknow to St. Helen's? 5. Why is the mail not carried to St. Helen's *viâ* the shortest route? 6. Has the contract to carry the said mail *viâ* Goderich been renewed since the receipt at the department of said petition? If so, for how long, and why? 7. Has an offer been made to the department to carry the mail from Lucknow to St. Helen's, for $125 a year? If so, why was it not accepted?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. A petition for the service of St. Helen's from Lucknow was received at this department. 2. No sum of money was mentioned in the petition. 3. $130 per annum. 4. From Goderich to St. Helen's, 21¼ miles; from Lucknow to St. Helen's, 6 miles. 5. The mail to St. Helen's is carried by the shortest route. St. Helen's is served from Belfast, only 2¼ miles distant, while Lucknow is 6 miles away. 6. A new contract was made for the mail service between Belfast and St. Helen's (not between Goderich and St. Helen's) on the 1st April last, and will continue until 31st March, 1895. This arrangement was made because it was believed to be the best possible for that post office. 7. Yes, an offer was received at $125 per annum. It was not accepted because having in view the present cost of the service which was fixed by public competition in January last, it was believed to be too low, and that eventually the cost would be considerably higher.

STRATHROY POST OFFICE.

Mr. HYMAN asked, 1. What is the name of the contractor who built the Strathroy Post Office? 2. What was the amount of the original contract? 3. What was the amount paid for extras upon said building? 4. What was the total cost of the work? 5. Was the lowest tender accepted, and, if not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1. Lewis & Cluff. 2. $14,475. 3. The amount allowed for extras was $594, and for additional work, Post Office, Customs and Inland Revenue fittings, &c., $2,875. 4. $25,028. This amount includes cost of site, heating Post Office, Customs and Inland Revenue, fittings, furniture, &c. 5. Yes.

SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the railway station at Summerside, P.E.I., to be changed? If so, where to and when?

Mr. BOWELL. It is in contemplation to move the railway station at Summerside, P.E.I., but it is not finally decided where it will be moved to, or when it will be moved.

THE TITLE OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

Mr. DELISLE asked, Whether the title of Queen's Counsel is conferred on advocates in the district of Quebec, in view of their merits or professional success, or in consideration of political services rendered to their party? How does it happen that on the last occasion of conferring the title of Queen's Counsel in the districts of Quebec, Beauce, Three Rivers, Montmagny, Kamouraska and Rimouski, no advocate belonging to the Liberal party was selected? Is it the intention of the Government hereafter to carry out the awarding of these titles in a manner more equitable and better calculated to promote the interests of the profession? Is it their intention to grant the said title to advocates who are appointed by the Attorney General to represent the Crown in courts of criminal jurisdiction?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The title of Queen's Counsel is conferred on advocates in all the Provinces in view of professional merit. As to the second part of the question: How it happens that on the last occasion of conferring the title of Queen's Counsel in certain parts of the Province of Quebec, no advocate belonging to the Liberal party was selected? I have only to say that I am not informed as to the political views of the gentlemen referred to; but I am aware that the last list included a number of eminent gentlemen belonging to the Liberal party. I am not informed of the political views of the particular gentlemen referred to in this question. It is the intention of the Government to carry out the awarding of these titles in the most equitable manner possible, and in the manner best calculated to promote the interests of the profession. As regards it being our intention to grant the title to advocates who are appointed by the Attorney General to represent the Crown in courts of criminal jurisdiction, that appointment no doubt is a circumstance that should be taken into consideration, but it would not, of itself, justify their appointment without other qualifications.

J. B. BRIGHT, C.E.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Whether J. B. Bright, C.E., is employed in the outside service of the Department of Public Works? If so, where, and what is the nature of the services rendered by him; also, salary paid? Are his duties of such a nature as to require his whole time and services, or is he permitted to do professional work outside of that given him by the department?

Mr. HYMAN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; Mr. Bright is employed in the outside service of the Department of Public Works. He is employed at Macleod, N. W. T. He is superintending the construction of a highway bridge over the Old Man's River, at Macleod. He is paid at the rate of $4 per day for every day except Sundays. Mr. Bright's duties require his whole time and services, and he is not permitted to do professional work outside of that given him by the department.

7TH MILITARY CAMP.

Mr. AMYOT asked, What special reasons induced the Minister of Militia to select Rimouski as the camping ground of the 7th Military District? 2. Are the Government aware that Rimouski is some two hundred miles distant from the recruiting centre of the battalions selected for their yearly drill, the Rimouski Battalion not being so selected? 3. Have the Government, at Rimouski, a site better suited and less expensive than the Government property at Lévis, where the camp is usually located? Has Mr. L. P. Asselin, of Rimouski, been authorized to ask the citizens of Rimouski to contribute towards the expenses of the said camp?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The selection of Rimouski is dependent upon the usual conditions being complied with by the municipality. With regard to the selection of localities for camps, the department has at different times selected different localities for the purpose of allowing them to share in the advantages of having the camps. Thus the camps of the 7th Military District took place at Montmagny in 1888, subsequently at Lévis in 1890, and this year it will be held at Rimouski if the conditions are complied with. We have no report yet as to the special cost of transport to Rimouski, which is 180 miles below Lévis. The difference in cost in transport may not be very large. We are not yet in possession of any reports upon the subject mentioned in the third part of the question. Mr. Asselin has been notified that in the event of a camp being established at Rimouski, the municipality of that locality would be expected, as is done elsewhere, to furnish free of cost, camping and drill ground and water supply necessary for the camp; and if these conditions are not complied with, the camp will not be held at Rimouski. Our officers must also report upon the site being a good one.

THE CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the following letter been received by the Government, and if so, has any action been taken upon it?

"To the Right Honourable
"The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

"SIR,—At a quarterly payment of the Chippewas of Saugeen, held on Friday and Saturday last, the 24th and 25th inst., Agent Allen called on Henry Ritchie, a member of the Band, and handed him an account of $493 to collect for Mr. Gordon, a miller and storekeeper, who supplies the Indians with goods, &c.; John George also sat at pay table to collect for D. Robertson, a merchant who supplies the Indians with goods; and after the payment had ceased, Ritchie handed the money he collected for Mr. Gordon to Agent Allen. I would like to know how long this state of affairs is going to continue.

"In reference to the charges recently sent by me to your Honour, I would like to know when they are to be investigated.

"I understand that in reference to the charges contained in the letter of Solomon and Johnston, that Mr. Agent Allen has been cleared by the Inspector of those charges.

"Some of the witnesses say that it was a one-sided affair, and if there were anyone to put questions to them they could have satisfied the investigators that Agent Allen did give orders and that Solomon and Johnston were entitled to half of the fine.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Sd.) "JOHN CREIGHTON.

"SOUTHAMPTON, 28th July, 1891."

Mr. DEWDNEY. A letter of which the above purports to be a copy was received, and the letter has been acknowledged, and a copy of the same has been forwarded to Mr. Agent Allen, with instructions to report on the statements made therein relative to alleged recent collections from Indians for merchants at the quarterly payments to the Saugeen Band, of the 24th and 25th July. As respects the charges previously made against Agent Allen by Mr. Creighton, the inspector was written to for a report, but none has as yet been received.

PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. WATSON asked, Was the Paspasckase Reserve sold on the 2nd of July last, according to the notice lately issued under authority of the Department of the Interior? If so, who are the purchasers, the quantity of land purchased by each, giving location by sections, and the amount paid for the same?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Part of the reserve was sold on the 2nd ultimo in accordance with the notice to that effect. The names of the purchasers, the quantity of the land purchased by each, the locations by sections, and the amount paid for the same, are included in the following list:—

Lot.	Section.	Township.	Range.	—	Principal.
					$ cts.
1	S.-W. ¼ 3	52	24	Nancy Miquelon, wife of J. Zoel C. Miquelon, of Calgary, Alberta.	504 00
2	N.-W. ¼ 8	52 156	24 a.	Belle Thomson, wife of John Thomson, of Portage du Fort, Province of Quebec.	702 00
3	N.-E. ¼ 5	52	24	John R. Gilmer, Calgary, Alberta.	648 00
4	N.-W. ¼ 5	52	24	Edward Lefèvre, of Bothwell, Province of Ontario.	624 00
5	S.-W. ¼ 10	52	24	Geo. Alexander, Calgary, Alberta.	568 00
6	N.-E. ¼ 29	51 149	24 a.	do	469 35
7	N.-W. ¼ 34	51	24	do	616 00
8	N.-W. ¼ 10	52	24	do	592 00
9	S.-E. ¼ 34	51	24	Herbert Samson, Calgary, Alberta.	488 00
10	N.-E ¼	51	24	Geo. Alexander, Calgary.	768 00
11	15 R.....	52	24	Arsène C. Miquelon, Sherbrooke, Quebec; Ed. Lefèvre, Bothwell, Ontario; Jno. Thomson, Portage du Fort, Que.	741 60
12	N.-E. ¼	51	24	Arthur Millers Rawlinson, of Calgary, Alberta.	624 00
					7,344 95

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. FRASER asked, Does the Government intend bringing the Short Line into New Glasgow by a route other than the present roundabout and heavy graded way *viâ* Westville and Stellarton? If so, when? Have surveys of any other route than the present been made by the Government, and with what results?

Mr. BOWELL. No decision has yet been reached to change the location of the Short Line into New Glasgow. A survey was made for a loop line from near Westville to a point on the Intercolonial Railway near the East River bridge, shortening the line somewhat. The line, however, from Westville *viâ* Stellarton to the bridge is only four miles.

SUB-COLLECTOR AT WALKERTON.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Did Mr. McNamara, sub-collector of Customs at Walkerton, resign his position prior to or during the election in February and March last? If so, when was he re-appointed? Does he now hold the position? Is it the intention of the Government to keep in office public officials who take an active part in the elections, or do they consider it improper for officials who are paid out of the revenues of the people to so conduct themselves?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. McNamara has not at any time resigned his position, and consequently holds the office of sub-collector at Walkerton. With reference to the last portion of the question, I have to say that each case will be dealt with upon its merits, when brought to the notice of the Government.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT WALKERTON.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Was any seizure, and of what article, made by the Customs Department at Walkerton in 1889? If so, who was the informer, and what share of the seizure did the informer receive?

Mr. BOWELL. A seizure of certain cast iron bridge piles was made at Walkerton in 1889. The department never seeks to know the name of the informer, and when the name is given to the department we decline to disclose it to anyone who may seek to know. The informer did not receive any portion of the proceeds, for the simple reason that there was nothing collected further than the duties, which were considered sufficient, after an investigation had been made.

LABOURERS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. HAZEN asked, Has any order been issued by the acting Minister of Railways, or any officer acting under his instructions, to reduce the pay of labourers on the Intercolonial Railway from $1.25 to $1.05 per day? And if such order has been issued, when does it go into effect and why was it issued?

Mr. BOWELL. No such order has been issued by the acting Minister of Railways, nor, so far as I can learn, by any official of the Railway Department. Upon enquiry I find that the wages have not been reduced, as currently reported.

TAY CANAL.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Return showing: 1. The amount of money spent by the Government up to the 30th June, 1891, on the Tay Canal; 2. The amount of tonnage passing through the said canal in each year since work commenced on the same; 3. The amount of tolls collected on the said canal up to 30th June, 1891.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the motion being carried, but I think the hon. gentleman will find the information in the answer given to the question put by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. CHARLTON. That was for only one year.

Mr. BOWELL. The canal has been only opened since last September, and consequently the answer I gave covers all information. The only information the hon. gentleman has not received is the total cost, and that amounts to $440,613.21.

Motion withdrawn.

NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT.

On the Order being called for:

Copies of correspondence and all documents whatever to induce the Government of Newfoundland to suspend the operation of the Newfoundland Bait Act against our Canadian fishermen during the present fishing season, pending the answer of the Colonial Office through the delegation now in London; and also the correspondence and all other documents whatever respecting the measures taken by the Government of Canada towards exacting from the Government of Newfoundland the fulfilment of the assurances to the Imperial and Canadian Governments that if the Act known as The Newfoundland Act, passed in 1887, received the Royal Assent, its provisions would not be enforced against British or Canadian fishermen.—(Mr. Kaulbach.)

Mr. KAULBACH. Stand.

Mr. CASEY. It can only stand by request of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not require any information in regard to that. Does the Government ask that this motion shall stand.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman wants his motion to pass, he might go on with it now.

Mr. TUPPER. I stated, when this was first brought up, that the information could not then be brought down, but as soon as it was in a proper position to be brought down I would bring it down. The hon. gentleman first brought this up as a question, and unless the hon. gentleman desires to discuss it he might allow it to pass, and if it passes now the return will be completed, and when the papers are ready they will be brought down. If, however, the hon. gentleman desires to discuss the question, it had better be discussed now.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am placed rather awkwardly in this matter, because the papers I have now are not complete, and I am waiting for some telegrams from Newfoundland and from England, which I understand have not yet been received. I would ask that the matter should stand over for the present.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better move it now, or he may not have such a favourable opportunity.

Mr. KAULBACH. Then I will move the motion of which I have given notice. The delay in placing my remarks before this House regarding the Newfoundland Bait Act has been in consequence of my not having received any satisfactory information through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the proper information had been received by him from the Government of Newfoundland or from the Colonial Secretary in Great Britain. The discrimination in bait is a matter which affects very seriously all the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces and also fishermen of Quebec. When the Bait Act was submitted in 1887 for the approval of the Government at home, or the Royal Assent, it only received that approval on the condition that it was not to discriminate against Canadian fishermen, but, contrary to that expressed understanding, Newfoundland has been excluding Canadian fishermen from the privileges, or the rights, rather, to which they were entitled. They have been discriminating against our fishermen as respects bait last year and this, and in favour of the fishermen of the United States, which has greatly inconvenienced the Canadian fishermen, and caused them serious loss, so much so, in many instances, that the vessels engaged in deep-sea fisheries, not being able to prosecute the industry successfully when the bait from Newfoundland was refused to them, have been compelled to remain in many cases in port for the want of bait, instead of going out to their fishing grounds. I have been informed that in one instance some fourteen vessels had been in the port of Lunenburg, N. S., at one time, waiting for an answer through the Colonial Secretary from Newfoundland in regard to this matter. My reason now for urging this so strongly on the Government is, that if some action is not taken now we will have those vessels lying over for another year, and the deep-sea fishermen will have to encounter the same difficulty again. Therefore, I would say, that if the Newfoundland fishermen persist in shutting the Canadian fishermen out from the enjoyment of that right I think the British Government, in the interest of Canada, should take such active measures as would compel them to concede to us those rights. If the Newfoundland Government are not in a position to legislate for themselves, then the Imperial Government should legislate for them, and make it a Crown colony. I do not know that I can say any more, except to urge upon the Government very strongly that some action be taken to obtain such a satisfactory answer as will be in the interest of our fishermen, and that they will not suffer this great inconvenience and loss any longer.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). In connection with this discussion, we may consider some of the reasons why our fishermen have to go to Newfoundland for their bait. What I am about to say now would perhaps have been more properly said when the discussion came up here some weeks ago, but I was absent at that time, and I do not see why this should not be brought before the House at this stage. A large number of our deep-sea fishermen go to Newfoundland for their bait, and I have an idea that if some of the reasons why our bait is scarce in Nova Scotia were more thoroughly looked into than they are—though I am aware that the Minister of Marine has been looking well into these matters—we might have more bait in Nova Scotia than we have now. I refer principally to the great scarcity we now have in the herring fish-

ery, which constitute the bait of our deep-sea fishermen. In the Bay of Fundy there has been a great depletion of the herring fisheries. When this matter was up before in this House hon. gentlemen pointed out quite a number of causes. Some stated it was the sardine factory; others said it was because the farmers had used herrings for manure; some gave one cause and some another. But there was one cause that I noticed in particular, of which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) said nothing, and that was the lobster fishing. Now, a petition has been presented to the Department of Marine and Fisheries with reference to this lobster fishing on the coasts of the Bay of Fundy, and in the Annapolis basin. The way the lobster fishermen set their traps forms a sort of barrier to the herring coming into the shores to spawn, or coming to the shores so that they can be caught by the herring fishermen. We have quite a number of these herring fishermen all along the coast from Cape Blomidon down to Digby Gut, and from Digby Gut down to Digby Neck, and also inside Digby Basin, where a large number of men fish for these herring, or Digby chickens as they are sometimes called. Now, these lobster fishermen set their traps in rows all along these shores, with the exception of the points. In some of the coves the traps are in rows of ten deep, and these fishermen assert, the herring fishermen assert, that the offal that comes from the bait on these traps makes the water and the shores so offensive that the herring, which is a delicate fish, will not come near the shore. Now, if this is so, if the traps are baited in such a manner, and if the bait becomes rotten and drops from the trap, as these herring fishermen allege, then it is this offal which, according to the reports that are given into the Department of Fisheries, operates to keep away the herring from the coast. I will read from a report of Mr. William Gunn and Mr. M. G. McLeod, delegates appointed to inquire more particularly into the herring fishery. On page 62 of that report they refer to the matter of the offal as regards the destruction of herring:

"Throwing offal or refuse of herring into the sea in the neighbourhood of the fishing grounds is another reprehensible practice, certain to drive the herring away, as they appear to be very sensitive of offensive sights and smells. It appears that in Sweden this had something to do in scaring away the fish as above referred to."

Mr. Mitchell says:

"Those vessels which, after gutting the herring on board, throw the refuse into the sea, ought not to be permitted to fish where there are herring shoals; and this law ought to be enforced by the Dutch Government (whose fishing vessels cure on board), which might order that the portions taken out of the herrings at gutting be barrelled up for use, for the purpose of making oil, or for manure, or for both purposes. The quantity of herrings fished in Sweden, prior to 1809, was about as great as that fished in Scotland; yet, by allowing the refuse of the herring which had been boiled at places on the coast, for the purpose of obtaining the oil, to reach and taint the sea, the shoals left, and, as we have seen, did not return for sixty-nine years."

Mr. Mitchell further says:

"We are of opinion that any operation which tends to disturb or scare the herring may drive away or diminish the shoals, such as leaving the nets loaded with herrings in the water, when they are unable to be taken out in consequence of their weight, throwing the refuse into the sea of the gutting of the herring, as is done by the Dutch busses, or allowing the refuse of the oil of the herring to go into the sea, as was done on the Swedish coast."

Now, this corresponds exactly with the experience of a number of men who have been engaged in this herring business in Nova Scotia for forty or fifty years, whose testimony I have taken the trouble to obtain, and which I will read to the House, in order to bring it more particularly to the attention of the Department of Fisheries. On page 82 of the same report we have also this with reference to the herring offal:

"We have already shown from unquestionable authority the evil effects upon the herring shoals of throwing offal or fish refuse into the sea; resulting, in the case of Sweden, in combination with daylight net fishing, in banishing the herring from the shores of that country for a period of sixty-nine years.

"All experience shows that the practice of throwing offal into the sea near the grounds frequented by the herring shoals invariably results in scaring the fish away for a time, or driving them away permanently, and we consider the practice should be prohibited under heavy penalties; and that, as in the case of trawling, the prevention of the practice on the high seas should be brought about by international arrangement."

That refers, in the cases to which I will call the attention of the House, to the practice of line fishermen throwing over the offal from their vessels close to the shores where this herring fishery is carried on, and in the mouth of Digby Gut in particular, and in Digby Basin, where the herring fishing is carried on extensively. The practice of throwing offal in the mouth of Digby Gut prevents the herring from coming into the basin. Now, in 1890—and I may say before there was a thought that a new election would take place—I took the trouble to go around among the fishermen for the express purpose of getting their ideas in reference to this matter, and I took the trouble of taking their testimony, which I considered would have more weight than their petition with reference to this matter, and I thought that their petition and their direct testimony also would show that they had some cause for the complaint to which I referred. I may say that these herring fisheries extend along the shores of the Digby Basin at Digby Gut up eastward on the north coast of Nova Scotia and up the Bay of Fundy shore, and also to the west down Digby Neck. I will read some of the testimonies:

"Mr. James Clark:—I am 77 years old. Have lived in Lower Granville 30 years. Have been interested in herring fishing during all that time, owning weirs and tending them. Have always had plenty of herring till about three or four years ago, and this year (1890) particularly we have had none whatever, not even a mess for our own use. The fishing of Lower Granville has always been very valuable and the people feel the loss much. I can hardly tell for certain the cause of the falling off in this fishing. Some say it is the lobster traps and some say it is the steamboats. But it cannot be the boats, as we have caught plenty of herring when the boats were running, and besides, there are no herring caught on the bay shore, where there are no steamboats. I am decidedly inclined to think it is the lobster traps. After the traps are taken up a few herrings are sometimes caught."

"James D. Winchester:—I am 62 years old. Have lived in Lower Granville all my life and have been a fisherman all my life, owning weirs, fishing them, curing the fish and selling them. Have always had a fair average run of fish, sometimes very extra, even wearing us all out in taking care of them, ever since I can remember, till within three or four years, or since the lobster traps have been placed along our coasts. The first year the lobster traps were used there was a decided falling off in the catch of herring; last year I only got $10 for my season's fishing; this year not one single cent—not a fish is hanging in any of the fish houses. I think most decidedly the lobster traps are responsible for this. Before the lobster traps came I would take from $200 to $600 for my fish per year; now I do not take one cent. And this is the experience of all the fishermen here."

"James H. Thorne, ex-Warden of the County:—I am the owner of weirs and interested in fishing. There has been no herring for 3 years; never occurred before in my remem-

brance. Line fishing plenty; never better before nor finer fish—but great scarcity of bait—or herrings. What is the cause of this scarcity? The winter fishing and the sardine factories on the north shore of the Bay of Fundy has something to do with it. The destroying of small fish for manure and the driving for bait has also something to do with it. The sawdust also gets on the spawning beds, spoiling them, and herring will not come into the basin to spawn—that has also something to do with it. But the gurry thrown off of the fishing vessels, line fishermen, I mean, along the coast, and the gurry from the lobster traps, is the main cause of the present great scarcity of herring."

"TOWNSHEND THORNE:—I am 75 years old. I have lived here all my life. Have been interested in herring fishing all my life. Have owned weirs, and now own them; fished, cured and marketed the fish. My average catch, during the time I have so fished, was 600 or 700 large boxes, sometimes over 1,000, but never dwindled down to nothing till now, and only once, a long time ago, do I remember when we had what would be called a very poor catch. I think it is the fault of the lobster traps."

"STEPHEN THORNE:—I am 30 years old. I fish with my father, Townshend Thorne. I know that before the lobster traps came we had plenty of herring, more, even, sometimes, than we would want to take care of. We would get tired out in taking care of them. Five years ago we had a great quantity. I have no doubt in my own mind but that the lobster traps are responsible for the scarcity of herring. It is not the steamboats, for they have been running up and down the river and basin for years, and we caught fish; besides, they catch no herring on the bay shore and they have no steamboats there. It is the bait that is allowed to rot in the traps till it becomes gurry that drives the fish away."

"GEO. E. WINCHESTER, a Municipal Councillor:—I am 40 years old. Have been in Lower Granville all my life interested in fishing. My father was one of the prominent fishermen here and made money at it. During the last five years there has been a decided falling off in the catch of herring. The last two years I have not caught a scale. I believe it to be in consequence of the lobster traps. The fish cannot get into the shore on account of the gurry around the traps, from the bait on the traps. This leaves a streak of oil around them which herring will not approach; these traps are set in double rows 100 feet apart east and west along the shore from Blomidon to Digby Gut, and around inside the Gut and Annapolis Basin to Lobster Ledge, and also from Digby Gut west down the Digby Neck shore. These traps prevent fish from coming into the basin to our weirs. I am sure it is not the steamboats that scare the fish away, for when we had the extra boat on the route to Bar Harbour, besides the steamers we have now, we had plenty of herring. I have never before known the herring fishing to dwindle down to nothing as it has the last two years, and it commenced four years ago."

"DAVID FOSTER:—I am from Hampton, on the Bay of Fundy shore, in Annapolis County, but now live in Lower Granville. I have been constantly employed in fishing for eighteen years, except this year (1890). I have lobster-fished also ever since that industry commenced here four or five years ago. One Green, from Eastport, Maine, came to Hampton for lobsters. We were warned that there would be no fish if he came. He did come. We fished lobsters for him, and we had no herrings. I lobster-fished where twenty fishermen herring fished. I did well; they did nothing. The bait on these traps is very offensive. If these lobster traps are not prohibited or regulated in some manner the herring fishery must go, and that means the depopulation of the Bay shore, for where there is one lobster fisherman who will flourish there will be twenty herring fishermen who cannot get a living. About the 10th of September closes the herring fishery. Lobster traps are taken up before this, but the gurry drips from the traps and makes the whole shore offensive to fish for weeks afterwards."

"WILLIAM MUSSELS:—I am 47 years old. Have been a fisherman here all my life. I think the scarcity of herring is due to several causes, the main cause being the throwing overboard of the gurry, which the fishermen do persist in doing. They have no gurryskids on board now as formerly. I think it is also due to the lobster traps, but I do not think they stop them coming in the basin. We have caught some herring at the Logpins since the traps were up, but even they have left."

"JOSEPH HAYNES:—Am a fisherman. It is the steamboats that keep the herring away. They rush off at the approach of thunder, and the noise of the steamer's paddles drives them off also. They catch herring on the north shore where there are lobster traps. The gurry may have something to do with it, however."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

I found he was a lobster fisher.——

"JAMES E. RICE:—Have lived in Lower Granville nine years; own part of two weirs. I recognize the depletion of the herring catch: I think this is owing to the lobster traps and the gurry. On the north shore of the Bay of Fundy I think the herring are caught outside of the lobster traps."

I have got testimony to the same effect from Alfred Winchester, James VanBlaricom, James DeLap, Gilbert Shaffner, B. W. Shaffner, Smith Bohaker, Daniel Croscup, Joshua Croscup. Then I went over to the shore of the Bay of Fundy; I saw the fishermen there with respect to the subject. I saw and took testimony from the following persons:—

"RICHARD MCCAUL, Delap's Cove, Bay of Fundy shore:—I have lived here all my life. I know the herring fishery has been a failure for at least three or four years along this shore. About five years ago the lobster traps were first set. One man in lobster fishing has charge of a ground in which 20 to 40 men could and have herring-fished. If the line fishermen threw off their gurry near the shore it would keep the herring off, but they, as a rule, throw gurry overboard when they are quite a distance from the shore. I consider the gurry with which lobster traps are baited is a hurt to the herring fishery. Gurry will keep off herring wherever it is found. The sardine factories are also a hurt to the herring fishing, destroying, as they do, the young fish."

"JOEL EDGETT, Parker's Cove:—I am 75 years old. Have lived here 50 years and have always fished. I think lobster traps are responsible for the depletion of the herring fishery. More traps this year than ever before, and no herring whatever. At Leitche's settlement a year before last, when there were no traps there, they caught herring, while here where the traps were we caught no herring. Fishermen from Grand Manan say that the same thing happened with them; after the lobster traps came they caught no herring. Caught some herring here in the spring before traps were down and the same thing occurred in Leitche's Cove. When they strike the shore they strike off at once on coming in contact with the offensive gurry, the bait of the traps."

"JOHN MAGRANAHAN, Margaretville:—Am a master mariner and a fisherman, born here, and am 47 years old. We have always had plenty of herring along this coast until the last three or four years. Herring fishing has tapered off and this year we have none. I am of the opinion the lobster traps are the cause of this. There will be fifty traps on one string; these traps are 8 fathoms apart and are strung all along the shore from Digby Gut to Cape Blomidon (except on the points) in a single row, and in coves they are sometimes 10 rows deep. In one place there was a space of about two miles where no traps were placed; this was the only place where any herring were caught. The lobster fishermen come from other places and employ one man here. There are about fifteen men here who have usually employed themselves in the herring fishing. It is my opinion if the lobster traps are not stopped the herring fishery will be completely destroyed."

"HARDING W. BAKER:—Am a fisherman; always fished here (confirms Capt. McGranahan's statement). I know it is the lobster trap that keeps the herring away and nothing else. On a calm day I can follow all the lobster traps by the streak of oil on the water above the line of the traps. This oil comes from the gurry with which the traps are baited, and nothing will drive herring off quicker."

"SEVERINUS GRAVES:—I am a fisherman, and lobster-fished with traps one year, and know that the lobster traps are depleting the herring fishery. It is impossible to keep the bait on these traps clean, and when you pull them up the rotten bait drops off, and thus a string of gurry setties all along where the traps are. It is this gurry that keeps the herring away. The gurry thrown overboard by the line fishermen is also an injury to the herring fishery. These are the facts all along this shore."

Now, this herring fishery being so depleted, this question becomes an extremely important matter to the people along that shore, and it is on account of the importance of it that I see fit to occupy the time of the House for a few moments, in calling the attention of hon. gentlemen to the matter. I do not desire by any means to wage war upon the lobster manufactories, or upon the lobster fishing; I say it is a grand industry in this country, and I

believe it is a proper thing to encourage them in every way possible ; but, at the same time, the lobster fishermen must not be nourished in preference to the herring fishermen, more particularly where there are a great many more herring fishermen than there are lobster fishermen. These lobster manufactories are located in one place ; and, for instance, as is the case more particularly under discussion—in the town of Digby, where we have quite a large lobster factory, they employ one man who lobster-fishes a district where twenty or forty herring fishermen usually fish, and if by the prosecution of this lobster fishing in the manner in which it is done these twenty or forty men are kept from earning a livelihood, then some regulation ought to be made and something ought to be done in order that this lobster fisherman should not control the entire district where he sets his traps. If I am not very much mistaken, there is a law with reference to the bait to be used by the lobster fishermen, and if there is such a law it should be carried out to the fullest extent, and all the bait upon these traps should be kept clean. I have read statements here from lobster fishermen, who say that because of the manner in which they now set their traps, and on account of the way they bait their traps, it is impossible to keep the traps clean. When it is impossible to keep the bait clean, then the gurry will be scattered along the shore during the period for lobster fishing, and that will render the ground entirely obnoxious to the herring, and the herring will be kept off this coast, as they were kept off the coast of Sweden, perhaps for a long number of years.

Mr. GILLMOR. What sort of bait does the hon. gentleman say they use in lobster traps ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). As I understand it, they put in whatever kind of bait they can get—old fish or gurry, or anything of that kind ; but they should be compelled to use good, clean bait. As I am informed by the herring fishermen, if such bait is used and the lobster traps kept clean there will be no necessity for this gurry to be dripping along the shore. I am quite sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look thoroughly into this matter. The hon. gentleman has already caused his officers to interview these herring fishermen, and I have quoted to-day from the testimony given by them. He has caused his inspector to make a special call upon them, in order to obtain information as to the proper way of remedying the difficulties experienced by both the lobster and the herring fishermen. I repeat that I do not wage war against the lobster fishing by any manner of means. I desire, if possible, to see that industry nurtured to its fullest extent ; but, at the same time, I protest strongly against the lobster fishing being allowed to interfere unnecessarily with the herring fishing.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The herring fishery is, no doubt, a very important matter. It is important in itself, and it is also important as affording bait for the deep-sea fisheries ; but I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that the lobster fishery is the cause of the failure and destruction of the herring fishery. We must all admit, for it is generally known to be the fact, that the throwing of gurry, or fish-offal, from off a vessel, or from off a wharf, or from the fishing stations, into the harbours and bays, is very disastrous indeed, and injures the herring fishery very materially. This offal, when put into the water, goes to the bottom, decays there and becomes rotten, and of course prevents the herring, which, as my hon. friend has said, is a very delicate fish, from approaching the shore or going there to spawn. But when the hon. gentleman comes to speak of lobster fishing injuring the herring fishery so materially, I cannot agree with him. In the first place, no gurry is put into lobster traps. Gurry is, in other words, the liver of the cod-fish from which the oil is made ; it is a very valuable thing, and is invariably saved by the fishermen in order to make the oil. The bait that is used for the lobster fishing is, generally speaking, the heads of the cod-fish or haddock, or some other portion of the fish, and from that bait very little oil would be found floating upon the surface of the water. The lobster fishery is a very important industry indeed ; it is, perhaps, scarcely second to that of the herring fishery. The lobsters that are packed in the various establishments are but a very small proportion of the lobsters caught, because vast quantities of fresh lobsters are now being shipped to the United States, and that is becoming a very large and a very increasing business. If I were able on the spur of the moment, I think I could give the hon. gentleman statistics to show the immense quantities of lobsters that are being exported to the United States, and I believe that these statistics would astonish him by their magnitude. It is sometimes a difficult matter to discover why the herrings do not come along the shore. One season may be a very fortunate one indeed, and our bays and harbours may be filled with the finny tribe, whereas the very next season and in the very same places there may be none at all, and the fishermen around these shores are very apt to attribute the lack of herring to all sorts of causes. We find, even from the testimony that has been carefully selected by the hon. gentleman himself, that some of the fishermen attribute it to the steamers, and others to the sawdust, and to other causes than the lobster fishery. I think, before any regulations are made upon this matter, or before anything is done to affect the lobster fishery, there should be a very careful enquiry.

Mr. TUPPER. The papers called for by the motion under discussion have been under consideration for some time. I regret exceedingly that I am not yet able to make the announcement to the House, which I had hoped ere this to be in a position to do, that the prohibition now outstanding against the entry of Canadian fishing vessels into the ports of Newfoundland for the purpose of obtaining bait had been withdrawn. Up to this time it has been impossible to make that announcement ; but the subject has been, and is still being discussed and pressed upon the attention of the authorities in Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman who moved this motion has been most earnest in his efforts to obtain the removal of this prohibition, and I have been in the receipt of telegrams almost weekly from fishermen on our own coasts, who have felt very severely the action taken by the Government of Newfoundland in this regard. Touching the subject which has been more fully discussed and dwelt upon by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that hon. gentleman will recollect that at the instance of the fishermen he, some time ago,

placed himself in communication with the Fisheries Department, and urged with great force certain grievances in connection with the herring fishery, claiming that it was injured by the lobster traps, and the use in these traps oftentimes of foul fish and offal for bait. The subject, however, is one that would require a considerable amount of investigation before so radical a step should be taken as has been suggested by the fishermen; but, at the desire of the fishermen and at the request of the hon. member for Annapolis I have given instructions that the inspector for that district, together with the inspector for another district, shall go upon the spot, and not only ascertain all the fishermen can say in reference to the subject, but make a careful examination into the subject. It would be going a great distance, so far as my knowledge of the subject is concerned, to say that the lobster fishery is an injury to the herring or to any other fish. The hon. gentleman himself has given us testimony from the fishermen to show that the law itself, in reference to gurry and offal being thrown overboard, has been violated in that district by others than the lobster fishermen, namely, by the herring fishermen themselves; and, were it not for the lobsters which are attracted to that fishing bait by these traps those waters would be a good deal fouler, and more distasteful to the herring, in my humble judgment, than they would be if we took the advice of these fishermen, and prohibited the lobster traps altogether—for that is the measure they advocate. I merely throw that out, by the way, as a reason for the department proceeding very slowly, and investigating very deliberately the advice and arguments of those who desire such a step being taken. I observe, however, that in other districts—for instance, in Cape Breton, where the lobster fishing is prosecuted with great vigour, —the herrings have not fallen off; and the hon. gentleman is aware of the migratory habits of these fish. The hon. member for Annapolis, in his very interesting presentation of the case on behalf of the fishermen of his district, has mentioned various causes—not merely the bait used for lobster traps, but the weirs, nets, gurry or offal. In fact, each particular fisherman seems to consider no other system of fishing than that pursued by him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Steamboats.

Mr. TUPPER. Steamboats were mentioned as another cause. In fact, the only system which meets the approval of those engaged in that business is the system adopted by each particular fisherman, and it is the duty of the department, of course, to hear from each. On another occasion we had some interesting statements in reference to weirs and the sardine fisheries, and I promised that we would use all the facilities we had in prosecuting that enquiry further, and certainly the statement I made will be adhered to. Instructions have been given to those officers to proceed and ascertain on the spot whether their contention be right with regard to the present system of baiting these lobster traps, and whether there is any necessity of interference with it.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL CUSTOM-HOUSE EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. LÉPINE (translation) moved for:

Return showing, 1st. The names of all employés of the Customs at Montreal; the date of their appointment; their respective duties; the salary of each; their nationality; their place of birth; and, in case of their not having been born in Canada, for what period they had been in this country at the time of their appointment; and upon whose recommendation they had been appointed: 2nd. Whether they have all passed the Civil Service examination; and the names of those, if any, who have not passed this examination, since the law requiring it has been in force; 3rd. The names of those, if any, who have received salaries or pay in addition to that attached to the offices to which they were appointed; the amounts received by such persons, and for what additional work given; 4th. The names of the extra labourers for whose services there was paid in 1889-90 the sum of $12,176.25, as recorded in the Auditor General's Report for the year 1889-90, at page C—254; 5th. To whom was paid the sum $5,930.29 for cartage at the Custom-house at Montreal, as recorded in the said report of the Auditor General at page C—254."

He said: Mr. Speaker, after the reading of this motion there is no need of my saying that it refers to Civil Service, particularly to officers of the Custom-house at Montreal. I have not to complain of the efficiency of these gentlemen, but of the unjust distribution of public offices in that Custom-house respecting nationalities. If one takes the trouble to look over the list of civil servants in the Province of Quebec it will be found that the French Canadians have not the half of the offices that they are entitled to, and what I say here applies particularly to the Custom-house at Montreal. It requires extraordinary circumstances to secure the appointment of a French Canadian in that service. So much is this the case that for the last ten years only six French Canadians were appointed, while the number of the English employés was increased by twenty-seven. I must add that this refers only to permanent employés. There are besides a large number of extra employés, working from six to seven months a year during the season of navigation, to whom last year the country paid the sum of $12,176.25 in salaries. I have reason to believe that very few French Canadians are to be found among these extra employés. It is in order to get information on this subject and others, Mr. Speaker, that I ask for the documents mentioned in my motion. I consider it my duty to claim for the French Canadians the share of patronage to which they are entitled, by their number, their intelligence and their education. I do not blame the English for doing all in their power to obtain positions in the Civil Service. They are fortunate office seekers, and they would be wrong not to profit by their good fortune. But I blame those who have the power to give public employment for acting with such partiality—not to use a stronger, and perhaps more appropriate, expression. I do not believe that there would be one member in this House who would find it strange that I protest in the name of the French Canadians as I do at this moment. If the tenth part of what is done to the Quebec people was done to the people of Ontario protest would be made with one voice. The hon. Minister of Customs himself would probably be the first one to object, and he would be right. That is why I hope that my words will be given no other interpretation than justice and equity dictate. I will say no more, as it is always a delicate matter to bring questions relating to nationalities before the House. I will not speak of the preferences which are shown for certain employés, nor of the indifferences manifested for others in the Montreal Custom-house. I will not say, either, that many thousands of dollars in extra salaries per year are paid to Customs employés who are all Englishmen, while there are a number of French Canadians with smaller salar-

ies who do not receive the same favours. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the documents which will be produced will show the House that I was justified in raising this question.

Mr. BOWELL. The two latter portions of the first paragraph will be somewhat difficult to answer. However, the hon. gentleman will receive the information, so far as it can be obtained. As to his question, upon whose recommendation the different appointments have been made, I am not aware that any record is kept in the department upon that point. The appointments are very often made upon the recommendations of members verbally. When a vacancy occurs they often say to me that they would like so-and-so put in the place; and in some cases that recommendation is complied with, and in others it is not. With regard to the second paragraph, there will be no difficulty in obtaining the names of those who have passed the Civil Service examinations, but there are a great many who have been placed on the permanent list in the Customs Department at Montreal who never passed the Civil Service examination, though the appointments were made since that law was placed on the Statute-book. Under the section which provides that any person who had been continuously in the employ of the department or the Government on the 1st July, 1882, could, upon a certificate from the chief officer at the port or the chief officer in whose department the person was employed that he was qualified, be placed on the permanent list at the salary he was then receiving, without passing the examination and obtaining the certificate provided in the Act, a number have been placed on the permanent list under that clause.

Mr. LAURIER. Any one since 1882?

Mr. BOWELL. I said there had been a number placed on the permanent list since 1882, under the provision of the law. These also could be given, if the hon. gentleman desires that information. The names of extra labourers can also be supplied, and also the party who received the $5,000 as a carter. I understand that the hon. gentleman complains that the French Canadian population have not received proper recognition in the appointments, particularly at the Customs Department in Montreal. Full investigation into that charge will show that my hon. friend's complaint is not borne out by the facts, in so far as regards the appointments since I have had the honour of administering the department. Scarcely an important officer, if one, has been appointed since that time without the consent of the members who have represented that city in Parliament; and if it is an office of any importance, I have, as far as possible, obtained the recommendation of the three members jointly, conditional always that the person to be appointed shall be qualified for the position. With regard to promotions, where, in many cases, a French Canadian has, by superannuation, or death, or other causes, been removed, and the next officer happened to be of the Anglo-Saxon race, I have, as far as possible, promoted that person to the place; and precisely the same rule has been followed in the case of positions of importance vacated by English-speaking people when the next officer was a French Canadian. I could give a number of instances of that kind. I need not say that complaints are constantly made by our friends in that city belonging to both nationalities that they do not receive proper consideration in the appointments to office, and I may add that similar complaints are just as frequent, just as vehement, just as persistent, from our friends of other nationalities. The Government have, as far as possible, in all these appointments, endeavoured to do justice to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, and in the offices which are of any importance the greatest care has been taken to select men who are fitted more particularly for the positions they hold. I will not say as much in reference to the supernumeraries, for the House will readily understand that no Minister can have that full control of the appointment of supernumeraries that he has in the appointment of permanent employés. A vessel may arrive at port, perhaps in the evening, and it may be necessary, in order to assist in watching the goods during the discharge of the cargo during the whole night, the next day and the following day, for the chief officer to use his discretion in placing responsible men upon the wharves who will see that none of the goods which are landed are improperly removed from the wharf, and to follow them until they are placed in the sufferance or bonded warehouse. In such cases the employment of the men must be left, to a great extent, to the port surveyor and chief tide-waiter. The surveyorship was, as most of you know, filled by the late Mr. Lewis, whose position has not yet been filled, while the chief tide-waiter is a gentleman named Mr. Boyer; so in this particular branch of the service, where the superintendence is more particularly over the temporary men who are employed for the immediate service required at the particular time I have indicated, on the arrival of vessels, they have, I should suppose, done justice to all classes in the city. If not, it would be very much to be regretted. However, I reaffirm that the question of nationality in the promotion and in the appointment of officials has never swayed or influenced the department or the Government in any particular. It has been urged in many cases that where an English-speaking man vacated his office, by death or superannuation, one of the same nationality should replace him, and it has been equally urged with much persistence by our French Canadian friends that where a vacancy occurs by the death or superannuation of a gentleman of French origin the vacancy should be filled by one of that nationality. During the twelve years I have had charge of the department I have steadily refused to accede, in any case, to demands of that kind. Where I know, from experience and the reports of the officers, that the next officer in that particular branch was fitted to discharge the duties, he has been promoted, regardless of his nationality. There may be an exception or two; but I have laid it down as a principle, and carried it out, as far as practicable, that the next officer should be promoted to the position vacated. I need scarcely say, with regard to the existing *personnel*, that I do not think it is in the interests of the service or good government that these questions of nationality should arise, and I am equally convinced that no Minister is worthy of his position if he would allow a feeling of that kind to interfere in such appointments, and do injustice to any man on account of his nationality. My hon. friend says that a thing of this kind would not be tolerated in Ontario. A thing of this kind could not very well occur in Ontario, except it would be in the City of Ottawa and in the adjoining County

of Prescott ; but I can tell my hon. friend that, until I took charge of the Customs Department there was not one of the French nationality employed in the outside Customs Department in the City of Ottawa. Such is not the case now, so that the complaint on that score I have tried to meet as far as circumstances would permit. I am further of opinion that when the return, which will be made, and which will be brought down as soon as possible, though I fear we will not get it this session, as the hon. gentlemen opposite intend keeping us much longer than any of us would care to remain.

Mr. LAURIER. As long as the public good requires.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to be the judge of what will be for the public good I will soon decide when he shall go. It is true that, after hearing what the hon. gentleman said, I had the presumption to intimate that hon. gentlemen opposite could keep us here as long as they thought proper. However, I may say that the report will be as full and complete as they desire to have it, and that, when it is brought down, it will be found not to be of the character that my hon. friend anticipates.

Mr. LAURIER. In regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Lépine) I have no remarks at all to offer. He is more competent to speak on this subject than any one here, unless it be his colleague, the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). Those hon. gentlemen probably know better than anyone else whether any undue favour has been shown to one or the other, and I can leave it to them to settle that with the Minister. But I remark to the hon. Minister of Customs that it will not be so difficult as he imagines to complete the return which is asked for. I understand from the hon. Minister that he thinks there would be a difficulty in completing this return because it asks upon whose recommendation the different appointments were made. The hon. gentleman said that there was no record made of the recommendations, but later on he stated that no appointment had been made except with the concurrence and upon the advice of the members representing the city of Montreal, and especially when the appointment was an important one. If, as he states, no appointment has been made except on the recommendation of some one of the three members representing the city of Montreal, if there is no trace in his office as to whom especially the recommendation is due, we may assume that in all cases some hon. gentleman representing Montreal is responsible for the appointment.

Mr. BOWELL. I stated that I often held consultations with these gentlemen, and met them and talked these matters over.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the appointments were made on their recommendation ?

Mr. BOWELL. Probably—yes ; but not on any formal recommendation.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. member moved this resolution evidently with every desire on his part to avoid raising any question of race further than the motion itself calls for. The hon. gentleman I am sure is mistaken as to the number of persons who are employed in Montreal and as to their particular classification. In the city of Montreal the public departments are all very efficiently managed, and under the arrangement which exists there I think my hon. friend has no reason to complain that his fellow-countrymen have been unfairly dealt with. I, for one, would be the last to wish to do them any injustice, and I think, when the records are turned up, not only in regard to the Department of Customs, but in regard to all the other departments, they will show that, as far as recommendations go, not only have they received justice at my hands, but that a large majority of those whom I have recommended belong to the French Canadian people. Take the whole Civil Service in the City of Montreal. There are four or five departments there, and I think it is well, lest any false impression should go abroad that any class of the people is unfairly dealt with, that the truth should be known. Take the post office, for instance. For years Mr. Lamothe was the postmaster, and he was a French Canadian, and Mr. Emery, who was his assistant, was also a French Canadian. Mr. Dansereau, a very efficient officer and a very able gentleman, has succeeded Mr. Lamothe, so that a French Canadian has been appointed in his place. Then in regard to the department of Inland Revenue, the collector and his deputy, Mr. Vincent and Mr. Bellemare, are both French Canadians, and I have never heard any one complain that both those offices were held by French Canadians, both of them being able and good officers. In the same department Mr. Chaput, another French Canadian, is inspector of weights and measures. Then, the engineer-in-chief of the canals is a French Canadian, Mr. Parent, and the secretary is Mr. Lesage, who is also a French Canadian. The only important office held by an old countryman is that of superintendent of the Lachine Canal, but the wharfinger is a French Canadian, Mr. Corbeil. I think the Ministers in the Cabinet who represents the French Canadian race have been sufficiently careful that their countrymen should not be overlooked either in important matters or in matters of small importance. In the Customs-house we find that the chief appraiser of dry goods is Mr. Brosseau, whom I recommended, and who was entitled to the appointment by his ability, although in that case the gentleman who had disappeared from the service was an English-speaking Protestant ; and recently another French Canadian was appointed to an important position in that department. In regard to the temporary officers, the collector who has charge of that branch of the patronage has always been exceedingly careful that no cause of complaint should exist, and a fair distribution of the patronage has taken place in regard to this incidental work. In regard to extra work, I may say that the gentleman who has the selection of those who are to do it, such as tide-waiters and others, and who controls those who have charge of the bonds, is a French Canadian, Mr. Boyer, and if he does not do justice to his fellow-countrymen I am sorry to hear it, but I think he does. Under the circumstances, I think my hon. friend who has made this motion should have this matter cleared up, and that we shall see that no section of the people have been unfairly dealt with. I believe that the return will show that fair-play has been dealt out to all parties, and, if it has not, it is well that we should know it, and that justice should be done to all. I am very glad

that the motion has been made. I only wish my hon. friend had extended it to the other branches of the Civil Service in the City of Montreal, so that all parties might be thoroughly convinced that the Government has been anxious and solicitous that its patronage should be distributed in such a way as to leave no reason for complaint in any branch of our community.

Mr. LÉPINE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as a brief answer to what has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Curran), I will say that I am perfectly convinced that the French Canadians, who are three-fourths of the population, do not hold one-third of the positions in the whole Federal service in the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Montreal Centre declares himself satisfied with the present state of things. He would be hard to please if he were not. It is not because two or three French Canadians hold superior employment in the offices of Inland Revenue, the Customs-house or the Lachine Canal office that we should recognize ourselves as treated on an equal footing with the other nationalities, if all the other offices are filled by Englishmen. In the Customs-house not even one-third of the employés are French Canadians, and in the Department of Inland Revenue not one-half. I am perfectly justified in asking for the documents mentioned in my motion. This is not the first time that the injustice which I have pointed out has been spoken of. The citizens of Montreal have already raised their voice to obtain justice in the distribution of this patronage. And you are not without having seen, Mr. Speaker, the principal papers of the Province of Quebec, and among others *La Presse* and *L'Evénement*, severely criticise the unjust manner in which the French Canadians are treated in the administration of public affairs. Whatever may be said, Mr. Speaker, I remain convinced that my countrymen have not the share of patronage to which they are entitled, and the documents which I ask for will show it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the Minister of Customs if any superannuation has taken place in the Montreal Custom-house since January? How many have been superannuated, and have had their places filled?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to give the names, but I can give a general answer to the question. A number of superannuations have taken place of clerks who have held important positions with salaries averaging from $1,400 to $2,000. They have been superannuated on account of age or infirmity, and for the very reason that their services were no longer required not one of the vacancies thus made has been filled, nor is it the intention of the Government to add any additional members to the staff. As the House will readily understand, when an officer has been in the employment of the department for a number of years, until he attains old age, he is very apt to become enfeebled, and the younger members of the staff do the principal portion of the work. The officers who have been superannuated can be very profitably dispensed with, without filling their places. The work will be done by those who have been assisting in the different branches. So far as my recollection serves me now, the salaries which have been saved by the superannuation of those who were on the Civil Service list, in the Montreal Custom-house, will amount to $10,000 per annum. I am in hopes that I shall be able to increase that sum by 100 per cent. when I receive the report of the officers whom I have detailed to make a thorough investigation of the port. I hope to be able to reduce the expenditure next year in that port, by the course I am pursuing, by $15,000 to $20,000. Possibly there may be some other ports where a saving can be effected; and as the officers have proved themselves well fitted for the duties they are now performing, in making an investigation into the port of Montreal, they will be detailed for the same work in other ports, and if officers are found who have become, through age and infirmity, unfitted for their work, they will be removed from the service and a saving will thus be effected. Of course, hon. gentleman will understand that the superannuation must be paid as long as those men live, and the amount of saving would be reduced, so far as the revenue is concerned, to the difference between their former salaries and the sum which they will receive from the superannuation fund.

Mr. LAURIER. Tardy, but worthy of attention.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to admit that.

Mr. MULOCK. The intentions are not worthy.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not say that. He says the intentions are good, but that I have been tardy in fulfilling them. It is a very difficult thing to do. I do not know any hon. gentleman in this House who would be more reluctant than he to go to work and apply the pruning knife to old and valuable servants who have been a long time in the department. I think the hon. gentleman himself, if he thought an injustice was being done, would be one of the very first to protest, and his better nature would suggest an attack upon the Minister who was making the removals. The reduction has not been done hastily, but it has been made as soon as it could be, without doing injustice to the civil servants.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am somewhat surprised at the complaint made by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Lépine) concerning the appointments made in the Montreal Custom-house. In Quebec we have had the same state of affairs revealed during the present Administration. In almost every case where a French Canadian has died he has been replaced by an old countryman.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you say in all cases?

Mr. LANGELIER. Not in all cases; but in most cases. It is of general notoriety in Quebec, and cannot be disputed. Of course, we had no reason to complain, or to expect that the hon. gentleman opposite would do otherwise; we did not expect that people on our own side of politics would be appointed to Government positions in the City of Quebec, where the great bulk of the population of French Canadian origin is opposed to the present Administration. But I am surprised to hear that the same state of things prevails in Montreal, where the same excuse cannot be offered. The present Government cannot complain of the attitude of the French Canadian population of Montreal, who have supported this Government in almost every election for a great number of years. Looking at the Auditor General's Report for the last fiscal year, I am surprised at the

facts it reveals concerning appointments in the Customs Department. I find some thirty or forty officers in the Customs Department—I have not counted them, but their names fill almost one whole page—and among all these names I find only one French Canadian employé, who gets the small salary of $850 a year. That is the only one I find in the Customs Department here at Ottawa. I suppose that in the Customs offices at Quebec, Montreal and elsewhere, the Government follow the rule which has been laid down in the department at Ottawa, which rule is that they have no place for French Canadians.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error in the statement he has made. I do not know where he gets his information. There is the same number of French Canadians in the inside service of the Customs Department as there was when I entered it. So far as the outside service is concerned, there was not one French Canadian when I entered, and there are now one or two, I am not sure which.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING LICENSES--RESTIGOUCHE RIVER.

Mr. FAUVEL moved for:

Return of the names of proprietors to whom licenses have been granted for salmon net fishing on the Restigouche River, in the County of Bonaventure, for 1890 and 1891.

He said: Many complaints have been made with reference to the unfairness of the distribution of fishing licenses in the County of Bonaventure. Salmon licenses are given to fishermen every year, but the Government is generous enough to allow these licenses to be continued yearly until the death of the licensee. Unfortunately, when that occurs it is a cause of a great deal of trouble and misery to the household. The members of the family not only lose their bread-winner, but their nets are allowed to rot in the sheds, and these people are deprived of their livelihood. A great number of licenses are granted on this river; about double the number is granted in the County of Restigouche that is granted in the County of Bonaventure. Some people have two licenses, others cannot obtain one, and a great deal of injustice is done in this maner. Are the pioneers of the County of Bonaventure to be deprived of their livelihood in this manner, while the American anglers are allowed to fish in those waters, and thus take away the bread from the pioneers of the County of Bonaventure? On the 13th of July last I asked this question in the House:

"1st. What is the amount of fee levied on each salmon net fishery license in the County of Bonaventure for 1890? 2nd. What is the amount of fee levied on each salmon net fishery license for the County of Restigouche in 1890? 3rd. Is it the intention of the Government to levy a uniform fee on each salmon net fishery license in the Counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche for the year 1891?"

The answer of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was as follows:—

"On the salmon net licenses in the County of Bonaventure a fee of 40 cents per barrel of fish caught was levied in some districts, and in others 3 cents per fathom on nets. In Restigouche County the fee levied on each salmon net was 3 cents per fathom. The Government has instructed its officers to levy a uniform rate or fee (3 cents per fathom) on each salmon net fishery license in the Counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche in 1891. The reason of the difference in Bonaventure and in Restigouche, and in that of the districts in Bonaventure itself, was due to the fact that instructions changing the old rate from 40 cents per barrel did not reach the officers of certain districts until the licenses under the old system had been granted to the fishermen and the fee exacted."

On the following day I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Charles Brown, a letter addressed to him by Mr. Verge, fishery overseer for the counties both of Bonaventure and Restigouche. Mr. Verge writes:

"In reply to yours of the 2nd instant, I beg leave to inform you that my instructions, dated the 8th of May last, with salmon fishery licenses, from W. Wakeham, Esq., our inspector of fisheries, say: 'You will add the numbers of fathoms of wings to each license and make up the total number of fathoms on which the fees have to be paid.' My instructions from the Department of Fisheries, Ottawa, dated 30th May last, sending me the salmon fishery licenses for the New Brunswick side of the Restigouche estuary, say: 'Fees are payable on delivery of the licenses, and are for this year to be collected on bar-nets only.'"

In the County of Restigouche salmon fishermen pay exactly one-half of what is levied on fishermen in the County of Bonaventure. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is there any fairness in this? Why should there be discrimination against the fisherman in the County of Bonaventure in favour of those of Restigouche? They have the same chance of earning their livelihood on both sides of the river. It is very unfair, and there is great dissatisfaction existing on this score.

Mr. TUPPER. The papers will, of course, be brought down. I regret to learn from the hon. gentleman that dissatisfaction exists in his county. It is the first time that I have heard that there was even a pretended discrimination in the administration of the license system in the Counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche. Of course, if the state of affairs the hon. gentleman has described, exists there, it will be rectified at once. I will first take up the point the hon. gentleman has mentioned about the great hardship and troubles that follow where the licensee dies and the license is not renewed. The hon. gentleman went on to make the statement that this was in the interest of the American anglers, and to the detriment of our own fishermen. I am sure, if time permitted, I could very easily establish to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman, who lives in a fishing district, that the reason which induced that policy, long before the time when I came into the department or had any connection with the administration of the fisheries, was the interest of the Canadian net fishermen, wholly regardless of the anglers, whether they happened to be citizens of the United States or of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman knows that the anglers on the rivers of New Brunswick and Quebec are not altogether citizens of the United States; and while it is quite true that many Americans have leases on the rivers of Quebec, the department proceeded in reference to the protection of the salmon with the view of preventing the extermination of that fish, and there were very many great difficulties met with. For years the opinion of the officers of the department and all who have studied the question thoroughly has been, and many fishermen have agreed in this opinion, that one of the great causes of the diminution of the fish supply in the district to which the hon. gentleman has referred, as elsewhere, is that too many nets were set. As the hon. gentleman knows, better than I can tell him, the salmon follows almost a steady course or run up the river. They come along the shores and keep the same

track year after year in going up to the spawning grounds. These nets or stands, each with so many wings, intercept the salmon at every point. If the hon. gentleman will look at a chart, as these charts appear in the report, he will see the number of these stands the fish have to pass in order to reach the spawning grounds, and it is marvellous they reach there at all. Direct interference with the fishermen, who for so many years have been permitted to do as they pleased in regard to fishing, and have been permitted by the Government to pursue that policy for years, was considered a too drastic measure—that is to say, to summarily interfere with the operations of the fishermen and abolish all those stands that are injurious to the salmon frequenting those waters. But while this should not be done, there was a general feeling that whenever the death or removal of a licensee occurred it would be the least injurious to the fishermen if the department would declare that that stand would not be renewed. The only occasion on which a departure has been made from that principle was where the stand was not considered half as injurious as stands above or below that particular stand, and the removal of that particular stand would not to any great extent improve the run of the salmon on that stream. The angler of course gets the benefit of this. You cannot conserve the salmon interest in that respect without benefiting the angler, and, of course, the river is more valuable when the salmon are allowed to ascend in larger numbers. But the hon. gentleman knows that anglers fish with the fly altogether, and are confined to it; they are on the river a comparatively short time each year, and often have against them special conditions of the water, high or low. So the catch taken by anglers has never been considered so great as to seriously interfere with the fishermen below. Speaking not only for myself, but for my predecessors in office, I can assure the hon. gentleman that never for one moment have the interests of the anglers been considered, or has any attempt been made to assist them at the expense of the fishermen in the estuaries or of the fishermen in any part of the country. It is a very plausible argument, I admit, to use before the fishermen, that the fishing has been destroyed by the anglers, and the fishermen are ready to quickly wreak their vengeance on the Government having the responsibility of protecting the fisheries. Nevertheless, if we desire to protect the fisheries in the interest of the fishermen themselves it is absolutely necessary that we should regulate in some way the number of stands or traps in the locality in question, and that we should do so in their own interests. This is not a new policy, but it is one that has prevailed for a long time. With respect to the charges for licenses to which he has referred, I think he is under a misapprehension. I will look into the matter again, but I apprehend that we have not made new regulations to the detriment of fishermen of the hon. gentleman's county, but simply adopted an uniform regulation, which will be greatly to the advantage of the fishermen of the County of Bonaventure. I understand that up to this year the rate was so much a barrel on the Quebec side, or, rather, 40 cents for every 200 lbs. of fish caught, while on the New Brunswick side it was 3 cents per fathom of the net. There was that want of uniformity, which operated to the advantage of the fishermen of New Brunswick. When the subject was brought before me in a very elaborate report by Mr. Wilmot on the salmon fishery of the Baie des Chaleurs, which is printed, I found that want of uniformity to prevail, and I adopted Mr. Wilmot's suggestion in part, and directed that the rate should be made uniform, and adopted the lower rate, which was the rate on the New Brunswick side. That is in the interest of the fishermen whom the hon. gentleman represents, as he will find on looking into the question. The calculation is given in that report. There was an objection to the rate prevailing on the Quebec side of the river, namely, that the imposition was in the nature of a tax. We tax the fisherman on the quantity of fish he caught, and even if it could be shown that that was proper, and within the law, it was contrary to the spirit which induced the department to charge a license fee. The principle was not to give the fishermen a license and then wait to the end of the season and impose a tax on the catch; but the reason which induced the Government to adopt the license system and charge a fee was to prevent applications being made unless they were really necessary—in fact, to prevent too many applications being made, and practically, therefore, to restrict the number of applications for licenses. Unless that were done at the commencement of each season, and cash payments required, the object could not be attained, and speculative fishermen would apply for licenses by the end of the season to obtain a sufficient sum to pay the fees. There is more in the question as to whether this license payment is a burden in any event. From a list of the licenses it appears that many of the fees are for amounts of from $2 to $7, one of $7 and one of $12, while the others ranged from $5 to $1. The amounts are not large, nor are there any great complaints in regard to them. The hon. gentleman's other statement, that there has been a regulation in Restigouche by which fishermen were charged, not only on the bar-net, but on the wings, is one which I shall certainly look into and have rectified, and wherever an improper charge has been made regulations will be made with respect to the settlement of the fees, so that there shall be nothing unfair, that we will not collect on the wings of the net in one county if we do not in the other. I yet believe that the hon. gentleman in that respect must be misinformed; but if his information has been correct there has been a misunderstanding of the instructions given either by myself or by the officers at the head office in Ottawa. If the hon. gentleman examines the report of Mr. Wilmot he will see that I acted in that respect, only I adopted an easier system, a system that would not bear so hardly on the fishermen as that which was recommended to me by that officer. He suggested that instead of making the fees on the Quebec side at 40 cents per 200 lbs. there should be a uniform fee on the Quebec and New Brunswick sides of Baie des Chaleurs of 50 cents on every 200 lbs. That was an increase, and I think it would have met with great complaint. I did not adopt that, but I adopted the suggestion of the conference of all the fishery officers which met at Ottawa, and that was to make a uniform rate on both sides of the Baie of 3 cents per fathom of the net.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED

Petitions, correspondence, reports of surveys and any other documents relating to the construction of a dry dock at the Town of Amherstburg.—(Mr. Allan.)

Petitions, correspondence, &c., relating to reconstruction, by private parties, of the Caledonia Dam, across the Grand River.—(Mr. Montague.)

Correspondence, whether by letter or telegram, all reports of officials, and all tenders and other papers, relating to repairs of the Caledonia Drill Shed.—(Mr. Montague.)

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

After Recess.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

On the Order being called that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presumed that this Bill would not come up again on the Order Paper after the decision of the other night. I would suggest to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that it might be as well not to proceed with the Bill now, in view of the decision already arrived at.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course, I suppose I may as well bow to the request of the Minister of Justice. The Order has been called, and perhaps he might permit the House to signify pleasure on the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let it stand.

VETERANS OF 1837-38.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Kirkpatrick :

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government should bestow some mark of recognition upon the veterans of 1837-38 for their services to the country at that time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understood that several members of the House wanted to speak on this motion. In fact, I think two or three hon. gentlemen had the floor when the matter was under discussion the other night, but I presume members were under the impression that some of the prior orders would take up some time of the House this evening, and they are, in consequence, not present. I do not intend to say anything on the question to-night as to the phases on which the discussion proceeded when it was before us on the last occasion ; but I simply wish to express my opinion as to the desirability of this House and of this Government dealing with the question. Whatever the merits, in public estimation, may be, as to those who were concerned in the conflict of that period on either side, I submit that in this Dominion Parliament, formed as we are, not merely of the two provinces in which that struggle raged for a time, but formed of new provinces, having nothing to do with the events of 1837-38, having nothing indeed in common with the feelings which were then excited, and which aroused animosity in this part of the country it is not proper that this Parliament should be called upon to deal with this question, or that the bounty of the Dominion Government should be claimed in that regard. We have had in the other provinces of Canada prior to Confederation — fortunately not the same character of contest which is referred to in this resolution, not a contest in which blood was shed or civil war resorted to — but we have had contests of great bitterness, in which public questions were fought out, and in which the constitutions of the provinces were established. We had, while these contests raged, men of the highest eminence in both parties. To one party, the Conservative party, is due, to a great extent, the establishment of the institutions of the country, the conduct of affairs at critical and during trying times in the history of the provinces ; and to the other set of men is undoubtedly due the freedom of institutions which is now enjoyed, and which we now hold as our birthright, as a portion of the British Empire. But when we came into Confederation we laid aside even the recollection of these conflicts, except in so far as they might excite our affection or our admiration for the ability and patriotism of the men who were engaged on either side of them. It would seem to me as appropriate that distinctions should be attached to the memory of those who were engaged in those contests, that their public services should be recognized in some way—by the resolutions, or by the votes, or by the Statutes of this Parliament—that the surviving individuals should be recognized and honoured, as that those engaged in the civil contests in Canada prior to Confederation should claim a bounty from this Dominion. I think, in respect of all such unhappy conflicts, much as I have said we must admire the heroism that was displayed, and much as we must appreciate what was done for the country by those who are referred to in this resolution, we ought, as regards all conflicts of that character, to consider the history of this country as dating from the period when the Dominion was formed, and when all the provinces joined hands in forming this new nationality. In that view the Government have declined, down to the present time, to recognize the proposed bounty as one which they should recommend to the favour of Parliament, and that for a long period, covering nearly thirty years, the provinces themselves, to whom a claim of this kind might with much more force have been presented, have resolved to let history do justice to those who were engaged in those conflicts as far as praise was concerned, and to refrain from recognizing the event referred to as one that would have been treated as a conflict with a foreign power should be treated. That is the view which I propose to present to the House this evening, and in order to avoid the closing of the discussion, as I understand other members wish to take part in it, I make the motion now that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FLINT moved second reading of Bill (No. 34) to amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888. He said : In moving the second reading of the Bill which I had the honour to present as long ago as the 14th of May, I desire to make a very few observations in explanation of the character of the amendment which I propose. Previous, however, to entering upon these, I might say, for the information of the House, that the Canada Temperance Act is of course not in force in the whole

of the Dominion of Canada. There was a time when it was in force in a large number of the cities and counties of the Dominion; but owing to circumstances which it is not necessary at present to go into at any length, in very many of these cases the Act has been repealed; so that practically at the present day it is in force only in the following counties and districts of the Dominion: In the Province of New Brunswick, in the City of Fredericton and the Counties of York, Charlotte, Carleton, Albert, King's, Queen's, Northumberland, Sunbury and Westmoreland; in the Province of Nova Scotia, in the Counties of Digby, Queen's, Shelburne, King's, Annapolis, Cape Breton, Hants, Inverness, Pictou, Cumberland, Yarmouth and Guysborough; in the Province of Prince Edward Island, in the Counties of King's, Prince and Queen's; in the Province of Manitoba, in the Counties of Marquette and Lisgar; in the Province of Quebec, in the Counties of Brome, Drummond and Chicoutimi—in all, thirty districts in the Dominion; and to the people of these districts any proposed amendment to the Canada Temperance Act is, of course, of interest and importance. The Bill is much longer than the amendment itself would necessarily imply, because, in order to make it complete, in case it should pass the Legislature, I have rewritten all the amendments in the Act of 1888. It will be remembered that in 1888 an important amendment to the Canada Temperance Act was carried through Parliament. The only clause of that amendment to which this Bill refers is clause 11, containing five or six sub-sections. The Bill does not interfere with any of these sub-sections, except sub-section *b*, and deals only with spirituous liquors and alcohol. The object of the amendment is to remove spirituous liquors and alcohol from the general operation of the exception mentioned in clause 11, and to bring them under the operation of the clause which I will now read, and which I may say is almost *verbatim* a copy of the clause in the original Canada Temperance Act, which affects the sale of spirituous liquors for medicinal, mechanical and other purposes mentioned in that clause, and which prescribes regulations for the sale of those articles by the licensed vendors named in the Canada Temperance Act. I think it was generally felt by the temperance advocates in the country, at any rate in those districts where the Act was in force, that the amendment of 1888, in the terms in which it was passed, as regards spirituous liquors and alcohol, did, to a large degree, emasculate the Canada Temperance Act. The object of the people in any particular district in adopting the Canada Temperance Act was to exclude the sale of spirituous liquors and alcohol entirely from the community. It was to prohibit it, except in certain particular cases, which have been recognized largely, and I think properly, to be proper exceptions to the general and unrestricted sale of intoxicating liquor. Those cases were where intoxicating liquors were required for medicinal purposes or for manufacturing or other purposes, which did not necessarily lead to their use as a beverage. In order, then, to make the amendment clear, it is necessary to add that under the original Canada Temperance Act intoxicating liquors, to be sold for medicinal purposes or for certain mechanical purposes, were required to be sold by certain licensed vendors in each of those districts; and each of those vendors was placed under certain very reasonable restrictions. The Act provided that none of the licensed vendors could sell intoxicating liquors excepting according to the following proviso, which I will read, because the amendment I have to propose to this Act is a copy of it:—

"Provided also, that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, may be made by such licensed druggist and vendor; but such sale, when for medicinal purposes, shall be in quantities of not less than one point, to be removed from the premises, and shall be made only on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale, affirming that such liquor has been prescribed for the person named therein; and when such sale is for its use in some art, trade or manufacture, the same shall be made only on a certificate signed by two justices of the peace of the good faith of the application, accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant that the liquor is to be used only for the particular purposes set forth in the affirmation; and such druggist or vendor shall fyle the certificates and keep a register of all such sales, indicating the name of the purchaser and the quantity sold, and shall make an annual return of all such sales on the 31st day of December in every year to the collector of Inland Revenue within whose revenue division the county or city is situated."

This provision is believed to be fairly satisfactory by those who have promoted the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act in the cities and counties I have mentioned; but in 1888 there passed through this House an amendment based upon the idea that the sale of a large number of preparations sold by druggists was either actually restricted or might be held to be restricted by the terms of the Canada Temperance Act, and, consequently, this amendment was passed, which provided, among other things, that physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors, if sold in quantities of not more than ten ounces at any one time, should not be interfered with. This clause is entirely removed by my amendment. In that amendment of 1888, clause *c* reads as follows:—

"Any patent medicine, unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of the Canada Temperance Act."

This clause is not affected by the amendment I propose. Clause *d* in the same Act is as follows:—

"Eau de cologne, bay rum, or other articles of perfumery, lotions, extracts, varnishes, tinctures, or other pharmaceutical preparations containing alcohol, but not intended for use as beverages."

This clause is also not affected by the Bill I introduce. Clause *e* reads:

"Alcohol or methylated spirits for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical uses."

This clause is amended by leaving out the words "alcohol or;" and then section 2 of the Act of 1888 is entirely repealed, and the following substituted:—

"(*e.*) Spirituous liquors or alcohol for exclusively medicinal purposes, or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture; provided that such spirituous liquor or alcohol, when sold for medicinal purposes, shall not exceed in quantity ten ounces at any one time."

And so on, in precisely the terms of the original clause in the Canada Temperance Act, which I have already read. The effect of this amendment is that druggists and chemists, in the prosecution of their business, are left untouched in every particular, and remain as they were placed by the amendment of 1888, except as regards the sale or purchase of alcohol and spirituous liquors; and with regard to the purchase and sale of those, they are placed under the same restrictions as those under which

licensed druggists and vendors are placed in the Canada Temperance Act. And they are so placed for this reason: that, if the sale of spirituous liquors and alcohol, which may be used as a beverage, is of the character the promoters of the Canada Temperance Act believe it to be, it is advisable they should be placed under some reasonable restrictions, and such restrictions I believe to be contained in the original clause of the Canada Temperance Act. As the law stands at present, druggists and chemists, in the sale of spirituous liquors and alcohol for medicinal and mechanical purposes, are practically not restricted at all, because they are under no obligations, which they are made to appear to be under by the sub-section 2 of section 11, which is repealed by the operation of my amendment:

"The name and address of the purchaser, quantity and name of liquor, medical man prescribing the same, and the purpose for which it is required; and the said book shall be kept open for inspection by the proper county inspector at all times."

Now, the difficulty with this section is that it entirely exempts the druggist or vendor from any penalty whatsoever if he fails to keep the record provided in it. The wording of the clause itself exempts all of the sales included in the clauses and paragraphs I have mentioned from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act. If the second clause of the Act of 1878 is violated by any druggist, there are no means whatever in the law of punishing him for that offence; while under the operation of the amendment I propose they come, if they violate these restrictions, under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act. I think I have covered the whole ground of the explanations required, and I believe that the passage of this amendment will restore to the Canada Temperance Act, in those communities in which it is enforced, the force and power it was originally intended it should have, and the Act will be replaced in something like the position it should occupy. I need not spend any time whatever in arguing before this House that if we have a law on the Statute-book it is necessary that law should be effectual for the purposes for which it was designed. I think I will have the support of all those who have studied the matter when I say that the law, as it now stands, is not effectual for the purpose of preventing the sale of alcohol and spirituous liquors for improper purposes. The reasons, however, which apply to spirituous liquors may be said not to apply so closely to alcohol, but those who have studied the matter state that the sale of alcohol, where it can be purchased, to be subsequently doctored or made use of for improper purposes as a beverage, is quite extensive among a certain class of people: If it is possible by any reasonable restrictions or regulations to prevent this, and at the same time permit the sale to those who wish to use it for mechanical or medicinal purposes, we ought to legislate in that view. If it is objected that the legislation I propose, in the case of those who use liquor for medicinal purposes, goes too far, it will be shown that no person who wishes to purchase alcohol for purposes we recognize as reasonable will be at all interfered with by the operation of this amendment, because it provides that the same restrictions precisely shall apply to druggists and chemists as now apply in the original Act to licensed vendors. The vendor then fyles these certificates or prescriptions, as the case may be, and keeps a record in a book, giving a statement of all the parties and the transactions, and on the 31st December each year a proper return is made to the collector of Inland Revenue within whose division the vendor is situated. I leave this matter in the hands of the House, trusting I will have its assistance in perfecting the Act, in so far as it is capable of being made perfect in this direction. There may be a great deal said with regard to the failure of the Act, and, in some respects, I presume it has been a failure; but I think it will be generally admitted that this failure has arisen from causes which do not reflect discredit upon the Act or the temperance people, but which are causes it is very difficult to prevent operating in any community. In the first place, the Canada Temperance Act has failed in consequence of the difficulty of passing technical amendments, or amendments of a technical nature, through the Legislature. Parliament is a difficult body to move in matters of this kind, and I think that in a large proportion of the cases in which failures to convict—probably 90 per cent.—after the ultimate hearing in the final court of appeal, have occurred, have almost invariably been on technical points. If the House could on some future occasion take the matter in hand in regard to that I believe it would have useful results. A number of trials have taken place, and the law is pretty well established, and convictions have been secured which will stand, and which are producing good effects. I believe the adoption of this amendment will strengthen the hands of those who are endeavouring to restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages within reasonable grounds. I hope the House will take the same view.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 17,

Mr. JAMIESON. I have not had time to give this matter as much thought or consideration as I would like before it came before the House to be considered, but it strikes me, in looking at the Bill, that in some respects the hon. gentleman is weakening the restrictions which were thrown around the sale of liquor for the purposes specified in the Act of 1888. I do not know why the hon. gentleman should apply the restriction, so far as recording the sale is concerned, to two of the purposes only, and should leave the other puposes for which sales may be made by licensed druggists and physicians without any restriction so far has the sale is concerned. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that sub-section 2 of section 11 in the Act of 1888 requires that all the sales which may be made under the authority of the statute must be recorded. I recollect at the time this Act was introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe we had a good deal of difficulty in inserting this clause requiring that all the sales which might be made under the permission which was given to druggists and physicians should be recorded. Now, my hon. friend proposes by his Bill to allow sales for the purposes indicated in sub-sections *a*, *b*, *c*, *d* and *e*, without any record whatever, and I am afraid, if this becomes law in its present shape, it will lead to a very serious abuse. I would like to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say on this matter.

Mr. FLINT. The objection of the hon. gentleman is technically correct, but I think anyone who looks carefully over the clause will see that practically his objection is not an overwhelming one against the amendment. In the first place, I think it cannot be doubted that in any county which is under the Canada Temperance Act no druggist has ever kept or tried to keep any record of the sale of the articles described in clauses *a*, *b*, *c*, *d* and *e*, and I think that when the Legislature requires that these articles should be recorded it must have intended spirituous liquors. I am not at all of the opinion that druggists should be compelled to record the sale of eau de cologne, bay rum, articles of perfumery, lotions, varnishes, or other pharmaceutical preparations not intended for use as beverages. I do not think that provision is at all important, and I do not think the temperance community think it is important that chemists and druggists should keep a record of the sales of these articles, which are innocuous, and are not regarded by the temperance community as being injurious. But when it comes to spirituous liquors and alcohol, then the matter takes on a new aspect, because these are articles the sale of which it is desirable to restrict and guard by all reasonable rules that can be adopted. Now, the difficulty with this clause is, if I am correct in my interpretation of the law, that there is no penalty, and it is impossible to punish, under the amendment of 1888, any druggist if he keeps no record whatsoever of the sale of any of these articles—for this reason, that the Act itself makes no penalty.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Have you considered the section in the Act providing penalties—section 107 of the Canada Temperance Act?

Mr. FLINT. Yes; but clause 11 is an exception in favour of chemists and druggists. "Nothing in the Canada Temperance Act shall be held to interfere with the purchase or sale," and so on, of any of these articles. Then the clause provides that each such sale shall be reported in a book, but there is no penalty for not so reporting.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Would that be an offence against the Act?

Mr. FLINT. Possibly not; but even if there were a penalty I contend that the restrictions of clause 2 are so few, so inadequate, so far from being as perfect as the clause which I have adopted, that it practically becomes valueless for all purposes to restrict the sale of these articles. Of course, I would not object to any amendment to provide that these other preparations, apart from alcohol and spirituous liquors, should be placed under similar restrictions; but in my view, and in the view of a great many, it is not at all important. I believe that public opinion would not sustain any united action or prosecution against druggists or chemists for the sale of such articles as eau de cologne, bay rum, lotions, perfumery and articles of this kind, if they did not keep the record prescribed in this Act.

Mr. COATSWORTH. In some places they might. I have known them to sell these articles to Indians as a beverage.

Mr. FLINT. That may be, but the sale of these articles is generally admitted to be as harmless and innocuous as the sale of any other articles in the chemist's shop. For instance, in the case of perfumery I cannot see any reason, in morals or practical economics, why perfumery, lotions and articles of that kind, for sale in a drug store, should be placed under any restrictions; but when we come to alcoholic liquors and alcohol itself, then the whole force of the temperance feeling and the whole force of public opinion is largely directed to placing them under reasonable restrictions. However, if my hon. friend deems it at all important, of course I would not object to having the clause amended so as to provide for that; but, in my view, it is not at all important. I think that is substantially the answer I would make to my hon. friend.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am decidedly opposed to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman as contained in this Bill. At the time this Act of 1888 was passed it will be recollected by those who were members of the House at that time that there were two Bills introduced at that session for the purpose of amending the Canada Temperance Act. I had charge of one Bill, which was promoted by the friends of temperance in the House, and the Act which the hon. gentleman now seeks to amend was in charge of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and was passed though the House in opposition to the wishes of the temperance sentiment of the House—that is, in opposition to the wishes of those who represented what was known as the prohibition sentiment of the House. For my part, I fought very strongly against it, because I thought it was a very serious innovation, and emasculated and destroyed, to a very large extent, the efficiency of the Canada Temperance Act. Of course, the Act having been almost entirely repealed, I think entirely repealed, in the Province of Ontario shortly afterwards, we were not in a position, in our province, to ascertain to any extent what the effect of the amendment would be upon the operations of the Act itself. Those residing in the country sections, however, where the Act was in force, would be in a much better position than we to judge in that respect. However, I recollect that we had a very lengthy and somewhat heated discussion upon that Bill when it was introduced into the House by the hon. member for North Simcoe. The change proposed by the Bill had been, if my recollection is correct, urged upon us by the druggists and chemists of the Dominion. We refused to accede to their request, because we believed that it was going to be a very dangerous innovation. We knew that the Act was being evaded as it was, and, after examining the matter, we came to the conclusion that if the amendment which was proposed was adopted it was, in effect, going to impair seriously the usefulness of the measure. Now, when we saw that we could not prevent the passage of that Act we endeavoured to have this section 2 tacked on to it for the purpose of preventing, as far as possible, what we considered would be otherwise the bad effects of the law; and if the hon. gentleman's Bill, as it appears before us at the present time, is passed, I am satisfied that it will have a very serious effect in localities where the Temperance Act is in force. I trust that the hon. gentleman, if he is acting in the interest of temperance—and from his action in this House in the past I have no reason to suppose that he is acting otherwise—I do trust that he will not endeavour to force this Bill through the House in its present shape. In my judgment, the Act of

1888 is much preferable, and I am quite satisfied that the friends of temperance will prefer to have the law remain as it is now, rather than have it changed in the way the hon. gentleman proposes by his Bill. The reason why we opposed the change, as contained in this Bill, was that we knew there were doors enough open at that time for the purpose of avoiding the law, without opening any more. I am fully satisfied now that if the hon. gentleman's Bill becomes law it would very seriously affect the operation of the Act, and I am quite satisfied that if the people of the localities in which the Act is in force were aware of the nature of this Bill strong representations would be made against it in this House.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman has not exactly stated in what respect he objects to this Bill. It is not now a question of considering whether it is right or not to allow the sale of liquor by druggists, because that is settled by the Act of 1888. It is now merely a question of regulation, and I must say, with regard to alcohol and spirituous liquors, that I cannot see how my hon. friend can contend that the regulation proposed in the Bill before the House is less effective than the one in the Act of 1888. It deals very much more fully with all the difficulties that would naturally occur in such matters. The only defect I see in this Bill is that it allows the sale of medicinal preparations, and of perfumery, such as eau de cologne, without restriction. So far as I am personally concerned, I think it is right. I do not think a record should be kept of every sale of eau de cologne. That would be unreasonable, and therefore it seems to me that with respect to alcohol and spirituous liquors this Bill is certainly an improvement on sub-section 2, section 11, of the Act of 1888.

Mr. JAMIESON. My objection is to clause *e*. The serious objection at the time the Act of 1888 was before the House was with respect to the sale of alcohol and methylated spirits for pharmaceutical, medicinal or chemical manufacturing purposes. At that time it was thought those sales should be permitted without any record whatever, or any restriction whatever. We opposed that view, because we believed that under the sale of alcohol or methylated spirits for the purpose indicated there would be a very wide door opened. Those who were consulted, and who were quite competent to pass judgment on the matter at the time, were fully aware that very great abuses would arise if alcohol and methylated spirits were allowed to be sold unconditionally for such purposes and used without any record being kept, because the sale would simply be a cover for other uses. A man, for instance, might go into a drug store and simply say he wanted alcohol for pharmaceutical and chemical purposes, and that would be the end of it. The druggist was, under the law, obliged to make the sale without any certificate or record being kept. The hon. gentleman now proposes to do the same thing. We very strongly opposed the change at the time, and I feel as strongly now in regard to it as I did on that occasion. I have been informed that even methylated spirits have been used, by those who have fallen to a very low stage in drinking, for beverage purposes; I believe they can be used diluted for beverage purposes. It would be a very serious mistake to allow such sales to be used without registration. There may be something, perhaps in what has been said as to records being unnecessary in regard to sales of eau de cologne and other articles, but we should carefuly examine the whole of the provisions before passing the Bill and allowing it to become law. I would much rather retain the law as at present, and, at all events, keep the present clauses, so far as alcohol and methylated spirits are concerned. It will be remembered that in the Canada Temperance Act, as originally passed, it was provided that sales of intoxicating liquors could be made exclusively for medicinal purposes or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, when made by a licensed druggist or vendor. But such sales, when, for medicinal purposes, were to be certified by a medical man; and in the second case, when used for manufacturing purposes, they were to be certified by two justices of the peace. Those were the only cases in which certificates were required, and they covered the whole ground. The druggists came to Parliament in 1888—in fact, they came several sessions before that—and said that the Act hampered them, because they were not allowed, in counties in which the Canada Temperance Act was in force, to sell more freely than the original provisions of the Act allowed. They further stated that, in regard to those sales, they were put to a great deal of trouble in securing certificates from medical men and justices of the peace.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have not been able to understand the objection of my hon. friend opposite. As I read it, section 11 is amended by this Bill, the first clauses, *a*, *b*, *c* and *d*, standing as they do in the Act now.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Except in regard to the certificates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Clause *e* is taken out, and the Act is as originally reported.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not the restriction. Sub-section 4 of section 99 still stands; it is not repealed by the Act of 1888. So one of the principal objections of this Bill is, that it is merely re-enacting what is already law, with the exception of some changes in the certificates; because sub-section 4 of section 99 of the original Act provides that where the sale is for medicinal purposes there should be a prescription by a physician.

Mr. FLINT. It must be remembered that under the original Act these sales are made by certain licensed vendors, who must procure a license from the Lieutenant Governor of each province, while under this Bill every druggist can sell. I apply the same rule to every druggist while the original Act applies to every authorized vendor.

Mr. COATSWORTH. All druggists have sold under the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They violated the Act.

Mr. FLINT. As a rule, they were not druggists, but merchants or laymen. My Bill places all druggists under the same restriction as regards the sale of alcoholic and spirituous liquors as are licensed vendors under the original Bill.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I see that point; but, of course, no practical difficulty arose under the original Act, because there was no difficulty about procuring the licenses.

Mr. FLINT. Oh, yes, there was.

Mr. COATSWORTH. They all had licenses, so far as I know.

Mr. FLINT. It was a difficult thing to get the licenses.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Under sub-section 4 they could sell for medicinal purposes on the certificate of a physician, and on the certificate of a justice of the peace they could sell for mechanical purposes. In regard to sub-section 11, and to the first four proposed sub-sections, I do not know whether my friend has found it in his part of the country, but I have been informed by those who are living among the Indians, and I am also informed that it exists to a certain extent in the North-West Territories; that very many of these preparations are actually sold and used as beverages. I remember on one occasion a surveyor who had a large number of Indians working for him complained to me very bitterly, that when he sent his Indians down for supplies they could buy these preparations from the druggists and bring them up to the camp and use them for liquors. One of the things he spoke of is Pain-Killer. I see that is not referred to in the Act; but preparations of this kind that have liquor in them are bought by the Indians and used for beverages.

Mr. JAMIESON. If the hon. gentleman would allow clause *d* to be expunged the Bill will not be so seriously defective as I think it is at present. If the hon. gentleman will look into it, I do not think he will come to the conclusion that the clause is superfluous, because if methylated spirits are used for mechanical purposes, and I believe they are, that would come under clause *e*. I think to allow methylated spirits to be sold without a certificate would be a serious impairment to the law.

Mr. DAVIN. If you have a Temperance Act it may as well be effective, and I think my hon. friend who is responsible for this Bill (Mr. Flint) will really emasculate the Temperance Act already on the Statute-book. My friend who last spoke has referred to the North-West Territories, where you have theoretically a prohibition country; and we know that these preparations have been largely bought. My friend the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) says that Pain-Killer is a patent medicine. Well, Pain-Killer, I have heard, has been used extensively in the North-West for drinking purposes, and there is no doubt whatever that clauses *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* will open a wide door, and make a wide breach in your Act. If you have a Temperance Act it may as well be what it professes to be. I consider that clause *e* also will open a wide door in the law as it at present stands, and I will tell you why: If every druggist, or everybody who professes to be a druggist,—and you will have many professing to be druggists—can sell spirituous liquors as described here, though guarded by a certificate, you will find they will take advantage of it, and you will practically have a place of resort where men can go and get any amount of liquor they want. We know that without any license whatever, there is a town in Alberta where a druggist has made an immense fortune by selling all kinds of liquors; stout, whiskey, brandy and champagne, and probably that would suggest the difficulty of carrying out an Act of this kind. But if you have an Act on the Statute-book you may as well have it as complete as you can, and I can assure my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that this clause of his, instead of making the Act more effective will make a breach in the Act on the Statute-book'

Mr. COATSWORTH. Would my hon. friend add sub-section 2 of section 11 of the Act of 1888 under sub-section 8? Sub-section 2 says:

"Each such sale shall be recorded in a book kept for the purpose, giving the name and address of the purchaser, quantity and name of liquor, of medical man prescribing the same, and the purpose for which it is required, and the said book shall be kept open for inspection by the proper county inspector at all times."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me that one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has not quite understood the meaning of my hon. friend in introducing this Bill. When that amendment was made to the Canada Temperance Act some years ago it was made on the alleged ground that the Canada Temperance Act was so wide in its terms that an innocent article, if sold by a druggist, rendered him liable to a penalty, and the amendment was carried through the House on the argument that it was not desirable that such articles as are mentioned in sub-sections *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* should come within the purview of the Act at all. On that ground they smuggled a clause through the Act embracing the articles mentioned in *a*, *b*, *c* and *d*, and when the House got in a yielding mood they included in the amendment alcohol when sold under a physician's prescription. As the Act at present stands, which my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) is seeking to amend, if the physician chooses to do so, liquor can be obtained from an ordinary druggist on a mere prescription. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but if he reads the Act he will see that. There is one limitation, to the effect that it must not be over ten ounces. So that any physician can write a prescription, and any man who has got a pain takes that prescription to the druggist and gets ten ounces of alcohol. This Bill is intended to throw a guard around the sale of that alcohol and to provide that it shall not be sold, unless under these conditions and subject to the restrictions mentioned in sub-section *e*. If the hon. gentleman opposite is, as he professes to be, and as I would be sorry to doubt, a real believer in the Canada Temperance Act—he opposed the introduction of that amendment into the Act some years ago, and I voted with him, because he said it would throw open the door, and I agreed with him, to the obtaining of liquor right and left for anybody who wanted to get it. All they had to do was to tell the physician they were not well and they could get liquor. My hon. friend does not want to prevent them getting liquor if they really require it, but he places certain restrictions on the obtaining of it which seem to me to be a guarantee of the *bonâ fides* of the applicant, and the only question is: Whether those restrictions are just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable. I have listened to the hon. gentleman, but I have not heard him assert that there is a lacking in that clause, in the conditions which are inserted in it, anything that should be there, or that there is in it any condition which is oppressive or wrong. The conditions which my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) put in his clause seem, by universal consent, to be reasonable. They are not merely original suggestions of

his own ; they are the conditions which are already in the Act, under which a *bonâ fide* licensed vendor can sell. That being so, it appears to me that this amendment is in the proper direction, in the direction of temperance, and in order to make the Canada Temperance Act a workable Act, by closing an opening in the hedge which was made a few years ago, and out of which as much liquor went as anyone wanted to get. Those of us who live in districts which are under the Canada Temperance Act know that a man can get all the liquor he wants ; there are no effective restrictions. If he goes to a physician, and complains of not feeling very well, he can get a prescription, by means of which he can obtain all the liquor he wants.

Mr. JAMIESON. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that, as the law stands at the present time, liquor can be procured without a prescription.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that any physician may have an agreement with a druggist, as we know many have, to get a percentage on the prescriptions, and whether he is interested or not the physician can give a prescription under which a man can get all the liquor he wants.

Mr. JAMIESON. Of course, the medical man must give a prescription before the liquor can be sold. But what I object to—and the hon. member for Queen's sustained me in the position I took on this subject in 1888—is that the Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced removes that restriction. He is confining the certificate to two specific purposes, medicinal and mechanical, whereas, as the law stands at present, if a person went into a drug store for alcohol or methylated spirits for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical purposes, the sale would have to be recorded, and the record kept open to the public.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he opposed these amendments in 1888. I have no doubt he did, and so did I. But the hon. gentleman will see that sub-section 4 of section 99 is word for word the same as the provision of sub-section *e* of this Bill ; and the hon. gentleman in 1888 opposed the repeal of that section as he now opposes the restoration of the section by the Bill of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman says he was opposed to the amendment of the Act because, in a great measure, it broke down the restriction of the sale by a druggist ; and now my hon. friend proposes to restore that very section in almost the same words that were in the previous Act, the repeal of which the hon. gentleman deprecated, and the hon. gentleman opposes its restoration. What does the hon. gentleman complain of ? He complains that no record is kept of the sale of patent medicines, eau de cologne, bay rum, and articles of perfumery. These are not beverages which people drink, but are used for other purposes. What is of no consequence and what ought not to be included in the restriction my hon. friend proposes to take out of the restriction ; and what ought to be included, spirituous liquors and alcohol, whether used for mechanical or for medicinal purposes he proposes to restore to the restriction. This is important, and the hon. gentleman comes forward and opposes the very thing he supported when the Bill amending the Act of 1878 was proposed to the House three years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman, I am bound to say, has misapprehended the case altogether. I think my course has been quite consistent ; but the hon. gentleman will see that the law as it stands now is quite different from the law as it stood in 1888. According to the text of the Canada Temperance Act, as it was originally framed, a sale of methylated spirits for mechanical purposes, for example, could not be made except on the certificate of two justices of the peace. At the present time a sale can be made by a chemist or druggist, but there must be a record of it kept. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill proposes that methylated spirits may be sold without any certificate or record being kept whatever.

Mr. FLINT. I am not at all wedded to that feature of the Bill. If my hon. friend desires to have methylated spirits included, I am quite willing that that should be done. But my own feeling is against it, because I never heard of methylated spirits being used as a beverage. There never, as I understand it, was any very serious contention in reference to the authority of druggists to sell the preparations mentioned in *a*, *b* and *c*.

Mr. JAMIESON. The great controversy in this House was with reference to alcohol and methylated spirits. That was the bone of contention between the two parties when the Bill was under consideration. Now, if the hon. gentleman will simply consent to strike out methylated spirits and let any party who has occasion to purchase them for mechanical purposes, or any of these purposes to which no objection is taken, get a certificate and have a record kept, I think the hon. gentleman's Bill will not be open to very serious objection.

Mr. FLINT. I will accept that suggestion.

Mr. ROOME. I think the clause that the sale may be made on the certificate or prescription of a legally qualified physician, having no interest in the sale, would work a great injustice to the medical men of Canada. Throughout the whole Dominion, especially in the Province of Ontario, in our villages and towns, medical men have often interest in drug stores, and in many places there would be no drug store if it were not established by the doctor ; and under this clause any medical man, no matter how good may be his standing, and even if there be no other drug store in the vicinity, is not allowed to prescribe, if the prescription be filled in his own drug store, without being amenable to the law. I know of one medical man of good standing, one of the best physicians in the west, who owned a drug store, and because he gave prescriptions which were filled at his own store, he was fined under the Temperance Act. That particular clause ought to be removed. It is a reflection on the medical men of Canada.

Mr. FLINT. I move to amend the Bill by striking out the letter *e* and making that clause a part of clause *d*.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would draw attention to the point raised by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Roome). There are many doctors in the country who are carrying on their business in connection with drug stores. There are no less than two in the town I come from, and if this clause passes as it is, neither of them would have

any power to prescribe from his own drug store. I think that would be a hardship.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You would have to amend the original Act, as the amendment in this clause does not touch the clause in the original Act, which has been in operation since 1878. And I doubt the propriety of our making such an amendment. It is easy to cite instances where the clause works apparently with harshness, but we must not look at particular cases here and there, but at the question as a whole. Without desiring to cast any reflection upon the medical profession, there are some men in that as well as in other professions, who would not refuse to lend themselves to underhand tricks of the kind this clause is intended to guard against. I know of cases where a doctor sold printed prescriptions, so that a man carried round his book of prescriptions, and got a drink whenever he wanted one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That happens only in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not say it was in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The hon. gentleman cannot produce an instance of that kind in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The doctor who gave the prescription qualified in Ontario. Of course he was not tolerated in the profession; he was an outcast and the profession would not recognize him, but he had a diploma.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will guarantee he had not graduated at the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps not.

Mr. ROOME. I agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that these words should be taken out of the Bill. It is a great hardship in several parts of the Province of Ontario if a doctor cannot make up his own prescription.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This Act is not in force in Ontario.

Mr. ROOME. We do not know how soon it may be in force again. I second the motion of the hon. gentleman to strike out those words.

Mr. JAMIESON. I hope the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) will not consent to any such amendment, and I am surprised at the member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) taking such ground. If he looks up the *Hansard* at the time of the debate on this Bill in 1888, he will find that he was one of those who took the same stand which I take to-night in regard to this amendment. The same effort was made then, and was made before, and it is made again to-night, and I hope the members of this Committee will vote it down, and I am satisfied they will. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that, while members of the medical profession, as a rule, are above reproach, there are black sheep in every profession, and there is not a profession in which you will not find some men who are ready to make merchandise out of their profession. We have heard of men in the medical profession in the Province of Ontario selling their prescriptions, and this is not intended to meet the case of honourable practitioners, but of dishonourable practitioners, who are not only to be found in the ranks of the medical profession, but in all other professions. I hope hon. gentlemen who represent counties where the Canada Temperance Act is in force, will state their views strongly against the amendment. I hope my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) will look up his record on this question, and, if he does, he will find that he is breaking his record if he concurs in this amendment. I think these words ought to be retained. They were not inserted for the purpose of reflecting upon the medical profession, but to guard the Canada Temperance Act against the action of dishonourable men in that profession.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). As far as my record on the temperance question is concerned, I think it as good or better than that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I am always in favour of temperance, but I am in favour of what is for the interest of the people generally. These words are a reflection upon the medical profession, and are an insinuation that a medical man would be willing to sell whiskey to make five or ten cents on his own prescription. A large number of the medical men in the west have their own drug stores, and it is insulting to say that anyone belonging to the profession to which I have the honour to belong, would sacrifice his position in society to give any man who wanted a certain quantity of liquor a prescription in order to make a cent or two out of it. Besides, this is no protection at all, because, if a man wants to give a prescription for that purpose, the man who gets it may go to the next store and get it, or, if there is none in the village, he may go to the next village and have that prescription filled. I think this is a hardship and that it is not in the interests of temperance to keep these words in. I have not gone back on my record; I stick to it; but without doing injury to the rights and privileges which I think the medical profession should possess.

Bill reported.

SECOND HOMESTEADS.

Order being called for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davin:

That, whereas in 1883 an Act was passed granting second homesteads to those settlers who had completed the conditions of the first homestead entry; and whereas in 1886 an Act was passed abolishing the policy of second homesteads; and whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between 1st June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead.

Mr. DAVIN. I may explain that the principle of this motion is embodied in my Bill (No. 108) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, and I think that the Government are likely to place that Bill on the Government Orders, so that I need not proceed with the discussion of this motion. I, therefore, move that the Order be discharged.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the prospective Minister of the Interior has a Bill which practically includes this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not understand the jokes of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman blushes.

Order discharged, and motion withdrawn.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BARRON, moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Railway Act. He said: I am in doubt whether this Bill will commend itself to the minds of hon. gentlemen in this House, because I understand that it meets with a good deal of opposition from railway men. But it is a Bill which certainly ought to be considered. The object is, as appears by the clauses of the Bill, to compel passengers to leave a car by one door, and passengers entering a car to enter it by another door. It may, perhaps, more properly come within the regulations of a railway, but the trouble is that you can never get a railway to carry out such regulations; whereas if some such provision as this Bill was made law, then, of course, it would be compulsory upon railways to carry it out. Now, the reason why I introduce this Bill is because I saw, myself, on one occasion quite recently, a child nearly killed by reason of people leaving a coach and others endeavouring to enter it by the same door. There was a jam of passengers on the platform, and a little child was knocked from the arms of the lady on the platform who was carrying it, and if the child had not been rescued, it would have fallen from the platform on to the track. I think that, apart from the danger resulting from the practice which now exists, there is a question of convenience to be considered. While it may, perhaps, be rather risky to urge this legislation at the present time, I think the Minister of Justice ought to consider the point suggested by the Bill to see if some remedy cannot be found for the existing evil. I am perfectly well aware of the difficulties surrounding a Bill of this nature. All the coaches of a train do not have sufficiently long platforms, and difficulty arises from that circumstance; then again the stations on different railroads are not the same. But, so far as country places are concerned, there is no difficulty about it, this law would be a very great utility and would prevent great risk and danger to life.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are the provisions for its enforcement?

Mr. BARRON. I have added it as a further clause to the clauses in the Railway Act regarding the management of the road.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This refers to the passengers, not to the road.

Mr. BARRON. No; it refers to the management of the road. Hon. gentlemen will see, of course, that it would be utterly impossible to control the passengers, but it will be seen by this Bill that the conductor or the brakesman is obliged, when a train approaches a station, as he calls out the name of the station, to say to the passengers that they must leave the car at a certain door. I think the passengers will very quickly get into the way of doing that, if they are told to do it. Then, in order to meet the case of people getting on, there is a provision by which notice must be put up in a conspicuous place, somewhere about the station, and the constable at the station would be required to direct the passengers to get on at the rear end of the coach. Now, of course, I am not familiar with the practice in the old country, but I have been told there is some such provision as this to prevent the danger and the risk of life which I have just described.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. COATSWORTH. There is no such provision as that.

Mr. BARRON. Well, I may be misinformed regarding that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They do not enter as we enter.

Mr. BARRON. At all events that does not alter the need of such a provision in this country. For instance, take the stations in small towns such as Lindsay, Peterborough, Port Hope, Cobourg, and I am quite satisfied that if some such law as I now propose were in force, it would greatly promote the convenience of the travelling public, and would remove one of the great dangers now attending railway travel.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he desired to call attention to the Bill, but would not press the second reading to-night. The Bill was before the House I think a session or two ago, and was referred to a select committee. That committee were unanimously of the opinion that the Bill should not become law. There are various objections to it. I am not prepared to say that some regulation might not with propriety be adopted, and I think the Railway Department would be disposed to consider the propriety of having notices containing regulations of this kind required to be posted up by railway companies at their stations and in their cars, although one would hardly suppose that in the rush and crush and hurry of an outgoing train this would be very effective. Generally speaking, when excitement and hurry occur, it is impossible to prevent persons endangering their lives by crowding and jostling. This Bill purports to be an amendment to the Railway Act, chapter 29 of 53rd Victoria; it should be chapter 29 of 51st Victoria, as consolidated in 1888. It has, however, no practical relation to that part of the Act in which it is proposed to be inserted. Section 262, to which this Bill will be a sub-section, refers to packing of frogs, wing and guard rails and oil cups. But, coming down to the provisions of the Bill itself, the hon. gentleman will see it is a Bill which contains penalties against passengers, but it should be a Bill to inflict penalties on the companies. The first section provides:

"Passengers leaving a train at a railway station shall do so by way of the car-door and platform nearest to the locomotive engine attached to such train."

I call attention to the fact that the platforms, especially at small stations, may not be sufficient to accommodate the whole train, and a passenger may be obliged to go out of the door of the car where there is no platform. The second section reads:

"Every person entering upon a passenger train shall enter a passenger car by the platform and door of such car furthest from the locomotive engine attached to such train."

That would require more than an ordinary platform. If, under ordinary circumstances, a passenger desired to leave the train by the door which happened to open out on the platform or enter it, it would be very hard to prohibit him from doing so. Section 3 provides:

"The conductor and brakesmen on every passenger train shall, as the train approaches a railway station, announce to the passengers how they must leave the train, in accordance with this section."

I think it would be well to have regulations and notices to that effect, with a view to inducing or compelling, as far as possible, the officers of railway trains to direct their passengers which way to go, and that must always depend to a great extent on the convenience afforded by the platforms. We must leave a good deal to the discretion of the officers of the train themselves, because when there is no crowd and no confusion and the station is a small one, very little risk or difficulty occurs from getting out of the far end of the car instead of the fore end. Section 5 says:

"From the first day of November in each year to the first day of April next following, storm or double windows shall be kept upon all cars for the carriage of passengers."

That would apply to poorly equipped railways, which are running trains for accommodation rather than for ordinary business. However, I think the subject might well be considered as regards the posting up of notices including regulations; but it would hardly be wise for the hon. gentleman to press the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Bill of my hon. friend is intended as a police regulation applying to railway trains. I do not understand, by the provisions of the Bill, that my hon. friend intends that passengers should enter at the rear end of the train and leave at the end of the train next the locomotive, but the Bill says the passengers shall leave by way of the car-door and platform nearest at the front end of the car and enter by the rear. I think in many cases it would be found to be very inconvenient. It would be more satifactory if some arrangement were made that would prevent passengers who wished to enter a train from doing so until the passengers for that station have left the car. It might be found very inconvenient to carry out such a regulation as provided by the Bill. Suppose a passenger entered by the rear of the car in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, and found every seat in the car occupied. The conductor then informed him that there were seats in the next car in the rear. Would the passenger be obliged to leave by the front door and walk the length of the two cars and enter the rear door of the second car? In the meantime the train might have left the station. While it was very desirable to make regulations if they were such as could be enforced, it would be a much more workable regulation to enforce a rule by which passengers should leave cars before others entered them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think any such legislation, with all due deference to my hon. friend, is at all necessary. The railway companies, in their own interest, and out of consideration for the welfare of the public, provide every regulation that can possibly be carried into effect for the purpose of saving the lives as well as the property of passengers. They make any regulation that is workable on days when there are not large crowds, and on days when humanity is *en masse* for the purpose of getting upon railway trains, no regulation is workable, no matter how many Acts of Parliament are behind it to attempt its enforcement.

Mr. INGRAM. If railway companies posted notices in each car and in each station requiring passengers to leave the cars by certain doors and enter by certain doors that would be sufficient. I notice that in some cars they have a card in one end of the car which gives the name of the next station, and after they pass that station the card is changed to one bearing the name of the succeeding station, and so on. If this notice were placed on a card of that kind, people would know the station they were arriving at, and they would know the end of the car they should leave by. It is quite true that in many instances accidents have occurred by passengers crowding in entering and leaving the cars, and if this notice were given it would have a good effect.

Mr. BARRON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend has exhausted his right to speak. I might as well now draw the attention of the House to the Rule on this subject, which says:

"No member may speak twice to a question, except in explanation of a material part of his speech, in which he may have been misconceived, but then he is not to introduce new matter. A reply is allowed to a member who has made a substantive motion to the House, but not to any member who has moved an Order of the Day, an amendment, the previous question, or an instruction to a Committee."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has generally been the custom to allow the mover of a Bill to speak again at the end of a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. If my ruling is called in question, of course the House will decide upon it. The Rule cannot be clearer than it is. It is one of the Rules which have been laid down for the guidance of Parliament,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Our practice has been different.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barron) was rising to withdraw his Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman accept the proposal of the Minister of Justice to withdraw the Bill?

Mr. BARRON. If I had been allowed to speak I was just going to say what I intended to do.

Mr. BOWELL. I ask you now.

Mr. BARRON. Yes, I withdraw the Bill.

Mr. ROOME moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. BARRON. I can speak on the motion for the adjourment of the debate, and I just wish to say a few words. I think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has given this Bill a rather unfair construction. He says if that any person enters a car by the rear door, and finds the car crowded, he could not then go into the other car, because he would not be entering by the rear door. The wording of the section does not bear that construction. When the person enters the car he will have complied with this section, because it does not say that a person on a train cannot go through from one car to another. That is a very different thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. BARRON. It is not a distinction without a difference. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) has taken a rather unfair objection to the Bill. I quite appreciated that there would be opposition, and I was satisfied that there would be great difficulty in passing such a Bill as this. Had I been aware, which I was not, that two or three sessions ago a Bill similar to this was introduced, I should

have looked at the discussion and probably guided my course accordingly. As has been suggested by hon. gentlemen, there is great danger arising from the present custom of entering and leaving cars, and perhaps if no other good has been done the introduction of this Bill will draw the attention of railways to the difficulty that does exist, and suggest to them to introduce some regulation upon this subject. I quite understand the difficulty suggested by the Minister, that if the train is long it might not be able to get up to the platform; but still if this Bill was made law that difficulty might be easily overcome. There is one clause in this Bill which provides that from the 1st of November in each year, double windows shall be placed on the cars. I had forgotten this clause for the moment. I have seen a great deal of discomfort arising from the want of these double windows. That, perhaps, may be a matter of regulation also, but unfortunately sometimes, we can only carry out the regulations by making them the statute law of the land. I would suggest to the Minister that it might be advisable to consider this proposition. However, the object of introducing the Bill has been attained and I shall now be quite prepared to vote for the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

On the Order being read for second reading of Bill (No. 108) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not move the second reading of this Bill, because, as I understand, the Government intends to move it on to the Government Orders.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 110) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The principal clause in the Bill deals with protection in the North-West Territories from fires caused by railway engines. Sparks fly from the funnels of these engines and set fire to the prairie grass, causing great devastation. Last year the Government accepted substantially this clause, the Bill went to the Senate, and in the Senate Railway Committee one of the senators, I was greatly surprised to learn, moved that this clause be struck out of the Bill; and it was struck out accordingly. There is another provision that on each side of every railway running through settled districts the company shall erect and maintain a fence high enough to prevent cattle straying on to the track. In the North-West we have large settled districts where there are as yet no municipalities. If there were, under the Railway Act, the companies would be compelled to erect fences. But with us, as they cannot be compelled to do so, cattle stray on to the tracks and are killed, and the owners of the cattle have no remedy unless the cattle happen to be killed upon a portion of the line running through their property. There is also a provision for automatic brakes on freight as well as on passenger cars. That is very necessary, because the accidents that occur on freight trains are very numerous, and this provision will prevent a great number of them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BARRON.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That all accounts for paper purchased to be used in the Government Printing Office for the years 1886-87, 1887-88, 1888-89, and all tenders, contracts and vouchers respecting the same, be forthwith brought before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts for investigaton, in accordance with the recommendation made in the Ninth Report of said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—PRINTING EVIDENCE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the evidence now being taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts respecting certain items affecting John R. Arnoldi, and charged in the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year ending 30th June, 1890, under the heading "Dredging—Details of Expenditure," be printed for the use of the members of that Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Tenth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—RECEPTION OF REPORTS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until Friday, the 14th instant.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON (for Mr. DEWDNEY) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies of land hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company, in addition to the subsidy for one hundred and fifty miles of railway authorized by the Act passed in the session held in the forty-eighth and forty-ninth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter sixty, Dominion lands to the extent of six thousand four hundred acres per mile for the balance of the two hundred and twelve miles of railway which have been constructed and are in operation, that is to say, for a distance of sixty-two miles;

Also, to the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company, Dominion lands to the extent of six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's branch line of railway from Carman to Barnsley, a distance of about six and one-quarter miles;

To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in addition to the subsidy authorized by the Act fifty-third Victoria, chapter four, for the company's branch line running in a south-westerly and westerly direction, from a point

at or near Brandon, for a distance of one hundred miles, Dominion lands to the extent of six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the extension westward of the said branch line, from the western limit of the said one hundred miles to a point at or near La Roche Percé, situated in Township one, Range six, west of the Second Meridian, a distance of about sixty miles.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the said grants and each of them be made in aid of the construction of the said railways respectively, in the proportions and upon the conditions fixed by the Orders in Council made in respect thereof, and that, except as to such conditions, the said grants shall be free grants, subject only to the payment by the grantees respectively of the cost of survey of the lands and incidental expenses, at the rate of ten cents per acre cash, on the issue of the patents therefor.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

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

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Before you leave the Chair, I ask leave to move the motion which a few days ago I submitted to the House, but which I agreed to withdraw in order to facilitate the harmonious proceedings of this House. I then declared that I would take the earliest opportunity of again moving that amendment, and I now do so :

Resolved, That this House desires to express its approval (1) of the fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government, which, by permitting the free importation of raw materials, and by a judicious protection of our natural and manufactured products, has resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries; (2) of the liberal aid which has been granted to important and necessary public works, notably railways, canals and steamship lines, which have proved such important factors in developing our resources and facilitating our commerce: (3) of the wise and prudent management of the finances, which, while adequately providing for the public service, has maintained and advanced the credit of the country, and while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure, has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years; (4) of the policy of relieving from duty articles of universal use, such as tea, coffee and sugar (in respect of the latter the consumer being freed from taxation to the extent of $3,500,000 during the present session), and of the mode of meeting the larger part of the loss of revenue thereby caused by the exercise of economy in expenditure.

That this House, while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenues which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with a continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians.

That this House desires to express its special disapproval of any plan of commercial union between Canada and the United States which would involve a common tariff against the rest of the world and a *pro rata* division of the joint revenues of the two countries.

I have only a few words to add to what I have already said on the question. Without referring to a previous debate I may say, however, that all the questions involved in this amendment have been thoroughly discussed for about five weeks time and the debate is almost exhausted. The amendment, Mr. Speaker, as you will have observed, is the same as the one I submitted a few days ago, with the addition of a clause which I thought advisable under the circumstances, especially after the debate which has taken place in this House on the trade question and on the financial question before the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot surely pretend that they have not had fair-play. I know that some days ago I had a right to press my amendment to a vote, but if the House will allow me to make this short allusion to a previous debate, I will say that it was pretended at that time that, according to the agreement that was made between the Government and the leaders of the Opposition, the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, which was made on the motion for the second reading of the tariff resolutions, and almost at once withdrawn, was to remain in just the same position as if the House had then been divided upon it. Consequently, in order to have a square vote of the House on the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, after the angry passions had passed away, I was only too glad to agree to the withdrawal of my amendment. So we have given hon. gentlemen opposite the opportunity of having a square vote on their amendment. That amendment was an exposition of their policy on the trade question. I was the more inclined to withdraw my amendment, because I saw that the submission of a sub-amendment of that kind at that time might be interpreted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of their friends, as evidence that we were somewhat afraid to face the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and, of course, hon. members on this side of the House would not allow hon. gentlemen opposite to make that statement. We were ready to record our votes against the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, as we did. Now, I think hon. members on this side of the House have the right to submit a motion embodying a complete exposition of the policy best suited to the interests of the country, as we understand them. I have set out in this amendment the principles which a majority in this House, and a large majority of the people, want to see put in practice in this country. The first portion of the amendment is in these words :

It be resolved that this House desires to express its approval, (1) of the fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government, which by permitting the free importation of raw material and by a judicious protection of our natural and manufactured products, has resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries.

The principle of protection to our native industries, the principle of the National Policy, is embodied in my amendment, and I have a right to claim that this principle at the four last general elections, in 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891, has been affirmed by a large majority of the people. In affirming by resolution this principle, the House will only be doing what the people expect the House to do. My motion in the second place states :

(2) of the liberal aid which has been granted to important and necessary public works, notably railways, canals and steamship lines, which have proved such important factors in developing our resources and facilitating our commerce.

With respect to the second principle, I may claim that it dates further back than the other one, because ever since Confederation, in 1867, and even previous to that year, the people of Canada have at all the general elections affirmed the principle that it was good policy for the Government to aid the different undertakings and public enterprises which I have mentioned. The people have declared that they wish Government aid to be given for the promotion of the building of railways, for the enlargement and deepening of the canals, a work which was undertaken several years ago,

and which is still being prosecuted, and which we hope will be successfully completed shortly. The people have declared that it was good policy to subsidize lines of steamers. What the Government have done for the building of railways is considerable, and I may claim this, that the Government have acted loyally and with justice to the different sections of the country. I was looking a few minutes ago at the list of railways subsidized by the Dominion Government, and I ascertained that all the different sections of the country have had their fair share of aid for the development of railways. A few years ago the Dominion Government specially took into consideration the important subject of subsidizing colonization railways. The policy of subsidizing railways is not completed, and, as I mentioned some days ago, numerous undertakings are yet claiming the support of the Government. There are some of such railway enterprises in the different provinces, and in the different districts of the provinces, and speaking more particularly for the Province of Quebec, I may say that we have heard very often hon. gentlemen, even hon. members opposed to the present Government, asking subsidies for railways in which their constituents are interested and which they are anxious to see built. I know that one of the most important railway undertakings now discussed in the Province of Quebec is the line from Montreal, or Longueuil opposite Montreal, to Lévis opposite Quebec. This railway will traverse the different counties along the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec, the Counties of Chambly, Richelieu, Yamaska, Nicolet, Lotbinière and Lévis. There is a large population in those constituencies, who have been deprived of railway communication so far. I know very well, and hon. gentlemen representing those constituencies are also fully aware, that it will be very difficult to carry this undertaking to successful completion without some aid being given by the Dominion Government. I have always been in favour of this undertaking. If we look around the Province of Quebec we will find several other important railway enterprises. We have heard a great deal about a railway bridge at Quebec, and hon. gentlemen opposite have implored the Government to come to the assistance of that scheme. The system of railways of which the Lake St. John Railway is a large part is not yet complete. There is a large section to be built from Lake St. John down to Chicoutimi, and this being a newly settled country where there is much to be done, of course Government aid will be required. I may mention again the railway which will run between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec through to the lower provinces, and I take particular interest in this railway because it will traverse my own county. If I were to occupy the time of this House at greater length, I might mention several undertakings all over the Dominion, but I will refrain from doing so in order to shorten my remarks. I think I am justified in moving that the House express its approval of the Government's railway policy of the past, which will mean, of course, that this policy, always within the financial resources of the country, will be continued and aid given to the utmost extent to these national enterprises. We have been informed that, under the circumstances, the Government has thought proper to defer to a future session the consideration of the question of granting railway subsidies. The Government having this session come to the very excellent conclusion of abolishing the duties on sugar, it is of course only proper that some time should be given to see what will be the financial result of this policy. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the House by affirming this principle will be only doing what the people of Canada wish this Parliament to do. The third clause is as follows :—

That the House approves of the wise and prudent management of the finances which, adequately providing for the public service, has maintained and advanced the credit of the country, and while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure, has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years.

It is a very satisfactory fact that for the two years 1889-90 and 1890-91, the country has been able to make almost all the capital expenditure out of the surpluses, and when I affirm in this amendment that it is a good principle of financial policy that the finances should be so administered as to give a surplus at the end of the year, I think I should meet with the approval of all. The fourth clause of the amendment is as follows : —

That the House approves of the policy of relieving from duty articles of universal use, such as tea, coffee and sugar (in respect of the latter the consumer being freed from taxation to the extent of three and one-half millions dollars during the present session) and of the mode of meeting the larger part of the loss of revenue thereby caused by the exercise of economy in expenditure.

There are certainly contained in this clause two principles which anybody ought to be able to endorse : that is, the necessity of diminishing taxation when the financial situation of the country warrants it, and the relieving of articles of universal use from duty. That was the principle embodied in the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) some days ago, and if the Government and this House is not in a position to do all that was asked in that motion, I think the House can express its satisfaction that so much has been done, and that we have no taxation whatever on such articles of universal use as tea, coffee and sugar. Then with regard to economy, there is no person who can find fault with the policy adopted by the Government in trying to have both ends meet at the end of the year. That will be done by practicing a very wise economy in public expenditure, always, of course, subject to the efficiency of a good public service. Now, Mr. Speaker, the last clause of the amendment, as I moved it some days ago, was this :

That this House, while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and with the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenues which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with the continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians.

In this clause we affirm the principle that it is the duty of the Government to extend as much as possible the commercial relations of Canada with other countries and with the United States as well as with other countries ; but in all cases subject to the proper control of our own tariff and revenues, and also to the continuance of our profitable business and political relations with the mother country. These two principles I think it is the duty of the

House unanimously to affirm. I have added another clause to the amendment I read the other day, which is as follows :—

That this House desires to express its special disapproval of any plan of commercial union between Canada and the United States which would involve a common tariff against the rest of the world and a *pro rata* division of the joint revenues of the two countries.

I think it is, under all the circumstances and after all that has been said, the duty of this House to affirm the principle that this Parliament and the people of Canada do not want any kind of commercial union which would involve a common tariff against the rest of the world, and a *pro rata* division of the joint revenues of the two countries. Of course, I quite understand that there may be differences of opinion on questions of public policy ; but I think that, on the principles which I here affirm, there should not be any two opinions in this House. The House should be unanimous in declaring that we do not want any kind of commercial union by which our tariff would be made in Washington, or by which we shall have a common tariff for Canada and the United States against Great Britain, our mother country, and the other countries of the world, and a division of the revenues of the two countries according to population. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am decidedly opposed to such a scheme, and I repeat once more that I think it is the duty of this House to unanimously affirm these principles. After the long discussion that has taken place on all these questions of trade policy, I do not see the necessity of adding any more to what I have just said. I will place this amendment in your hands, Mr. Speaker, with the hope that it will meet with the approval of a large majority in this House.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, when some few weeks ago the hon. gentleman introduced the motion which he has now again placed in your hands, and which he was afterwards compelled to withdraw, for the reasons he has alluded to, he launched upon us as a Parthian arrow the threat that we should still hear his motion. One would have hoped, one might have expected, that in the meantime reflection and better advices would have given him a wiser decision ; but it is evident that the hon. gentleman has for this offspring of his brain, the blind fondness which sometimes makes people mistake deformity for beauty ; he dotes upon this motion of his. Not satisfied with presenting it to us, in the form in which he presented it to us the first time, he has embellished it, and given it a new toilet for the present occasion. Still, it seems to me that it remains what it was at first, an *olla podrida* which it would be difficult even for the rude stomachs of National Policy men to digest. There are some things in this motion which under ordinary circumstances I should not object to ; but the hon. gentleman has not been quite fair. He gives us something to swallow which in itself might be acceptable, in order to cram down our throats a good deal that is altogether unpalatable. For instance, the hon. gentleman wants us to approve of the policy of the Government in their efforts to extend our trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain, and with the United States. What have the Government done to extend our trade with the far East ? They have subsidized some steamers. Certainly that is not a stroke of genius nor anything unheard of. And what have the Government done to extend our trade with the West Indies ? They have again subsidized steamers, and not only that, they have sent my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to negotiate reciprocity treaties with our sister colonies in the West Indies and with the Spanish colonies as well. My hon. friend, however, has never boasted of his success in that line. He has not been very prompt in laying before the House the result of his efforts. It is only within eight days that he has thought fit to acquaint the House of the result of his endeavours ; and certainly he will agree with me that he has not much to boast of in that direction. He made an offer, but his offer was not accepted. He offered to the colonies of the West Indies that Canada would accept their sugar free of duty if they would accept Canadian products equally free of duty. I so read the statement, and I think I shall show before I conclude that I am correct. At all events, I think the hon. gentleman made an offer to reduce the duties on sugar, if the West Indies would accept our products in exchange. The offer was rejected ; but the hon. gentleman has not only reduced the duty on sugar, he has altogether abolished the duty, and this after he had made the offer of a treaty and failed. Then we are asked by the mover of this resolution to approve of the efforts of this Government to foster our trade with Great Britain. What in the name of common sense have this Government done to foster our trade with Great Britain ? They have done everything which it has been possible for them to do to kill our trade with Great Britain. Why, the very policy which has been enacted and supported by this Government, has had for its very purpose to destroy the trade we have to-day with Great Britain. Their policy has been to manufacture everything we could manufacture here, and which we have been in the habit of buying from Great Britain. The hon. gentleman says we should also approve of the efforts of the Government to establish a trade with the great nation to the south of us. Well, if anyone can show me what those efforts are, I will be prepared to vote for this resolution ; but so far they are not visible to the naked eye, nor do I believe them to be visible under a microscope. Why, the policy of the Government has not been to develop trade between this country and the United States. On the contrary, their policy has been in every instance to do what they could to injure trade between this country and the United States. Then the hon. gentleman asks us to rejoice over the policy which has created surpluses and great public works. Sir, it takes a man of some courage to make this assertion at the present time. We have had hitherto surpluses, it is true ; we have had high taxation, large revenues, and great public works ; but it is now apparent and only too manifest that these public works have cost the country double the amount they should have cost. We have this further evidence, that every cent of the surpluses that should have been expended on these public works has been applied in peculation, in malversation, in corruption, which to-day are a lasting shame and an eternal disgrace to the name of Canada. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that this policy has developed industries, and has in consequence made this country prosperous. Well, this is a question of fact upon which I am sure we might all agree ; yet, in the

long debate which closed a few days ago, we have not been able to agree upon this one fact, whether the country was prosperous or was not prosperous. We on this side of the House have asserted that the condition of the country was not satisfactory, and especially that the condition of the agricultural industry was most precarious. True, we have been met by negation on the other side of the House. I will not discuss the question with them, because their powers of negation are too strong for me. Whenever a thing is asserted on this side of the House, no matter what it is, denied it will be, and the negation will be persisted in, until perchance it is possible to unearth some declaration that hon. gentlemen may have made in what I would call an unguarded moment, but in perhaps what they would call a moment of weakness, and thus confront and silence them. With regard to this question, as to whether or not the country is in a dissatisfied condition, as to whether or not the agricultural interests are in a flourishing condition, I will not give to the House any argument of mine, but will content myself with reading from the report of perhaps the most important financial institution in Lower Canada: The Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien. That institution, in its report of May, 1891, not yet three months old, says:

"With regard to rural real estate, we called your attention in the report of last year to the crisis which it was then undergoing. This situation has only become worse in the course of the year 1890, and a very bad harvest has been added to the two preceding ones. Add to this the deplorable effect which the McKinley Bill has produced upon the industry of our Canadian farmers by abruptly closing the American market to their products, almost without any notification, and without giving them time to modify their system of farming. Under these circumstances we thought it wise to use double precautions, and to accept demands for rural loans only in most favourably situated localities."

I will be asked this question: Who is it that has drawn this woeful picture? Who is this preacher of blue ruin? Who is the Yankee sycophant that dares assert the McKinley Bill is not a blessing in disguise? Who is this veiled traitor that dares say anything in disparagement of the great National Policy? I will give you his name, Sir, but I am almost sorry to have to give it, for he is not one of mine. He belongs to the other side of the House, and I almost fear for him the fate of Orpheus, who was torn to pieces by the Thracians because he would not give them the music they expected. Well, Sir, the name is that of the Secretary of State for Canada, and the report is that of the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien, appended to which is the name I have just mentioned. There are in my friend evidently two different characters. I will not do him the honour to say that one is Dr. Jeykll, nor will I do him the injury of saying that the other is Mr. Hyde; but I will say that the one is the politician, the member of the Conservative Administration, whose object it is to show everything under rosy colours, and to drug the people with some hashish or some potion the effect of which would be to create in them illusive sensations; and the other is the man of business, the capitalist, the investor, the director of a financial company, whose object is to show things as they are, so as to make proper investments and not lose any money. And whom are we to prefer to believe? The Secretary of State, the politician, or the capitalist? For my part, my choice is made. I rather prefer to believe the man who looks after his business, than the man who simply speaks as a politician. That is not all. I also find the name on these pages of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), who is also a supporter of the great National Policy. I also find the name here of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who spoke on this question some time ago and quoted this report. He quoted it to establish what? To establish that real estate in the Province of Quebec had not decreased in value, but he did not cite the part I have just quoted, but something else. What did he quote? He quoted to prove that the debtors of the company are not in arrears in their payments. That may be, but he cited something more. He stated that the company had been forced to bring to sale a certain number of properties, fifty-four in all, which they had been forced to buy themselves, and of these they had sold fourteen, and had realized from the sales the amounts they had lent on those fourteen properties, less a few hundred dollars. But at the same time he stated that they only effected loans on real estate valued at double the amount lent, so that, by their own showing, property in the Province of Quebec has just decreased in value 50 per cent. However, we will not quarrel with this. Let us see things just as they are represented by the Secretary of State, when he speaks, not to the shareholders of the Crédit Foncier, but to the people of Canada. We will see that there is one point upon which we are all agreed, on both sides of the House. Out of the debate which took place a short time ago this fact towers, conspicuous above all others, affirmed by all on this side, and admitted by all on the other side—admitted, not always in so many words, but when not admitted in words, admitted by their criticisms and by their equivocations, still more eloquent and significant. That fact is that the power of consumption to-day of the Canadian people is not equal to their power of production, and we must have new channels of consumption. There are many varieties of opinion as to the methods to be applied, as to the channels that ought to be opened; but as to the fact itself I believe there is not a dissenting voice. Nor is this new. The same want was felt as far back as 1877, and the very same divergencies of opinion then existed as to the methods to be applied. Hon. gentlemen opposite professed to supply a remedy by means of a policy of restriction; we advocated a policy of expansion. They believed that the National Policy would not only build up the power of production, but create an equal power of consumption—that not only would we produce more liberally, but that the National Policy would give a greater market for everything we produced. That this was a delusion cannot any longer be denied. The problem then, as to-day, was not only to increase the powers of production, but to get a market for whatever we could produce. Is it possible to find a remedy within the policy now in force? Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is. They have been profuse and lavish in their encomiums of the National Policy, yet they support a Government which is pledged to go to Washington next October in order to find a market for our natural products. This is a strange inconsistency, but a greater inconsistency is that, although the Government are pledged to go to Washington to find a market for our natural products, yet hon. gentlemen opposite have heaped up mountains of statistics

to show that reciprocity in natural products would be destructive to our best interests. This is so far as natural products are concerned; but we put the question: Can we under our present fiscal system find a market for our manufactured products? An attempt, indeed, has been made to solve the problem in some manner. An attempt has been made to solve it by equalizing production and consumption, —not, however, by increasing production or by increasing consumption, but by reducing production to the level of local demands. This has been the policy resorted to by the very industries the National Policy was intended to foster and develop: millions of dollars had been taken away from the capital of the country and invested in mills—cotton mills and woollen mills for instance. Thousands of men were withdrawn from their usual occupations and brought to these mills to spin and to weave; but the day soon came when it was found that if these mills were worked to their full capacity, they would weave and spin in a year more than could be consumed by our small population in the same time. Then we know what took place. The masters combined and agreed to control production; they agreed to close up some of the mills and to work others at half time; and they forced men to be idle, one week or two in the month, and one month or two in the year. These periods of enforced idleness sometimes amounted to three or four months in the year. Now, I hold in my hand a circular which was issued last year by one of the knitting manufacturers of shirts and drawers, and after speaking of the hard times in which the industry was then labouring this is what he proposed:

"If under such circumstances we should continue to run our mills to their full capacity, the result would probably be such an over-production of goods as would affect the market for the next two years, not only destroying all chances of profit, but probably bringing disaster in its train.

"I submit, therefore, whether it would not be wise for the mills to at once stop all machinery except such as is in use on *bonâ fide* orders, that is orders that pay a fair profit.

"I have already stopped one-third of my machinery and given imperative instructions to stop the balance as fast as orders are exhausted.

"If all the mills will co-operate in this conservative policy, keeping the supply of goods fully within the limits of demand, I have no hesitation in predicting, not only an avoidance of disaster for the future, but a fair prospect of remuneration instead of loss."

Sir, you propose legislation to prevent combines. Remove the causes and you remove the combines. Increase the markets and the mills will be working at their full capacity, but as long as the manufacturers have to operate in a restricted market it is impossible that the mills should be working all the time. If all the mills in cottons and woollens were to work to their full capacity for one year, and if at the end of the year all the goods remaining unsold in the warehouses were to be piled up in a public square, the sight would be appalling, but it would be a fitting monument of the folly of those who once believed in a restrictive market. Those who believe in a false system of protection, when any industry is injured, say that the only remedy they have is to apply a little more restriction, which is just like the system followed by the old practitioners: If a patient was ill, they bled him, and if that was not enough they took more blood from him, and if he was not well then again more blood, and finally the ailment was cured, for the patient was killed. In this case, however, there is a slight difference, for the principle, advantageous as it may be to the capitalist, while it is ruinous to the workingman, cannot be enforced all around. The farmers cannot combine, but they are the victims of combines—combines in woollens, combines in cottons, combines in salt, and in almost everything they buy. What is the remedy for this? The remedy is expansion of the market; and what we propose on this side of the House is that, as our population cannot consume everything it produces, it should find a market elsewhere, and if possible should find it in the great nation of 65,000,000 to the south of us. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess not to believe in unrestricted reciprocity with our neighbours to the South, but there was a time when they believed in reciprocity, at all events in natural products. Time and again we have proposed to send commissioners to Washington to endeavour to obtain that limited reciprocity, but every time we were met by a stern refusal. In 1884 my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), taking advantage—not taking advantage, but looking to the fact that the fishery clauses of the treaty of 1871 were about to terminate, urged upon the Government the necessity of sending commissioners to Washington to negotiate a new treaty. This is what he moved:

"In view of the notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries."

This motion was met by Sir John Macdonald, who was then Prime Minister, in these words. He said it was of no use to go to Washington, that the people there would not agree to any unrestricted reciprocity. He thus continued:

"That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as our natural products, we will never have a treaty. I am quite satisfied the United States will not agree, the country will not agree, the voice of the country will be against a repetition of the Treaty of 1854. Then, Sir, the only question is this: Can we have a treaty on a larger basis? If there is no indication that the United States people, that their representatives, their Congress, will accept the recommendation of the president and appoint a commission, or go into the question and see whether there cannot be an arrangement, and if we know and the hon. gentleman admits—and it is evident he is correct—that by no possibility will there be a Bill to allow reciprocity in these articles, what indication, what sign is there that there would be any use in our going again, for the fifth or sixth or tenth time, on our knees to Washington, and asking them again, for Heaven's sake, to enter into a treaty with us?"

This was the key-note of the language which has been held ever since. Hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever we have asked them to go and negotiate even a treaty in regard to natural products alone, have told us invariably that it was against the dignity of Canada to propose anything of that kind; but all of a sudden, last winter, we heard that the Canadian Government had, not at the eleventh hour nor the twelfth hour, but at the fourteenth hour, determined to send commissioners to Washington to endeavour to negotiate such a treaty. What? Those proud men, who never would lower

their dignity by endeavouring to negotiate a treaty, those who never would consent to enter into any negotiations with the Yankees, to send commissioners to Washington to negotiate with them! So it was, but those hon. gentlemen told the people of Canada that this negotiation had not originated with them, but that the Government at Washington had come down on their knees to them, and asked them to send commissioners. I say here that in making this statement to the people of Canada they went to the people with falsehood and deceit in their mouth. We know now that the facts are the very reverse. We know that it was not the American Government who invited them, but that it was themselves who acted in this matter. A stranger who came into this House would think this was a matter of very little moment, whether the invitation came from Canada or from Washington; but, small as the question may appear to be, I charge upon them that they did not dare to state the fact, and that they went to the country with falsehood and deceit in their mouth. And why? Because up to that moment they had refused to do what the circumstances then forced them to do. Up to that moment they had instructed their party that it was against the dignity of Canada to send commissioners to Washington; and now if they had avowed that they had taken the steps which they were pressed to take during many years, they would have stood in antagonism to their own record, in contradiction with their own notions of national dignity; they would have stood before the people of Canada self-confessing that for many years they had neglected a duty which it was their business to perform. But, Sir, even though we had the assurance of hon. gentlemen that it was the Government at Washington who had first sought reciprocity from them—an assurance the accuracy of which some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had dared to doubt—after the letter of Mr. Blaine to Congressman Baker, it was impossible not to come to the conclusion that these hon. gentlemen had not told the whole truth to the Canadian people. When my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright) took occasion to recall to the hon. gentlemen that they had lacked in frankness toward the people of Canada, he was met on the other side of the House with the usual answer—disloyalty. Of course only a disloyal man like my hon. friend could doubt the word of a Canadian Minister; but it was natural to him, disloyal as he is, to take in preference the words of an American Minister. Now, to show to the House that I am doing no injustice to the hon. gentlemen on that side, let me quote from the language made use of on that occasion by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance:

"I think my hon. friend from South Oxford will allow me to tell him that it would be well for him to trust the Canadian people a little more, and even to trust the Canadian Ministers when they make grave statements on their responsibility as Ministers of the Crown."

They had made a grave statement on their responsibility as Ministers of the Crown. What was it? We find it in the report of Council adopted on the 12th of December last:

"The Committee of the Privy Council having learned that the Honourable the Secretary of State for the United States had expressed to Her Majesty's Ministers at Washington his readiness to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty on a wide basis, and particularly for the protection of the mackerel fisheries, and for the fisheries on inland waters, and had subsequently stated to Her Majesty's Minister his great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty, they desire to take the opportunity afforded by these intimations from Mr. Blaine of suggesting the expediency of taking early steps to adjust the various matters that have arisen and now exist, affecting the relations of Canada with the United States."

This was the key note of the language held by hon. gentlemen all through the elections. Now, what are the facts? Let me quote from the official correspondence laid on the Table of the House a few days ago. I will quote the language of Mr. Blaine in April last, in a letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my Minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State."

Mr. Blaine here directly denies the statement of this Minute of Council adopted by the Canadian Privy Council. But I may be told that after all this is only the statement of one man against the statement of another man; it is only the statement of the American Minister against the statement of the Canadian Government. Sir, we can view this question in the light of the testimony of no less a man than Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper, as we know, had an interview with Mr. Blaine, and he thought it good policy to advert to this fact; in a letter which he wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald, relating the interview which he had with Mr. Blaine, occurs this very significant passage:

"I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, in reference to the initiation of negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries."

Here we see Sir Charles Tupper forced to admit to Mr. Blaine that the language which he, Sir Charles Tupper, and the Canadian Ministers had used to the people of Canada during the elections, was untrue. Sir, we see here to what depth of baseness our opponents will go whenever they want to find a cry with which to go to the country. Not satisfied with the unfair advantages which the Gerrymander Act gave them, not satisfied with the unfair advantages of the Franchise Act, not satisfied with the advantages which they have enjoyed from the appointment of partisan returning officers, they have stooped to the low level of misrepresenting the American Secretary of State, and when they were taken to task by the American Secretary of State, like Ancient Pistol, they had to eat the leek, but nauseous as was the operation the leek had served the desired purpose of doing duty in the elections. Now we are told that the Government, at the fourteenth hour, have decided to send commissioners to Washington. What are the circumstances which have at last induced the Government to reverse their policy and to do that which they have refused to do during so many years? Sir, the reason is not far to seek; it is now a matter of history. It was the policy of our sister colony of Newfoundland, which, not so fastidious as the Government of Canada, took proper steps to secure a treaty, and they did it in a very business-like way. Sir William Whiteway, Premier of Newfoundland, and Mr. Bond, a member of his Government, were in London. Mr. Bond secured a letter of introduction from Lord Salisbury

to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the English ambassador at Washington, who then introduced Mr. Bond to Mr. Blaine; and inside of eight days a treaty of reciprocity was negotiated between Mr. Bond and Mr. Blaine, whereby Newfoundland secured the admission of her fish free of duty into the United States, and gave in return to the United States free bait on the coast of Newfoundland. During all that time our Government were standing, or rather sleeping, on their dignity. Sir Julian Pauncefote, however, thought that it was time to arouse them from their dignified slumber and to tell them what was going on; then they became very lively. Their action took the form of a protest. Protests by telegrams and protests by letters, urging Sir Charles Tupper to prevent the Colonial Secretary from allowing that treaty to go into force. I will not now discuss the question of the policy of this Government, whether it was fair or not, toward the sister colony of Newfoundland, in preventing her from managing her own affairs according to her own views—I leave that for another occasion; but I am now discussing the point in so far only as it relates to the previous policy of the Government, who at last were forced, by the action of Newfoundland, to take steps to prevent them from gaining an advantage which we could not have ourselves without negotiating a treaty. They remonstrated at the Colonial Office. But the Colonial Secretary of State told them the only thing they could do was to follow the example of the people of Newfoundland and negotiate a treaty for themselves, or to become a party to the negotiations then going on; and that is the way in which our Government have been brought to this position, that on the 12th of October next they are going to send commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty. Now, what is the basis upon which they will negotiate that treaty? Sir, I venture to say, after the long debate that we have had, that they do not know yet upon what basis they will negotiate. There are not two men on that side of the House who can agree upon a basis. They are all opposed to complete reciprocity; on this they agree; on everything else they disagree. Some are opposed to reciprocity in coal. For instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will never agree to reciprocity in coal. He told his electors, and he told the country generally, that he had taken Sir John A. Macdonald in hand, and had forced him to abandon his reciprocity notions concerning coal. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) will not have reciprocity in natural products. Yes, I beg his pardon, he will agree to reciprocity in some products. And what are they? Horses, lambs, hay, barley and eggs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Also potatoes from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LAURIER. That was an afterthought, because the articles I mentioned are those he first included. If the hon. gentleman spoke for his party, they want reciprocity in those articles which we always sell to the Americans, but which the Americans do not sell us; they expect that the Americans will agree to give us their markets for our horses, lambs, hay, barley and eggs, and even potatoes from Prince Edward Island, and at the same time, that we will keep our market closed against all their goods. If that is the idea entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite of reciprocity, let them call it by some other name, and I advise the Government to stay here. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has given them the basis on which they should negotiate, and that basis is unrestricted reciprocity in natural products and in manufactured products as well. But hon. gentlemen opposite would not agree to that. They have voted down my hon. friend's resolution; and I may ask them now, for what purpose are you going to Washington? Mr. Blaine has told Congressman Baker in this letter, that it was of no use, that no reciprocity would be adopted except upon a basis of unrestricted terms. Still, if the commissioners to Washington secure the settlement of the Behring Sea difficulty and of the Atlantic fisheries question they will have the hearty support of this side of the House. But this will not settle nor even advance the great problem of finding a market for our productions, and this is the question to be settled. I affirm again on the part of the Liberal party that the true policy to be followed on this question is unrestricted reciprocity. This brings us face to face with our policy. I know very well that this policy from its sweeping character will be likely to excite alarm among the timid and timorous; but I never heard it seriously questioned that unrestricted reciprocity would not favour Canada at large. The only objection I have heard against unrestricted reciprocity is perhaps it would injure some special classes of manufactures. If unrestricted reciprocity were to injure manufacturers and were to benefit everybody else and every other interest, what would you do? Would you abandon it? I do not hesitate to say that I would still be in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. If it is proved that unrestricted reciprocity, although it might injure the manufacturer, would at the same time favour the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, the fisherman, and the whole body of consumers, would any man stand up in this House and say it would not be sound policy to have unrestricted reciprocity? But I go further than this. I have no hesitation in saying, though my testimony is not worth much in such a matter, that unrestricted reciprocity would favour the manufacturers as well as every other class of the Canadian people. What is the reason? Because unrestricted reciprocity would give to the manufacturers markets, consumers. And what is it the manufacturers want in this country? Why, it is the very thing I have named—markets, consumers. But at the same time I admit that unrestricted reciprocity would create competitors to our manufacturers; this is the very thing to which our manufacturers object. They will not have competition. It is said that competition is the life of trade. So it is. But there is nothing at the same time which the trader dreads so much as competition, because with competition the trader must limit his profits and extend his operations to secure the same results at the end of the year, and thus trade is enlarged and the community is benefited; while without competition the trader will not extend his operations, but will extort the largest possible profits from his consumers in his limited market. If unrestricted reciprocity would bring competition, I admit, and I have no hesitation in doing so, that to some extent it would disturb some existing interests. From this fact alone I can well understand the hostility this policy has excited in some quarters.

But this is the history of all reforms; the history of all reforms has been a struggle to free the community from the incubus of some existing interests, and the history of all reforms has been that those who were interested always combined in order to make the people believe that they were to suffer and not those who were making the objection. Let me call back to your mind, Sir, a well-known instance. When Paul was in the city of Ephesus preaching against the superstition of his day, struggling against the absurdity, against the folly, against the wickedness of worshipping idols made by the hands of man, all the manufacturers of idols saw at once that if the doctrines of Paul were to prevail, if the people were to be set free from those superstitions, their trade was gone. They assembled in the Red Parlour of that day, and the leader of the crowd opened the conference with these very suggestive words: "Sir, ye know by this craft we have our wealth." And the object of the policy adopted was to try to convince the people that their interests, not the interests of the manufacturers, but the interests of the people at large, were endangered, and they appealed at once to the passions and prejudices of the people. They sallied forth, saying: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." And now in our own country, in our own day, while the Liberal party, like Paul, are struggling against the superstitions prevailing in this age, against the folly, against the absurdity and the wickedness of restricting trade, all those who profit by these superstitions, the Government who therein find the source of their power, the monopolists who therein find the source of their wealth, assemble in the Red Parlour, and there, as in the days of Paul, the policy adopted is to prevent the people being imbued by those doctrines preached by the Liberal party. Like the men of Ephesus, they appeal to the prejudices and passions of the people. The cry they raise is not "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," but "Great is the loyalty of the Canadians." This motion which you, Mr. Speaker, have in your hands, is the last appeal made to the passions and the prejudices of the people. What does it assert? I will not quote its rather verbose language, but in its last sentence there is an appeal to the fact that unrestricted reciprocity might discriminate against England, and there is a further appeal against assimilation of tariffs with the Americans. This is what the resolution means when the hon. gentleman uses these words:

"That this House, while approving of the special efforts made by the Government to increase Canadian trade with the far East, with the West Indies, with Great Britain and the United States, desires to express its confidence that any negotiations for the extension of commercial relations with the United States will be so conducted that their result will be consistent with that proper control of our own tariff and revenues which every self-respecting people must maintain, and with a continuance of those profitable business and political relations with the mother country which are earnestly desired by all intelligent and loyal Canadians."

This is an appeal to the passions of the people. This is an appeal to the loyalty of the people. We claim that we on this side of the House are just as loyal as are hon. gentlemen on the other side of House, but we object to men trying to make loyalty the cloak for their selfish policy. What is the argument which we hear in reference to this appeal against discrimination against England? It is stated that it would be unmanly and ungenerous to grant to another nation trade facilities which are denied to the mother land. This is the burden of the objection which is generally made on that score. Let us see what is in it. In the first place, I assert that this policy is not conceived in hostility to England. This policy is conceived in the light of what we believe to be for the best interests of Canada. But I state again, and I have admitted without hesitation, that this policy might disturb some existing Canadian interests. But I do not admit that English interests are to be more favoured than Canadian interests. It may be our duty when we have this policy enacted, as it is our duty now, to raise our revenue out of duties on British goods as well as the goods of other nations. I put the case in this way. I assume that this policy would realize what we expect from it. I say that I assume it, but I should not say so, because I believe it rather than assume it. However, I assume it just for the sake of argument. I assume, for the sake of argument with hon. gentlemen opposite, that unrestricted reciprocity would do what we expect from it: That it would foster agriculture, develop trade, stimulate industries, build up cities and settle our North-West. Then, Sir, if unrestricted reciprocity were to produce all these results, what, I ask, would be the attitude of England towards us? If we could show to England that unrestricted reciprocity would open for us an area of wealth and prosperity, would England dare to bring down her arm upon us in order to kill that possible prosperity? There was a time when England would have come down with a strong hand upon any such arrangement; that was the time when the notion was prevalent in England that colonies existed simply for the benefit of the parent state; that was the time when colonies were not allowed any trade except what was graciously conceded by the parent state; that was the time when, if the trade of the parent state came in collision with the trade of the colony, the trade of the colony must give way. But, Sir, that selfish policy pursued for generations by the parent state towards her American colonies, cost to England, during the last century, the loss of her American colonies. For years and years—no, at all times—the American colonies had been prohibited from exporting sugar, cotton, furs, to any country but to a country acknowledging the British flag. At all times, the colonies had been prohibited from exporting manufactured goods, such as wool, to any country, not even from colony to colony. At all times they had been prohibited from erecting iron furnaces; and all these prohibitions were made to benefit the trade of England. They benefited indeed the trade of England, but they alienated the heart of the American colonists, and when a struggle arose, British domination had to reel back before the universal discontent created by this selfishness. Now, Sir, even in the days of that conflict, there were men in England with hearts broad enough, and minds broad enough, to protest against that selfish policy. Charles James Fox in those very days declared in England, that the only manner in which the parent state could keep distant colonies was to allow them absolute freedom in matters respecting their own Government. In our own day, and in this country, that doctrine was applied to its fullest extent. Canada has the honour of having revolutionized the doctrines which formerly bound colonies to the parent state. We have been granted

freedom of Government in this country, and we have been allowed to settle our own interests in the light of our best judgment. And now, Sir, I ask, and this is a question which I want to have answered by hon. gentlemen opposite: Is there any restriction in this right that has been granted to us? To what length is the right to extend? Would it extend even to the point where Canadian interests would come in conflict with British interests, and even invade British interests? Sir, I say that the only limit to Canada's right is Canada's interests. So far as goes Canada's interest, so far goes Canada's right; and the doctrine which I assert now has been asserted by all colonial governments, except the Government in front of us. This doctrine has been granted by the Imperial Government, not once, or not twice, but it is now the settled common law of the colonies. The concession was not made spontaneously, but it was wrung from the mother land by the very force of circumstances and events. Since Canada has been granted freedom of Government the fact always apparent became manifest, that the colonies and the parent state had conflicting interests and that these conflicting interests could not be controlled by the same tariff. Why, Sir, in 1843, two years after we had been conceded responsible government, England which at that time had the corn laws, made an exception in favour of colonial cereals. Colonial cereals were admitted at a nominal duty, while foreign cereals were subjected to the heavy duties of the corn laws. But three years afterwards, in 1846, freedom of trade was adopted in England. The colonies protested; the privilege in which the colonies had rejoiced for three years disappeared, and complaints were loud and hot, but the parent state did not listen to those complaints. Nay more, not only would not England consent to listen to the complaints of the colonies, but England went to the extent of attempting—not by force, of course, but by every constitutional means in her power—to force the colonies into adopting free trade. The British Government went so far as to instruct colonial governors to refuse assent to any laws passed by colonial legislatures which might be in conflict with the system of trade adopted by England. Well, Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you that this policy of England was bitterly resented by the colonies. No colony in British North America would adopt the system of freedom of trade which had been adopted by the mother land, and among others the colony of New Brunswick protested very vehemently. I will quote to the House a very suggestive despatch which was sent by the Colonial Secretary of State, Sir George Grey, in 1850, to Sir Edmund Head, at that time Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick. The despatch proceeds to say:

"It is with much regret that I have learnt from your despatch, No. 59, of the 7th ultimo, that dissatisfaction has been occasioned among the inhabitants of New Brunswick by the instructions given you to withhold your assent from any Acts which may be passed by the Provincial Legislature in contravention of that system of commercial policy which the Imperial Parliament and Her Majesty's Government have judged it advisable to adopt, with a view to the interests of the Empire at large."

Now, Sir, I ask the good men and true who are ever so prone to put forward their loyalty: Are they ready here to give assent to this doctrine, that freedom of trade was established in England not only for the good of England but for the good of the Empire at large? Not one of them, Sir, would admit that doctrine. This despatch goes on to say:

"II. While it is the desire of Her Majesty's Government to advise the Crown to use its authority in such a manner as to interfere as little as possible with the management of their own affairs, by the Legislatures of the several colonies there are certain subjects on which measures cannot be adopted by an individual colony, without affecting the interests of others, and perhaps of the whole Empire."

Now, Sir, I ask again: Has it been the concern of the Conservative party, who pretend to be loyal, when adopting their policy, to look to the interests of the Empire at large? Has it not been to look to the interests of Canada, as they conceive the interests of Canada to be? Has not their policy always been Canada for the Canadians, and not Canada for the whole Empire? And so, the whole doctrine as applied in practice by the Conservative party, is in direct antagonism to the policy of the British Colonial Secretary of State. The despatch continues to say further:

"III. Measures for the regulation of trade are of this description, and from the very foundation of our colonial Empire, the Imperial Parliament and Government have always claimed and exercised the right of deciding on the commercial policy which should be adopted by all British colonies."

Sir, is there a man in the ranks of these loyal men and true who would to-day agree that the policy of Canada should be decided by the British Parliament? Not only was the doctrine set down by the Colonial Secretary of State, Sir George Grey, not adopted, but so far back as thirty years ago the Canadian Legislature protested that they and they alone were the best judges of what were the interests of the Canadian people. Nay, the day came when in 1879 the Conservative party which had just gained the elections adopted a policy in direct antagonism to the policy of free trade; they adopted a policy of high protection. I remember very well, Sir, that upon that occasion they cheered as lustily as they cheered some few days ago, but I remember also that they did not sing "God save the Queen," over it. They did not sing "God save the Queen," for very good reasons—because the objection had been taken then that their policy, which was calculated to injure British trade, might endanger British connection, and the answer was: Then so much the worse for British connection. The answer then given by their press, solidly maintained by every one of them, was that if protection was for the best interests of Canada, then protection was to be had, even if protection was to destroy British connection. Sir, for this language, which if it had been used by us, would have brought upon our heads storms of denunciation and abuse, we never upbraided the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they believed that protection was for the best interests of Canada, it was not only their right but their duty to act in the line of their belief. But I protest against the shouts of disloyalty being raised against us, because the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite having been tested and found wanting, we propose a policy which we know to be no more inimical to our connection with Great Britain than the policy which they adopted fifteen years ago. Sir, there is more. The British Government, finding that they could not make Canada or their other colonies adopt free trade, initiated another system: they negotiated commercial treaties without reference to the interests of the colonies, but solely

in the interests of the British people, leaving the colonies to judge for themselves what they would do. Some few weeks ago my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Rider) put a question to the Government—whether or not there was a treaty of commerce between France and England? The Government have not yet been able to give an answer, though it is quite easy to give one. The Cobden Treaty was negotiated in 1860; and I am bound to say that the class of English goods which were admitted into France at a special rate of duty under that treaty were not those in which Canada could have competed with England, with one single exception, ships. British ships were admitted into France under the Cobden Treaty at the rate of 25 francs a ton, while the general tariff of France at that time, if I am rightly informed, was 50 francs a ton. That treaty was negotiated in the interests of British ships, and without regard to Canadian ships, though Canada could have competed with Great Britain in that article, because Canada was at that time a ship-building country. But that treaty has come to an end, and there is now no special commercial treaty with France. But there is a convention to-day between France and England, signed in February, 1882, whereby English goods are admitted into France on terms reserved to the most favoured nation. Now, my hon. friend from Stanstead asked this question: What is the difference of duty on fresh butter, salt butter, cheese, salt meat and lard, as between the Canadian product and the English product when admitted in France? The answer is this: Under this convention, which is to last until February, 1892, when it will have been ten years in operation, fresh butter coming from Canada is subjected to the general tariff of France, which is 13 francs per 100 kilos, whereas English butter is admitted free; that is to say, there is a discrimination against the Canadian article in favour of the British of 13 francs per 100 kilos. On salt butter the general tariff of France which is applied to Canada, is 15 francs per 100 kilos, and the tariff upon English salt butter 2 francs, a difference of 13 francs per 100 kilos. On soft cheese the general tariff is 6 francs and the special tariff 3 francs. On hard cheese the general tariff is 8 francs and the special tariff 4 francs. On salt meats the general tariff is 8.50 francs and the special tariff 4.50 francs. Lard is free. So that, Mr. Speaker, the English Government have negotiated that treaty without looking to the interests of Canada, but looking simply to the interests of the English people. But, Sir, there is more. England has negotiated treaties with Germany which directly affect Canada; and if the hon. Minister of Customs were here, I should have his testimony that in the treaties negotiated in 1862 and 1865, if I remember rightly, between England and Germany, German goods imported into Canada cannot be charged a higher rate of duty than British goods; and in the face of that treaty the hon. Minister of Customs is not at liberty to so appraise German goods coming from Germany to the full cost of transit between Hamburg or Bremen to Canadian ports, but simply as if they were shipped from Liverpool or any English ports. Therefore, England has negotiated treaties in a manner directly contrary to the interests of Canada. But there is more. In 1870 the late Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, tested the American pulse in order to ascertain whether or not he could obtain a treaty extending not only to natural products, but even to manufactured goods. Sir John Macdonald was charged with that in the House in 1870 by Mr. Huntington, and he did not deny it. Moreover, we would have the proof of it in the blue-books, if they could be had; and we have the proof in the English press. The *Times*, the great organ of public opinion in England, which had been kept *au courant* with what was going on, used this very suggestive language in reference to that matter:

"It is at this very moment a matter of discussion in Canada, whether a treaty of reciprocity should not be concluded with the United States; and the result of the deliberations may very possibly be an admission of the manufactures of New England into the Dominion under lighter duties than the manufactures of Great Britain. If the Canadian Ministry come to the conclusion that such an arrangement is for the benefit of that country, will the Colonial Office advise the Crown to disallow the negotiations? Assuredly not."

This is the sentiment of public opinion in England; and I say it is the merest flunkeyism on the part of any one in this country to try to be more English than the English. It is the merest flunkeyism to prevent us from doing what the English people are prepared to concede to us; and if there is any man in this Parliament to-day, forgetting that he is a Canadian, wants to do what men would not do in England, all I have to say is that his place is not in the Canadian Parliament, but he should go to the other side of the water and try to find a seat in the British Parliament. But, Sir, there is still more than that. There is the very recent action of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who last year, with the view of promoting trade with the West Indies, induced the Government of which he is a member to pass the following Order in Council for the establishment of better trade relations between certain colonies in the West Indies, not only British but foreign, and Canada; and this is what was proposed on the part of Canada:

"A reduction in Canadian duties on raw sugar imported from the Spanish Antilles into Canada for refining purposes, such reduction, however, not exceeding the maximum of 30 per cent. of the present duties."

This was the offer made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to the West Indies. Now, what was he to get in exchange for this?

"In return for this the Spanish Government to admit at equivalently reduced duties into their islands, grain, flour, fish, coal, lumber of all kinds, vegetables including potatoes, and such manufactured goods as may be agreed upon."

Sir, is it to be conceived—can it be possible—that these loyal men and true were ready to ask the Spanish Government to discriminate against Great Britain in favour of Canada? It is an act of disloyalty when we, in order to obtain the American market, are prepared, as we are, to discriminate to some extent against England. This is an act of disloyalty; but these gentlemen, saturated as they are with loyalty, can try and induce the Spanish Government to admit Canadian manufactured products at a special rate to the exclusion of British products of the same kind. That is what they call loyalty. Sir, loyalty is but a sham in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite. They would be loyal just so far as it suited them, just so far as their loyalty would keep them in office, but if ousted from office they would resort to their old attitude of 1849. There is another pet objection, which is also mentioned in this motion of the hon. member

for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). It is said—and it is a pet objection—that unrestricted reciprocity is not to be thought of because that would involve the assimilation of the Canadian and American tariffs. This I deny. Unrestricted reciprocity can be had with or without assimilation of tariffs, but I will go further, I will assume that unrestricted reciprocity cannot be had except by assimilating the two tariffs. Is there anything in that to break the heart of a good solid Conservative who has voted every item of the Canadian tariff and cheered over it? Is there anything in that to break the heart of the Finance Minister who has brought our tariff to the height it has now reached? Is the distance which separates the tariff of my hon. friend from the tariff of the Americans so great that it is beyond the capacity of his legs? If my hon. friend believes he cannot cover the distance, I tell him he does not do himself justice. Judging of the nimbleness of his limbs by some of his former acrobatic feats, I can tell him that he can turn still another somersault and sing "God save the Queen" over it. But my hon. friend points to his heart, and says he wishes to keep control of the Canadian tariff in the Canadian Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. And I hear, "hear, hear" from some gentleman on the other side. What use, I ask, has the Canadian Parliament made of its control of our tariff under the guidance of a Conservative Government, if not to copy, servilely to copy, the American tariff? There is a magic in words. We all know that the very term "assimilation of tariffs" sends hon. gentlemen opposite into a frenzy whenever it is pronounced. I tell them, and I challenge contradiction, that their policy for the last fifteen years has been to assimilate the Canadian to the American tariff. That has been done under another name, but not the less has it been done. Hon. gentlemen opposite remind me of Monsieur Jourdain in Molière's comedy, *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*. M. Jourdain, the hero, is a merchant who has made money but whose early education had been somewhat neglected. At the age of forty and over, he sends for a professor of philosophy in order to be instructed. The professor finds that the philosophy of his pupil is not of a very high order, though perhaps practical. Our hero wishes the professor to aid him in inditing an amorous epistle. "Very well," says the professor, "shall it be in verse." "No," said the other. "Then it will be in prose." "No," again said our hero. "Well," said the professor, "it must be either in prose or in verse because everything that is said or written is either in prose or verse." "What," said M. Jourdain, "do you mean to tell me that whenever I have said to my handmaid: 'Nicole, bring me my slippers, and give me my night-cap,' this is prose." "Yes," said the professor. "Well, upon my word," said M. Jourdain, "I have been making prose for over forty years and never so much as suspected it. I am much obliged to you for the information." In like manner I want to inform hon. gentlemen opposite that for fifteen years they have been assimilating our tariff to the American tariff, and if they are not as grateful to me for giving them the information, as M. Jourdain was to his professor, it is because they are not so honest. In 1877 we had two courses open to us: one was to continue the revenue tariff we had then, and the other was to copy the American tariff. If we had kept on as we began, with a revenue tariff, undoubtedly we would not have the large public works which we can boast of now; but we would be able to boast to-day of a purer name than we now enjoy. Undoubtedly our revenue would not have been so large, but corruption would not be as rampant as it has been proved to be. Undoubtedly we would not have so many millionaires, but we would have a more general and even distribution of wealth. But hon. gentlemen opposite, good, loyal men, were dazzled by the career of the United States. Even at that time there was a settled conviction that the natural market for Canada is the great republic to the south of us. What was it that prompted the Tories of 1849 to adopt the policy of annexation? It was not hostility to England. I will not do them the injury of ascribing such a sentiment to them. It was because they were convinced the American market could not be had otherwise. In 1877 there was, as there has been at all times, and as there is to-day, the conviction in the minds of the people that the natural market for Canada was the American market. Then, what was the policy adopted? It was reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs. Sir, these were by-words in those days. Reciprocity of trade, with whom? With England? No; reciprocity of trade with the United States. Reciprocity of tariff, with whom? With England? No; reciprocity of tariff with the United States. In the name of common sense, I ask, what was that, if not assimilation of our tariffs with that of the Americans? The motto which was displayed on every public occasion at that time was: "Reciprocity of tariff or reciprocity of trade;" and the language used was this: We are ready and willing to trade with the Americans. If they will lower their barrier, we will lower ours. If they will not, we will build up a barrier as high as theirs. What was that, Sir, if not assimilating our tariff to the American tariff? I remember the catch phrase in vogue at that time among hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not want a single-handled-jug policy, they wanted two handles: the Americans had one handle of the jug, and they wanted to hold the other. What was that, again, if not assimilating the American tariff to ours? But for fear it might be supposed by the younger men of this generation that I am not representing things as they are, let me quote the speech of Sir John Macdonald, which was the gospel of that day, delivered at Compton on the 7th of July, 1877:

"Although Messrs. Alexander Mackenzie, George Brown and others of that free trade stripe tell us, 'Do not irritate the United States; do not annoy them; by-and-bye they will come to their senses and let us go into their markets.' The people of the United States know better. They say: 'Why should we open our markets to you? You have already opened yours to us.' The way to meet them is to say: 'What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.' (Cheers and laughter.) The only way is to tell them: 'If you can stand it, we can; if you keep us out of your markets, we can keep you out of ours.' (Cheers.) Until we have the pluck and manliness to adopt that policy; until we give up that cringing attitude (for which I am afraid I am somewhat blameable, because I was in power when the reciprocity treaty ended, and I am afraid I went too far to have it renewed) the present state of affairs will continue. Long, long ago, I gave up that attitude, and I said: To get reciprocity, we must give them a touch of equality; we must give them a taste of what we get ourselves."

What was that if not assimilating our tariff to the

American? Then Sir John Macdonald continued:

"I believe they were quite willing to return to the old reciprocity treaty of 1854, but no, the farmers on the whole line, from Maine to Wisconsin, rose in their might and told the Congress of the United States, that it was as much as their positions were worth to renew that treaty, and we were told that no matter what the desire of the American Government might be, the farmers of the whole northern belt, from east to west, had resolved there should be no renewal of the reciprocity treaty. I gave it up from that moment. Why, there are 40,000,000 of people. If these 40,000,000 are afraid of the competition that our 4,000,000 in Canada would produce in their markets, what should we say? If our products can affect the markets of 40,000,000, how much more will the products of 40,000,000 affect ours? It is not a matter of doubt, but of certainty—we are to have this country developed, if we are going to make this great country what the United States can make theirs, we must take a leaf from their book. (Cheers.) I told them in the House and I tell you now, it cannot be called a retaliatory or vindictive policy to adopt their tariff. It is said the truest and most sincere flattery you can bestow on a man is to imitate what he does. We will say to the United States: 'We were free traders; we took our cue from the mother country. We did not recognize the difference between the circumstances of an old country and a new one like ours, but we see you are wiser than we were. We will pay you the compliment of saying we were wrong and you were right, and we will do to you as you do to us.'"

I ask again what, in the name of common sense, was that if not assimilating our tariff to the American tariff; and to do the hon. gentlemen opposite the full justice to which they are entitled, I must say that they were as good as their word. They won the election on this policy of the assimilation of our tariff to the American tariff. The average of the American tariff at that time being 40 per cent., they raised our tariff to an average of 35 per cent.—not a bad commencement—and from year to year since that day the Finance Minister has been adding bar after bar to the barrier which we have raised against the United States in order to make our tariff as close as possible to the American model which has been chosen by hon. gentlemen opposite. And now these gentlemen who have adopted this policy in the past pretend to be shocked because unrestricted reciprocity, they say, would involve an assimilation of tariffs between the two countries. There is one thing which would be most objectionable. I do not wish to give the control of our trade policy to the Americans. I am in favour of unrestricted reciprocity as much as anyone, but if unrestricted reciprocity is only to be had at the cost of anything derogatory to the honour of Canada, I am against it. But what difference would it be whether the Canadian Parliament raised the tariff to the height of the American tariff from the position in which we find ourselves to-day? It is almost done already, and, if this would involve an assimilation of tariffs, the Parliament of Canada would not have a very hard work before it, and, judging from the experience of the past, judging from the last stroke of policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, by which, because the McKinley tariff reduced the duty on sugar, he has done the same, I do not think it would be hard for him to bring about an assimilation in tariffs. Let me say this definitely: There is no intention in the breast of any Canadian on this side of the House to surrender to the American Government one iota of our rights. If the Americans will give us reciprocity on the lines which we advocate, that is, that each nation shall preserve its independence commercially as well as politically, I am in favour of it, but if unrestricted reciprocity is to be determined, as suggested by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), by a commission on which the Americans would be represented by thirteen and the Canadians by one, I am as much opposed to it as he is. All I have to say to my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) on this subject is that, when the day comes, which is not far distant, when the Liberal party will send commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty, we cannot choose my hon. friend as one of the diplomats. I have every confidence in him as a business man, but as a diplomat, judging from the specimen of his diplomacy which he has given us here, I have no faith in him at all. We will send men who are prepared to stand by the rights of Canada, and not only do I not fear that the Americans would try to trample over us, but I believe they would meet us in a manly way as we are prepared to meet them. Another objection is raised, which is the pet objection of the Minister of Finance, and that is the question of revenue. His heart is harrowed as to what would become of poor Canada under unrestricted reciprocity. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to tell us that that is their only objection, that were that objection removed they would have no other one to raise, I would not hesitate to tell them where we would get our revenue. But they are inveterate sinners. If that difficulty is removed, they will fall back on another, and when the other is removed they will discover one more. They will not be convinced. They will for ever remain blind. What would we lose in the way of revenue? We would lose first of all the revenue we now get from our importations from the United States, which amount to a little over $7,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. $8,100,000.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, say $8,000,000. Then we would remove from the shoulders of the people of this country $8,000,000 of taxation. Hon. gentlemen have taken some credit because they have recently removed as they say $3,500,000 of taxation. Let us say we will remove $8,000,000 from the shoulders of the people. Would it be a very extraordinary feat in finance to fill up the gap thus caused in the treasury? I do not pretend to be a financial man myself, but from plain common sense and judging from the experience we have had during this session, I ask if it is a very extraordinary and impossible feat to remove taxation with one hand and reimpose it with another hand? My hon. friend could remove three millions and a-half of taxation from sugar and impose them on whiskey and tobacco and beer. It seems to me I could do that myself. But my hon. friend will tell me that this is not all we would lose. He will tell me: You will buy more from the United States than you are now buying; you will buy from the United States goods which you are now buying from other nations which now pay duty and which would not pay duty under those circumstances. How much would that be? My hon. friend cannot tell, and I cannot tell. But the basis of unrestricted reciprocity is this—and if the basis is not true we are all wrong—that it would make Canada as prosperous as a people as the Americans are, and if it will have that effect—and I believe we are situated economically in the same position as the Americans are—then there would be no more difficulty in our levying our necessary revenue

from Customs and Excise than there is for the American people to levy their revenue on Customs and Excise. The difficulties would not be greater and the same results would apply on one side of the line as now apply on the other side of the line. These objections will not stand when they are ventilated. The only objection, perhaps, which can be urged against us is one which I have heard sometimes from business men. We are told that unrestricted reciprocity would create a great disturbance of trade. Sir, if unrestricted reciprocity were to be adopted to-morrow, in twenty-four hours, without further notice, I admit that it would create a great disturbance of trade; but we propose, when we negotiate such a treaty, to do it like sensible men, to give ample notice beforehand, to make a treaty that will come into operation at definite periods gradually, by a sliding scale, so as not unduly to affect existing interests, and under those circumstances we have no fear whatever of the result. Sir, some few days ago the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), whom I regret not to see in his seat, told us that this policy of unrestricted reciprocity was the only plank in our platform; he almost regretted this was the only plank in our platform, and he said to us: "If you fail in your endeavours, what will you do?" Sir, I do not believe we can fail, because justice and truth must prevail in the end, and this policy is founded on justice and truth, and we shall not fail. But after all, supposing for an instant that the United States were not disposed to meet us like men, supposing they were disposed to be overbearing and to exact sacrifices from us which we could not make, what would we do in that case? Sir, we would then turn over a new leaf in our book, and I say this to the hon. member for Muskoka, and to those who believe with him, that I would be prepared then, speaking for myself alone, to look into the very scheme which he has proposed, the United Empire Trade League. I do not believe in the principles of the United Empire Trade League, for the reason that that scheme limits trade to allegiance, it proposes to make allegiance the basis of trade; whereas we desire to make trade interests alone the basis of trade. This latter principle seems to me to be the most sensible one. Now, those are the objections which are urged against us. We are daily denounced, we are daily assailed, but neither assault nor denunciation will make us deviate one iota from the path which we believe to be the path of truth. Canada has rights and Canada has duties. In the adoption of our policy we forgot neither the rights nor the duties. From England we exact every right which is due to our manhood; to the United States we will concede nothing which might be derogatory to our national dignity. This double consideration is our inspiration, it is for us the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night which will guide our course throughout this whole struggle until we have reached the goal.

Mr. TUPPER. In following the hon. leader of the Opposition I feel my task considerably lightened by the fact that the course he has adopted and the line of argument he has taken in his speech are, in my humble judgment, as I believe they are in the judgment of others, a great compliment to the results and experience of this country under the National Policy since 1878. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) threw down the gauntlet on the floor of the House, if not defiantly, at any rate squarely and above board. This House having heard for weeks and weeks all that could be said on one side or the other in reference to unrestricted reciprocity, the hon. member for L'Islet has asked this House to express an opinion upon the results of the National Policy. He gave the head notes of that policy and he claimed that it had achieved a wonderful success; and how has he been met? The hon. leader of the Opposition, with all his eloquence, with a carefully-prepared speech, has failed to deal with any single point in that resolution with one exception, that is, the question of discrimination. The able men who preceded him in the debate during the last few weeks have not been able to do justice to their side of the question as regards our foreign trade policy. The hon. gentleman has failed thus far to discuss the vital question which underlies the policy of the Government, and he has left the field in the possession of the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition began his speech with a certain amount of good-natured banter in reference to the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet, and he told him that having changed his clothes somewhat, having embellished the amendment as he first presented it to the House some days ago, it now appeared as a new policy. Well, upon this subject of dressing up questions, and producing new policies, and changing resolutions, the hon. leader of the Opposition has had considerable experience in the last few years. After that hon. gentleman and his party refused to follow the leadership of the Hon. Edward Blake, after they had refused to adopt the policy of his Malvern speech, they have been, in season and out of season, during sessions and during recesses, arranging new toilets, and endeavouring to present a policy more attractive to the country than the policy which they, from time to time, have thrown away. Why, the hon. gentleman was ashamed to refer to this resolution, for the House will bear in mind that the hon. gentleman, as I have already said, dealt very sparingly with the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet; but though he discussed generally the question of unrestricted reciprocity which came more particularly under the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, which has been rejected by the House, he did not allude to this extraordinary feature, to this extraordinary change which has been introduced into the so-called programme of the Liberal party of Canada, that is to say, that instead of, as formerly, pronouncing again here in solemn tones in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, they, to use his own language, are convinced that some sweet had to be introduced in order to enable their policy to go down, and so the policy as a whole was abandoned. The language of the first part of the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford reads:

"The circumstances of the country require that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artizans, miners, fishermen and farmers."

Why, that resolution was so contradictory in terms, it was so absurd, if I may use the expression, that an organ of public opinion in the United States that is continually doing service for hon. gentlemen opposite, the New York *Tribune*, came

out and expressed its contempt for the manner in which the Opposition were dealing with this question of unrestricted reciprocity. That policy has been denounced all over this country by their best friends, by men who are not rabid partisans, by men who are Liberals, and here is the end of that policy. The recalcitrants of that party have been approached and arguments have been used, not openly perhaps, but to the effect that the Opposition have not the courage of their convictions, that they did not mean what they constantly say in their resolutions in this House, but they merely wanted to find a cry upon which to carry the elections. The New York *Tribune* at first took their argument as serious and made love, as it were, to this policy, and encouraged these hon. gentlemen in the direction they were going. But during the contest that policy which has been announced and defended by the hon. member for South Oxford as the policy of the Liberal party, was shown to be so ridiculous that there was not a man in the whole of the United States who would have anything to do with it. But the fight has passed away, and now these hon. gentlemen come out of the smoke, after their terrible defeat on that question at the hands of the people of this country, and they dare not put in terms their resolution of last year. Take the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), he must have a hole out of which to crawl. That hon. gentleman's whole speech on nomination day was on the line denounced to-day in the most vehement terms by the leader of the Opposition, and in running his last election he pledged himself that he would not vote for any policy that would discriminate against Great Britain. Yet the hon. leader of the Opposition has occupied considerable time to show that it was within our right, that it was not treacherous to the Empire, that it was within the interests of the Empire to do what the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) pledged himself not to do at the late election. There are other hon. gentlemen sitting behind the leader of the Opposition who would not dare, and certainly did not dare, to argue so openly in favour of discrimination. Why, it was a question on which every hon. gentleman on this side when discussing the question with the people, was challenged to produce proof to show that the leaders of the Opposition did intend to adopt a policy that involved discrimination against the mother country. The utterances of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were brought out in support of that position; but to-day the hon. member for Quebec East, for what reason I know not, has courage enough, if not to argue the whole question that he first put before the people, at least to argue that phase of it, to endeavour to convince this House and afterwards the country that our connection with Great Britain was of small importance and that it was of small interest whether our trade was carried on within the British Empire, but that we should work for our own interests wholly regardless and irrespective of how the British Empire would be affected. The hon. gentleman has changed the clothes of his party, as he has done on very many occasions. We have had all kinds of trade propositions from the Opposition benches since 1888, but to-day it will be remarked that while the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) took several cardinal points in regard to the success of the National Policy and brought them before the House, he elicited very little on those different heads from the leader of the Opposition. Taking the motion generally, the hon. member for L'Islet called attention to the success that has attended the policy of this country in respect to the encouragement of the free importation of raw material. The statistics on this subject the hon. leader of the Opposition wisely left alone. The success in this direction, I venture to say, will not be controverted to any great extent by hon. gentlemen who may follow him in this debate. The hon. member for L'Islet drew attention to the great benefit of judicious protection for natural and manufactured products. When the leader of the Opposition said that some of the things in this motion were unobjectionable, I am led to consider whether he is about to take another departure and whether he does object altogether to a protective policy, but is free to admit that, it being a necessity, there are some features which he rather appreciates. Did he not apologize to-day in his most eloquent manner for the tariff of the United States? That is not such a terrible thing; it is not a system of legalized robbery, it is not so beastly as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his choice language was in the habit of declaring it, when he was Minister of Finance; but, take it all round, it is not so very much above the tariff in Canada. That is the argument of the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for L'Islet drew attention to the policy of granting aid to railway, canal and steamboat lines. He drew attention to the splendid management of the finances of this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member for Queen's P.E.I., says "hear, hear." I am glad he appreciates the advancement we have made. Certainly the money lenders of the world have given us the best testimonies as to the results of the financial operations during the last few years. Those figures and statistics have not been dealt with, and yet they seem more pertinent and germane than the very eloquent remarks with which the leader of the Opposition favoured us this afternoon. The hon. member for L'Islet expressed gratification that the day had come when, notwithstanding the vast expenditures on necessary public works, on public works of general utility, on enterprises for the extension of our railway system and for the improvement of trade in every respect, it had been found possible to make income balance expenditure, and the Government had seized the earliest opportunity to relieve the consumers of taxes. The tea, coffee and sugar duties are especially referred to. These subjects the hon. leader of the Opposition treated with silent contempt. The hon. member for L'Islet next expressed the hope that in the coming negotiations with the United States, British interests would be regarded as well as Canadian interests; and it was to that question the leader of the Opposition found it necessary to devote most of his speech. I am right, therefore, I submit, in considering and in judging from the argument of the leader of the Opposition, that the main position of the hon. member for L'Islet is at present not seriously affected. While the hon. member for L'Islet asks this House to consider our internal policy or fiscal policy with regard to our

connection with Great Britain, the leader of the Opposition refused to discuss that issue, but he wishes to discuss the possibility, the vague possibility, of trade arrangements between this country and other countries, and particularly with the United States. The hon. gentleman alluded to the mission of the Minister of Finance to the West Indies, and he devoted a very small portion of his time to what I thought was a rather jubilant expression on what he considered the failure up to this date of this mission. No doubt the Minister of Finance will yet be able to show that the mission he undertook has been beneficial to this country, and will be of greater benefit to this country. Rome was not built in a day. During the four or five years during which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) occupied the position of Minister of Finance, although he talked greatly about fighting, and boasted on certain occasions what he would do if the United States did not come to terms with him, and talked about carrying on various foreign wars, it is remarkable that the hon. gentleman's missions, if there were any, certainly his efforts in the direction of trade, were singularly unhappy. The hon. gentleman, however, in that respect has been more than answered by members from the Maritime Provinces, who spoke with a business knowledge on this subject. I am fully aware of the temper of the Maritime Provinces, and indeed of western Ontario, in regard to the importance of maintaining steamship connections with those islands, whether we have treaty relations with them or not, and statistics will show that great progress has followed the efforts of the Minister of Finance in that direction. So also as regards trade with Great Britain. The hon. gentleman is evidently preparing his party for another turn, and for some reason to-day, instead of denouncing trade with Great Britain, the hon. gentleman wound up his speech by dwelling on the importance of that trade in connection with an Imperial trade league. He has appreciated that much of the recent debate, so that he is of the opinion that there is an almost unlimited market for us, where we can achieve greater success than even the very gratifying success that has been reached up to the present time. The hon. gentleman, however, again came back to the old statement which seems to be necessarily made by all members of his party when discussing Canadian affairs, and that is the condition, of this country. The hon. member for L'Islet gave certain definite reasons why the condition of the country is satisfactory, and he was met by a flat contradiction, and an allusion, which I could not follow at the time, in respect to some statement made in a book published in Quebec as to the condition of trade there. But in respect to the condition of the country, time and again the Trade Returns have been produced in this House to prove that it is satisfactory, that this view has been sustained by the utterances of public men not only in this Parliament, but in the Liberal party generally, and only the other day the Premier of Nova Scotia gave a flat contradiction to the statement made by his leader here to-day. He told the people in England that the condition of his own province, which is a fair index of the condition of the rest of the country, is satisfactory, and I believe that the statement of the Premier of the province from which I come was certainly correct. The hon. gentleman alludes to farm lands, but I cannot avoid mentioning that one argument sometimes resorted to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills),—not in this debate on the Budget, but resorted to by him in connection with other questions as they come up from time to time—is singularly appropriate in the present instance. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has stated that the settlement of the condition of the farmer and the value of the land will settle the question as to whether this country is prosperous or not. Does the hon. gentleman deny that England to-day is prosperous; does he deny that the United States is a prosperous country; does he deny, in fact, that there is any prosperity in the world? For I ask him the question seriously, with this to follow: If he does not find that in those great countries, that, in fact, in the most prosperous countries in the world, the condition of the farmers is certainly worse than it is in Canada? The hon. gentleman has had proof after proof given to him on that point. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) can explain to him the reason for the decrease in farm lands when a railway proposition is before the House, or some other proposition that for a moment makes the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) forget the line of argument of his party on the trade question. He explains the various causes, known to all who look on this subject without political bias, that have brought about a decrease in farm lands all the world over. Without wearying the House with my arguments, I will give in better terms than the hon. member for Bothwell is accustomed to, the argument on this condition of affairs from a free trade paper. In the London *Times* only a short while ago there was an explanation given for the decrease in the value of farm lands during two decades. There is no question that there has been a decrease, but it seems to me to be trifling with the intelligence of the farmers to pretend that that decrease is confined to Canada alone, or to countries enjoying a protective policy; or that it is in any way connected with the fiscal policies of any of these countries. The London *Times* gives the reason for this decrease in the following words:—

"The two decades which began with the seventies, and of which we have seen the last as we enter upon the nineties, have had seasons of bounteous plenty, and seasons also of sad disaster. Had these matters alone been their characteristics there would have been little to say with regard to them. But mightier forces than the seasons have arisen, and it is to the effect of these on our agriculture, and its social and economical position, that many persons are looking with more or less anxiety. The more general application of steam to a large number of agricultural operations, and still more for the rapid conveyance of the produce of the acres of other lands; the bringing into cultivation of acres that were as unknown 20 years ago as is the interior of the 'Dark Continent' now: the use of the telegraph wire to regulate and regularize the market supplies and prices of produce—these matters, combined with the giant strides in mechanical, scientific, practical and educational matters connected with agriculture, have made the 20 years just ended of great and paramount importance. The question now is: What have been the results? Some are so plain as to need no explanation, as, for instance, that wheat which in 1869 was 50s. 9d. per quarter was in 1889 only 29s. 9d., and with but little chance of it rising. A decrease of a pound sterling per quarter in the value of the leading cereal is a fact which is too well known. The important question at the present moment is rather the effect of these multitudinous changes on the actual farming of the country."

The statements made by that writer seem to me to support in a very satisfactory manner the arguments

made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me on this side of the House (Mr. Desjardins), and it is for that reason that I apologize for again referring to a subject that has been so thoroughly sifted. Now then, with regard to the reference made by the leader of the Opposition to the Secretary of State, I will leave the answer to the Secretary of State himself. I did not follow that portion of the hon. gentleman's argument, although I believe it was connected with the condition of farm lands in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman admitted that new channels are required for trade. We do not deny that. We say that the very success of the National Policy has brought about such a condition of plenty in this land, that if there is suffering among the farmers or among the manufacturers, it is largely on account of over-production, and that is true of more countries than one. The new channels of trade that we want are channels of trade generally with all the world. We do not want to be locked up with the United States, nor to be fastened down to our most powerful and most gigantic rival in all questions of trade. We have no desire for that; but the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite looks towards that one channel only, and the closing up of all other channels of trade in order that we may obtain that. What is the condition of the United States to which they ask us to look for our sole trade? He knows that they are suffering there from an over-production unparalleled almost in any country in the history of the world, and that country is using its greatest efforts to obtain new markets. It is even going into the country of the "blacks" as the West Indies are often sneeringly referred to by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; it is going to the South American Republics; whether the population be large or great, the people of the United States are straining every nerve and making tremendous efforts for new markets to get rid of their surplus products. That is the country to whose chariot wheels hon. gentlemen opposite wish to bind Canada. So much for the passing references which he made to some of those questions of trade. The hon. the leader of the Opposition in conclusion of that part of his argument, states that they advocate expansion of trade while we advocate restriction. We do nothing of the sort. That statement is playing with the two policies. The expansion of trade could not certainly be explained by a policy having for its object trade restricted with the United States, and trade prevented with the rest of the world. That is the hon. gentleman's policy which he defined to-day at great length. His whole argument on the trade question, in bringing about our absolute dependence upon the United States, is an argument fraught with great danger to our interests in this country. The argument that we cannot exist as a commercial people without the United States is an argument of great danger to this country. I remember being struck very forcibly with a statement made by a former colleague of the hon. gentleman; a colleague who has gone down in the fight owing to his having followed so loyally the hon. the leader of the Opposition on the trade question; I recollect that hon. gentleman who was then the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), in 1887, using words of great importance in a debate; using words which I submit have been almost verified by subsequent events. He stated:

Mr. TUPPER

"I thought that, while it was so well known thoughout this country that our people were anxious for the renewal of the reciprocity treaty on equal terms, it was not wise or judicious that we should publish to the world, from every commercial standpoint, the opinions we entertained on that subject. I am aware that that expression of mine was quoted on a recent political occasion in my own province: but I expressed it there in the same sense in which I would express it here, because I believe the Government, recognizing their responsibility in dealing with a matter of so much importance, would be freer to act on behalf of our country, if there was not brought to bear, from the other side, expressions of opinion from our own people that we could not live or prosper without trade relations with that country * * * In regard to the treaty, I think it is very undesirable that here or elsewhere any expressions of opinions should be given as to the great desirability or necessity of a treaty with the United States."

Now, I ask the attention of the House to enquire, whether the arguments we have heard in the recent debate, or the arguments from the leader of the Opposition to-day, are calculated to aid the negotiators of a trade treaty at Washington in October? I firmly believe, if it is within parliamentary rules to say it—and what I say can go for what it is worth in this House and in the country—that the tactics of the Opposition inside and outside of this chamber for weeks has been to draw from this side of the House answers to their arguments, and to make arguments themselves that can have and will have but one effect, that is, to impede this Government in the negotiations which are to take place in October, and to prevent any trade arrangements being made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to laugh; they are bound to express doubts as to that; but I can point them to the course of the Toronto *Globe*. After both parties had for years been advocating limited reciprocity, up to 1887 or 1888, there having been no practical difference of opinion between the parties on the subject up to that time, the *Globe*, when it saw that this Government was about to bring about enlarged trade relations with the United States, which would be likely to strengthen the Government in the eyes of the people, came out and denounced partial reciprocity openly and strongly. The Opposition has denounced every step taken by the Government in that direction, and endeavoured to cover the efforts of the representatives of this Government at Washington with ignominy. It has attempted to brand them as not representing the views of Canadians, as being hostile in their feelings towards the United States, as desirous of bringing about an arrangement which would be injurious to the United States, and as having conducted the Government of this country with that sole object in view. The logical result of such tactics is foreshadowed in the words which I have quoted from the late senior member for Halifax, but I believe they will fall flat. The correspondence to which the hon. gentleman gave a passing reference will show that the United States Secretary of State has risen above all that petty feeling displayed from time to time in politics both in this country and in the United States, and that the United States Administration are prepared to discuss with the representatives of this country the questions put before the country at the time of the last general election. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to the combinations, and in general terms used an argument which has been very ably handled on both sides of the House. In answer to the hon.

gentleman, I do not feel it necessary to say anything except this, that if there is such an opportunity in Canada for combinations of the manufacturing interests, does he think that his policy will grant us relief? When he adds the United States markets to our own, and places our manufactures on equal terms with the manufactures of that country, does he think that we shall be running away from all possibilities of combinations? It would have been very pertinent, so far as the interests of the people of this country are concerned, if the hon. gentleman had shown that those combinations to which he referred had unduly enhanced the prices of goods. But it is known that the very article to which he referred, cotton, contrary to the predictions of hon. gentlemen who opposed the National Policy, has decreased in price in a remarkable degree since 1878 and since the introduction of the cotton factories. Then, the hon. gentleman expressed great sympathy for the poor farmer. The farmer is a most curious individual in Canada. You can insult the manufacturer as much as you like; you can talk about his interests being a mere bagatelle; you can accuse him of combining to make his business profitable; but when you come to the farmer, you must speak of him with bated breath, and allude to him as the poor farmer. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in talking of this poor farmer, became unduly excited about the grasping manufacturers of Canada. The hon. gentleman will have no pity or mercy for them when he gets the chance to exercise the one quality or the other. But does he think that the farmers of Canada can be excited against the manufacturing interests, as one would suppose he does, by listening to the arguments he used? Is the farmer antagonistic to the manufacturer? I remember a pertinent question being put by a protectionist in the United States in reference to the same argument used in that country. He said he would go into any state of the Union where that argument was used, and test it by picking out from his audiences any farmer, and asking him this question: "Which would you prefer for a neighbour—a man owning as rich and valuable a farm as your own, or a man carrying on a manufacturing industry of some kind?" And he said the reply of every man would be that there could not be too many manufacturers in his district; that they were his best customers and his best friends, and the nearer they get to his farm the better for him. And that is the answer that has enabled this Government, notwithstanding the specious arguments based on the want of prosperity among the farmers, to have at their back to-day, in support of the vigorous policy which has been outlined by the hon. member for L'Islet, a large body of the intelligent farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman then came to the year 1885, and referred to the motion made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in that year in reference to a renewal of negotiations; and he brought forward the old assertion that although we had stated that we would never bend the knee to the powers at Washington, we had been forced to come off the high horse, and had been compelled to sue for terms at Washington. The hon. gentleman bases his statement upon a point which is somewhat trifling in one sense, and upon which he prefers a serious, grave and most unfounded charge against the Conservative party and against the late Government, namely, that they went to the country on a falsehood. He used that expression; and he endeavoured to show that he had made good his position, by reading the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States, and the statement made by the High Commissioner when at Washington. He was so anxious to make a case against the Government, that he did not attempt to examine into the means of information at the command of the High Commissioner at that time, or the material on which he had formed a conclusion or the documents he got from the blue-books showed to be the case. I say that any hon. gentleman who is at all inclined to be fair and to look at this correspondence in order to ascertain the real position of affairs, will find in reference to that subject that no misrepresentation occurred, certainly no wilful misrepresentation; but that the position taken by the late Government at the last election was correct, notwithstanding the inference drawn by the High Commissioner or the statement made by the Secretary of State of the United States. Remember that on that subject the Secretary of State was dealing with the British ambassador and the British Government, and dealing with them direct. Remember that their conversations were not recorded. Remember, moreover, that it was upon the documents that were in possession of the Dominion of Canada that the Government of Canada made the announcement that they had not sought or sued for a meeting at Washington to discuss trade affairs. But that the initiation of the proceedings, that the initiation of the invitation proceeded from the United States, and that document makes good the statement, which these public documents will establish, to the satisfaction of any impartial mind, that the position taken by the Government before the people was correct. The main point was not the miserable little quibble upon which the hon. leader of the Opposition ventures to establish a charge of falsehood, as to who asked the other. The position taken by this Government was that we had not done what the Opposition desired us to do. We did not go and knock at the doors from which our country had been so often driven away, as it were, and call again for the consideration of trade relations. But these papers show that, in the fall, when we discovered that an arrangement was proposed between a British colony, which, whether it was to the benefit of that colony or not—and that is now a matter of discussion in that colony—which was fraught with the greatest possible detriment or injury to the Dominion—when we discovered that negotiations had been carried on without our knowledge or consent, directly affecting our interests, what we did was to interfere and interpose—not to beg to be drawn into the agreement, not to sue to have a meeting appointed and a commission formed, not to ask any favour or to press our own position with the mother country—but to insist that the mother country should consent to no arrangement between the United States and Newfoundland which would be detrimental to the interests of so large a portion of the Empire as the Dominion. We not only interfered, but the despatches show that we demanded that the rights and interests of the people of this country should be so far considered; and the correspondence to which I will refer is of great importance in view of

the serious charge which has been so rashly preferred to-day. I will refer at some length to portions of the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and which he could not have considered before making that charge. In the first place, at page 7 of the blue-book, on the 9th December, 1890, in a report to the Council, after reciting the facts with reference to the fisheries in Newfoundland, the Minister of Justice and myself say :

" Your Excellency was, on the same day, moved to request from Lord Knutsford, communication of the authority possessed by Mr. Bond, and likewise to urge that no arrangement be concluded until your Government should be informed of the nature thereof, and unless Canada should be given an opportunity to be included therein, if she should so desire.'

That was the position taken by this Government that in the absence of definite information as to the instructions given, it was most important to put the British Government on its guard concerning the wide range the negotiations might take, and the great extent to which this country might be affected thereby. On page 13 will be found the minute of Council which was published during the election, and which contains the answer to one part of the hon. gentleman's arguments, namely, regarding the basis on which we propose to negotiate in October next : and the answer given at the last election is the answer now, and that answer was approved then, and there has been no expression of disapproval since. In that minute of the 13th December, 1890, it is said :

" The Committee of the Privy Council having learned that the hon. the Secretary of State for the United States had expressed to Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, his readiness to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty on a wide basis, and particularly for the protection of the mackerel fisheries, and for the fisheries on inland waters, and had subsequently stated to Her Majesty's Minister his great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty."——

The minute goes on to make a proposal on the lines on which that subject would be discussed, so far as this Government is concerned. On page 15 will be found a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, dated 29th January, 1891, in which these words appear :

" Her Majesty's Government will doubtless remember that when the protest of Your Excellency's Government against the draft convention, which was considered in December last, was made known to the principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, His Lordship intimated that if Canada were willing to commence negotiations at once, the Newfoundland convention would not be concluded immediately, but that negotiations on behalf of Canada could go on *pari passu* with those regarding Newfoundland."

That will give hon. gentlemen a cue to the position that, whatever may have taken place between the British Government and the United States Administration in order to expedite the arrangement with Mr. Bond, whatever requisitions were preferred, all that this Government is responsible for or is aware of are the communications and the documents passing between it and the Home Government, or between it and the Government at Washington through the Imperial Government. In this report on page 16 it is said :

" Your Excellency's Government at once assented to the propriety of this course, and announced their willingness to commence negotiations at once, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, only expressing a preference for a formal and official conference under commission rather than a private and unofficial discussion."

The hon. gentleman can infer, from the language used in that report, that from some source had come an invitation for an unofficial and private discussion, and had the hon. gentleman a little charity, he would not have been so ready to bandy foul charges across the floor of this House until he had discovered what preceding proposition had been made. I call attention again to that report, to show that the Government of Canada had expressed to the Imperial Government on being approached, that we were ready and willing to arrange for a conference, but preferred a formal and official conference under commission to a private and unofficial discussion.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER. When the House rose for recess, I was dealing with a subject of great importance, and I regret extremely that I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House while I give at greater length some important extracts from the blue-book on which the charge, if upon anything, was based. The charge was that the Government had been guilty of going to the country with falsehood in its mouth, in the statement that it had been invited by the United States Government to consider and deliberate upon the trade question, and the hon. the leader of the Opposition stated that we were not invited, and went on further to deal with that subject. I have already given the House as much of the correspondence as in my judgment bears upon that phase of the question. I would call your attention, however, to a note dated the 20th March, 1891, from Sir Julian Pauncefote to Mr. Blaine, on page 65, in which he says :

" I had the pleasure to inform you confidentially, that the Canadian Government, in deference to your preference for an unofficial conference on the question of reciprocity, were disposed to meet your wishes in that respect. It was understood that you would be ready after the 4th March to discuss the subject unofficially with me and one or more agents from Canada."

And on page 67, for I take the references in their order, there is an extract from the High Commissioner's report which was quoted and referred to by the leader of the Opposition, together with the despatch or note of Mr. Blaine of 1st April. I again call the attention of the House to the statement of the High Commissioner in that respect, prefacing it, for the better understanding of my argument, with the remark I have already made that it did not appear how many of the previous despatches I have read were accessible to the High Commissioner or to the Secretary of State. The High Commissioner expresses his belief in regard to this subject, and says :

" I believe it arose from the negotiations which had recently taken place between the United States and Newfoundland, and the desire expressed by Canada to be included in any arrangement such as had been understood to have been contemplated by the United States and Newfoundland ; and that, upon that being communicated to him by Sir Julian Pauncefote, he had expressed his willingness to open negotiations for reciprocal trade arrangements between Canada and the United States, assisted by delegates from the Dominion Government ; the negotiations to be informal, and to a certain extent of a confidential nature until they could assume a more formal character, if any result were arrived at."

Further on, at page 76, there appears an extract from a telegram from Lord Stanley of Preston to Lord Knutsford, dated the 26th November, 1890 :

" With reference to your telegram of the 25th instant, Canadian Government appreciates the consideration

evinced by Her Majesty's Government in delaying the Newfoundland convention.

"Canadian Ministers are prepared to open negotiations immediately on lines indicated in my telegram of the 19th, provided their representatives at Washington could be commissioners associated with British Minister and empowered to negotiate directly, instead of being merely delegates.

"As the Newfoundland arrangement is inapplicable in some details and incomplete in others desired by Canada, they think that a separate convention will be necessary, rather than an inclusion in the Newfoundland one."

On the 28th November, 1890, Lord Stanley of Preston telegraphs Sir Julian Pauncefote:

"The text of the draft convention between Newfoundland and the United States was telegraphed me on the 15th instant by Her Majesty's Government. I was informed of Blaine's views, as well as of your suggestion that we should send delegates to Washington unofficially simply to discuss matters, and the inclusion of transit in bond in the negotiations was suggested."

Later on appears this passage:

"We are prepared to arrange for commercial relations with United States being liberally extended, and wish that United States may be so informed. This Government objects to sending delegates to Washington unofficially, as liable to give rise to misunderstanding, but is ready at once to open formal negotiations with sanction of Her Majesty's Government."

And again, on page 78, Lord Knutsford telegraphs to Lord Stanley of Preston, under date of the 2nd January, 1891, and referring to Mr. Blaine, says:

"He added that he would be prepared to enter into private negotiations at any time after 4th March."

On page 81, Lord Stanley of Preston, in a despatch to Sir Julian Pauncefote of the 16th March, 1891, says:

"I understand from previous communications that it is the wish of Mr. Blaine, without prejudice to the future appointment of a commission or otherwise, to discuss with yourself and with one or more persons delegated by this Government, the various questions which might become the subjects of reference to a joint commission: that such a conference should be of an unofficial character; and that it should afford an opportunity for considering on what points it would be likely that the two Governments could come to an agreement. It was also understood that any date prior to the 4th inst. would not be convenient to Mr. Blaine for such a meeting. The Government of the Dominion would have preferred the appointment of a joint commission, but they desire to defer as far as may be to the wish of the Secretary of State, and I should be glad, therefore, if you will be good enough to ascertain from him at what date it will be convenient that the representatives appointed by the Canadian Government should proceed to Washington to confer with yourself and Mr. Blaine."

Then, coming to the last material portion of this correspondence, we find a statement of the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, upon which the leader of the Opposition has dwelt. In a letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote of the 1st of April, 1891, he says:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference, as explained in my minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me, when several weeks later, during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblies that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State."

Now, I will call the attention of the House to the word "initiation." I do not think it will be found in any speech made in Canada that an attempt was made to induce the people of this country, or that it was worth the while of anyone to show that these proceedings had been initiated by Mr. Blaine; and much in reference to the gravity of the charge which has been preferred turns on the word "initiation," which I think was "invitation," and the statement made by these gentlemen, and all the members of the Government, was not the abrupt statement to which the Secretary of State alludes, but a statement as to the manner in which an invitation arose for them to go to Washington. It was not in reference to the initiation of the matter, but it was a statement that Newfoundland was apparently endeavouring to make an arrangement with the United States at our cost, and to take advantage of the peculiar condition of certain subjects in dispute, notably the fisheries, then pending between the United States and this country, and it appearing that out of that an attempt was being made, whether wilfully or by accident, by a neighbouring colony of the kind I have mentioned, this Government insisted in its communications to the British Government that we should be represented before any arrangement was consummated with Newfoundland. The extracts I have given show that all the members of the Government were abundantly justified, and I do not believe that Mr. Blaine himself would have anything more to say had he before him the communications I have read and the state of affairs as they existed between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government. There is only a portion of that correspondence, as hon. gentlemen who are versed in diplomatic correspondence know, which could be open to Mr. Blaine or this Government. His main point was that we had not done, as previous Governments had done without success, that is, knock at the doors of the American Government and beg again to have another trade arrangement brought about. We take an entirely different attitude, and standing on our rights, acting with the home Government, we have got affairs to such a point that an invitation was sent to this Government—and it did come from Mr. Blaine; Mr. Blaine does not deny it; the day was fixed, and it was intimated that the 4th of March would suit Mr. Blaine's convenience, which we had consulted and recognized from that time to this. The chief point now is, without any quibbling or cavilling, that this Government has arranged for a conference with the United States Government in October next, without any confession such as hon. gentlemen opposite insinuate, that we are in any sense more dependent upon the satisfactory arrangements than are the people of the United States themselves. We go there, relatively, in as strong a position as they meet us; we go there anxious to see whether an arrangement, consistent with the interest of both countries, can be brought about. In reference to this much talked of McKinley Bill, in reference to that question which hon. gentlemen understand is a subject connected with the negotiations, surely the position we take is not only reasonable, but it is the position that was taken by the hon. gentlemen themselves, by the hon. gentlemen's leaders in the Mackenzie Administration, when they sent their commissioners to Washington, who took the ground we take as regards the commercial independence of Canada, and we are just as independent of the United States to-day, indeed a great deal more so, than was Canada in 1874. We go there, not to sue for terms, not to beg for favours; we go there claiming that we are able to do without their trade just as well as they are able to do without ours. Every one is aware that a powerful party in the United

States is saying to-day that, injurious as the McKinley Bill is to Canada, according to the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite, its injury is far greater to the larger country; they are still more affected by the McKinley Bill than we are, and I know the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will agree with me in that opinion.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Yes, ten to one.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is quite within the mark. But if hon. gentlemen doubt that, they have only to take up that interesting state document of the Hon. George Brown, in which he not only makes these statements in regard to the operation of a fiscal law of that kind between the two countries, but he goes on to show that when a re-arrangement of our fiscal relations was sought with the United States, however advantageous that re-arrangement would be to this country, it was infinitely more advantageous to the United States. So much, then, for the remarks of the leader of the Opposition and his charges in reference to negotiations with the United States at the time of the general election. Now, we must remember, in reference to these charges, that the hon. gentlemen are just now exhibiting considerable temper. It is not to be expected that they are just now in an angelic frame of mind. These gentlemen have suffered a serious defeat, and naturally they are now smarting from its consequence. The result of their defeat is discouraging. We have heard to-day, from the leader of the Opposition, that they have sounded a retreat all along the line on their trade policy, and it is a most difficult thing to reform under the fire of the enemy, and so the hon. gentleman has descended to doing a thing so un-Canadian and un-British that no leader, I believe, of any Opposition in this House ever did before, and that is, to take it for granted that these serious charges now being investigated by men supposed to approach the investigation with judicial minds, he being one of that Committee—taking it for granted that the charges are proved before the accused has been heard, before the whole case has been considered. We heard him to-day upon the supposition, if not the hope, that all these serious charges would be proved, make a most serious accusation in reference to the administration of one of the departments of this Government. It shows the temper the hon. gentleman is in, and, therefore, we must not be surprised if he ran off to make so extraordinary a charge as he did in reference to the negotiations, based upon such very slim material. He spoke of Newfoundland having no pride, that they were ready to go to Washington to make a trade arrangement without talking, as we had talked, about bending the knee, and so on. But he must recollect that while we were not disposed to forget our dignity, the Conservative party has maintained all along a straightforward business-like attitude. As I have already stated, Newfoundland desired to go to Washington to accomplish a treaty at our cost and to our detriment, and when the opportunity arose that colony took advantage of it. The two positions are not at all analogous, and I fancy that was a little banter on the part of the hon. gentleman, and I shall pass it by. He wound up that part of his subject by assuring us that we would have the hearty support of the Opposition in the settlement of the Atlantic fisheries and the Behring Sea question. Well, I hope the hon. gentleman will, in the future, give us some better evidence of that support than we have had in the past. I can tell him that the great trouble to-day that we find in arranging these questions with the United States is the fact that the Opposition endeavour in every way to turn the minds of the United States Government against us, almost by whispering into the ears of our neighbours, and by stating in this House and on the hustings that we are doing all we can to annoy our neighbours and to irritate them in reference to the Atlantic fishery question and the trade question—I say that this course of the Opposition renders the task of this Government much more difficult. So far has their influence gone in this direction that you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in their state dispatches the United States Administration have taken it for granted that in standing by our rights in the Atlantic fishery question and in the Behring Sea difficulty, and the prosecution of seal hunting, we are influenced entirely by a desire to annoy and harass our neighbours, and the only tittle of evidence upon which the United States Government base their argument are the charges and statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite from one session to another. Therefore, I hope that the assurance of support in the settlement of this question means that the Opposition are to take a different course, not only upon the fishery question but also upon the trade question. Now, then, the amusing part, if I may venture to say so, of the hon. gentleman's speech—and it was important as well as amusing—is that which indicates a new turn in the trade policy of the Opposition. I alluded to the many phases through which that trade question has gone in the hands of the hon. gentleman and of his predecessor, the late leader of the Opposition. But, as I understand him now, they do not mean to allow all the terrible consequences that we ascribe to unrestricted reciprocity; in a word, that policy has become so unpopular, it has driven so many prominent men out of the ranks of their party, that he now promises not to allow unrestricted reciprocity to do all at once all these terrible things that we fear; he is not going to interfere with great and important interests in this country at one fell swoop; and, as his predecessor once said at Malvern, or somewhere else, when he was afraid that his policy had carried fear into the hearts of the business men of this country, he was not going to be a bull in a china shop. And so the present leader of the Opposition says he is not going to knock the dishes all down at once, but apparently he is going to take them shelf by shelf. He says they are going to proceed by easy stages. In this way the country is going to enjoy this tremendous boon that will be procured for us by unrestricted reciprocity, or continental free trade, or commercial union, or whatever you like to call it. We have great and dire distress because of the absence of it. After the smoke of the last battle has blown away, and the hon. gentleman has had time to look over the field and count his losses, we can scarcely expect him to come to this Parliament and admit that he and his party have abandoned this their last policy. But it was gradually hinted at by the resolution to which I have referred, when there was tacked on an enunciation of a principle absolutely inconsistent with unrestricted reciprocity;

and the hon. gentleman tells us now that he intends to treat this as all reforms are treated—that while all reforms threaten great interests, and those interests are greatly alarmed, he endeavours to appease that alarm by telling—and I suppose it is the manufacturing interests he principally addresses—that he will destroy them by easy stages. As St. Paul was a terror to the manufacturers of idols, so the hon. gentleman, I understand, is a terror to the manufacturing interests. I can tell him that if they believe the speech he made to-day and can trust him, his wishes will be attained, and they will not have very great reason to fear. They will understand that the hon. gentleman is not in earnest. The Minister of Justice who sits beside me says he is not an enemy of idols, and we have abundant evidence of it. The hon. gentleman is only too willing to worship at the shrine of any idol so long as it will give him power. The hon. gentleman in his onslaught on manufacturing interests reminded me of a very good story, though not so good as that of his about St. Paul, but it is indicative of that extraordinarily worked-up feeling against manufacturers, not only in Canada but by the so-called free traders in the United States. Old John Randolph, the Sage of Roanoke, was a free trader. He said he always kicked a sheep when he saw it. He despised anything that was suggestive of industry, and it was he who said in Congress, speaking of England, that there was no country in the world and no climate where men could stand the smoke and dust of manufacturing except in old England. Why, he said, you introduce manufacturing into this country and you will have small-pox, and cholera, and yellow fever. The hon. gentleman seems to make war upon the manufacturing interests to-day in a somewhat similar spirit; but the manufacturers have been able to stand it and they have been able to summon a considerable number of followers to their side, because the interests of both have been shown to be identical. The most interesting part of the hon. gentleman's speech, however, was the most dangerous from his own standpoint. He knows as well as I that this feature of unrestricted reciprocity, or what is left of it after the hon. gentleman's speech, will prove most unpopular to the members of his party and the yeomen of the country—that feature connected with discrimination. I am not doing him an injustice to say that the object of the longest part of his speech was to show that discrimination against the products of the mother country would be neither injurious to the mother country nor injurious to the interests of Canada, but if it were injurious to the interests of the mother country, so much the worse for the mother country, and the hon. gentleman borrowed an old phrase in connection with tariff equalities for all countries. The hon. gentleman then went in for discrimination strongly. Before I deal with this point I must show the hon. gentleman that it was only candid that he should do this and have no beating about the bush in the next fight, but it should be understood that whatever else hon. gentlemen opposite may do, this much is clear, that when they control the fiscal policy they will arrange it in the interests of this country, whether it discriminates against the interests of the mother country and in favour of the interests of a foreign country or not; discrimination will be brought about, cost what it may, connection with Great Britain or no connection. That was a subject which in the late election was one of general debate and difference of opinion. I am not aware that I ever met any hon. gentlemen on the platform fighting for the political views of the leader of the Opposition who was bold enough to confess that he entertained the views which the leader of the Opposition enunciated to-day. I do not mean to say there were none, but I did not meet them; and in Nova Scotia such would find very little support for utterances of that character. An hon. gentleman who went the greatest distance during that discussion was the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), and he got out of it by saying this, and he said it seriously, for it was the only argument he brought to bear: we might be sure it would not prejudice our relations with Great Britain, for it could be done without the consent of Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. It is not safe in the Maritime Provinces for the party to go the length which the leader of the Opposition went to-day. The hon. member for King's said, however, that it was necessary that the Queen should ratify and authorize the completion of any treaty which the leader of the Opposition might make. We were, therefore, left to assume that all this dangerous talk on the part of the Liberals would be brought to naught, because Her Majesty the Queen would protect the interests of the British Empire, and the Liberals would have to come back to the old tariff, with all its hideous features, as proclaimed by the late leader of the Opposition at Malvern, when he said they would have to swallow the whole thing with a few changes. Let us have on record once again, in connection with the leader of the Opposition, some of the utterances of hon. gentlemen of his party speaking with almost equal authority. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), speaking on 10th October, 1887, at Ingersoll, said:

"There is no doubt whatever that before we can obtain such a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as the advocates of this system desire it will be necessary for us to discriminate against the manufactories of other countries, against those even of Great Britain."

In the late contest the hon. gentleman, at Oshawa, on 10th February, was asked by C. W. Scott:

"Does the Liberal party favour discrimination against Great Britain by admitting American manufactures free and taxing the manufactures of Great Britain?"

Sir Richard replied:

"Certainly we do. I will tell you why. We have a perfect right to manage our own tariff to suit us, the people of Canada. The interests of Canada demand that we should have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We can only get it by taxing the goods of every country on the face of the earth except those of the United States. That is undoubtedly part of our policy."

A gentleman who was permitted to take a prominent part in the late campaign, under the wing of the hon. member for South Oxford, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, is on record with his definition of what this trade policy means. He is reported in 1887 to have stated as follows:—

"I have no hesitation in saying that the people of the United States will never consent to a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and that all the time spent in talking about reciprocity is wasted. What is a reciprocity treaty? It is a treaty under which the Custom-houses are kept up as before to their entire extent. Why will the United States

not give us such a treaty as that? Simply because they are not fools, and because they respect their own interests.

* * * * * * * *

But let no person be deceived: this will mean that we will have to adopt the American tariff against Great Britain."

In regard to the Customs tariff, the leader of the Opposition said at Montreal:

"We must continue for many years to raise our revenues by a Customs tariff, and by a very high tariff at that."

And he expressed the opinion that England would not object to be discriminated against. The views expressed by the hon. gentleman to-day go to the extent of justifying that policy. Let me refer to the policy of the Government of which the leader of the Opposition was a member. I will give only a short reference from the state papers in connection with previous negotiations under a former régime with the United States of America. We heard about it being in the interest of the people of this country that we should discriminate against the mother country. We heard arguments at great length earnestly addressed by the leader of the Opposition to the effect that it was the duty of a statesman in this country to take that course in the interest of Canadians, and believing it to be in our interest he took his present course. I will quote to the House a Minute in Council passed on the 26th of March, 1874, before Mr. Brown proceeded to Washington, and which was of the following character:—

"That any measure which will tend to promote and maintain friendly intercourse and harmony between our neighbours and ourselves through the free interchange of commodities, so that it be not seriously prejudicial to our industrial interests, will receive the support of the Dominion Government.

"Mr. Brown will communicate this view to Sir Edward Thornton, accompanied with the representation that the Government of Canada do not propose any modification in matters of trade and commerce which would in any way injuriously affect Imperial interests."

In the debate in the Senate later on, when explaining what he had done in Washington, Mr. Brown said that such an idea as discriminating against the mother country was not thought of for a moment; and we know the views of the leader of the Reform Government, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, on that point. I do not know that he has ever qualified them, but they were views expressly made. In connection with that matter I will give some reference to another point on which the hon. gentleman dwelt—that is, as to a common tariff. The hon. gentleman made an argument upon the word "assimilation" which seemed to be a little ambiguous, but we know exactly what a common tariff means. It does not mean assimilation in the sense in which the hon. gentleman discussed it, namely, that it is a tariff managed and framed in the interests of this country, and by this Parliament, separate and apart from that of the United States: but it means a tariff which surrounds and encircles both of these countries from the rest of the world, and that was construed by Mr. Blake as an essential part of the present policy of the Liberal party. Mr. Blake has said, and I quote his words:

"I have said that any feasible plan involves differential duties; but it does more: it involves—as to the bulk by agreement, and as to much from the necessity of the case—the substantial assimilation, in their leading features, of the tariffs of the two countries.

"The absence of agreement would give to each country power to disturb at will the industrial system of the other; and unrestricted reciprocity without an agreed assimilation of duties is an unsubstantial dream."

The hon. gentleman apparently has come to the opinion that Mr. Blake was right and that his party was wrong in the late contest, because he began—as hon. gentlemen opposite always begin when they come to the subject of direct taxation—by saying: "We don't mean to resort to direct taxation," and then they go on for about an hour to show what a splendid thing direct taxation is, and how beneficial it would be to the country at large. The hon. gentleman in the same manner introduced this subject by saying: I do not propose the assimilation of tariffs, but the assimilation of tariffs would not be such a bad thing; and he went on to show that there was a very slight difference between our present tariff and the tariff of the United States. Mr. Blake points out the weakness of the policy of the Liberal party in this regard. He says:

"Without needless, lengthy recapitulation, you will see, by contrasting my views by those of the present advocates of free trade with the United States, several serious questions of difficulty and difference—for example, uniformity of tariff and its control, deficiency of revenue and its supply—on which I am unable to adopt their opinions."

And he finally says:

"The tendency, in Canada, of unrestricted free trade with the United States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union.

We heard to-day a most extraordinary doctrine for the first time laid down by the leader of any party in this House, so far as I am aware, and that was, not only as to our right to discriminate against the mother country, but that it was proper we should do so as a return for the many injustices received at her hands and the many occasions in which our interests had been overlooked by that country. The hon. the leader of the Opposition went into a very extensive argument to show that for all these reasons, and no matter what the consequences might be, we had not merely the right to discriminate against the interests of the mother country, but if necessary we were bound to do it. Now, as I said, the hon. gentleman was honest as to his intention that his policy should discriminate against the goods of the mother country, and that our feelings of loyalty were not to be referred to in this connection; but he entirely misinterpreted the argument we make as regards loyalty. We are not loyal, I take it, to a particular policy or to any particular party in Great Britain, nor to the Government of Great Britain in the sense that the hon. gentleman would imply. We are loyal just as the people of Great Britain are loyal, and as firmly resolved as they are to maintain at all costs and hazards the integrity of the British Empire. If we find that under the policy of a particular British statesman many years ago, or a few years ago, steps were taken which threatened the integrity of the British Empire, it is not for us to adopt that policy, nor to change our own on account of it. It is for us to strain every nerve, and by our advice and by our action, and in every possible way that a free people can, to take such a course as will tend to cement and keep together the bonds that now unite the British Empire. In this regard, therefore, we have to look at the logical consequence of our severing ourselves commercially from the country on which we look now with feelings of gratitude, love and veneration; and beyond that, if I may say so, for

protection as well. Take the question of the Atlantic fisheries; take the question of the Behring Sea. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me how long we would be settling these questions, or how long we could defend our interests in these waters, without the strength and support that we now receive from the mother country. The hon. gentleman is aware of this, and surely it needs no argument, it goes without saying that the British tax-payer was not at all overjoyed with the adoption of the National Policy, to which the hon. gentleman alluded; and the arguments that were then used by his own colleagues were, that we were trying the temper of the British tax-payer, and of Britain herself, a country to which we owed so much. I ask the hon. gentleman how long the British tax-payer or the British merchant would tolerate such a condition of affairs, if, while they were charged for our protection, and while they were charged with the great responsibility of maintaining an army and navy for us as well as for themselves, we should undertake to throw the whole of our trade away from them, into the arms of a foreign country. The hon. gentleman must admit on reflection that it is impossible that we could for a moment maintain our connection with the mother country if such a state of affairs were brought about, or such a policy adopted here. It is our own interests that we are to consult. It is our own interests in every sense that we are consulting in opposing such a policy. We take the course of both parties, and of every Government in this country hitherto, by holding that in all these trade elections we shall not merely serve the selfish interests of that part of the Empire in which we live, but that we shall endeavour to promote the interests of all parties of the Empire, and certainly in that connection to do all we can to maintain the integrity of that Empire. The hon. gentleman in this connection—I suppose to upbraid the mother country, or, at any rate, to give us an excuse to take our own course, regardless of England—alluded to the provisions of the treaty between England and France; and it is remarkable—and I think he will see the force of this—that in order to make that point good he is practically confined to the provisions of that single treaty since Confederation in which the interests of this country were not directly consulted. The hon. gentleman knows that the practice which now obtains without exception is, that before the mother country makes a commercial treaty with any country in the world she consults Canada, and asks us whether we are desirous to be made a party to that treaty or to be left out. The hon. gentleman by that reference gives me the opportunity to point out the care taken by the mother country of our interests in connection with the negotiation of commercial treaties; and the hon. gentleman, when he dealt with that subject, was able only to cite the case which forms an exception to the rule. But the point which I wish to make is this: Suppose that the mother country should act in a selfish way and should not consult our interests, the hon. gentleman argues that, therefore, Canada should do the same—that it should look to its own interests, and let the mother country take the consequences. But are the consequences relatively the same? Would the mother country be affected as much as Canada if in the one case we took umbrage, cut the connection and went out of the Empire, or if, in the other case England, said to us: "You have chosen your bed and you can lie on it; you have chosen to make a trade arrangement in which you have given all the benefit of your trade and commerce to a foreign country and denied us any share of those benefits, and you can go out of the Empire." Are the colonies in this enormous Empire in the same relative position as the mother country? In the one case the consequence to us would be ruinous, fatal—would be such as the hon. gentleman says he hopes would never happen: the connection would be snapped at once. But, in the other case, while we might deplore an occurrence of that kind on the part of the mother country, there would be no good logic or common sense in our taking the course which the hon. gentleman's argument implied we should. The hon. gentleman refers to the German treaty, of which we have not the benefit; but I ask the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentlemen with him, how they get over the difficulty which the German treaty, at the first blush, puts in the way of the accomplishment of unrestricted reciprocity. Certainly the United States would not allow articles manufactured in Germany to come into their country on the same terms on which they are admitted into Canada; and since the hon. gentleman has made reference to that treaty, there is a lion in his path that should be removed in some way if he intends to proceed seriously in the direction of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman, as I said, dwelt upon the subject of the assimilation of tariffs, and suggested that we had not to go very far in order to assimilate our tariff to that of the United States. But the great trouble and difficulty he did not face, and that is, how it is possible that in any assimilation or in any arrangement for a common tariff you can meet the objections raised so pointedly by Mr. Blake, as to the extent to which our interests will be consulted when 5,000,000 are dealing with 60,000,000 having interests antagonistic to ours, and our competitors, producing nearly everything that we produce. I would ask the hon. gentleman and those supporting him how they think it is possible that a common tariff can be made fair to all when our interests conflict with the interests of 60,000,000 people. Not only have they neglected to meet that point—which was brought out so well in the debate that I apologize for referring to it—but the question how far that would be a common tariff which would be framed at Washington in the interest of the 60,000,000 people of the United States, and which it would be for the 5,000,000 people to take or leave alone. The hon. gentleman made a passing reference to the statements of the late leader of the Conservative party, but I could not see that they were so appropriate to the branch of his argument in reference to which he made the quotation. The late leader of the Conservative party was then speaking of fighting fire with fire; and, as the Hon. George Brown himself stated, not being able to make a partial reciprocity treaty, or a treaty on the old lines, he suggested that we should take a leaf from their book—not to adopt their tariff or to assimilate ours to theirs in the sense of the danger that exists of having a common tariff for both countries, but their policy of protection having been so successful, that they would not allow us to participate in the benefits of their trade, he advocated, and advocated with success, that we should take a leaf from their book, and frame such a tariff in the interest of this coun-

try as would bring about the same results; and we are proceeding admirably in that direction. In this debate, in reference to free trade and protection, it is extraordinary how many positions hon. gentlemen opposite have to assume towards political economy. In the first place, the Democrats are fighting hard in the United States to show that all the burdens of the protective tariff fall on the people of the United States, whereas the so-called advocates of continental free trade are injuring the cause of free trade in the United States by attempting to prove that all those burdens fall on the Canadian exporters, and that the people of the United States are not punished as we are. It is upon the arguments put forward in this House last session by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and those used by Mr. Goldwin Smith, that Mr. McKinley mainly based his case for the duties on farm products. His argument was almost wholly confined, with the exception of that with regard to wheat, by his quotations from speeches made by these gentlemen; and he met the free trade arguments of the Democrats by showing that instead of the American farmer suffering from the high duties he imposed it would be the Canadian farmer. We find another inconsistency in the position of hon. gentlemen opposite when we point to the extraordinary progress and development the United States have made. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell, in particular, are wont to show that that is owing to the fact that they enjoy a large measure of free trade over an enormous extent of country and among an enormous population. In reference to that, it can be said that the United States began as we are beginning. They began that policy with a population something like ours, and with a country somewhat similar; but the curious part of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite occurs when you show the terrible position into which the farmers in the United States have come. When you point to their sufferings and losses, the answer comes back quick and sharp, that it is due to the protective policy of the United States. So that they get all their benefits from partial free trade, and all their losses from the protective tariff. I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile those positions, because they instruct us so much as to the internal affairs of the United States that it is only fair, before they bring us completely into that parlour, that they should explain those different features of the policy of that country, and its working. Then the hon. gentleman passes glibly over a very important subject, upon which we would like to have a good deal more light thrown than has been thrown in this debate, and that subject is the loss of revenue which would accrue under unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman hugs very fondly the delusion that it would be only the $8,000,000 which Canada would lose under his policy. He is hardly fair, because he knows that our contention is, not only that we should lose that amount directly, but that the indirect loss would be fully as large, if we were to deal with the United States to the extent they intend we shall and hon. gentlemen opposite are willing we shall. If we are to overthrow our own manufactories and allow the Americans to control this market at their own sweet will, our loss, instead of being $8,000,000, would amount to $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 a year or more. The hon. gentleman then takes a most extraordinary argument, and I have not heard any reason advanced why he should treat the subject in the way he does. He talks of what surpluses we can dispense with; but he must remember that what our Government now raises in the way of duties is raised on a tariff which will bear no semblance to the tariff under unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman takes the surpluses into calculation that are realized on a tariff against the whole world, and uses them in connection with a tariff which will affect only the few articles that will come into this country from other countries outside of the United States when we have unrestricted reciprocity. Reference was made by him to an English journal, I think the *Times*, concerning another branch of the subject. I will, before closing, give him a reference to that subject which is pregnant with very important points. It says the situation is complicated and forecasts the future, and takes precisely the same view that we do of the momentous question, which was raised, whether honestly or for mere party tactics, in the last fight by the Opposition; but before quoting that article I would like to give the hon. gentleman the views of a paper referred to often by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the London *Economist*, a free trade paper, a paper holding and carrying out the views that hon. gentlemen opposite are now and then in the habit of making love to. That paper, in discussing the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, says:

"But this would not be free trade. The American manufacturers would be protected against the only effective competition they have to fear—the competition, that is of British manufacturers. They would, therefore, be under no compulsion to lower their prices, but would work up to the full limit of price which the tariff on British imports permitted. Thus the million and a-half pounds sterling or so which the revenue lost would go, not to the Canadian consumers, but to the American manufacturers, with the result that the Canadian tax-payers would be compelled to pay the amount twice over. They would have to continue to pay it in the price of the goods, and then taxes to a similar amount would have to be imposed to make good the gap in the revenue. Nor would the process end there. To whatever extent the American products were successful, with the aid of the tariff, in displacing British goods, to that extent the loss of the revenue would be increased. What the people of Canada are asked to do, therefore, is to pay to American manufacturers some millions of money which now go into their treasury, and to tax themselves to make up the loss."

That is the opinion of a paper well calculated to give an opinion from the hon. gentleman's standpoint of political economy. But why is it the leader of the Opposition made no reference to the views of his allies in the United States? There has been a reference to that subject, and I do not intend to go further into it, beyond reminding the hon. gentleman that in December, 1890, when speaking at Halifax, he was not ashamed of the views of the hon. gentlemen in the United States who, quite within their right, properly avowed and candidly told their constituents that their one object was to obtain commercial supremacy in North America and ultimately to obtain commercial union. The men whom the hon. gentleman was not then afraid to call his allies in Canadian politics were Senators Sherman, Blair, Mr. Hitt, Mr. Butterworth and the Boards of Trade of New England. Those were the gentlemen with whom he was going to co-operate, and, as he said:

"Have we not the pledges of such statesmen as Senators Sherman, Blair, Mr. Hitt, Mr. Butterworth and the Boards of Trade of the New England States?"

The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) gave at length, and in a manner which no one could fail to understand, the views these gentlemen in the States entertained, and it is because we believe these men are sincere, and because we know they are the only allies hon. gentlemen opposite have in promoting their policy, that we fear the dangers I have mentioned. I fear that in this attempt to cover the different points taken by the hon. gentleman I have occupied a great deal too much of the time of the House. But I would ask, since I have taken this much time, the House to permit me to give, not at great length, a reference from the London *Times*. The hon. gentleman referred to this organ of public opinion in England in connection with the opinion as to the effect of discrimination, to show that we could discriminate if we pleased, so far as the mother country was concerned. For instance, there is the statement, I believe, of Mr. Chamberlain, which has been alluded to often by Mr. Wiman, that, of course, we could do it. But supposing we could—and we do not argue that point—all the consequences would be, nevertheless, such as we claim they will be on this side. We may have the power to discriminate and may be permitted to exercise it; it may not be considered wise at this time, in the history of the mother country, to prevent a large growing colony pursuing any trade policy it pleases. But this does not remove any of the difficulties that would follow the operation of such a policy. This does not remove the objection that under it we would not enjoy the benefits which we now derive from our connection with the mother country. But the opinion of the English people, so far as the organs of public opinion can give it, is in the line, I must say, that we must count the cost of the step we take, and that such a step means, if it means anything, as Mr. Blake has put it, ultimately political union with the United States; and during the contest a leader of the London *Times* of February 19th, treating this matter dispassionately, looking upon it, and rightly so, as affecting the interests of the Empire, was couched in these words:

"In this struggle the ultimate issue is whether Canada shall remain a portion of the British Empire or shall enter the American Union. We do not mean that this issue shall be finally decided by the general election now pending. It takes more than one election to decide issues of this magnitude, and the Liberals would find, if they secured power, that they were only at the beginning of their task. But it is nevertheless true that the issue underlying the struggle for commercial union with the States is whether Canada shall become a part of the American Union or shall remain subject to the British Crown. Opposition leaders are loud in proclaiming that they desire only unrestricted reciprocity with America, that is to say, a commercial amalgamation whereby Canada shall have free trade with the States, as the States have free trade among themselves, and shall join with the States in erecting an impassable fiscal barrier against the rest of the world, which for all practical purposes maims the British Empire."

And in support of that inference, I would refer to the speech of the hon. gentleman, delivered to-day, as to the meaning of his policy of discrimination against the mother country:

"Unrestricted reciprocity involves political union, as the only arrangement that can secure for Canada any portion of the commercial advantages reciprocity is supposed to offer. The Americans know this very well, and are frank enough to make it the basis of all their dissertations. Canadians also must know it well, but those who desire annexation, pretend that it has no necessary connection with unlimited reciprocity."

Then again:

"When this point is cleared up there remains the question whether we can expect Canada to forego substantial advantages merely because they involve separation from the British Empire. For our own part, we must say that we do not expect Canada to forego permanently any really great and substantial advantage in order to gratify a sentiment. But the Canadian people ought to be fairly dealt with by their politicians, and not jockeyed into annexation on false pretences. Let the advantages be set forth, but let it be also plainly stated that in order to gain them the sentiment of loyalty to the Crown must be sacrificed, and with it some not insignificant benefits."

And, therefore, I say, whether the leader of the Opposition be serious or whether he be not, in the argument he has addressed to the people of this country to-day, when he has pointed the way to Washington almost in direct terms, regardless of the views expressed by the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) to his constituents, regardless of the views expressed by many of his supporters that they would never agree to discriminate against the products of Great Britain, not merely because of the question of trade which it would involve, but because of the danger which it threatened to the integrity of the Empire and the almost certainty that our present happy relations with the mother country could not be continued after that, the country must weigh seriously the words which have fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman to-day. Take them as they have been construed by me, take them as they have been construed by his own late leader, and as they have been construed by many men who wish to work in harmony with him in the Reform party, and their significance is momentous. It is such as to corroborate the worst fears the Conservative party entertained as to the issues which were involved in the late fight. I say that, after that speech, no matter how distorted unrestricted reciprocity may appear, no matter how inconsistent the hon. gentleman's platform appears compared with the platform he put before the people at the last election, this much is announced: that, whether we preserve our connection with the mother country or sever it, the Liberal party are pledged to a trade policy which must interfere with our relations with the mother land, and which will ultimately throw our trade into the hands of a foreign power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has laboured at very great length to attempt to convince this House that there was a new departure in the speech which was delivered by my hon. leader this afternoon. I listened to his speech very carefully, and I listened to a number of his speeches during the last election when he made his tour through the Maritime Provinces, and I am unable to discover the slightest deviation in principle between the speech which he has delivered to-night and those which he delivered during the last election. If the electorate had any ground of complaint in regard to the issues which were presented to them at the last election they certainly had no ground of complaint as to the issues which were tendered to them by the Opposition. The Opposition party went to the country proclaiming a clear, definite and distinct policy. It might commend itself or it might not to the people, but it had at least the benefit of clearness. The Government went to the country, having for ten years opposed every form of reciprocity and

every motion which was brought forward in favour of reciprocity, partial or complete, declaring that not only would they enter into negotiations, but that they then had opened negotiations with a view to obtaining reciprocal trade with the people across the border; and I venture the assertion, that if they had not coupled that dishonest outline of their policy with the other issues upon which they went to the country they would have been returned here in a lamentable minority. My hon. friend who has resumed his seat knows that they could not have gone to the Maritime Provinces on their record of the last five years, or on the statement that the National Policy has been successful, or on the ground that their fiscal policy has been for the benefit of the country; but they were obliged to tack on to that statement that they had opened negotiations with the United States, and that, if they were returned again to power, they hoped to be able to complete those negotiations satisfactorily. The hon. gentleman opened his speech by stating that the Opposition were trying by this debate to prejudice in advance the negotiations which are going to take place at Washington. We are not responsible for this debate. The Government have challenged this debate. The member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) was put forward to move this resolution, and the Opposition are not afraid now or at any other time when they are challenged on their fiscal policy to defend it either in this House or out of this House. The hon. gentleman took up more than half his speech in endeavouring to prove that the Government, when they told the people that negotiations for reciprocity originated with Mr. Blaine or with the people of the United States, told the truth. I am not going to wade through this blue-book in order to disprove his assertion. He has quoted page after page and paragraph after paragraph from the despatches contained in that book in his weak and lamentable attempt to prove that assertion. I will leave him to the tender mercies of the High Commissioner, and, if he should go as one of the commissioners to Washington next October, he will have to do as the High Commissioner did. When he enters the room of the Secretary of State he will have to eat his own words and he will have to eat humble pie to begin with. We have from his own pen the statement of the High Commissioner as to what he had to do when he went to open negotiations with Mr. Blaine in April last. He told him in so many words: It is true that Sir John Macdonald and myself made use of that argument to the people of Canada, but I take the first opportunity of withdrawing all those statements and admitting that the commencement of these negotiations came from the Canadian people, notwithstanding the denials which I have made, and Sir John Macdonald has made, and every member of the Government has made. A more humiliating position Canada was never placed in. Listen to the words of the representative of Canada as he enters the room of Mr. Blaine:

"I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries; that I believe it arose from the negotiations which had recently taken place between the United States and Newfoundland, and the desire expressed by Canada to be included in any arrangements such as had been understood to have been contemplated by the United States and Newfoundland, and that, upon that being communicated to him by Sir Julian Pauncefote, he had expressed his willingness to open negotiations for reciprocal trade arrangements between Canada and the United States, assisted by delegates from the Dominion Government; the negotiations to be informal, and to a certain extent of a confidential nature, until they could assume a more formal character, if any result were arrived at."

Now, we have the High Commissioner, as he proceeds into the office of the Secretary of State, declaring that he withdraws all he has said on the platform, all the misleading statements he has made when he went round at the behest of the Government to mislead the people of this country, and he withdraws also the statements of Sir John Macdonald, and admits that the initiation of these proceedings came from Canada, and not from the United States. I allege that in that humiliating confession and withdrawal the High Commissioner placed Canada in a position more humiliating than she ever occupied in any negotiation in which she was previously concerned with the United States. I tell the hon. gentleman that, when he or his colleagues go to Washington in October next, they will have to repeat the words of Sir Charles Tupper. They will have to eat humble pie as he had to eat it, and if the hon. gentleman goes he will have to do more—he will have to withdraw some of the very bellicose expressions he used in that famous Minute of Council which he and the Minister of Justice signed, and which is embodied in this blue-book, in which he told the Prime Minister and Government of Great Britain that the avowed object of the McKinley Bill was to strike at Canadian industry, and to sap the loyalty of the Canadian people. Sir, the hon. gentleman made a statement there that he will have to withdraw when he goes down to Washington. That was not the avowed object of the Bill and he knows it. It has been stated time and again that the avowed object of the Bill was to encourage the domestic manufactures of the United States. The hon. gentleman, therefore, has committed himself, not only in that state document, but in other places, to statements which he will have to withdraw before he is allowed to open negotiations, as the High Commissioner had to withdraw statements which he had made when he went there a short time ago. Now, the hon. gentleman is the first Cabinet Minister who has spoken on this trade question since the Finance Minister made his Budget speech. He discussed at some length the policy of the Opposition; he dissected that policy, and showed what a terrible policy it was, and how ruinous it would be to the interests of Canada. But did he tell his followers behind him what kind of a policy for reciprocal free trade he is going to offer when he goes there? Have they given the hon. gentlemen who form the Government *carte blanche* to go to Washington and negotiate what treaty they please? Are the great Conservative party, a large number of whom are opposed to any reciprocity at all, willing to entrust these gentlemen with a commission to negotiate at Washington, without knowing anything of the lines on which they are going to proceed? Or are they thoroughly satisfied in their own minds, as many hon. gentlemen are upon this side of the House, and others throughout the country, that the whole thing is a humbug and a farce, that they have no desire, as they have no reasonable hope, of securing any treaty whatever?—that in

face of the declarations made by Mr. Blaine, in face of the repeated statements made by the leaders of the Republican party, no policy of reciprocity such as they suggest is feasible, or can be carried out at all? Sir, we are asked, before we discuss the question of reciprocity, to give our adherence to a resolution which has been submitted by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), which asks us to approve of the fiscal policy of the present Government, because, forsooth, that policy permits the free importation of raw materials into this country. Well, Sir, the innocence of the hon. member for L'Islet may be pardoned, inasmuch as he is a new member, and has not sat here before; but if he had sat in this House a few years ago he would have seen the late Minister of Finance rise in his place and propose to this House and succeed in carrying through it, a policy directly the opposite of that which he has set out here. Are the raw materials which enter into this country admitted duty free? Why, did not we hear a year or two ago that in order to complete the great scheme of the National Policy, it was necessary to add to the taxes upon raw material, that the chief raw materia. which is imported into this country and enters so largely into our manufactures must be taxed, the taxes upon it must be doubled and trebled in order to promote native industry? What about the article of iron? Is the hon. gentleman nor aware that that is a raw product? Both iron and coal are heavily taxed for the avowed purpose of encouraging the iron industries of this country, and the result was that so far from doubling those industries, those taxes have had the contrary effect. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that they have exacted from the people of this country, in increased duties upon iron alone, nearly $1,000,000 per year since these new taxes were imposed; and this House is coolly asked to assent to the proposition that the present fiscal policy of the Government involves the free importation of raw material. Why, Sir, it shows a deliberate misstatement, on a most important point, in the very start-out of the resolution. Then we are asked next to say:

"That the liberal aid given to public works and to steamship lines has resulted in the development of our resources and our commerce."

We are asked to make this declaration in face of the evidence which has been taken for the past six weeks before the Committee sitting upstairs, exposing a rottenness and corruption in the administration of the public affairs of this country that can find no parallel outside the city of New York. Sir, the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, accused my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, with prejudging the case pending before the Committee of Privileges and Elections. The hon. gentleman prejudged no case, he passed no judgment upon any individual, he did not say whether the head of the department was guilty or innocent. But there are certain facts which we all admit, which the country admits, which have been proven and which there is no attempt to dispute, and that is that corruption was rampant in the department, from the highest down to the lowest official in it. Whether the head of the department is guilty or not, no one has asserted, none has passed judgment either upon him in his personal capacity, or as a departmental head. But that the department is corrupt, I do not think there is a man standing in this House, with the responsibility of a Minister at least, who will deny in the face of the evidence given. But in face of this rottenness, in face of this corruption, and with the squandering of millions of money which it has been proved have been squandered during the past ten years, since this Government have been in power, we are very coolly asked to assert our continued confidence in the manner in which the public works of the country have been carried on. Sir, it may have advanced the credit of this country, but if so, it has advanced its credit at the expense of its honour, and I for one, under these circumstances, would be loth to record my vote in favour of that statement of the resolution. Sir, we are then asked to extol the management of the finances of this country. In the first place he states, in so many words, that there has been no increase in the public debt in the past two years at least. The resolution ignores entirely the fact that since the present Government came into power—I speak of the Government that have been in power for the last twelve years—they have increased the public debt of this country over one hundred million dollars. We are asked to subscribe to a statement that during the past two years they have not increased the public debt at all. Sir, the statement itself is inaccurate and untrue. The fact that they have increased the public debt one hundred millions during the past twelve years is left out altogether, as an unimportant fact, and the statement that they have not increased the public debt during the last two years is in itself inaccurate. The total debt in 1878 was $175,000,000 in round figures and at the present time it is $286,000,000. I find, that two years ago, the gross public debt was $284,500,000, whereas to-day it is $286,000,000. The hon. gentleman asks the House, in face of these figures—which he could not have taken the trouble to look at—to assert as true what the figures state to be false. Sir, there has been an increase in the net public debt, from $234,500,000 in 1888 to $237,500,000 in 1890, an increase of $3,000,000 in the public debt during that time. We have nearly every paragraph of this resolution bristling with inaccuracies and misstatements, and yet I will venture the assertion, that notwithstanding that fact, a majority, or a number at any rate, of the hon. gentlemen sitting on that side of the House, will coolly stand up and record their votes in favour of statements the inaccuracy of which they can judge by turning to the Public Accounts. But that is a small matter. My hon. friends smile over there; they have swallowed the camel, they are not going to strain at the gnat. We were asked next to give our assent to the policy of reducing the duties on articles of universal use:

"(4) of the policy of relieving from duty articles of universal use, such as tea, coffee and sugar (in respect of the latter the consumer being freed from taxation to the extent of three and one-half millions during the present session), and of the mode of meeting the larger part of the loss of revenue thereby caused by the exercise of economy in expenditure."

Well, I think the less said about the relief given to the tax-payers by lessening the duties on sugar the better, because the fact of the matter is simply this, that for the past three or four years we have been told in this House that we must pour out our money like water to build up a trade between this country and the West Indies. We did so, and voted $100,000

a year in the form of subsidies to build up trade between this country and the West Indies and exchange our products for theirs. What did the Minister of Finance do? He makes sugar free below 14 Dutch standard, and he knows that the very class of sugars which the Jamaica people could send here is above 14 Dutch standard and he taxes it four-fifths of a cent. The hon. gentleman knows that instead of this policy being calculated to develop the West India trade, it is calculated to destroy it. He knows it, for he heard the statement from an hon. member to my right, that one of the largest sugar growers in Jamaica, hearing that the duties were to be taken off sugar, came here for the purpose of making an arrangement to export his sugar here and purchase with the price he obtained the products of this country in exchange, and he found that the quality of his sugar was above 14 Dutch standard, being 15 and 16, and although he could get it into the United States free of duty, he found Canada placed a duty on it. He found that he could not trade with this country, because the Government had determined only to allow low grades of sugar to be imported free, and the better grades of unrefined, which were capable of being used without being refined, were excluded by this policy. There never was a policy more calculated to deter and prevent the building up of trade between this country and the West Indies than the one which it is proposed we should endorse. I for one will not do it. We are told in the motion that the loss of revenue is being met by economy in the expenditure. It is amusing. Look at the Public Accounts and see what economy there has been in the expenditure. When this party came into power in 1878 the expenditure was $24,455,000 per annum, and they showed their economy by bringing the fiscal expenditure last year up to $35,994,000, or an increased expenditure of about $11,500,000. Yet hon. gentlemen will come here and ask us to affirm the general proposition that the loss of revenue is to be met by economy in the expenditure; and a Government which has gone on increasing expenditure year by year with a recklessness which marks it as the most extravagant Government Canada has ever had, induces one of its supporters to come forward and ask this House to support the Government, because, if there is nothing else to be said in its favour, it is an economical Government. Then we are asked, as a last proposition, to condemn a scheme known as commercial union, which I have not heard formulated or proposed to this House or this country by any political party in it. Why do they do that? Simply to carry out the deception practised during the last year or two. I have never yet met an opponent on the platform who has not sought to make the people believe that the policy of the Liberal party is one of commercial union, is one of handing over to the United States supreme and sole control over our tariff and the assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries. They call that commercial union They criticize it, not because commercial union, in terms, has ever been proposed here, not because it is the policy which the Liberal party has heretofore formulated and now formulate again for the acceptance of the people, but because they think they can catch some votes by doing it. The day may come in this country, for ought I know, when we may have to grapple with that policy of commercial union. It has many advantages; it has great simplicity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen seem to think that the policy of commercial union has no advantages whatever. It has disadvantages I acknowledge, very great disadvantages, and one of the great reasons why it was not adopted was that it gave the neighbouring republic control over our tariff, and for that reason we refused to accept it as our policy, and accepted unrestricted reciprocity instead. Why is not that policy condemned here? Why do not hon. gentlemen join issue with us on unrestricted reciprocity, which is the only policy we present for the acceptance of the people? Why do hon. gentlemen opposite condemn a policy that is not before us? The answer is that it is for one object alone, and that is to endeavour to deceive and humbug the people. They will not discuss the question on its merits, disassociated from claptrap and other accessories which they throw around it. They try to make it hazy and misty, they endeavour to make the people afraid of it as a bogy or bugbear. Although it has difficulties, as every change of commercial policy must have difficulties connected with it, still they are not insuperable, and the advantages and benefits greatly outweigh the difficulties and disadvantages. While I shall discuss this question I propose not to do so at any great length, as the House has already had the advantage of having had the question discussed very thoroughly. We have had figures from the blue-books skilfully massed on both sides and able speeches delivered, and I do not propose to go over the ground which has been so ably traversed by my hon. friends behind me and by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I may be pardoned if I refer to a personal matter. I know it is not generally considered right to drag personal matters into a discussion. But I have heard time and again, not once but six or seven times, from those who have discussed unrestricted reciprocity a statement made that the hon. member for Queen's has proved it to be an impracticable proceeding. A speech delivered by me in Charlottetown is referred to, in which it is said I condemned the whole scheme as impracticable, and said the Americans would never be arrant fools enough to accept it. That speech is very simply explained. It was made before any proposition for unrestricted reciprocity was submitted in this House. It was made at a time when the question first came before the people, before it was thoroughly understood by the people, and when it was discussed before the board of trade there were a large number of members who were opposed to commercial union, because commercial union they said would vest the power of making and unmaking our tariff in the American commonwealth. But they said they would prefer unrestricted reciprocity, and if we had that we must knock down the Customs barriers between the two countries. I pointed out that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, we would maintain control of our own tariff and if at the same time we knocked down the Customs barriers between Canada and the United States, as against foreign goods, a state of matters would result which no Government in the United States would tolerate for one hour. I said Canada might have a 20 per cent. tariff and the United States a 45 per cent. tariff; and if you have no Customs barriers for foreign goods, all such goods would come through Montreal, and do you

suppose the people in the United States are fools enough to tolerate such a thing for a moment?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That commends itself to hon. gentlemen opposite because they cheer it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Settle that with your leader.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that a condemnation of unrestricted reciprocity? The Minister of Customs sneers. Does he understand the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity?

Mr. BOWELL. No, nor anybody else.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is, if your courtesy, your well known courtesy, your distinguished courtesy, will permit me to finish my sentence before your answer.

Mr. BOWELL. Your distinguished courtesy in saying that I was sneering.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am asking the hon. gentleman if he will kindly permit me to put the question: Has he ever known the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity as defined from this side of the House, to involve the total abolition of the Customs line?

Mr. BOWELL. It never was defined yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He never has. He knows that under unrestricted reciprocity the Customs line must be retained as against foreign importations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your leader does not say so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My leader did say so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He says so now, and he has said so always. My hon. friend knows that unless the tariffs of the two countries are alike—and it does not necessarily follow, although from indications which I see on the other side of the line I hope the time will come when their tariff will come down to ours, and I believe it will—but it does not necessarily follow that the tariffs will be alike, and if the tariffs are not alike you must have a Customs line for foreign goods imported into the two countries. But, Sir, referring to the speech that I am replying to, and in order to show hon. gentlemen that the position I took then is the same position which I take now, I will point out that at the close of that debate before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, I moved the following resolution, which I think hon. gentlemen will see is in accord with the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) a few days ago:—

"That this Board warmly approves of reciprocal free trade with the United States on the broadest possible basis, including the abolition of the restriction on the coasting trade and the transfer of vessel property and embracing the concession to the Americans of the common right with our fishermen to use our fisheries."

Now, Sir, what is the history of this question, and why do the Liberal party adhere so strongly and advocate so warmly this policy of unrestricted reciprocity? A few years ago when we moved in the matter of reciprocal trade with the United States in this House, we did not advocate unrestricted reciprocity, because at that time we believed and we hoped and we were told that a more limited measure of reciprocity was possible. We moved in that direction, we asked the Government opposite to send delegates to Washington to ascertain whether it was true or not that a smaller measure of reciprocity could be obtained; a measure of reciprocity such as we had from 1854 to 1866. I venture to say that so far as the Liberal party of this country are concerned, a very large majority of them would be satisfied if we had the old reciprocity treaty of 1854 renewed. They would be satisfied if a treaty such as that proposed, and very nearly successfully negotiated, by the late Hon. George Brown was carried into effect. We do not desire unrestricted reciprocity because it is absolutely the essence of all that is good, but we advocate and support unrestricted reciprocity because we believe it is the only possible measure of reciprocity that is obtainable. In 1884, when a resolution was moved—I believe I had the honour to move it myself—in favour of a more limited reciprocity; in favour of a reciprocity such as the hon. gentlemen deluded the people of this country last year into the idea that they were going to get; when they stated that they were going down to Washington, not to get unrestricted reciprocity, but a more limited form of reciprocity on the basis of a treaty of 1854; when that resolution was moved, what did Sir John Macdonald say at that time speaking officially, not on the platform, but speaking in this House, where he knew his words would be weighed not only by the people of this country, but by the responsible minister of the adjoining country about which he was speaking. He was referring to the time when Mr. Brown went to Washington, and he said:

"And I believe that the feeling which then existed still exists, and that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural productions of the two countries. The Americans said—whether truly or not I do not know—that it was a nominal reciprocity, that all the advantages were on the side of Canada. We had no market of sufficient importance to offer to them for their productions of grain and cereals and fisheries. We, on the other hand, had to gain everything by their markets being open for the articles which were specified in the treaty. That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States shall come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty not only for our natural productions but for our manufactures as well as our natural productions, we will never have a treaty. I am quite satisfied the United States will not agree, the country will not agree, the voice of the country will be against a repetition of the treaty of 1854."

Sir, the English language is not capable of making any stronger statements than was made then. He told this House and he told this country, that the obtaining of a limited form of reciprocity with the United States was an impossibility, that it was nonsense, and that it would be a farce to send delegates to Washington to try to negotiate such a treaty. He told us that to get a treaty you must include manufactured goods as well as natural products, and that meant unrestricted reciprocity. He stated that was the only possible form of reciprocity that could be got, and he stated it on his authority as the leader of the Government, from an experience of some twenty years, during which time he said he had discussed this matter formally and informally with men on the other side of the line. He knew the thing was impossible, he knew it was only wasting our time to try to get a more limited treaty, and therefore he said: You have to turn your attention to this; if you want a treaty at all, it must be one embracing manufactured articles as well as natural products. That declaration of the leader of the Government did a great deal to crystallize public opinion in this country and in the Liberal

party in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. When we found we could get nothing else; when we found that unless we went in for that, we could not get a treaty at all, then we determined that although it had difficulties in the way, difficulties which were not by any means small, still the overwhelming advantages to all parts of this country were such, that we would be recreant to our duty as representatives of the people if we failed to advocate that policy. Now, we are told to-day by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, that the two great objections to our scheme are, in the first place, that it will create a great loss of revenue which we have not shown how we can supply; and in the next place, that it involves discrimination against Great Britain. That is not news; we knew that from the time it was first proposed. I have a speech here that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made when he first introduced this policy in the House, and it contains statements as clear as the English language can make them, pointing out that these difficulties existed and were to be overcome. But, Sir, what is this policy of discrimination, of which so much seems to be made by the other side of the House? Is it a new policy? Why, Sir, I find away back in the year 1869 that our right to discriminate, where the interests of Canada required it, was asserted by the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald in no ambiguous language. Our right to discriminate was not only asserted but successfully asserted in the treaty of 1854, and that treaty discriminated against Great Britain in some of the articles, although there were very few of them; but still the principle was there and the principle was admitted after a learned discussion between Sir John Rose and the English Secretary of State for the Colonies. Passages from this discussion were read by me in this House some years ago, and I will not repeat them now; but I say, that after embodying the principle of discrimination in the old treaty of 1854, the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, when that treaty expired, did not scruple to go further and to enter upon the project of a treaty having as one of its terms the assimilation of the tariff of the two countries. The statement was made by Mr. Huntington in his place in this House, and has been read by myself some years ago, as well as during the debate the other day, but I will take the opportunity of reading it again, as I think it is very important in this connection. Mr. Huntington said:

"I know something about the memorandum entered into by the contracting parties in regard to the preliminary negotiations, and I have my information from sources which I believe to be reliable and trustworthy. And I say that in the preliminary negotiations between Hon. Mr. Rose and Mr. Secretary Fish it was agreed that the manufactures of both countries should be admitted duty free, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it."

Sir, there was unrestricted reciprocity. When I quoted that statement a few years ago, I challenged the Government to bring down the papers if the statement of Mr. Huntington was not true; but the papers have never been brought down, and no Cabinet Minister dare deny the truthfulness of that historical statement, that in the year 1869 Sir John Macdonald entrusted his Finance Minister with power to enter into a treaty which amounted to unrestricted reciprocity, because it admitted the manufactures of one country into the other duty free, and necessarily involved discrimination against Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Two Cabinet Ministers have denied it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I challenge the hon. gentleman now to bring down the papers. This is an important matter, a vital matter. Mr. Huntington said the papers were there, and he was supported in his statement by the hon. member for East York in the debate in 1870, and I think that hon. gentleman is not accustomed to make use of hap-hazard statements in serious matters connected with affairs of state. The late Hon. Sir John Macdonald was challenged in this House time and again to bring down the papers if that statement was not true; but we have not been furnished with them. But we find more than that. In 1875, when the late Hon. George Brown was sent to Washington, he was put in possession of all negotiations which had taken place between Canada and the United States previous to that time; and he has made a statement with reference to the fact to which I am now referring, in connection with the negotiations of 1869. He made that statement from the facts he gathered from the public documents put into his hands. What is his statement? Does it corroborate that of Mr. Huntington or not? He says:

"In 1869 formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government, and the project of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. The project included the cession for a term of years of our fisheries to the United States, the enlargement of our canals, the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the assimilation of our Customs and Excise duties, and some other propositions."

There is the statement made by the late Hon. George Brown after his return from Washington—not speaking as a private member, but speaking officially as the accredited representative of the late Liberal Government. He was authorized informally by this Government, but formally he held the commission from Her Majesty's Government to negotiate; and speaking with all the authority he possessed in that character, and with the knowledge he had gathered from the official documents which had been put into his hands, he stated deliberately that the Government had entered into a project which had included the assimilation of the Customs and Excise duties of Canada and the United States; and that meant commercial union in so many words. So that this scheme which the hon. Minister of Marine says involves the disintegration of the Empire is not a novelty. The hon. member for South Oxford must not claim the honour of originating this scheme. He is only copying a project agreed to by the late Sir John Macdonald, and the late Sir John Rose—a project the negotiations for which were commenced in July, 1869, and ended in March, 1870, and the preliminary negotiations for which involved this assimilation of the Customs and Excise duties of both countries. These facts are in the records of this country at the present time; and we have the authority of such men as Mr. Huntington, the hon. member for East York and the Hon. George Brown for the statements we are making; and I do not think there are many men in this country who would repudiate the authority of those three gentlemen. So that we must understand that this scheme, whether it is advantageous or disadvantageous, whether it

involves the disintegration of the Empire or not, whether it has the effect of severing our connection with the mother country or not, is not a scheme which originated with us, but one which received the imprimatur of the late Prime Minister himself, and was very nearly carried into effect by him. But as for discrimination, we hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if they never discriminated at all. I have shown that that principle was involved in the Treaty of 1854. I have shown that our right to introduce it was held by Sir John Rose; I have shown that it was acted upon by the late Sir John Macdonald to the fullest extent possible when he finished the preliminary negotiations for the assimilation of our Customs and Excise duties with those of the United States in 1869 and 1870. And I say more than that. I say that the present Government, superabundantly loyal as they claim to be, loyal beyond Englishmen, loyal beyond the Queen herself, singing "God Save the Queen" after every division in this House—that these hon. gentlemen continue this discrimination against Great Britain to this day—not theoretical, but practical discrimination. Why, turn up the Trade and Navigation Returns. It is true they do not say that a particular article imported from the United States to this country shall bear a smaller rate of duty than a similar article imported from Great Britain; but, taking the class of articles which we import from the States, and the class which we import from England, they have deliberately placed, and for years maintained, a lower scale of duty on those which we import from the States than upon those which we import from Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He will deny anything.

Mr. BOWELL. That is your usual courtesy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not speaking to the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, I was speaking to you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hold in my hand the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I see that last year we imported dutiable goods from Great Britain to the amount of $33,267,000, on which we paid duty to the amount of $9,576,965, which was at the rate of 29 per cent., and we imported dutiable goods from the United States to the amount of $30,575,000, on which we paid duty to the amount of $8,126,625, which was at the rate of 26 per cent. In addition, we imported free goods from Great Britain to the amount of $10,122,520, and from the United States to the amount of $21,716,000. On all the goods, both dutiable and free, we paid a duty upon those from Great Britain of 22½ per cent., and upon those from the United States of 15½ per cent. Is there any discrimination there? I am not talking about theoretical discrimination, but practical and actual discrimination. I say that, although you take very good care not to single out a specific article and say it shall pay a different duty when imported from Great Britain than when imported from the United States, yet, as a matter of fact, you pay less duty on the dutiable and other goods combined imported from the United States than on the goods imported from Great Britain. You discriminate and have discriminated for years against Great Britain. But it is said that this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity necessarily involves direct discrimination.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Direct taxation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, but direct discrimination, and I do not deny that. I admit there are evils connected with this policy. We have never shrank from denying what Mr. Blaine said, that we cannot have commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity without discriminating against Great Britain to some extent. But how far is that going to work? Is it going to be a very serious and practical matter? I do not think it is. Hon. gentlemen will find that, after we have unrestricted reciprocity, we will continue to import from Great Britain the same goods that we import now. During the late campaign I went into one of the largest wholesale dry goods houses in the Maritime Provinces, and I spoke to one of the members of the firm about this question, which was then on everybody's lips. I said to him: Supposing we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, would you continue to import from Great Britain the same kinds and quantities of goods you now do? Well, he said, that is a question I could not answer you off-hand, as I would have to look into the matter in my office, and could only give you an answer in a day or two. Well, I asked him to look the matter up; and in a couple of days I returned for an answer. He told me that he had examined into the question, he had seen what goods he imported, and looked over the invoices and compared the invoices with the quotations for these goods in the United States, and he had no hesitation in saying that, with the exception of printed cottons, he would continue to import from Great Britain, under unrestricted reciprocity, the same goods he was then importing. I asked him his reasons, and he replied: Because I can buy them cheaper in England. Let any man look over the United States returns to-day, and what will he find? He will find that, notwithstanding their tariff is very much higher than ours, the United States have to go to England and purchase very largely all the classes of goods there which they can buy cheaper than they can manufacture themselves. In 1887 the United States imported from Great Britain to the value of $165,000,000, or 24 per cent. of their whole importations. In 1888, they imported to the value of $177,897,000. Supposing we had to-morrow the United States tariff applied to Canada, would we not continue to buy from Great Britain the very classes of goods that the Americans are compelled to get there? To hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk, one would imagine that, once we had unrestricted reciprocity with our neighbours, we would cease to import at all from Great Britain. I contend that, although there will be discrimination, it will not amount to one-third of what hon. gentlemen opposite say it will On the contrary, we practically will continue to import from Great Britain a great portion of the very goods we now import, because we will be able to buy them cheaper there than in the United States. On examining the returns, I find that the importations of the United States last year were as follows:—

Woollen goods	$63,612,000
Cotton goods	28,917,000
Iron and steel manufactures	48,999,000
Linen and flax manufactures	41,287,000
Silks	53,282,000

Why do the United States continue to import the larger part of those goods from Great Britain? because they can buy them cheaper in Great Britain, despite their almost prohibitive tariff, than they can manufacture them. And if we were to go into unrestricted reciprocity to-morrow to the full extent mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, we would continue to buy from Great Britain a great part of the very goods we buy now, because we can buy them cheaper there than we can manufacture them, and if the Americans have to buy in Great Britain we will have to do likewise. I have shown you, therefore, Sir, that this matter of discrimination is one that need not frighten us. The question we come down to is this: Is it necessary for the interests of Canada that we should adopt a policy of reciprocity even if it does involve to some extent discrimination; and I say if it is necessary in Canada's interests that we should adopt this policy, we ought not to hesitate doing so, even if it should involve discrimination to a small extent against Great Britain. There should be no shirking of the question or beating about the bush at all, and hon. gentlemen will be forced by their constituents to do what in their hearts they know is to the benefit and advantage of Canada, even if accompanied to some extent by discrimination against their mother country. But it suits the purposes of hon. gentlemen now to shout: Oh, you are going to sever the tie that binds us to the motherland. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) read an extract from the *Times*, admitting the right of Canadians to adopt such a policy if they choose, saying that if they did so the Imperial Government would not interfere with their rights. I admit that I would be satisfied to have a treaty made on the lines of 1854, but if we cannot get that, as I know we cannot, I would be prepared to go on the lines marked out by the late Hon. George Brown in 1875, and if we could not get that—as we were told by the late Sir John Macdonald, by Mr. Blaine and by leading statesmen of the United States we could not—then, if it was necessary to go as far as unrestricted reciprocity, I would go that length, taking the evils connected with it, knowing that the advantages are ten times as great as the evils, and knowing that nothing will redeem this country so quickly from its depressed condition as a free system of reciprocal trade with our neighbours to the south. We are then told that another fatal defect in our policy is the loss of revenue; and hearing the arguments that have been propounded in this House day in and day out, on that subject, I have come to the conclusion that very many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House believe that this objection is a good one. There are some gentlemen over there with whom it is no use arguing, because they are opposed to any kind or scheme of reciprocity whatever. I put these gentlemen to one side. They do not want reciprocity either in natural products or manufactures; but those who are anxious for a fair system of reciprocity, but who are frightened that the loss of revenue is an insuperable obstacle, I would invite to consider a fact which they seem to have overlooked, and that is that it never was proposed that the scheme of reciprocity, if brought into effect to-morrow, should be brought into effect in one day *quoad* manufactured goods as well as agricultural products. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that statesmen charged with the administration of the affairs of a country, in initiating a treaty of that kind, would not have regard to the vested interests in this country? Did not the free traders in Great Britain, when they introduced free trade, have regard to the vested interests in that country at the time? Did they introduce free trade in one day? Not at all. Hon. gentlemen who have read history know well that they had regard to the vested interests in that country, and that free trade was gradually introduced so as not to destroy, at one fell blow, interests which had been nurtured by the unnatural system of protection. Sir, we are opposed to protection in the abstract and in the concrete. We believe that, under that system, the Government have built up a large number of manufactures in this country that it is not desirable should be protected to the extent that they have been at the expense of the public generally. No doubt, some of these manufactures will go down when they are exposed to free trade, because they are unnaturally protected, but we do not propose that those people who have invested their money in these manufactures shall lose their investment at one fell blow. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite argue that, if our policy were introduced, in one day natural products and manufactured products would cross the line free. The introduction of this policy must *ex necessitate* be a gradual one, and while we are hoping and seeking to bring about unrestricted reciprocity, it must be done by a gradual process and not by a mode involving the loss of money, and disturbance of trade indicated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The introduction of this policy must necessarily be gradual, so that, if you lose the duty, you will not lose it *in toto* the first year, but by a gradual process running over several years. If hon. gentlemen opposite carry reciprocity in natural products, they will lose the duty on the natural products. We propose the same thing. If they can provide for that, we can do so also. Our difficulty *quoad* natural products would be no greater than theirs, and the difficulty *quoad* manufactured goods if their introduction were provided for by a gradual scale for three, four or five years, would not be anything like what those hon. gentlemen assert, and so their objection fades away. We predict that, under unrestricted reciprocity, the people of Canada will become wealthy, much more wealthy than they are now, that they will purchase more goods than they do now, and, as the barriers gradually go down, they will purchase more from England than they do now, and that there will be no difficulties which cannot be overcome by an economical expenditure of the public money. I acknowledge that, if, on the 1st July, the entire Customs duties between Canada and the United States were abolished, there would be great difficulty in raising sufficient revenue next year to meet our demands, but no such policy has been proposed and no such policy is before us. Let us consider what is reasonable and fair. I do not see why hon. gentlemen opposite should persist in arguing against what is not proposed, or should tilt at windmills; I do not see why they should put in clauses against commercial union which is not proposed, and should argue against certain

supposed phases of unrestricted reciprocity which will not be found to exist when the scheme is carried into operation. I do not see, therefore, either in what is alleged against the scheme or in the scheme itself any such difficulties as hon. gentlemen find. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who will have the task of carrying it out, says these difficulties can easily be overcome. I believe he is right. I believe the majority of the people agree with him, and I believe that it is only because hon. gentlemen opposite sprung an election upon the country and raised a false issue that they have succeeded in obtaining the majority they have. The hon. gentleman said that the nearer the cities were to the farm the better for the farmer. I do not want a better argument than that in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. I want to bring the great city of Boston, with 500,000 inhabitants, near to the Maritime Provinces, and to make it a port and a market for the products of those provinces, so that the farmers there will have this great and prosperous city brought to their doors.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the hon. gentleman laughing at? Is he scouting the proposition of the Minister of Marine? I do not see what difference it makes, from a commercial standpoint, whether a city is outside of our borders or inside of them, if you can have free interchange of products with that city and the farmer can get a market for his goods. If you go westward, you find, as far as the great Province of Ontario is concerned, that, under this scheme, the great cities to the south would be the markets for the farmers of that province, as the city of Boston would be for the farmers of the Maritime Provinces. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec would have opened to them the markets of Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Oswego, Ogdensburg and other cities with populations aggregating two or three millions. If it is true that the nearer the city is to the farmer, the better it is for the farmer, why is it not true that, if you knock down the trade barriers between us and the United States, the farmer would benefit by having access to these great cities across the line? If a man is a benefactor who builds up a city near to the farm, why is he not a benefactor to this country who brings in the cities of the adjoining country and breaks down the barriers which prevent our farmers for reaching those markets? That is true in regard to the Maritime Provinces, it is true in regard to Ontario, and it will be true in regard to the North-West. You will bring St. Paul and Minneapolis within easy communication of the North-West, and so will give the North-West a new market for her products. So far from breaking away from Great Britain or adopting a policy ruinous to us, we would be introducing a policy which would build up the interests of the farmers, the interests of the artizans, the fishing interests, and the manufacturing interests of this country, in a way that nothing else can do. We believe that the statements which have been made in regard to the mineral wealth of this country are not exaggerated. We were told the other day that the southern part of British Columbia has such an amount of undeveloped mineral wealth that it cannot be described. Why is it not developed? Will it not be developed if we have unrestricted trade with the United States? Why, in such case, you will have money and men and markets — money to develop that industry, men to work the mines, and markets to which to send the product of those mines. It will do the same for the fisheries and for the farm, and I believe that the thinking men on the other side of the House, although they are bound by their party allegiance to oppose our policy, really believe that it is the only true policy which can make our country great and prosperous. I take up the Montreal *Gazette*, which is perhaps the ablest organ of the Government, and I find that the policy it lays down is not very far different from that which we advocate. What does it say in its issue of 4th May?

"If Mr. Blaine on the other hand, offered the kind of unrestricted reciprocity championed by Mr. Scriver, of Huntingdon, and many of the Liberal candidates of New Brunswick, at the late election, namely, free trade between the two countries with the retention by Canada of the absolute control of its tariff, the matter would still be capable of a satisfactory solution."

Sir, that is the very proposition embodied in our scheme—free trade between the two countries with the retention by Canada of the absolute control of its tariff. That is unrestricted reciprocity in a very few words, and you cannot have a better definition of it. That is the kind of reciprocity that the Montreal *Gazette*, and the tens of thousands of Conservatives for whom it speaks, advocates to-day; that is the kind of reciprocity we have been contending for; that is the kind of reciprocity that a very large majority of the people of this country want, and are prepared to vote for, but have been prevented from voting for by the malignant and persistent misrepresentations of hon. gentlemen opposite, and those misrepresentations are continued in the resolution they propose to-day which is intended to lead the people to believe that we are advocating a scheme of reciprocity which does not retain control of our tariff, that we are advocating a scheme of commercial union and propose to surrender the control of our tariff. Hon. gentlemen know that is not the case, and why do they continue to deceive the people? Sir, what hope of negotiating a treaty can our people have from the Finance Minister in the light of the speech he delivered to this House only a year ago? Hon. gentlemen know that he then came forward declaring that the hope of ever obtaining reciprocity with the United States had vanished into thin air. On that occasion the hon. gentleman introduced a change in the tariff, increasing the tariff duties, not, as he said, for the purpose of increasing the revenue, but for the sole and only purpose of retaining Canada for the Canadians. The great changes that he made in the tariff, the many increases he made in the duties that we had to pay, were not to add to the moneys in the exchequer, but simply to carry to its logical effect the policy of protection. I do not want to do injustice to the hon. gentleman, and I will read a line or two from his speech:

"I may say in answer to that, that the changes in this tariff were not made with any idea of increasing the amount of revenue of the country; that was not the purpose for which these rates were levied."

The hon. gentleman introduced his new policy, feeling sure that he, at least, would never be called upon to negotiate a treaty with the United States, and as if that one statement alone was not enough

to ensure this being thoroughly understood by the people, he repeated a little further on :

"I am free to state that, as the intention was not, by the imposition of these higher rates, to increase the revenue."

The hon. gentleman at that time had a clear and distinct intention to build up Canada for the Canadians, to compel us to buy so far as the tariff could compel us, goods manufactured in this country, and to prevent us from buying elsewhere. When the hon. gentleman was reminded that the increased duties he proposed to levy, and the policy which he introduced, would have the effect of retarding the bringing about of reciprocal trade relations with the States he answered that there was no reason to hope that any such negotiations with the States would ever be successful. He said :

"I ask every gentleman whose memory runs over the history of forty years, whether or not, as the teaching of all this history and the legislation and counter legislation in both these countries during that period, they would feel justified in deferring any longer the carrying out of any policy which they think best in the interest of their own people, out of deference to the idea that possibly by doing so they might be doing something which might militate against the probability of developing trade relations between us and the United States? * * * If they could point that out, it might be an argument for this country and this House to stay their hand and to wait a while longer."

He says he saw no hope in the future, and, therefore, we ought not to stay our hands, but we must proceed to legislate as if we had no hope of obtaining reciprocity with the United States. And further, the hon. gentleman in the same speech said :

"I repeat that we have waited long enough, that the trend of sentiment in the United States does not justify us in waiting any longer, and that what we have to do is to sit down here as the citizens of a great and free country, and to make our own tariff square with our own interests, and in a spirit of courtesy and a spirit of prudence, with the heartiest good-will towards the country to the south of us, and to every other country, to do what we consider best for our own interests. That is what we are doing now."

And so the hon. gentleman proceeded to do what he thought was for the interest of Canada, and that was to increase in every instance the duties upon foreign goods for the purpose of protecting the Canadian manufacturer. Sir, the hope he laid down then was a hope clearly understood, but a hope, I admit, directly at variance with our belief, with our teaching, and with our policy, and the line was clear and distinct between that honest declaration of his, in favour of protection pure and simple, protection for itself and for its own benefits, as against the free trade policy which this party hope in the near future to consummate. The lines between the two parties were drawn ; the forces stood divided, and they joined either the Minister of Finance in building up the tariff walls still higher, or they joined the hon. member for South Oxford in breaking down the tariff walls, and in securing between this country and the United States continental free trade, trade as free as regards the natural and manufactured products of each country as between one state and another, with this condition alone attached to it, that Canada retained the right in her own hands of determining just what her tariff shall be, whether it shall be 20, or 35, or 40 per cent. But so long as we retain that right to control our own tariff, we need not fear that any treaty we may negotiate will be dishonourable to ourselves or to the country to which we belong. Holding these views, I cannot for a moment consent to record my vote for the resolution which is tendered here, but I shall support, so far as my feeble voice can do, the policy with which this party went before the country at the last election ; and although we were unsuccessful then, I believe, when that policy is tendered again, and it becomes better understood by the people, as it is daily being better understood, that policy will be successful, not only in the Maritime Provinces but throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. My only apology in asking the House for a few moments of patient hearing at this late stage of the debate, is that I have not, up to this period, taken any part in what may be called exclusively the trade debate which has been going on for the last ten or twelve days. During that time I have been in my seat, I think, as patient and constant a listener to the speeches made upon both sides of the House, as any other member in it ; so that while I promise the House not to trespass too long upon their attention, I do not think I am presuming too much when I ask them to listen to me while I make a few remarks in criticism of somethings which has been said to-night. I wish, first, very briefly to say something with regard to the remarkable speech of my hon. friend who has just sat down, a speech which I do not notice because of its worth, or because of its argumentative force, or because of its courtesy in regard to myself, but because it is a specimen of the arguments which are used too frequently by hon. gentlemen upon the opposite side of politics in rebuttal of the policy of the Government. I wish merely to point out the unfair method and argument, if we may call it such, which has been adopted by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. member for L'Islet asks this House to endorse the policy of the Government for several reasons. He asks first, that the House express its approval of the fiscal policy of the Conservative Government for two reasons, namely, for permitting the free importation of raw materials, and secondly, for the judicious protection of our natural and manufactured products, both of which, the resolution asserts, have resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat dismissed this proposition with a single reference to its first, and with a total disregard of its second basis : and he said we were called upon by the young and verdant member for L'Islet to vote confidence in the policy of the Government, because, forsooth, that policy had encouraged the importation of raw material. And his conclusion was that it had not encouraged such importation. Why ? Because the important article of iron, which he called a raw material, paid a duty when it came into this country, and because iron paid a duty he took no note of other raw materials which to the value of $35,000,000 came last year free into this country. He took no note of the second part of the argument on which the proposition was based, and committed himself to the palpable absurdity, which even he I think might have seen, of making the assertion before this House and the country that iron was a raw material. If the hon. gentleman were asked to make a bar of pig iron and bring it to the manufacturer who proposed to make it up into something else, I think he would then

revise his opinion of that as raw material. If he must first dig it as ore out of the mountain he smelted it, if he put it into the condition of pig iron to be used for manufactures in other and more advanced stages, I should like to know if he could call that raw material such as we generally speak of raw material in this country. And, Sir, the patent fact remained untouched by him that in last year's importations, although $77,000,000 worth paid duty to this country, $35,000,000 of goods were brought in without paying any duty whatever. So the position of the hon. member for L'Islet is perfectly justified in asking approval of the policy of the Government on one count, namely, that it does encourage the introduction of raw materials free for use in manufacturing in this country. The hon. gentleman took up the second point on which my hon. friend challenges the approval of the House for the policy of the present Government on account of its liberal aid to important public works, railways, canals and steamship lines, and he, as the hon. leader of the Opposition did, dismissed that argument, dismissed that proposition with the remark that they thought little should be said with respect to public works in this House at the time when great scandals are being ferretted out, as is alleged, and when investigations involving the good name of hon. members sitting in this House are being carried on by a committee of this House. I want to ask whether or not it is a fair argument, allowing for the sake of argument that certain moneys have been ill-expended on certain public works, that because there has been that ill-expenditure of money, therefore the Government policy carried on from 1878 to the present time, of granting liberal aid in railway building, in canal building, in subventions to steamboat lines and to other public undertakings which have made this country a great country, which it never could have been had there not been these liberal appropriations for public works, should be condemned. It is not a substantial, or satisfactory, or fair argument to dismiss the proposition in that way. Then the hon. gentleman states that my hon. friend for L'Islet has made another mistake, being a young member and not so old and wise as the hon. member for Queen's, in fact that he had made a deliberate misstatement. What does the hon. member for L'Islet say? He approves in his motion "of the wise and prudent management of the finances which while adequately providing for the public service." Has it not adequately provided for the public service? "Has maintained and advanced the credit of the country." Has that not been done? "And while producing substantial surpluses for capital expenditure." Has not that been done? "Has made no appreciable addition to the public debt during the last two years." My hon. friend, if such I may term him, left out the word "appreciably" which the hon. member for L'Islet used when he stated that there had been no appreciable addition to the debt during the last two years, and the hon. gentleman then went on to make the assertion that there was $3,000,000 of increased debt during the last two years. In both of these statements the hon. gentleman's methods are unfair and characteristically unfair. Not only is it true that there has been no appreciable addition to the public debt in the last two years, but the proposition is also true, as to the adequate provision for the public service, as to the credit of the country and the large surpluses. He attacked none of them, but he said that the hon. member for L'Islet was guilty of a falsehood, of making a false statement in declaring there had been no increase in the public debt. The hon. gentleman knew just as well as the youngest and most verdant member in this House knows, and no one knows it better than himself, and he would consider it an insult to his intelligence if one were to point it out to him, that when we are speaking of the debt of this country, its increase or decrease, we are speaking of the net debt which is the true measure of the debt; and I challenge the hon. gentleman to state that it is not literally true as embodied in this proposition of the hon. member for L'Islet, that in the last two years there has been no appreciable increase in the public debt. Sir, my hon. friend again says that this Government and the hon. member for L'Islet in proposing this policy should have been the last to have said anything about the removal of the duties on tea, coffee and particularly on sugar. Well, if the hon. member for L'Islet should be the last one to say anything about sugar, that criticism might apply to a great many other members and particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite, for, if there is one thing that has struck down deep into their marrow bones and rankles there to-night, it is the fact that this Government, which they have berated so much, whose policy they have so much derided, whose extravagance they have so much talked about and whose impending ruin they have declared to be certain, has been able after twelve years of exceptionally successful government in this country to take off $3,500,000 from the burdens of the people and to impose no appreciable taxation in compensation for it. But the hon. gentleman said we should talk little about sugar because, forsooth, we have taken the duty off and so destroyed our prospects of a West India trade. I simply note this by naming it; it does not require an argument for men of intelligence and those who are acquainted with the circumstances of the case to know that the statement is not a correct one. He says we talk as if discrimination was a new thing, and declared that the tariff of 1854 discriminated against Great Britain, when everyone who has read history knows that, as regards the articles admitted from the United States into Canada by that treaty, similar articles if they came from England were admitted on exactly the same terms; no discrimination was intended, no discrimination was allowed, and no discrimination was actually practised or carried out. My hon. friend says that the treaty negotiators of 1869, actually in their drafts of the negotiations, had provided for discrimination against the goods of Great Britain, and yet, Sir, we have against the unsupported testimony of Mr. Huntington, which has been read here and which has been met time and again in this House, the statement of Sir Francis Hincks, and the statement of Sir John A. Macdonald, that although they were not allowed to bring down these papers—because secret and confidential papers could not be brought down—they challenged the accuracy of Mr. Huntington's statements, and that denial stands good to-day against the statement which has been read here from Mr. Huntington, and it is assured in the light of history that from the year 1854 to the present time, Great Britain has never had to contemplate discrimina-

tion in reference to reciprocity treaties which have been negotiated, or which have been actually made, between the United States and this country. The hon. gentleman refers to the treaty of George Brown in 1875—the draft treaty—which he says by the way we came pretty nearly getting. Yes, we did; we were ready for it, and willing for it, and the other side of the line would have nothing to do with it. That is just how near we came to getting it. He says that draft discriminated and provided for discrimination against Great Britain, and yet he knows that the Hon. George Brown himself, in his place in Parliament, and the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie as well, repudiated any idea of discrimination, and declared that not only did it not exist, but that every article from Great Britain of like kind should come into this country upon the same conditions and on perfect equality, with those that came from the United States. I wish to notice just for a moment the climax of the argument of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I want it to be listened to in this House; but I hope it will never get as far as Washington; I hope it will never even reach Bar Harbour, for if the quick ears of Mr. Blaine ever catch it, the hon. gentleman and his cohorts may come on this side of the House, and remain here for a legion of years, but they will have to turn their whole policy inside out, and repudiate the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) before they get any treaty from the United States. Why is that? My hon. friend knows, for he has stated it, and so has the leader of the Opposition, and so have all gentlemen on that side, and it is open to reason that the United States will conclude no treaty with this country out of sheer kindness and good-will for us. They will not conclude a treaty with this country unless they hope to get some advantage out of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the only advantage that the United States can get under reciprocal trade is to be found in the fact that they will obtain a market here for their manufactured goods. That is it. They dare not take any other position in their love for the poor farmers, as they call them, and they do not take any other position. Now listen to my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). He commences with a fairly mild statement, and he ends with a strong and extreme one. That is the way of the hon. gentleman. His first statement was this: We will import much the same goods from Great Britain as now, if we get unrestricted reciprocity. Then he put his foot upon the chair and he recalled the conversation that he had with a prominent importer in the Maritime Provinces, who actually told him: Yes, Mr. Davies, you get unrestricted reciprocity, and carry it into effect, and I will import, with the exception of a few cotton prints, much the same goods from Great Britain that I do now. And then he amplified that, and he ended with the strong statement: "Practically, we will import the very same goods from Great Britain as we do now." Then, if we shall do so, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what *quid pro quo* they expect the United States will get by unrestricted reciprocity, if they carry it out? If the hon. gentleman has as much influence as he has assumption, he has effectually damned unrestricted reciprocity from this hour henceforth and forever. But, fortunately, the hon. gentlemen is only a feather in the tail of the kite, he is only a small portion of the party, and it may be that in the hum and hurry of the discussion his small voice will lack power to reach so far as Washington, and possibly even so far as Bar Harbour.

The hon. gentleman has no faith in humanity; especially humanity on this side of the House, and he never rises but he begins by a profession of faith; his creed is that there is no honesty of purpose on the Conservative side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not state anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. His profession of faith is that there is no good motive, and there is no honest principle on this side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is doing now as he persists in doing whenever he replies to me: he is deliberately misrepresenting my statement. I never made such a statement. On the contrary I have always recognized that there are a very large majority of gentlemen on the other side of the House with whom I have the kindest social relations, and I know that they have just as much honesty of purpose as I have and as my hon. friends have.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has now stated his point of order, and I will leave it even to the very young man from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) to pass his opinion on that point of order from so old and wise and long standing a member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state what I stated before, that I never remember the hon. gentleman rising and making a speech in this House, without his attributing a lack of honesty of motive and principle to this side of the House. He did it to-night; he knows he did it, and he knows he always does it. He knows that when he puts the bridle on his steed and places his foot in the stirrups, he no longer has control of the steed; and if there is any question of public policy of any kind that is proposed and carried out from this side of the House, the hon. gentleman thinks that the best way to meet it is by impeaching the honesty and good motives of its supporters and so he denies that we have any desire for reciprocity on this side of the House. He says that our statement to the contrary is a sham and delusion, and he goes upon that assumption here as in the country. Now, if my hon. friend will take a little advice from one whom he esteems so highly, he possibly will allow me to say to him that he will get along better in this House, better in the world, and at greater peace with his own conscience, what there is of it, if he will just go upon the assumption that there is some honesty, some good motive, and some good principle in other breasts than his own.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the Government plan for reciprocity?

Mr. FOSTER. I really cannot attend to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and answer the philosophizing musings of the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) all at once. One at a time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the Government plan?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you the Government plan before I get through. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davis), before reading an extract from a speech which I made in this House last year, commenced by stating that I had practically

declared that there was no longer any hope of reciprocity being obtained from the United States of America. He went on to read the extract, and the extract simply bore out, what? It bore out this: That I said I saw no particular trend towards reciprocity in my reading of the sentiment of the United States; that from 1866 up to the present time we had been counselled to watch and wait; to go upon the assumption of waiting and watching to see whether or not the United States would not meet us with a reciprocity treaty; and I said that I thought the time had come, and fully come, when we should leave that position, and with the greatest courtesy and good-will possible to the United States, we should do our own fiscal legislating, in our own interest as we saw it from the standpoint of Canadians. That is all I said. That is exactly what I stated, and I think I am perfectly consistent in that respect. Since that time, Sir, a change has taken place, and on the invitation of the United States Government itself we are to send delegates on the 12th day of October to Washington to confer with Mr. Blaine and the President of the United States, and see whether or not we can have framed or formed a reciprocity treaty on the basis which we have set forth in our Order in Council, and which is as plain as it can be made. Now, Sir, having stated this much with reference to the hon. gentleman I leave him. I must, in the next place, say one word with reference to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. His speech was rich and in some respects rare—in its phrasing, in its fine dialectic points, if I may call them so, and in its glittering generalities; but when the hon. gentleman came down to the hard work of practical detail, I do not think I am going too far in saying that, in my opinion, his speech was not so strong as we might expect it to be, from the leader of the Opposition, and for the time being the exponent of the financial and trade policy of that side of the House. He declared that the Government were strong in assertion. He may apply some of that to his own side. I leave it to the judgment of this House, and to the judgment of the country who are looking to the sayings and doings of this House, if they put the speeches which hon. gentlemen have made on the trade question on this side of the House along with the speeches which have been made on the same question on the other side of the House, whether they will pick out more bare and unfounded assertions from those made on this side than from those made on the other side. It is not for me to judge of that; it will be for this House and the country.

The hon. gentleman has said that we went to the country with falsehood and deceit on our lips. That is a strong statement; but did the hon. gentleman back it up? He backed it up by no proof which would be satisfactory to this House or the country. What was the statement with which we went to the country? It was embodied in the Order in Council, it was stated by Sir John Thompson and myself at our first campaign meeting in the city of Toronto, it was stated in the public papers and at other public gatherings, and the gist of it was this, that since 1866 negotiations had been carried on for reciprocity treaties between this country and the United States, but that from that time up to a few weeks ago there had been no showing by the people of the United States of one single favourable opening for the negotiation of such a treaty; but that within the last few weeks, in negotiations which were being carried on with the Island of Newfoundland, in which Canadian interests were very nearly affected, it had come about that Canada had made a protest against certain legislation, and that in the course of these negotiations a door had been opened by the Secretary of State for the United States himself, and an invitation had been given to Canada to send commissioners to Washington for an informal talk and conference with reference to a reciprocity treaty. That in sum and substance is what was stated; that in sum and substance is true; and I am not responsible, and the Government is not responsible, for amplifications of that statement which may be made. But that is the essential truth, and that truth is borne out by the papers which have been brought down to this House. After all, what does it matter whether the negotiation commenced in one way or in another? The whole point is that up to that time there was no door opened by the United States, that at that time the Secretary of State himself invited conference, that since that time the Secretary of State and the President officially have issued a formal invitation, and that on the 12th of October we are to send to Washington a delegation to negotiate, if possible, a treaty of reciprocity upon lines which may seem fair and just—on the basis laid down by the Order in Council which I have quoted here to-night. That is the simple question, and all other is quibbling. But if you wish to go back to that, I say that the bald statement made by the Government is true in every particular, and is carried out by the papers which have been brought down to this House. My hon. friend said that there was an old physician, living long, long ago, I suppose, who for every disease had but one remedy. I think he said that was bleeding; it matters not. That remedy he would call a panacea; and we know that what cures every disease that humanity is heir to is known by that name. Well, Sir, there is a doctor of that class abroad in this country to-day; he is a professor of unrestricted reciprocity. He sits not very far from me in this House, and about opposite to me. He has declared that the farmer is in a terribly doleful state to-day; that nothing will save him but unrestricted reciprocity. Mortgages are cropping up every year; nothing will rid us of them but unrestricted reciprocity. Taxation is heavy and high; the only hope is unrestricted reciprocity. This country is going to the dogs as fast as it can, and is now almost tumbling over the brink of ruin; save it by unrestricted reciprocity. That is what my hon. friend must have had in his mind, which called up the remembrance of the old physician of long ago who had but the one remedy, of bleeding for all diseases. But now, is it not doleful to be told, after all these professors of unrestricted reciprocity have passed through the country exciting the popular sentiment against bloated monopolists, barbarous protection, relics of the middle ages, and worse, declaring that the body politic is diseased all through, and that the only help which can be given is unrestricted reciprocity—is it not sad and doleful to be told now that we must take this remedy in homœopathic doses, one little pill after another, and spread over a long series of year. Why, long before the medicine has had time to take effect the patient may die. We are told now that only one bar at a time

of this Chinese wall that separates us from liberty and life must be taken down, and meanwhile what will become of the hungry and thirsty waiting ones? How absurd, after the preachings and predictions of the last ten years, to tell the mass of the people—even the majority by their own count, who are looking to them as the only saviours of this country, who are to snatch them from this policy of monopoly and ruin, that after all the treatment can only be applied in homœopathic form, and in very small doses at that. My hon. friend lapsed into scripture, and he made a quotation as to Paul at Ephesus preaching against the idolators and stirring up a certain political leader by the name of Demetrius, who was afraid that all the gain he got from making idols and such things would be taken away. My hon. friend went a little too far. Instead of crossing the sea to Ephesus, he should have stopped at Athens and listened to Paul preaching to the people of that great city: and finding that he could do nothing with them, because they had a temple upon which was an inscription, "to the unknown god." As was the case with Paul with the Athenians, so we here can do very little with hon. gentlemen opposite. They have that temple dedicated to the unknown god, and for the last ten years they have been trying amongst them to conjure up a name for that god so that they can place it in their temple under its proper designation.

Then my hon. friend talked for a long while about the power of consumption in this country not being equal to its power of production, and he thought that was a great evil and source of weakness. I hope that the power of consumption in this country will never become equal to its power of production. I certainly hope it will never exceed the power of production, because if it should, how would we live? I suppose it is the chronic condition of all great powers and progressive states that their powers of production exceed their powers of consumption. Now, the hon. gentleman says, as Canada has reached this stage—has it not always reached this stage — when its powers of consumption are no longer equal to its powers of production, a great want is felt, which the Opposition have discovered and that is outside markets to take away our surplus production. And then the hon. gentleman proceeds to treat the working of our policy. We have built up mills under it, and then following the mills came over-production, and then came the combines; and now there is but one way out of the difficulty. We must get rid of that lack of balance between production and consumption, and the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall do so by unrestricted reciprocity, by opening wide the doors between ourselves and the United States, because—whisper it softly—the United States are a country where such a fatal calamity as that of over-production is unknown, where the powers of production do not exceed the powers of consumption, and if once we got there, we would become rich beyond all expectation. My hon. friend talks about woollen mills and cotton mills curtailing their production in this county. But has he never read the New England papers? Does he not know that there has not been a year in the last ten or twelve years, in which there have not been periodical stoppages of the spindles and the mills in the New England States, in order to bring over-production somewhere near to the consumption of the people.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we will be wonderfully benefited. This country which has suffered under the dire calamity of finding its production exceed its consumption, will be wonderfully helped by going in with the United States where the powers of consumption are so great compared with their powers of production, that they are sending hundreds of millions of their surplus products, which they cannot use themselves, to the rest of the world, and products of the very same kind as those of which we have an over-production now. But I want to come down now, if I possibly can, to the very marrow and bone of the policy and procedure of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have two methods of procedure in order to get at the end they have in view. The first is to raise the cry of "wolf, wolf" in this country in order to frighten the people. They try to do that more than in any other way by attacking the National Policy, and once they raise this cry of fear and scare in the country they proceed to dangle before the people that homœopathic panacea, I am sorry to say, of unrestricted reciprocity as the only thing that can bring salvation to the woeful state of affairs which exists in their own imagination, but of which the people as a rule are blissfully ignorant. They attack the National Policy not knowing the strength and fibre of that which they attack. They imagine the National Policy affects merely a set of refiners, of woollen and cotton mill owners, and that when they attack the National Policy, this is the only class they have to deal with in this country. Sir, the National Policy in this country, is not restricted to any class. It has a triple cord of strength in it. The National Policy in this country, began to dawn when we got hold of the broad prairie lands of the North-West. It grew still fuller when we linked British Columbia and that great North-West country to the heart of Canada, with an iron band. It developed itself still more in 1878, when home markets and home production were helped by the introduction of a reasonable and judicious system of protection; and it saw its rounded fulfilment when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, and when our steam communications were provided, and our canal system perfected for internal communication. That is the triple strength of this National Policy. It is to be found in the development of the national resources of this country; it is to be found in the multiplication of means of transport for interprovincial trade, and in the creation of home industries and home production; and it is to be found in the extension of the traffic resulting from the production we have fostered at home by our National Policy, and which overflows and seeks a market in outside countries. That is the National Policy. If you would find its monument in this country, you have simply to look to its results in the particular lines I have spoken of. Look to the Province of British Columbia, and you will find a country growing into new life, with its vast mineral wealth, its grazing lands and fisheries and its growing trade east and west. Look to the North-West which lay there a few years ago in its virgin uselessness, but which to-day, if crop reports speak truly, will send out to the hungr mouths of

Europe 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 bushels of wheat and grain, a fact which would have been to-day impossible, if it had not been for the National Policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. You have to look for its results in our canal and railway system, with the vast interprovincial trade which flows and interflows from one part of this country to the other. Make a calculation, if you like. What advantage would a few millions of foreign trade amount to alongside of this immense interprovincial and local trade? How many families are there in the country? A million. How much do they consume per year? Would it be too much to say that each family and its belongings consume $500 worth per year. That will amount to the immense consumption of $500,000,000, and that is home consumption; and for all that there is coming and going along these great lines of communication of ours this ceaseless intercourse from section to section, this supply calling for demand and demand calling for supply. You have to look for it, Sir, in the multiplied and varied industries of the older provinces of Canada, where busy labour finds its daily wage, and the hum of wheel and spindle and anvil accompanies the transformation of our natural resources into the rich necessaries of our daily life, and the steady accumulations of national wealth. That, Sir, is the National Policy and that is what hon. gentlemen fight against, what they beat against in vain, and what will find its constant defenders in the intelligent electors of this country. Now, let us see what this boasted panacea is; let us come down, if we can, to a close examination of unrestricted reciprocity, and I ask my hon. friends opposite in all candour and earnestness to correct me when I give a wrong definition of what unrestricted reciprocity is. I have sat for fifteen days listening more or less to this debate. I have honestly tried to get at and to frame upon this paper a fair definition of unrestricted reciprocity as it is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I may not have been successful, but I will essay to define what I understand to be unrestricted reciprocity, and I will take it as a favour on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to correct me if I am wrong in my definition. Reference has been made to the change in dress. We may have asked before what unrestricted reciprocity was, and we may have considered that it was a more or less unreasonable proposition; but hon. gentlemen opposite, in the amendment which they proposed as the antidote to our policy, have made it infinitely more absurd and inconsistent than it was before. We find that they have added a rider to it. Why did they add that rider to it? There may have been two reasons. There may have been some restive members of the herd, and this rider may have been added in order to prevent their jumping the enclosure; or they may have thought that, in the bye-elections, it would be convenient to have something put forward by them in Parliament which might mean anything or nothing as they chose to interpret it to the electorate. What is this rider? It proposes to abolish or to reduce the duties on all the necessaries of life which enter into the consumption of four great classes in Canada. Through all the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite, there has been a reprobation, keen and constant, of any duty on the necessaries of life. Every breath which has come from the opposite side has been laden with denunciations of that class of duty, and if the hon. gentlemen had carried the resolution for which they have voted what would it have meant? Nothing less than a total abolition of the duties on the necessaries of life which are used by these four classes of the people. To that policy hon. gentlemen are pledged, and that they can easily carry out if they get into power. They pledge themselves to unrestricted reciprocity. They do not know whether they can carry that out or not. That depends on the will of another country. But this depends simply upon themselves. If they get into power, the first thing they will have to do is to take off the duties on the necessaries of life, whether they get unrestricted reciprocity or not. What will that mean? The moment these gentlemen get into power they take off the duties on the necessaries of life. What is the result? They go to the farmer, for whom they profess so much solicitude, and they say: We do not like these duties on the necessaries of life, and therefore, according to our policy and according to our convictions, we immediately take away the duty on wheat, and we say to you who raise wheat in the North-West, to you who raise wheat in Ontario, to you who raise wheat in Quebec, to you who raise wheat in any part of this country, that the American can bring his surplus wheat into this country free of duty, but, when you take your wheat into the American market, you will have to pay a duty of 25 cents on every bushel you take over there. That is their policy. They desire the good-will themselves of the farmers. This is their commendation. They say, we do not believe in a duty on the necessaries of life. Then the duty must be taken off flour, that is to say, that the milling industries which are fed by the farmers will have the protection taken off their flour, and the American miller can place his flour of all grades free in our market, while our millers will have to pay $1.20 on every barrel they send into the United States. Then they would go to the coal miners of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to the coal miners of British Columbia, to the coal miners of the North-West, men who toil down in the depths of the earth and by hard blows struck in dangerous places make their living and raise these coals to the surface for the production of heat and motive power, and they will say: Toil on and moil on, and, when you have raised your coal to the surface, we will put American coal by the side of it free of duty; but, when you take your coal into the United States you will have to pay 75 cents on every ton. That is the hon. gentlemen's solicitude for the miners of this country. They will go to the hardy fishermen of this country, and they will say: We have love for you, we have said many brave words for you in Parliament, but we believe that the food of this country should be free; you may catch your fish and send it to the United States and pay 1 cent or 1½ cents or ½ a cent duty on it, but the American fishermen may place their fish free of duty in the Canadian market. They will go to the pork raisers in Prince Edward Island, from which my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) comes, and who does not remember that wonderful acrobatic feat of his but a year ago? We have heard something about acrobats in this debate, but here was a free trader who raised his voice constantly against the monstrous tariff and the barbarous system of protection inaugurated by this Government, and yet who went strongly against my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) who is an honest free trader and would

stand by free trade though every fisherman and pork-raiser in the County of Charlotte went against it; and the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island said: I am a free trader on principle, but when it touches my county, I want protection on pork, not 3 cents, but 6 cents per pound. They will go to the pork-raisers of the east and west, and give them the gratifying intelligence that while American pork can come in here free of duty, that for every pound of pork they send into the United States they will have to pay 2 cents. They will have to tell them that bacons and hams will come in here free, but that our bacons and hams going into the American market will have to pay a duty of 5 cents a pound. And so on all through the list. Let me commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have to go to the bye-elections this fall. They have to meet the electorate, and many of them represent agricultural counties. Let them call the farmers together in those counties and say: This is the policy of the party which I support, I am pledged to take off the duties on the necessaries of life, and the moment we get into power we will take off those duties, but at the same time while United States wheat, flour and beef and pork and bacon and hams, potatoes and butter and cheese come in to compete with you free in your own markets you shall not get a pound of all these products into the United States market without paying almost prohibitive duties. This policy, Sir, is not even a jug-handled policy—no, it is a policy which is all handle and no jug to it at all. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to think how they will be able to make such a policy acceptable to the electorate.

But there is a still more absurd phase which has been already alluded to. You take the duties off the prime necessaries of life, and then you go to the United States of America and you say to President Harrison and Mr. Blaine: We want to sit down with you and make a treaty with you. Yes? We want you to let our products into your country free. Yes? And in turn we will give you advantages in our markets. Then comes the question: What are the articles which you propose to let into your country free? The answer will be, pork, wheat, beef, flour and so on. But it will be said: You let them in free now; we have all we want now, and without giving you anything therefor. If that is their policy and if that is carried out, they cut the ground from under their feet and take away the only inducement they have to offer to obtain reciprocity from the United States. That cuts the ground from under their feet in regard to natural products. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has already cut the ground away in regard to manufactured goods coming from Great Britain. Then there is nothing left. Ignominy and defeat would be nothing compared to the reception which would meet any set of men who would go to Washington to negotiate a treaty on such a basis as that.

Now, Sir, let us ask what unrestricted reciprocity is? What it was, is now no longer the question; what it is, is the burning question, and what it was and what it is, are two things very different. May I be permitted to define what it is, and will my hon. friends recall me quickly to the right path if I step out of it in the way of definition? When you get unrestricted reciprocity you will have freedom of intercourse between the United States and Canada in all natural products of each country. I am right in that, there is no doubt about it. All the things that are grown in the United States of America will come into Canada free; everything produced in Canada as a natural product will go into the United States free. That is the first principle, we are all agreed on that. Secondly, all goods manufactured from what is grown and produced in the United States will come into this country free; all goods manufactured from what is grown and produced in this country will go into the United States free—there is no doubt about that. I will go one step further to make my definition more clear. All foreign products or manufactures will come into each country subject to the tariff of that country. Those going into the United States will pay the United States' duty; those coming into Canada will pay the Canadian duty. There can be no doubt at all on those three statements. Natural products free both ways; all manufactures from natural products of the two countries, free both ways; all foreign goods, whether natural or manufactured, pay the duty each country imposes upon them. Here is where my doubt arises. Suppose that we do not grow a certain thing in this country, do not raise it, do not make it, such, for instance, as tin-plate——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Cotton.

Mr. FOSTER. Such, for instance, as cotton, to take the nearer object to my hon. friend. We do not grow cotton in this country; it is therefore not a product of Canada. When that comes into Canada, not being a product of Canada, can we take it and make it up in our manufactories and take it across the border free of duty? I ask my hon. friend to set my harassing doubts at rest upon that point.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman will only look at the different treaties negotiated between civilized nations, he will have no difficulty at all in solving that question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just about the definiteness that I expected in the answer of the hon. gentleman. I wished, however, to give him a chance to make a clear and honest declaration upon this subject, for once in his life, and he has failed to do it. Let me take that definition of his before the honest elector of this country, whether he is in city or country; when he puts that question to me, as he will and must, if he does his duty to himself and to his country, and I shall have to answer him: Sir, I cannot tell you; but I asked the originator of the scheme, the great physician who is to administer this wonderful panacea in homœopathic drops—I asked him before the high court of Parliament, in face of the whole country, and he had no answer to give, or he would not give it if he had, except this: You will have to look, my dear farmer friend, my dear artizan friend, to the treaties which have been passed between civilized nations.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows that the question he puts to me is a matter of agreement. It is a matter of agreement, and it is impossible to say upon such a question of detail, what the agreement will be or will not be. That has to be decided by both nations.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the position the hon. gentleman proposes to take on that class of materials?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How does the hon. gentleman propose to work out his own theory?

Mr. FOSTER. From whichever leader I ask the question, I cannot get an answer.

Mr. McMILLAN. If you go to Washington what position will you take?

Mr. FOSTER. The same indefiniteness which marked the campaign for unrestricted reciprocity from the time it commenced last year until it closed, still continues in the House. I thought when we came to Parliament and brought the men face to face with us, with an honest desire to make clear before the country what they proposed to have the electors vote upon, I thought we should get down to a firm, clear definition that would leave no man in doubt. But the same game is to be played on this point that was played on the point of discrimination, that was played upon my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who is so quietly resting in his chair yonder. The hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) said to-night: It has always been known that unrestricted reciprocity implied discrimination. The hon. gentleman from Huntingdon did not know it—did not know it after the election was through, and I do not know whether he knows it yet. But I know he has heard the declarations from his own leaders, and if he does not know it, he ought to know it. I am looking with interest to see how he will vote on this resolution. Discrimination was held up in this uncertain way, now dangled down and now dangled up, and with what effect? That in the city of St. John the lights and leaders of the Opposition party publicly and privately declared to the people, on the hustings and in the shops, that there would be no discrimination against England. In just the same manner direct taxation is being dangled before the country, and will be, I suppose, as long as this fad is in vogue, although down in the Maritime Provinces we had men declaring everywhere that no direct tax would be put on this country. A few days ago we heard the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) declaring, in his sturdy, honest way—and I honour him for it—that the party which makes direct taxation one of the planks in its platform, signs its political death warrant. And yet, Sir, I ask that hon. gentleman if he has found in the preachments and predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite during this whole debate, one single word of comfort to his harassed soul; have his leaders pointed out to him any possible way by which the vast amount of revenue that must be lost, can be made good without resorting to direct taxation? But, Sir, I am off my track. I knew I should not get a plain answer to my question. I must come back to the subject of cotton and wool, and as my hon. friend will not give me a direct answer, as he parries that question, let me show him what it means. It will be the one thing or the other, I suppose. Either cotton, not being a product of Canada, can be manufactured here and go free into the United States or it cannot. In either case what will happen? I will first reason on the assumption that a product of another country, when it comes into this country, cannot be made up in our manufactories and then carried into the United States market free of duty. What will happen if it cannot? You will have the most one-sided free trade and the most one-sided reciprocity that I ever heard of being put before any people.

Mr. ALLISON. Could we not get a set-off to this article? Do we not allow the Americans to get lumber from this country and manufacture it into machinery, and send that machinery back here now?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and we tax it.

Mr. ALLISON. Could we not do it just as well if there was no tax?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. So cotton could come here and be manufactured and carried back there, just as well as timber can be manufactured there and the product brought back here?

Mr. FOSTER. I see that my hon. friend must soon be promoted to a front seat. My hon. friend is at least honest in his desire to impart knowledge. He at least gives what he thinks is a true solution. The difference between timber and cotton, however, is that both countries grow timber, and only one country grows cotton. Now, I am putting this proposition. Products that are not native to this country coming in here and being made up, will not pass free into the United States of America; products not natural to the United States of America, coming into the United States, will not be made up and pass free into this country. What will happen? Again, an astonishing one-sidedness. We raise no cotton, they raise cotton in the United States. Put on unrestricted reciprocity; and if this is the condition, what happens? That every cotton mill in this country will at once shut up. Why? Because the cotton is a native product of the United States; they will make it up in the United States mills, and it will come into this country free. It is not a native product here; it must be brought here and made up in our mills, and when our cottons go to the United States they will meet with duties equal to 40, 50, 60, or 75 per cent. That is what will happen. Take the article of wool. The wools raised in the United States and in Canada are not sufficient for either country, and they have to be imported here very largely. In the United States there is, however, a large wool production; in this country there is a small wool production. The producer of wool in the United States makes it into woollen cloths, which will come into this country free. We make up wool, which we import from a foreign country, as we have to import it, and when our wool manufacturers take their goods to the American boundary they will be met by a tariff running up to 150 per cent. or more. That is a beautiful kind of reciprocity. Take the tobacco trade. The United States raise a great variety of tobaccos, and of good qualities. The Americans manufacture tobacco, it being a product of that country, and it will come into this country free. We raise some tobacco, but not nearly sufficient. It is brought in here as a foreign product; it is made up here, but it will be met on the American border by a prohibitory tariff of $2.75 per pound. I could easily go through the catalogue. That would be a fine kind of reciprocity; that would not only not be unrestricted reciprocity, but it would be the most one-sided proposal that any party or any man has ever submitted for the ap-

proval of the intelligent electors and asked their support for it. I take now the other side of the question, that these products of other countries coming in here raw, afterwards pass as our manufactured goods free into another country; each side to hold control of its own tariff. What would happen? Take tin-plate. The United States duty, which is now in force, is 2½ cents, a prohibitive duty and meant to be so. They are endeavouring to make tin-plates out of their own ores and are seeking to build up that manufacture in their own country. What will happen? All we have to do is to import tin-plate free, as it is to-day on the free list, and we can manufacture the tinware for the United States in spite of any competition. Will the United States agree to that? And so you may take article after article on that side of the argument. Whichever horn of the dilemma you take, you are, on this ground of control of the tariff, led into a difficulty from which no hon. member on the other side has attempted to relieve us, and which no one has attempted to explain, and which I believe is beyond the bounds of practical statesmanship. Let me go one point further. If we had control of our own tariff, how can the United States be sure of any compensation for any treaty it may make? If it makes a treaty with us for unrestricted reciprocity, the Americans will look over the list and say: We will get entrance to the Canadian market with great advantage to our manufacturers, because they have a tariff against outside manufacturers; we will consequently gather, if we have no duties to pay, the largest part of that trade in manufactured products; we will give Canada in return certain advantages by way of compensation. The treaty is made and goes into force for 10 years. We have control of our own tariff. Immediately we take the duty off hardware. What *quid pro quo* does the United States obtain on manufactured hardware in this market if we, having control of our own tariff, take off or lower the duty on British hardware? The United States is robbed of the advantage they expected to derive by our allowing their manufactures of hardware to come into this country free of duty. The United States would be arrant fools if they were to make a treaty with us, the fundamental principle of which was a certain compensation for their manufactured goods, then give us control of our own tariff, as at present, so that, if we wish, we could let in British manufactures or those of other countries free or at very low duties, and take away every coign of vantage which the United States had expected to secure from this country. It would not be honest treatment, it would not be proper treatment, and the United States would never make a treaty upon lines which could leave such a course open to us.

Mr, MILLS (Bothwell). It is so good you are opposed to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking simply of the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me ask the attention of hon. members to some figures. The imports of hardware from the United States last year were of the value of $4,900,000. The value of imports of similar goods from other countries was $5,600,000. What was more fair than for the United States in making a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity to say: We sent $5,000,000 of hardware to Canada last year; that country obtained $5,500,000 worth from other countries besides; let us in free of duty and we will take the hardware market. But we have control of our tariff, and we will let other countries in on the same terms as the United States if we please, or we will lower the duty nearly to the notch of nothing, and the United States so far from getting its $5,500,000 more from hardware will get nothing or next to nothing. So you may go through a long list. With respect to raw material, I have already taken that up and dealt with it. What I want to point out is this, and I ask hon. gentlemen to gainsay it if they can, that a fixity of tariff is the essential condition of any treaty of reciprocity, unrestricted or not, and for the period that treaty exists a tariff must be fixed at the first and must be kept to the last, except upon mutual understanding and agreement of both parties; and there is no possible means of obtaining a reciprocity treaty outside of that. I say more. The very moment my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stated here, so differently from what he is reported to have said in the country, that we are, as a fundamental point in unrestricted reciprocity, to keep perfect control of our own tariff, that very moment he read his whole case out of court in the United States. Every paper hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted, every statesman they have called their ally, and every public man who has deigned to notice the proposals of hon. gentlemen opposite, has made it a fundamental condition of considering the proposition that there shall be a uniform tariff made by common consent. I go further than that. I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite, who are good at quoting, to quote one single statement, one single resolution of a board of trade, one single utterance of any newspaper which will give them warrant for saying that, with the tariff under the control of this country, they can get the slightest shred of public opinion in the United States in favour of their proposition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are you going to do?

Mr. FOSTER. I am criticizing what the hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to do. When this question came up the Halifax *Chronicle*, the organ of the party in Nova Scotia, and the St. John *Telegraph*, the organ of the party in New Brunswick, came out flat-footed against the proposition of adopting an uniform tariff and having the United States fix it in common with this country, and said "we must keep control of our own tariff." What said the New York *Tribune?* Taking up that point, this influential Republican paper and organ of the party said:

"It [the Halifax *Morning Chronicle*] argues in favour of unrestricted and absolute reciprocity between Canada and the United States, with each country at liberty to adopt such tariff as it may prefer, and represents this, and no more than this, as the deliberate purposes of one party in the Canadian contest. If this is the fact, one party of Canadians closely resemble the baby which cried for the moon and got into a rage because the moon would not consent to be grasped. This nation has not the slighest notion of allowing Canada to open the back door as wide as it may please, while tariff enactments by the United States are closing the front door against sundry importations at New York and Boston. If any one is silly enough to suppose such a plan is entertained by Americans, he does not live in this country. All such representations may as well be put aside as utterly and widely at variance with anything Americans can possibly be brought to adopt."

Sir, the latest declaration by the hon. leader in this House, an authoritative declaration, recorded in *Hansard*, taken down by an English reporter, and

placed where it can be revised, stands, and cannot be contradicted, and the fundamental position is this: The control of their own tariff in their settlement of unrestricted reciprocity. To-day they have read their case out of courts in the United States of America; they have no longer the shred of a warrant for supposing that it will meet with any acceptance there. Now, Sir, what does this unrestricted reciprocity involve? I am going now to take up the arguments of my hon. friend opposite to me (Sir Richard Cartwright). It involves several things. First, it involves discrimination against England. There is no necessity for my going into that point, for it has been well gone into, but I wish to read what is the definition of this given by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He has spoken out plainly, he has made all his arguments in favour of discrimination, and then he declared:

"We do not propose to discriminate against Great Britain *per se*, but we propose to enter into a treaty of commercial relations with the United States, whereby certain privileges will be given by Canada to the United States, and by the United States to Canada, against all the world."

The hon. gentleman has been bolder; he has stated in this House in less equivocal language, he has declared the same in the county that they do intend to discriminate against Great Britain. Now he puts it in the negative way; but what child's play. What is the use of putting in *per se*—saying on one hand that he does not intend to discriminate against Great Britain *per se*, and saying in the same breath that he intends to give the United States advantages against the rest of the world, including Great Britain. Most certainly, discrimination is to-day nailed upon the topmost fold of their flag. They intend then to discriminate against Great Britain. Now, I want to ask the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who devoted some attention to me a little while ago, who tried to make me out very inconsistent upon the temperance question: I want to ask him now what he proposes to do about it? My hon. friend cannot plead ignorance any more. There is his leader, and he has heard his leader's statements to-day; there is his financial leader (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he has heard his statements the other day; there is his co-worker (Mr. Davies), and he has heard his statement to-night, to the effect that they will discriminate against England; and here is the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) read before the electors of the County of Huntingdon, after the smoke of the battle of the 5th March has passed away, and he said then:

"Leaving the electoral lists, I take up the issues upon which the election is being fought out, and find the main question to be one of trade—that of reciprocity. Persistent efforts have been made to misrepresent the position of Reformers with regard to reciprocity, it being alleged we were willing to consent to a free exchange of commodities with our neighbours on conditions none ever pledged themselves to, never declared, and do not now. We do not seek, nor will we consent, to reciprocity on the terms our opponents allege, namely, uniformity of tariff and discrimination against Great Britain. You will not find in any announcement of principles by the Reform party that it ever proposed to accept the American tariff as the price of reciprocity. And I am free to say, that had the Liberals gone into power and negotiations been opened Reformers would never have consented to accept reciprocity, if doing so entailed placing Canada under the American tariff or discrimination against the mother country. Liberals are just as loyal as their opponents, and will consent to no act of injustice to Great Britain, and any arrangement that may be made with the United States will render our markets as accessible to the mother country."

Now, I have read this as the statement attributed to my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver). He rises in his place, and he can say whether that represents his convictions or not.

Mr. SCRIVER. It did fairly and fully; and it represents my views now.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is related not very far back to my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). They come from the same kind of stock; they get up and state exactly what they mean, and in doing so they cut themselves loose from this hour forward from the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, as defined by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, as defined by the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as defined by the leader from the Maritime Provinces—I speak with bated breath in the presence of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser)—the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies.) Now, then, we will be anxious to see what the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) means to do about it. Will he be inconsistent? Will he swallow his expression and his opinions, and vote for discrimination against the mother country on the ground that we have a perfect right to, and that if it hurts the mother country, so much the worse for the mother country. Well, we will see, we will see.

Mr. SCRIVER. Yes; you will see.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Sir, I wish just to note one argument of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He says upon this question of discrimination: Your tariff discriminates against Great Britain to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it does.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says, so it does. When the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) stated that it did discriminate against Great Britain I said it did not. I said it almost with bated breath, but I managed to pluck up courage enough to say it, and he replied that I would deny anything. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says it does discriminate. Now, it depends entirely upon his point of view, and I know exactly what his point of view is, but I mean to say this: that we are men and not children, and that we ought to talk about facts and not quibble about words. I say to my hon. friend that the difference between the two policies is simply this: When an exporter of hardware from Great Britain brings his goods to a port in Canada, and an exporter of the same class of hardware in the United States brings his goods to the same port, under the present tariff, both are on an even scale and pay exactly the same duty. But I say, that under this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, if a British manufacturer of hardware comes to the port of Halifax or Quebec, and enters his hardware, he will pay a duty of 20, or 30, or 40 per cent., and when an American comes over with the same class of hardware he gets it into the markets of this country without a cent of duty. That is the difference. You may quibble about discrimination as long as you like, but that is the common sense view, the view that this House will take and the view that the country will take. There is no discrimination in our present tariff *per se*, to borrow a word from my hon.

friend; the same classes of goods, come from where they may, pay exactly the same duty. You may just as well say that we discriminate in favour of the West India Islands, because the West Indies, geographically and economically, are situated so that they do not send to us manufactured goods, but raw materials, the most of which we let in free. But that is simply quibbling; the main, honest position is what I have exactly stated with reference to this policy. Now, then, Sir, we come to the question of loss of revenue; and if there was anything that would make one consume himself with laughter it was the way in which my genial and eloquent friend, the leader of the Opposition, treated this question of loss of revenue in his speech to-day. What did he say? Well, he says: Now come to revenue, which is the sticking point in this question, especially with the Minister of Finance; how much will we lose? $8,100,000 he says; these are the duties from the United States. Well, he says, suppose we do lose that; will there not be so much taxation saved to the country? Certainly there will, but how does that help the loss to the revenue? What we are talking about is not the saving to the people, but how you are to make up the loss of the revenue. Then, he says, a part of the English taxes we lose, and how does he make up for that? By the fact that the people will be richer than they were before. How will that help the revenue if they buy more goods which come in free and less goods which are highly taxed? But I must come to my hon. friend from South Oxford to get at the beauties of this argument. To the question as to how the loss of revenue is to be made up he answers: Use your surplus. The hon. gentleman knew, when he said that, that by my own calculations given in this House, the surplus of this year will be *nil*, or almost *nil*. He knows that we have taken off $3,500,000 of taxation and put on only $1,500,000, and I propose to make ends meet by economy; and that is all. When my hon. friend said: Use your surplus for a part of the loss, he knew at the moment that there would be no surplus to use in making up the loss of revenue. Then, he says we will not spend $1,400,000 in keeping up railways and canals. Well, we do not spend that much. I can take no meaning out of that remark but this, that if you take the expenditure on canals and railways for maintenance and running expenses and compare it with the revenue there is a deficit of $1,400,000; but such is not the case; the whole deficit is less than $900,000, and the hon. gentleman would economize by putting the figure of the actual deficit at $500,000 more than it is and saving the imaginary deficit. Then my hon. friend says, we will not spend $1,000,000 for Indians. We will not? Then, we will repudiate our treaties with our Indians and the fair and reasonable expense for them. Let me tell this House that the country will watch with great care and scrutinize keenly the policy of any gentleman or party who propose to deal in a niggardly fashion with the Indians, once the owners of all this great domain and all the enormous resources of the country, and now the wards of the nation, and will expect them to be treated in an honourable and generous way. I challenge the hon. gentleman to look after the Indian bands throughout the country and observe treaty rights, and do it on much less than $1,000,000. Then, he says, we will not spend $1,000,000 on the Mounted Police. There is another peculiarity of his finance. We spent only $750,000 last year, and the hon. gentleman puts the expenditure at $250,000 above the actual figure, and by such a simple expedient he proposes to make up the loss of revenue, a very easy method, but presenting practical difficulties which even he may find it hard to meet. Again, he says: You can do what you have just done: you have put $1,500,000 of taxation upon malt liquors, tobaccos and spirits and you can make up for loss of revenue by a further increase of the Excise taxes. My hon. friend is going to have unrestricted reciprocity. Is he going to have unrestricted reciprocity in beer, in spirits and tobacco, or not? Is he going to cut off these great branches of trade, or have unrestricted reciprocity in them? One thing or the other. If he is going to have unrestricted reciprocity in them he will lose a deal of revenue instead of gaining; and if he is not going to have unrestricted reciprocity in them, I ask him how much more Excise he can put upon those articles? The Excise duty to-day is very much higher than is the similar Excise duty in the United States. We stand to lose in the Excise duties under his scheme rather than to gain. So I suppose I have taken away the resources of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who was going to avail himself of these means of making up the loss of revenue. Then, he says we can economize in many other ways, but he does not specify in what respects. But his important argument is that we will be richer. Grant that I am worth $5,000 this year and that I will be worth $10,000 next year; when the same class of goods are placed before me, one having no duty upon it and the other having a duty, am I, just because I am a rich man, going to buy the goods on which there is a duty, instead of buying what I can get to the best advantage? That would be well, provided the hon. gentleman made a law that the rich people must purchase a certain proportion of the manufactured goods on which heavy duties were imposed: but if that were done, what would become of that old adage of his that we should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. But I want to ask one more question. The hon. gentleman stated, and I have it here in black and white, that what the country will lose will be $8,000,000; what the people will gain will be $16,000,000. My hon. friend cannot get away from that statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will gain more.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not quarrel with the hon. gentleman as to what they will gain. The question is what we shall lose in point of revenue, and the hon. gentleman says it is $8,000,000. Now, my hon. friend is too old and experienced a financier not to know that he will lose more than $8,000,000. Let me tell him what he will lose. He will lose $8,220,000 on United States imports alone, on a parity of the imports of last year. He will lose the duties paid on all goods from other countries, which will no longer come when there is a duty against them, while the same classes of goods come from the United States without any duty at all. I hold in my hand a statement of all the imports for the year ending 30th June, 1890, and what do I find? I find that in manufactures of brass from the United States we imported $340,000 worth, and from other countries $120,000 worth. Let the American brass manufactures come in free and put a duty of 35 per cent. against all

other countries, and how much of the dutiable articles will come in competition with the free articles of the same class? Does not my hon. friend see that he will have to lose the major part, perhaps all of that? Take the article of buttons. We imported from the United States $80,000 worth, and from other countries $198,000 worth. Let the buttons from the United States come in free and keep the duty upon buttons from other countries, and a large proportion of that import will cease. Take cotton manufactures. Last year we imported from the United States $748,000 worth, and $3,214,000 from other countries. Keep your duty of 50 per cent. or so against the manufactures of other countries, while those from the United States come in free, and I want to know how much duty-paid cotton importations will come into the country. And so you may go through the whole list, and you will find, when you come to the end of it, that from articles brought from the United States and articles brought from other countries, equal classes of manufactures in the main, we get duties equal to $8,000,000 from the United States, and equal to $15,750,000 from other countries; and I take the calculation as a reasonable one, that if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity, if we keep up our duties against other countries but abolish them as regards the United States, we will lose at least two-thirds of the duties we now collect on goods coming in from Great Britain. That is $6,000,000 we will lose on duties in connection with our trade with Great Britain. On goods from other countries, besides Great Britain, we collect duties amounting to $6,210,000. We have already dropped a third of these by striking off the sugar duties. We will drop at least $1,000,000 more, and that would leave only $3,000,000 from that source, leaving to be got from the entire duties, under this calculation, and I am prepared to trust it, a total of $18,000,000 under unrestricted reciprocity. I invite my hon. friend to answer that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is too childish to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I invite my hon. friend to show how he proposes to put a high tariff wall against other countries and let in goods free from the United States, that great manufacturing country, and expect to get the same duties on our importations from other countries which we do now. We would not get the same amount of duties, or anything like. Sir, the hon. gentleman will have then a revenue of about $18,000,000 on the present scale of duties. What has he to meet? He will have to meet interest charge and sinking fund, which are as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, if we do not intend to repudiate, amounting to $11,800,000. He will have to meet provincial subsidies, which are now $4,000,000, but which will be $6,000,000, after hon. gentlemen opposite get through one winter's legislation. Because, Sir, talk as you may about being tied up or owned by a chattel mortgage or anything of that kind, the hon. the leader of the Opposition has pledged himself to Mr. Mercier, and he stands or falls by his pledge in Quebec, and his party stands or falls with him on this pledge, he has pledged himself that when he obtains power in Ottawa he will add $2,000,000 to the provincial subsidies; and this is not the assertion of a newspaper, but the deliberate statement of the leader of the Opposition, made this session from his seat on the opposite side of the House. He will have to meet for collection of revenue, which is almost entirely for the railways and canals and post offices, which, I do not suppose, he intends to skimp, $9,000,000, making a total of $27,000,000 required to meet costs and charges which cannot be escaped; and all he will have to meet them with is $18,000,000 revenue. That leaves him with a deficit of $9,000,000. And then what has he to face? He has to face the Indian expenditure, which is about $1,000,000; the Administration of Justice, which is about $700,000; Civil Government, $1,300,000; Legislation, $932,000; Penitentiaries, $350,000; Militia, $1,300,000; Police, $750,000; Lighthouse and Coast service, $500,000; Immigration, etc., $300,000; Public Works, $1,500,000. Public works he may reduce by skimping these works, but if he attempts to do that he will have the hon. member for Brant (M. Paterson) to reckon with, because that hon. gentleman warned us that we were not going to get any quarter or credit on account of any economy we might effect in reducing the public works of the country, which must be necessarily carried on. Ocean and river service, $400,000; Fisheries $320,000, making a total of $9,500,000. Add that to the deficit and we find that makes $18,000,000 which he will have to make up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend can call "hear, hear," until doomsday, but I ask him to set himself down to the work of practically disproving this calculation. Let him show by any process of practical calculation how anything else can take place under his plan. I ask the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), who has given this House his convictions with reference to direct taxation, to look into that question and to ask his leaders, before he follows them any longer in this policy, how they are going to make up that deficiency of $18,000,000 without resorting to direct taxation? Direct taxation—it is in the air, and if it is not in the air, there is a practical necessity stronger than the fates of old which sat relentless above the will of men and gods, which will drive them on to direct taxation in spite of themselves if once they adopt unrestricted reciprocity. There is no other way to meet the deficit that is bound to occur. Let them put a higher tax on manufactured goods, and see how that will work. Every ten per cent. they add, say on hardware coming from Great Britain, while they allow hardware from the United States in free, will simply raise the wall of prohibition against English goods still higher, and prevent their importation to the advantage of the American manufacturer. There will be no door open out of the difficulty but direct taxation. My hon. friend from South Oxford has stated over and over again that nothing but the incomprehensible stupidity of the people of Canada prevents them from adopting direct taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend very smilingly and earnestly gives in his adhesion to this principle, but the people of Canada, under the training of hon. gentlemen opposite, are not going to remain incomparably stupid all these years. They will become educated; but I wish to ask the hon. member for Iberville what he thinks now of the

hon. and gallant knight who cries "hear, hear" in echoing the sentiment which dubs that hon. gentleman and those who do not believe in direct taxation in this country as incomprehensibly stupid. Surely I count in vain on the independence of the back benches on the other side if I do not see in this and succeeding votes these worthy men, the men from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), and Iberville (Mr. Béchard), and Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), rising up and denouncing this discriminating, this direct taxation-breeding policy, which is fathered by the leader of the Opposition and the men in the front benches. Leaving that subject for a moment, let me go one step further. After having taken up so long the time of the House I must bring my remarks to a speedy close, but I wish simply to direct public attention to this incomprehensible muddle of a policy, incomprehensible even to the leader of the Opposition himself—so incomprehensible that when a fair question which a child might ask and any person might answer, was put to him, he had to take refuge behind a stilted, stultifying phrase about treaties between civilized governments, in order to conceal his lack of knowledge or lack of candour, and such a policy is the best outcome of four years of their best political thought and genius. We have weighed these gentlemen in every balance necessary, and the country has weighed them. They had a period of maintenance and administration, if you choose, and in the five years of their administration what happened? Taxation was heaped up by $3,000,000 and more; revenue went down; trade went down; the trade prospects of the country grew duller each year; surplus faded away into deficits; the public debt grew apace, and the whole financial and commercial body politic was sick and diseased throughout. These hon. gentlemen could find no other resource in their brilliant and administrative genius than to simply say we will pile on the taxes and trust in Providence. That was their period of administration. They were weighed and found wanting. They have another policy, that of destructiveness. That is the policy they carried out in 1872, and under the breath of a scandal mostly created and fanned by themselves they succeeded in getting into power, through their destructive tactics, through their power of pulling down and tearing to pieces. Since that they have tried their policy of destructiveness on several occasions. They tried it in 1878, they tried it in 1882, they tried it in 1887, and they tried it in 1891, and they failed. And now, within this last four years they have attempted to adopt a constructive policy; and here you have it in this anomalous, indescribable, indefinite, misty absurdity, which they have named unrestricted reciprocity, and that is all they have to show us for four years of constructiveness on the part of a great political party.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. On the top of all this, my hon. friend who cries "hear, hear"—and I expect to receive another salvo from him—says: Instead of the Government's policy, "we offer a clear-cut, rational and distinct policy."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear. We do not offer you the power of understanding it. That is impossible.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, this is the clear-cut, distinct plan and the rational policy which they offer. When asked for what it is, they simply say, as one child does to another: Just shut your mouth and open your eyes and we will give you something to make you wise. They say "We are not bound to explain—let us over on that side and we will show you what our policy is." They show their incapacity in nothing more than in this. Those hon. gentlemen cannot hoodwink in this manner the people of Canada in this 19th century. The artizans and all classes of the community, before they will let them tear down their national house, want to know what kind of building he is going to put up to shelter them. Before they take hold of the ship of state, before they undertake to guide it, some of them at the helm and some on the bridge, the hardy navigators will want to know what kind of diplomas these men have. The people want your policy; they asked for it at the polls last March, and they will ask for it when you go to them again, and you will never get the voice of the people by simply saying: We have no explanation to offer. In contradistinction to their indefinite policy, this side offers to the country a distinct policy, a policy that is known as the National Policy, a policy which is known by its results during twelve years of steady upbuilding and improvement of this country, a policy which is based upon the development of our resources, upon the creation of home industries and of home markets, and upon the gradual widening and broadening of interprovincial trade and the overflow therefrom of trade to other countries. That is what we offer against this shifting, indefinite thing which is christened on the other side by the name of unrestricted reciprocity. Here is something which the people have tried and which they have before them in entity and substance, a policy which has grown up the form and embodiment of great and almost unparalleled progress amongst themselves. With this National Policy, with this development of our natural resources, with this development of interprovincial trade, there is also the desire to widen the bounds of commerce on every side. With the United States? Yes, and on the principles laid down in the Order in Council, taking the basis of the treaty of 1854, and adding to it whatever may be agreed upon by the commissioners appointed on both sides as being in the interests of both countries. That is a policy as plain as can be laid down. No one should be asked to say more than that in going into a trade negotiation with another country; and, however hon. gentlemen opposite may refuse to attribute to us an honest desire to carry out this policy, as they will in their Christian charity and their distinguished probity, the Government knows that the party behind it will trust it, because it reflects the opinions of the men who support it. On our previous record and on this policy we propose to ask the House and the country to support and sustain us, and not support the policy which is propounded by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is one other allusion that may be pardoned to me. Over across the sea there is a market which some hon. gentlemen have thought it not wrong to speak slightingly of. They have spoken much of the interests of Canada, and have said that we should go where the interests of Canada lead us. So we should; but the fundamental opinion of gentlemen on this side of the House is that Canadian interests join us in an identity of interests with Great Britain, and when

hon. gentlemen opposite stand up in their sturdy independence for the rights and privileges of Canada, I stand with them; but we believe on this side that Canadian interests are best subserved by our keeping in touch and unison with the interests of the Empire, and not by putting ourselves in the power of another nation. The market on the other side of the ocean has been wonderfully developed in late years in regard to several of the great staples of our country. It is not long ago that that trade was in its infancy, and now it has reached vast proportions, and our cattle, our cheese and other products are finding a limitless market in Great Britain. There is no reason why that should not be further developed. There is no reason why our butter should not take the same position in Great Britain which Canadian cheese has taken, and it is taking it and will take it under the intelligent and educative methods which are being carried on now by the Department of Agriculture. So it is with other branches of our trade, and this leads up to my thought, which is, that we may well put by the side of this empty, uncertain, indefinite something with the United States of America proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite an alternative infinitely higher, infinitely more in bodily form and certain prospect, and ask the people to choose between the two. This alternative, Sir, is the prospect of wider, fuller, richer trade relations with Great Britain. Why not? Here we have limitless lands waiting for the cultivator; there are the congested districts and the overcrowded populations. Here you find the lack of capital; there you have wealth in abundance. Here we have an almost unlimited source of supply and there an almost limitless demand. Between us we have the broad and facile ocean, over which transit is becoming easier and cheaper every year; in both countries there is the same indomitable spirit and mettle; both inherit the same historic past, contemplate a common and boundless prospect for the future. I do not despair that in these times, when revolutions in trade, in thought, in economics, come about with the swiftness of electricity, that there may soon strike the flash of a common thought, the conviction of a common interest, and the sentiment of a world-wide loyalty, which will fuse all seemingly diverse interests into one and establish between Canada and the mother land, by favourable legislation, one great inflow and outflow of commerce, embracing the products and providing for the wants of the British Empire through and through, uniting heart and extremities in one great bond of trade union, which shall bid defiance to the world, and add the fresh life-blood of health and happiness and prosperity to every portion of the Empire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have listened with the very closest attention to the speech of the Minister of Finance, and I must say that although the hon. gentleman has often addressed extraordinary statements to the House, I think the speech he has just delivered contains a larger number of extraordinary statements than all the other speeches he has made during the period that he has had a seat in Parliament. The hon. gentleman has told the House that we did not explain or define our policy, and he expressed a great deal of regret in regard to that matter. He presented all sorts of hypothetical views as to the disasters which would be brought about by the policy which my hon. friend and those associated with him have advocated in the House and in the country. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman was careful, from beginning to end of his speech, not to say what was the object of the mission to Washington, or for what purpose the hon. gentleman and some one of his colleagues, or some other party on behalf of the Government, intended to visit Washington in October. Surely that hon. gentleman and his colleagues are responsible for the administration of public affairs, and it was his duty to state to the House for what purpose he intended visiting the capital of the neighbouring republic in October next. Sir, the hon. gentleman and the late leader of his party informed the country that Parliament was dissolved for the purpose of taking the opinion of the country upon the policy of the Government with reference to the subject of reciprocity. The country could not pronounce upon the policy of hon. gentlemen upon that subject, because the country did not know what the policy of hon. gentlemen was. The hon. gentleman has very frequently declared against reciprocity with the neighbouring republic; the hon. gentleman had told the House that the country lying nearest to us was not our natural market, nor our best market; and a colleague of the hon. gentleman, in the session previous to this, entered into an elaborate discussion for the purpose of showing the disasters which would befall the farmers of this country if we had free trade with the neighbouring republic. Now, with this declaration of a Minister of the Crown who still retained his position in the Cabinet at the time of the election, with the declaration by the Minister of Finance himself, with the views that have been elaborately put forward by hon. gentlemen who support the Government, what was the country to suppose the hon. gentlemen meant when they said they were going to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty of reciprocity? Why, Sir, it was impossible that the country could form an intelligent opinion, and we supposed that the hon. gentleman, when this subject came under discussion in this House, would undertake to give the House and the country, through his speeches here in Parliament, that information which he failed to give to the country during the recent election. I have listened to the hon. gentleman to-night, and I must say that I am not any more enlightened at this moment than I was when he began his speech. Surely, it was of the first consequence to the House and to the country that the hon. gentleman, who is responsible for the administration of public affairs at this time, should have informed us as to the advantages he expected to derive from the negotiation of a treaty of reciprocity. The hon. gentleman has told us of the disaster that would befall this country if there was reciprocal free trade in certain natural products; he has told us what disasters would befall this country if there was reciprocal free trade in certain manufactured products. Well, if the hon. gentleman thinks that reciprocity would give rise to these disasters, he was in duty bound to give to the House information as to why he thought no disadvantage or no injury would flow from the negotiations which he contemplated. What are to be the articles of free exchange he has not informed us. Does the hon. gentleman

contemplate these negotiations still? Sir, we have but to look at the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to see with how much reluctancy that visit to Washington was made. The hon. gentleman and his friends met in the eastern portion of the Dominion; they found there was unrest, there was distrust, and as a result of that visit the hon. gentleman undertook to traverse the Southern Atlantic. He went to the Windward Islands, and to the Leeward Islands, and to the mainland, and he undertook negotiations with various parties; he sought to establish free trade, from such extraordinary disasters as, in his opinion, are likely to arise if such trade is adopted with the neighbouring republic. I say he sought to establish free trade with certain communities in the West India Islands. Well, Sir, his mission was not successful. The hon. gentleman promised us that correspondence some time ago, and I believe the greater portion of it is not down yet. There are a few letters and papers laid before Parliament, but those letters and papers do not give us any idea that the hon. gentleman's mission was anything else than a failure. Well, when the hon. gentleman returned he did not speak in such glowing terms of the National Policy as he has been doing here to-night. It is true the campaign was begun on that line, but the campaign was not continued on that line. Suddenly, the hon. gentleman discovered that the National Policy required to undergo certain modifications, that certain changes in the trade relations with the United States were necessary, the people thought, as the hon. gentleman had promised them before the elections were had that the moment the victory was won on the 5th March the next day he and others associated with him would be on the march to the capital of the neighbouring republic. For what purpose was that journey undertaken? If reciprocity leads to such great disasters, why did the hon. gentleman undertake this journey to Washington? If reciprocity can lead to nothing good, why has the hon. gentleman promised to return to Washington again in October next? I think the House is entitled to know. If hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side do their duty, if they are the masters of this Administration, if we are, as we should be, masters of any Administration that may be formed in this House, we will insist upon knowing, for the Ministry are but the instruments with which Parliament discharges a part of its duties; they are the standing committee of Parliament for the purpose of carrying into effect the views that Parliament may hold on any public question. Well, Sir, I for one am not disposed to abdicate my own functions. It is not so very important to know what our views are as to any question of public policy as it is for those who sit on that side of the House, who are charged with the administration of public affairs, and with the adoption of a policy in the public interest. I again ask what object have hon. gentlemen in going to Washington? What is this reciprocity treaty they intend to negotiate? There is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who declares we do not want free trade in agricultural products; there are other hon. gentlemen who have spoken in the same way; the vast majority of hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that side on the tariff declared that we do not want free trade in agricultural products and that it will be injurious. The hon. gentleman urged that the two countries produced very much the same articles, and that profitable trade cannot spring up between them. What, then, is the object in proposing to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity? The Minister of Finance has not told us, and it is his duty to enunciate his views on this question. How has he treated hon. gentlemen who support him? He has said to them: Gentlemen, this is none of your business; we possess the brains; we are the men of capacity who sit on this side of the House, and you must trust us; you have no right to know; you must have confidence in us; we are the parties who are to decide, and we will decide by-and-bye, whether you are to have a treaty of reciprocity or not, and what is to be the character of it—you have no right to know now. That is the line of argument which the hon. gentleman adopted towards his supporters at the very time when he was asking us to go into details with respect to our view of reciprocity, although at this moment we are not charged with the conduct of the government of this country. The hon. gentleman has told us he is in favour of standing by Great Britain. Let me say that I do not think that is a very candid statement. What is the policy of Great Britain? Does she undertake to confer special favours on the people of Canada? Does she undertake to favour any colony of the Empire, and give to that colony any advantage on account of its liberal tariff over and above any country in any part of Christendom, no matter how hostile its tariff? Does she distinguish between Belgium, with its low tariff, and France, with its higher tariff? Does she distinguish between countries that admit her goods under low duties and those who admit them under high duties? No; she has adopted free trade, and she applies it to all peoples, and as four-fifths of her trade is outside of her Empire she is never likely to discriminate in favour of Canada or any dependency of the Empire. She has pursued that policy, believing it to be in her interests. We are not guardians of the interests of the United Kingdom. The people of the United Kingdom have a Parliament for themselves, and its members, in adopting free trade and extending it to all countries alike, whether their tariffs are high or low, liberal or illiberal, are pursuing that policy which they believe best in her interests. It is the business of this Parliament to adopt that policy which is best in the interests of this country. We are here as guardians of the interests of the Canadian people, not of the interests of the United Kingdom, and if it will promote the interests of our people, if it will further the settlement of our wild lands, add to our wealth, develop at an earlier period the latent resources we possess, to adopt unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, then we would be guilty of treason to the best interests of this country, we would be doing violence to the rights of the people who send us here, by adopting any other policy than that which would lead to the greatest good. That is a position so incontestable that it must be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite who do not hold official positions, however it may be regarded by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Another thing the Minister of Finance has told us is that once before we got into power by a policy of slander. I slander my neighbour when I make charges against him which are not true, but I do not slander the man who has wronged me and wronged others by stating

the facts as they are. It is the business of the people of this country to turn their indignation, not towards the bell-man who has warned you that your house is on fire, but towards the incendiary who has put the torch to your edifice. The hon. gentleman says we have begun the policy of slander again. What policy of slander? Who is slandered? Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Perley was slandered when he was accused of taking a bribe in his public capacity? Does the hon. gentleman say that the men at Quebec were slandered who gave bribes to public officials in order that they might return false quantities? Has the hon. gentleman for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) been guilty of slander because he made certain charges against parties and has undertaken to call witnesses to establish the charges he has made? If he has made false charges he is guilty of slander and worthy of censure; but if his statements are true, the conduct of the Minister who has undertaken to characterize them must be characterized in very different terms from those which he has employed here to-night. I have confidence in the moral honesty and fairness of the people of this country, whether they send representatives to that side of the House or to this, and I say that both the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for L'Islet, in the motion moved by him, have undertaken to prejudge the case that is being examined elsewhere, and upon which committees have not reported, and every hon. gentleman who votes for this resolution votes to decide in advance of the evidence and in advance of the report of the committee what the result of that enquiry shall be. I do not misstate that fact. The Minister, I suppose, has seen this resolution before to-night, and I ask the attention of the House to its terms. First, it declares that the fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government, by permitting the free importation of raw materials and by the judicious protection of our natural and manufactured products, has resulted in the marked development of Canadian industries. That is a simple declaration of the protective policy of the Government in past years. The next declaration is one approving of the liberal aid which has been granted to "necessary public works, notably to railways." For example, to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, to which, I believe, the proprietors never paid one dollar, which was built for them out of the public treasury and which was handed over to them, and which, according to representations made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) when in this House, yielded a profit of $100,000 in cash to the parties who were the fortunate beneficiaries of the Government favours on that occasion. This resolution goes on to say "that in the construction of canals and steamboat lines a wise policy has been pursued." Well, Sir, there is something about subsidies to steamship lines that requires investigation by this House; there is something known to the Minister of Finance about steamship lines that requires some attention from this House. The hon. gentleman had some dealing with a member of the House on that subject, and he may have a very great deal of interest in having this House, before the facts and disclosures on the subject are submitted for discussion, to declare that it approves of these subsidies to these steamship lines and, of course, also of the expenditure upon public works. We have a public work just across the street here for which the contract price was, I think, a good deal less than one-half the cost of construction, and there are extraordinary revelations with regard to that public work. It is, therefore, more convenient to obtain a favourable opinion from the House on these subjects, before the facts are laid before Parliament, than it will be to obtain that opinion after they have been submitted to the House; and so, the less the House knows the more likely it is to vote right for the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman, of course, will feel it most important that this particular proposition in the resolution should receive the sanction of the House in advance. I may just say to these hon. gentlemen who are present in the House to-night and who may hear what I say that it is important that they should look at these facts before they undertake to record their votes in favour of these propositions. They look very innocent; they are abstract propositions, but they are abstract propositions that are intended to lead to practical results, and what these practical results are every hon. gentleman who has followed the proceedings of committees of this House, and who has read the reports of these proceedings, has an opportunity of learning something with regard to the meaning of these propositions. Now, Sir, there is added at the end here a declaration against commercial union—a proposition that nobody has advocated here, a proposition that has never been formally supported in this House, and why did the hon. gentleman wish to have that included in the motion? Simply because it was very much easier to condemn what nobody supported than to condemn that which a very large section of the House and a vast majority of the people of this country do support. I tell the hon. gentleman that the National Policy is as dead in this country, apart from those who are especially favoured by it, as Julius Cæsar, and all the hon. gentlemen can do will never resurrect it. I represent a constituency largely Conservative, and yet, Sir, one-third of the Conservative party in that county were my supporters, or supporters of our policy, in the last election, and they were my supporters because they pronounced against the National Policy, and said that the National Policy was dead. The hon. gentleman has told us to-night that a country ought to produce more than it consumes, and he says that it is an unhealthy condition if you do not produce more than you consume, and that you will soon become impoverished if your expenditure exceeds your income, and so, that we must look abroad for foreign markets, because we are not able to find markets at home. Was that the declaration that was made at the initiation of this policy? Why, they said it was necessary to bring the consumer and producer together; it was necessary to bring the people who were to consume the products of the farmers from Europe and to make them settlers in Canada. It was said that every village would grow to be a town, and every town was to become a city, and within the sight of every farmer in the country the smoke-stacks were to be seen, which were to be the symbols of new industries to which this policy gave birth. Why, Sir, you were to be hardly able to see the sun after this policy came into operation, on account of the smoke from the chimneys of those various hives of industry which were to be soon all over the country. Well, Sir, where are these towns? The city

of Toronto, by its railway connections with the North-West, and the City of Montreal, have been built up; but what other places have grown up? Why, every village over the country has been killed: its population has been drawn away: the population of the rural districts has dwindled down, and you have had elaborate theories by hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Treasury benches to account for this change in the condition of the country. We are gravely told about some mysterious law of nature now potent which is impelling the people from the rural districts into the cities. We are told that in England the population is flocking towards the cities. Why? Because that skilled labour is more profitable than unskilled labour. We are told that the same thing has happened in the United States. Why? Because by the policy of protection they have taxed the agriculturist well nigh out of existence, and they have built up the cities at his expense. You are producing the same conditions by your system, miscalled the National Policy, a system by which one class of the people are plundered for the benefit of another class, by which a vast majority are injured for the benefit of a few. You call that the National Policy! No name was ever more misapplied. The hon. gentleman says: You were in office for five years before, and the country was poor and trade diminished during the period of your administration. Well, Sir, we came into office when there was general depression in commerce all over the globe. It existed, not in Canada alone; it existed in the United States; the Americans had a high tariff, higher than ours has ever been, and there was bankruptcy there. Their cities ceased to grow in population; large classes of those who were employed in manufacturing industries were obliged to abandon the cities and to settle on lands west of the Mississippi. We ceased to have a market there for our lumber; the cottages that were erected for the artizans were no longer required. In England you had depression under a free trade system, and you had it in France and in Germany also. The very thing which you said was due to our Administration existed everywhere over the globe. Now, I think there is no proposition clearer than this: that where you find under a free trade system, under a protective system, and under a revenue tariff, the same conditions existing, it is perfectly clear that that condition can be attributed to neither of these systems of fiscal policy. I am not going to detain the House to night by a discussion of what the probable cause of that may have been. But I state that at that time, everywhere throughout the world, there was depression as well as in Canada, and there was no country in the world where the manufacturing classes weathered the storm better than they did in Canada. We had at that time upon the Statute-book an Act relating to insolvency, and we had reports made from assignees of every case of failure over the entire country. We classified them according to their calling and business, and what did we find? We found that there were scarcely any failures among the manufacturers; the failures were among the mercantile classes, and yet you proposed to create a better condition of things by imposing additional burdens on commerce. You proposed to provide a remedy for those who were not sick; but upon those who were sick and suffering you proposed to impose additional burdens. And what was the effect of that policy? During the first year after you adopted it, before the revival of trade brought relief, you had a larger number of failures by millions than in any previous year. The hon. gentleman says that our trade fell off. That is true; and why? Because our purchasing power had diminished. The people of South America, the people of the United States and the people of England did not require our lumber as before, and the result was that a large number of our lumbering population were out of employment, and the products of their industry did not find a market. The purchasing power of the people was diminished by many millions, and they imported into the country, in 1877, $40,000,000 less of goods than in 1873 or 1874. The hon. gentleman has said, and his friends have said, that Canadian manufactures were injured by Canada being made a slaughter market. If they prospered when your imports were $128,000,000, how could they be injured when your imports fell to $89,000,000? And yet hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, do not hesitate to say that Canada was a slaughter market. Let me say again that if Canada was a slaughter market who was injured? If I should sell my goods to my neighbour at half price who is injured—I, who sell the goods at half price, or my neighbour, who buys them? I quite understand that the man who sold goods at half-price would be bankrupt, but I do not see how the man who bought them at half-price could be injured. But that has been the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. It reminds me of a story told by the comedian, Charles Mathews. That gentleman told his servant "to run in and tell Mr. Young that his horse has cut its throat," and the man, without thinking of the probability of the story, ran in and made the announcement. So these gentlemen told the country that Canada was being injured by cheap goods, although the amount of goods imported was nearly $40,000,000 less than before; and that story has been repeated again and again, without these gentlemen stopping to consider for one moment the absurdity and the impossibility of the statement in face of the importation at that time. Sir, it we will take the progress of the manufacturing industries in Canada as shown by the census between 1861 and 1871, and between 1871 and 1881, we shall see that they made very much more progress in those periods than they have made during the past seven or eight years. Why, Sir, what is the confession of the hon. Minister of Finance to-night? He says that Canada has the appliances, the machinery for manufacturing very much more than she can sell, and he looks upon it as a reasonable operation that there should be combines, that establishments should be closed, and that work should be carried on on half time or little more than half time, because it would be useless to go on manufacturing when you cannot find a market for the product. But what does that show? It shows that there has been a misdirection of capital, and that you are producing your surplus at a price at which it cannot be profitably disposed of in a foreign market, because you have by the policy of protection increased the cost of production so that the surplus, if sold abroad, can be sold only at a sacrifice. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of the extraordinary difficulties that stand in the way of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. What are those difficulties? What difficulty is there in discussing with the American

Minister the subject of goods manufactured from raw material purchased from Britain as well as goods from raw material grown at home? Is there any insuperable obstacle in the way of discussing one more than another? A treaty of reciprocity is not something that springs up like a plant. It is an artificial contrivance, the result of negotiation: it springs from intelligent and deliberate discussion, resulting in mutual agreement; and you may embrace in such a treaty as much or as little as you please. There is just as much necessity for entering into an agreement with regard to goods manufactured from raw material found in the country as with regard to goods made from raw material imported from abroad. There is and can be no difference; and all that the hon. Minister said on that subject this evening is simple puerility. I cannot use an expression that will properly characterize it any less strong than the one which I employ. Why undertake to enter seriously into a discussion of that sort? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that those who support the Government are without the capacity to think or to reason, or without ordinary intelligence? Does he suppose that an argument of that sort can, in the smallest degree, influence the conclusions which hon. gentlemen reach? Why, Sir, the United States import wool from South America and from South Africa, and there is wool produced in the United States. Canada may do exactly the same thing.

Mr. BOWELL. Wool is free.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Very well; that must be a subject of discussion when the negotiation takes place. You cannot have a treaty without binding both parties. You cannot, by a treaty, declare that goods of a certain sort shall be free for twenty years, and at the same time to have the power to go on and tax them. You bind your hands by a reciprocity treaty or any treaty into which you may undertake to enter, and you bind them just to the extent to which you enter into a compact with the other side; and you bind yourself because you believe that it is to the advantage of the country to secure what you propose to obtain by the compact upon these terms. And so it is just a question of degree whether you enter into a treaty with regard to natural products or enter into a treaty including manufactured products as well. The hon. gentlemen tax a number of things at the present time. They tax small fruits; they tax other fruits; they tax trees from the nursery; they tax seeds of various sorts. These are natural products. If they undertake to negotiate a treaty, which I hardly think they will do, but if they carry out their promise, and then endeavour to put these articles on the free list, they have tied their hands, and they cannot legislate with regard to them during the continuance of the treaty. So far as the power of this Parliament is concerned, that power remains in abeyance during the continuance of the treaty. Then the hon. gentleman said that it was not a fact that these negotiations were initiated by this Government. He repeated what he said at the opening of the session. Well, Sir, I have looked at the correspondence so far as it is laid upon the Table, and I find that the Government did take the initiative. I find that Mr. Blaine complains because statements to the contrary had been made by members of the Administration, and I find that the High Commissioner in a report made to the late Prime Minister on the subject declares that the statement of Mr. Blaine was correct, and that the statement made by the Government he represented was incorrect. Now the hon. gentleman has declared himself again in favour of the National Policy. I see the hon. gentleman is trying to escape from the promise made during the election, a vague promise, an indefinite promise, a promise as nebulous as the hon. gentleman says our view of reciprocity is. But there can be no doubt that the promise of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues as regards reciprocity is in the clouds. There is nothing tangible in it. He does not know and cannot say upon what basis we are to have reciprocity. He will not venture to say what articles should be put upon the free list. He has not said so this evening, and since the opening of the House no member of the Government has said so.

Mr. BOWELL. I should think not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why then should the hon. gentleman want us to be more specific and definite than he is himself? Why should he think it would be proper for us to do what he says is improper for him? The hon. gentleman should at all events—I do not mean enter into minute details—but declare in a more specific way than he has what the Government propose to do. But he has no right to ask us to go into that minute detail, which, he says, would be little short of treason to the public interest, if it were done by hon. gentlemen on that side. Then the hon. gentleman says that there has been no appreciable increase in the public debt. Is that a merit? Was it a demerit when there was an appreciable increase in the public debt? Was it a praiseworthy thing to increase the public debt by $100,000,000? When hon. gentlemen opposite add to the public debt, it is regarded as statesmanship. When they do not run in debt it is statesmanship. When they impose taxes it is again statesmanship, and in the public interest: and when they take taxes off they ask the gratitude of the country on account of the extraordinary favour they have done it by relieving it of grievous fiscal burdens. That is the line of argument they have adopted on all occasions. We are told that the country has put itself under everlasting obligations to the Government on account of the change in the sugar tariff; still, we say the Government did not go far enough. In my opinion, the tariff they have proposed is entirely unjustifiable. It is a tax which will yield no revenue. It is a tax of which the public will not receive a cent. It is a tax in the interest of a few manufacturers and not of the community at large. The hon. gentleman leaves off the free list, as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) pointed out this evening, these raw sugars which the people can consume in the raw state. The only sugars he permits us to import free are those that cannot be consumed, and must be refined or washed by the manufacturer; and so the manufacturer is to receive ½ of a cent extra profit on every pound of sugar which he washes, although that process costs him the merest fraction of that sum. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the strength of the National Policy. He says it is so strong that it cannot be uprooted or overturned. Well, the strength of the National Policy depends upon the necessities of the Administration. They have run heels over head into

debt. They have impoverished us while they have increased our burdens, and the hon. gentleman says now: Look at the condition of things; we have imposed burdens upon you until $11,000,000 a year are sent abroad to pay the interest on our obligations; we have put you in the condition of the impoverished tenants of Ireland, who pay taxes to the non-resident landlords, and now we say, look at your condition, and we ask you how you are going to get on if you have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) said here to-day what I said to my constituents when discussing the question during the election: We are neighbours, and can agree upon a plan of unrestricted reciprocity. We may agree to put on the free list immediately articles mentioned in the schedule. We may agree that other articles, from time to time, shall go upon the free list, according as the fiscal circumstances of the country may warrant, until, within a certain period of time, all the various products exchanged between the two countries shall go upon the free list. I do not say that is the only way, but that is one way of meeting the objection which the hon. gentleman presents. The hon. gentleman says you will have a deficit, and how are you going to make it up? My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) points out how we can avoid a deficit, and the hon. gentleman says that is not satisfactory. Why? Because it does away with his objection, and if hon. gentlemen opposite could only continue to object they would have more satisfaction in fighting us, but now we have answered them and dampened their powder, the result is, our position is altogether unsatisfactory to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we are always decrying the country. That is not so, but we are decrying the Administration, and we have reason for decrying it. We say: You have been faithless servants; you have been entrusted with great public interests and have been faithless to those trusts; you promised to accomplish great results and have failed to accomplish them; you told the people how the population would increase in our towns and cities until the farmers would find in them a market for all they produced, and the farmers have to seek foreign markets, just as before, and you have not only failed to supply the markets you promised but have put up barriers in the way of their reaching other markets. You have done more than that: you have created difficulties in the North-West. The hon. gentleman said we must take good care of the Indians. Well, it is not by giving them rusty pork and musty flour, and by using a large portion of the appropriation for the Indians on officials, that you are going to take care of that population. The Government has been a great failure; it has exhibited great incompetency; it has not procured any of those advantages to the country which it promised from the adoption of the National Policy thirteen years ago; but I say that the country has great recuperative force, and if you give it a fair opportunity prosperity will be restored. I do not believe the country is in that hopeless position in which hon. gentlemen opposite pictured it some years ago. It never was in that condition. The mischief arises from the irritating disease which sits on the Treasury benches and causes disorder in the country. Remove the hon. gentlemen and public health will be restored and public prosperity will begin. The recuperative power of this country is very great. I remember that a few years ago President Hayes, in discussing the growth of wealth in the United States, pointed out that to-day the United States can produce in three years and five months all the wealth they at present possess, including the value of lands; and so, where a country once begins to practise economy, and the people are industrious, there is scarcely any disaster that may have overtaken it which it cannot surmount. I admit that the disaster which has overtaken this country is very great, and it is not simply a disaster in regard to our material resources, but we have moral disasters as well. There has been an attempt to blunt the moral sense of the country, and to degrade official life, but we hope to see the official life purified, and the moral sense of the country restored and the hon. gentlemen removed, and the country will then be on the high road to prosperity. The hon. gentleman has referred to the importance of protecting our industries and to the misfortunes that would befall this country if protection were withdrawn. If the hon. gentleman was a consistent protectionist he would put a high duty on raw cotton in order to encourage the production of flax. Why should he not make every one wear linen goods instead of cotton goods? He might not prefer that himself, but he must look to the industries of the country and to its natural resources, and he ought to take precious good care to keep out all Scotch tweeds and all American cottons, or goods manufactured from cotton of American growth. But the hon. gentleman is not a consistent protectionist. His protectionism extends only as far as his interest, and his interest extends only to the limits of the Red Parlour. There are very few things which are produced in this country that cannot be produced at a profit without Government interference, and I will venture to say that there is nothing produced in this country that ought to have been called into existence by taxation. The people of the United States, for instance, have given protection to their iron industries. I do not know what the tax is at this moment, but a few years ago it amounted to $9 a ton. The quantity produced was 2,000,000 tons, and therefore the consumer paid $18,000,000 to the manufacturer in consequence of this duty. There was $58,000,000 of capital invested in this manufacturing enterprise, and if you take the interest upon that you will find it was about $3,000,000. Then take the labour. I think about 36,000 men were employed and about $12,000,000 paid to them, so that, to pay the interest on the money invested and to pay the labourers employed by the manufacturers would require $15,000,000; and Congress gave to these men by their system of taxation $18,000,000—that is to say, they gave them $3,000,000 more than was sufficient to pay the wages of the men employed and the interest on the capital invested. That principle applies to almost every establishment in this country. I do not say that that should be immediately withdrawn, but I say that you have a wasteful production, and you never can have an economical production as long as you come to the rescue of any class of the community in this way. The hon. gentleman has said: If you have free trade with the United States and if you have a tariff applied to the imports of every other country the result will be that you will transfer a large portion of what you purchase from other coun-

tries to the United States. That is not so. The kinds of goods the United States could furnish us with are not the kinds that we purchase from the United Kingdom, or only to a very small extent. We have now a duty of 35 per cent. on tweed goods, but are Scotch tweeds kept out of this country because of that? Is not the kind of tweed you wear very largely a matter of taste? A man is willing to pay 85 cents for goods that he might buy here for 60 cents, and this duty does not keep those goods out of this country, nor out of the United States, where the duty is very much higher. The Minister of Customs knows that right well. He has every opportunity of acquiring practical knowledge on these subjects, in consequence of his official position, and I am sure that he will not say that the imports which come into Canada from the United Kingdom would cease if we had free trade with the American republic. The hon. gentleman says: You have $80,000 worth of buttons imported from the United States and $190,000 worth imported from other countries, and if you have free trade with the United States you will buy all your buttons from the United States. I do not think so. The $190,000 worth of buttons imported from other countries are not the same kind of buttons as the Americans manufacture, or only so to a small extent, and the hon. gentleman need not be afraid that his clothes would go without buttons of the proper pattern if we had free trade in buttons with the neighbouring republic. The hon. gentleman failed altogether to make due allowance for the influence of taste in the purchases of a population. I was very much struck, in reading over the reports of the consuls of the United Kingdom, who are scattered over various portions of the world, in finding that goods of a particular pattern are sold largely in certain places, while other goods which are equally valuable and of equally good manufacture cannot find any sale in the particular market or place, not because the one is good and the other bad, not because the one is dear and the other cheap, but because the one is of a style which is suited to the tastes of the population and the other is of a wholly different kind. I am not going at this time of the evening to detain the House by a further discussion of the subject. I think it is obvious that the Minister of Finance in his speech did not expect a serious discussion of his objections to the proposition in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. A more futile series of objections, I venture to say, were never addressed to any deliberative body than those which he addressed to the House this evening. The House is prepared, I have no doubt, to give a fair consideration to the propositions which the hon. gentleman entertains when he is prepared to submit them. I again ask the attention of the House to the character of the resolution upon which it is called to vote. A great deal of it has nothing to do with the fiscal policy of the Administration. A great deal of it, as I pointed out early in the course of my remarks, relates to the administrative action of the Government, especially to the conduct of the Departments of Railways and Public Works. I am confident that whatever view may be taken in the House, the country will not alter the opinions which it forms upon the character of the administration of those departments.

Mr. CASEY. The whole of the discussion on this motion, as well as the motion itself, has hitherto been of an extraordinary nature. It is a very unusual thing for a Government to put up one of its supporters to move an amendment on an occasion of this kind, containing a very large dose of taffy for the Government and a declaration of policy which, as the Government have adopted the motion, must be taken to be the Government policy. It is, as I say, a strange and most unheard of, and hardly a decent, course for the Government to take under the circumstances, for they ask the House to vote they have done all that is good and great in all matters financial and otherwise, and to vote, in addition to that, an approbation of the Government's policy upon a most important question, and one that may affect the negotiations with the United States, as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. I say that no Government that had any confidence in itself or in its supporters would adopt such a course as that. The discussion on that side of the House has been equally peculiar. The Hon. Minister of Marine has addressed the House in a style reminding us largely of his respected parent, respected at least by the Minister, the gentleman who now occupies a comfortable and well-paid position on the other side of the Atlantic. I do not know whether it will be necessary, in describing the hon. gentleman's speech, to revive a phrase that was classical in this House some years ago, when his father was a member thereof, and a phrase which passed without criticism, without anybody objecting to it as being out of order. I believe my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was the inventor of the phrase; it was a phrase intended to characterize statements made by the High Commissioner when a member of this House, and would just as fitly characterize the statements made to-night by his son. My hon. friend used to say that such-and-such statements were flagrant and glaring Tupperisms. I do not know that we can find a better word to describe the speech we had from the hon. Minister to-night. It is an old proverb, "as the old cock crows the young cock learns." The young cock, in this instance, is evidently imitating the performance of his respected parent. But although the tune of the crowing of the young cock is similar to the tune crowed across this House by the old cock himself, the voice is different. The young cock has not yet attained to the magnificent assurance, to the unabashed hardihood, with which the old cock used to crow. The tune is the same, as I said, but the voice of the young fledgling is still as the voice of a spring chicken, the voice of a hardly fledged cockerel, and it will be long before he attains to the glorious proficiency of the venerable chanticleer who now crows upon other shores. Well, Mr. Speaker, although the voice has been weak and ineffectual, the young cock said something which requires notice. For instance, he found that the speech of the leader of the Opposition, because he went into the question of trade relations with the United States, was not, as the Minister said, directed to the motion before the House; he said that the motion dealt almost entirely with the fiscal and internal policy of the country, and that my honoured leader should not have discussed such matters as he did. Now, as a matter of fact, the motion itself contains references to our trade relations with the United States. It contains, I will not say a declaration of policy in regard thereto, but

it contains phrases intended to avoid the declaration of a policy in regard thereto, but still implying a reference to those relations. As a matter of fact, my honoured leader's remarks were perfectly in place in speaking to this motion. But what did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries do? Did he confine himself to the fiscal and internal matters of which he spoke? Why, Sir, his speech from beginning to end was an attack upon the trade policy which he assumed we on this side of that House favoured. So that, while condemning our leader for referring to such a policy, he himself alluded to that, and spoke of that, almost to the exclusion of any other subject; and the Minister of Finance followed in his footsteps, both practically discussing the resolution which was moved some days ago by the hon. member for South Oxford, and not the amendment brought before the House by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). Now, he went on to say—and in this particular he was re-echoed by the Minister of Finance, who should be his leader, but on this occasion followed in his footsteps—to assert that all the producers of this country, and notably the farmers, were in a very prosperous and satisfactory condition. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Marine may tell that to the marines. The fact that he has ventured such a statement in this House may be due to his official association with that proverbially incredulous race of people. But if he were to go outside of this House into Ontario, and make that statement to any audience of farmers, he would find out that he had not the marines to deal with. I would scarcely care, as a matter of policy, to object to his statements in that particular. All I wish, Mr. Speaker, is that every farmer in Canada should know that in the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that in the opinion of the Minister of Finance, that in the opinion of the Government to which they both belong, those farmers are as happy and as prosperous as they have any right to expect to be. I am heartily glad that Ministers have taken this position—the position that the farmer of this country ought to be satisfied with his present condition, and has no need or no right to look for anything better. But, although the statement is contradicted by the consciousness of every man who may hear it, it is, perhaps, proper that those of us who represent agricultural ridings should speak of our own personal knowledge in regard to the condition of the farmer. I speak now of my own personal knowledge in regard to the county I represent when I say that the price of farm lands in that riding during the past ten years has declined fully 33 per cent., fully one-third. I say I have seen more than that, even. Farms within a few miles of a good market have been put up at public auction without a single bid being received for them. It is not only that land has become reduced in value, ruinously reduced in value, but that in many cases it is impossible to sell it at all. I speak in this respect, not only from observation, but from my own personal experience. I have found it impossible to sell lands at any price on several occasions, although they were well situated and desirable in every respect for farm purposes. We turn our eyes to other great producing industries to which the Minister has called attention—mining and lumbering. Do we find there the condition of content and prosperity of which the hon. gentleman spoke? Is the lumber business prospering? Look at the closed mills and idle saws at the Chaudière. Look at Hull, and the number of unemployed men, women and children there, who formerly earned a living in this industry. Take this as a sample of the lumbering business throughout the Dominion, and if you say that that great producing industry is prosperous you must be a marine.

Mr. DENISON. What about Booth's new mill?

Mr. CASEY. It is a fact that there has been an addition to that mill, but I still hold that the condition of the lumber yards, and of the Chaudière as a whole, with Booth's improvements thrown in, shows that the trade is not prosperous; and it must be admitted that there are more mills closed and more people out of employment than during many years past. I can speak from a recollection of 19 or 20 years, and I never saw so little doing at the Chaudière as this year. Take mining. The Minister of Finance has spoken as if something was done for mining by the so-called National Policy. What are the facts? Compare the north and south of Lake Superior. We have on the north shore vast deposits of iron ore lying undeveloped, while our neighbours to the south have increased their trade in ore from Lake Superior mines to the smelting works at Toledo and elsewhere by millions of tons each year. Is it not because there is a market on that side and not on our side? What is the only thing that will develop our mines? A market. Take the iron industry. Sir Charles Tupper told us when he proposed his last dose of protection to iron that they had in Nova Scotia some of the most remarkable mines in the world, situated especially well for producing iron cheaply; that they had iron ore, coal and limestone for flux, all in one happy valley, where they could be brought together more cheaply than elsewhere in America. He drew from this fact the peculiar deduction that because we could so cheaply manufacture iron we should protect it by largely-increased duties and a bounty. That was done several years ago. What has been the result? With $4 per ton duty and $2 bounty on pig iron we do not produce one-twentieth of what we require in this country. There are only one or two smelting establishments in Canada, and the principal one at Londonderry is in a chronic state of bankruptcy. Protection in its extremest form has done nothing for the iron industry. Why? Because, although we do not yet produce sufficient for the Canadian market, the market is so small that capitalists do not think it would pay to establish extensive works. What the iron industry wants is a market, and it is suffering largely on account of the National Policy. What has this policy done for coal? The Minister of Finance has told this House about the "vast interprovincial trade." The National Policy was intended as a force-pump to force coal from the Maritime Provinces into Ontario. It has not done so to any appreciable extent. Coal comes as far west as usual, but the quantity has not increased. The whole attempt to bring coal westward by the National Policy force-pump has failed. At the same time, our relations to the United States and the tariff have been the means of shutting off Nova Scotia coal from its natural market along the sea-board of the United States. It is true they do not seem to feel their loss in this respect, as might be expected, but it is one of the peculiarities of protec-

tion that those who think they are being protected are always afraid of taking any step in advance, and always fear a change in the existing state of things. It is not without appropriateness that the protected industries are always described by the advocates of protection as infant industries. They are so in one sense, although some have grown to considerable size. They remain helpless, as they did in the early state of their existence. Although some have been overfed to the point of dyspepsia, although some are overgrown under the system of monopoly, combined with protection, they are still fat, flabby "infant industries," and the bigger babies they become the greater demand they will make on us for sustenance. They remind me of a calf alluded to by an American politician, who said the more cows that calf sucked the bigger calf it became. The more we assist those industries the more help they will need, and the greater will be the burdens we shall have to carry in the future. The Minister said that the National Policy had caused such plenty that trouble was arising from over-production. It is not often we hear a country pitied on the ground that it is too rich and produces too much. As a matter of fact, I think it can be shown that Canada has not produced too much. If there was such a large surplus it would have been exported, even although not at a profit. What do the returns show? That from 1870 to 1889 there were only two years in which the exports were less than during 1889. While under the sad and gloomy rule of a revenue tariff, we had in 1873 exports to the value of $14,995,000, while in 1874 we exported $18,500,000, in 1875 $17,250,000, in 1876 $21,000,000, and so on; and even in 1881 we exported 31,000,000. We find that since that time the exports have been generally decreasing, and they have sometimes been absurdly low. In 1884 we only exported $12,400,000; in 1885, $14,500,000; in 1886 there was an improvement to $17,000,000; but in 1889, the last year included in the Trade and Navigation Returns, our imports were rather less than $13,500,000 in round numbers. This being the case, it is absurd for the Minister of Marine or for anybody else to say that we are troubled with a surplus of useful products in Canada. It was also stated by the hon. gentleman that the National Policy had rather favoured trade with the mother country, the fact being that while in 1878, the last year of Reform Administration, the last year of a revenue tariff, the percentage of our total exports sent to Great Britain was 52·75, in 1888, after ten years of the National Policy, the percentage of our total exports to Great Britain was only 41·25; while the percentage of exports to the United States grew from 49·65 in 1878 to 55·86 in 1888. Not only has the percentage of exports to Great Britain decreased, but the amount of exports to that country was decreased by over $2,000,000. So that the National Policy has not fostered trade with Great Britain, but rather with the United States. If we are to look for extended trade relations at all we must look in these directions in which trade naturally flows. If you want to drain a piece of land you observe in what direction the surplus water takes itself away; and if you find the natural water-course blocked up with obstructions of any kind you clear them out, and, if it is necessary, you deepen the channel by digging. Now, I say that if we want to increase our tariff relations with the outside world, if we want an outlet for our surplus productions, which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine say we do want, let us look to the natural channels of trade. Let us look to where trade flows in spite of all obstructions; let us enlarge and deepen these channels, and our trade will be increased and our wealth increased with it. It is impossible to make water flow up hill, and it is impossible to make trade flow elsewhere than in its natural channels. Now, the Minister of Marine stated that the Opposition acted as if we were willing to say anything we liked that was insulting about the manufacturers of this country, but that we assumed a very different position towards the farmer, and he asked would the farmers listen to the tactics of the Opposition, and become excited about the way in which they are treated? The hon. gentleman need not ask, if the farmers' attention is called to these matters, will they take steps to right themselves? They have done it. All over the Province of Ontario—I cannot speak so well for the other provinces—the farmers are taking a leaf out of the book of those whom the Minister of Finance says are justified in combining to protect themselves. The farmers are beginning to combine for their own protection; farmers' alliances are springing up here and there all over the country, and the voice of the farmer will be heard in the future, not as the indistinct hum of the multitude, but as the voice of a mighty organization. It was heard in the last election; it has been heard since that election, by many a member on that side of the House as well on this. I say it was heard at the last election, which recalls to my mind a remark of the Minister of Marine, who stated that reciprocity had sustained a terrible defeat at the last election, and that the Government had won a great victory on their trade policy. The hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the facts, or he has not been able to convey the information he received correctly to the House. He knows perfectly well that the last elections were not conducted on a straight issue between reciprocity and protection. The Government went to the country asserting that they were in favour of some sort of reciprocity, and what sort of reciprocity they were in favour of was explained to suit the particular audience that was to be captured. The Conservative voters who favoured freer trade relations with the United States said that it was not a question between reciprocity and protection at all. They said: If we want reciprocity our old friends will give it to us, and we will rather trust them to give it to us than vote for the Opposition. Naturally, they preferred to get this benefit from their own friends rather than from their former opponents; but, in addition to that, the Government had other powerful support in carrying these elections. They had the support of the gerrymander, they had the support of the Franchise Act, and they had the support of money in vast supplies. We are beginning to find out where some of that money came from. We knew before that the pet monopolists, the particular infant industries which were being fattened—while the Government was a stepmother to other industries equally valuable—contributed largely to the election funds. We knew that they could afford to do so, but we are beginning to find out now how contractors were bled, and so on. I say that the Government had money in addition to the other things I refer to.

Mr. STEVENSON. It is a good thing.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) says it is a good thing, and he evidently knows. I suppose it would amuse the House if he told us how much of it he had in his own election, but he will not do so. In addition to these influences I have named, they had the sentiment of loyalty to their old chief, who was then the leader of the Government, and for which I must give credit to the Conservative party. I could not join in that feeling myself, but I must give credit to the vast mass of the Conservative electors of this country for having a strong feeling of loyalty for their old chieftain. The victory that that was won by the Government, narrow as it was, was not due to the preference of the people of this country for protection, but to the combined effects of love for the old man, love for the dollar, and the Franchise and Gerrymander Acts as well. Now, Sir, speaking of loyalty, what kind of loyalty do the supporters of the Government profess in contradistinction to us? What right have they to speak of loyalty, whose leader, the Premier of this country, signed an annexation manifesto years and years ago? They may say that that was done in his youth. How do they know he does not entertain the same opinions still? It is a very bad certificate, at all events, for the party to give to themselves when they choose as the head of the ultra-loyal party of this country a man with such a record. Of course, I do not mean to infer that the Premier is a disloyal man at the present time; but I say that this fact takes out of their mouths the right to talk much about loyalty. But we are willing to talk about loyalty, and we are willing to do more than that: we are willing to practise it. Now, Sir, loyalty to what? Loyalty to whom? What, in fact, is the meaning of the word "loyalty?" Does it mean the mere sentimental effusion of "guff" and theatrical talk across the floor of the House? Does it mean the mere sentimental feeling which we have as British subjects for the Crown and the throne, and the present occupant of the throne? No, Sir; loyalty means a great deal more than that. That is mere surface loyalty. No Canadian is a true Canadian, no Canadian is a true Briton who is not loyal first of all to his own country. That is the principle of British loyalty; that is the principle on which Britons have always acted and on which they have maintained themselves among the nations of the earth for so many centuries—loyalty to themselves, loyalty to the truth, loyalty to common sense and reason, and loyalty to the country which has given them birth and the means of living. Such loyalty as this we can all agree in, and I believe that 99 out of every 100 electors of this country are willing to support loyalty of that kind if called upon to do so. But, if Ministers think that they are going to cover up the effects of their policy and the failure of their promises by shouting about loyalty, and about the old man and the old flag, they are greatly mistaken. When the Budget debate began, and during the continuance of this second debate on practically the same subject, we have been waiting for a declaration, not of vague, unmeaning loyalty to Great Britain, but of the Government's policy, and why have we not had it? We have tried to get it, but the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance has been framed as if it were the policy of the Opposition and not the policy of the Government that was on trial. We have failed to get anything from the Minister but the vaguest sort of theatrical talk as to what the Government mean to do. In short, if we have had to drop the nickname of stretcher which was formerly applied to a distinguished member of this House, we shall have to introduce a new nickname for the hon. Minister of Finance. If Sir Charles Tupper was known as the great stretcher when he occupied that chair and that portfolio, I am sure that its present occupant should be called the great wriggler, because he has wriggled out of every statement to-night, and has avoided giving us the details of his policy. We were told with great gravity when the Government went to the country, and it has been repeated since by members in the House, that it was of no use to begin negotiations with the United States in the last year of a moribund Parliament—that before they went to Washington to negotiate they must have at their back a majority who had confidence in them and in what they would do when they went there, and that for that reason they had to dissolve the House and to go to the country. It strikes me that it would have been more reasonable to say: We have gone to Washington and ascertained what we can get from the United States, and we have approved or disapproved of it, as the case might be; we agree or do not agree, as the case may be, to accept such conditions of reciprocity as we can get from them. If they had done that, and laid the proposition before the House, and asked the approval of the House, and the House had refused to give its approval, and they had then gone to the country, they would have been acting reasonably and constitutionally. Or if they had said: Before we go on with these negotiations we will submit to the country the provisional arrangement which we have arrived at with the American statesmen, they would have acted reasonably and constitutionally. But what did they do? Before they had any negotiations with the American statesmen, or any policy to lay before the House, or any issue on which to dissolve, except the vague statement of a wish to negotiate about something at Washington, they tried to snatch a verdict; and now, having got their majority, scanty though it be, they claim that it is a victory for the National Policy. It is nothing of the kind. It is a condemnation of the Government policy for the past ten years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We will take a repetition of the same defeat.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps you will not get it. The next time the Government go before the people, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) will find that the people have found them out and know what side of the fence they are on. The Government profess to be in favour of reciprocity, and talk about going to Washington to negotiate a treaty, and yet in this House they talk nothing but unadulterated protection. They speak of sending ambassadors to Washington, and then the Minister of Finance gets up and gives away our whole case. He says if negotiations should fail at Washington it will be the fault of hon. gentlemen on this side who ask for unrestricted reciprocity, and who say that the United States will not grant partial reciprocity. But we have the statement of Mr. Blaine, contained in the documents

laid before the House, that we need not expect partial reciprocity, or reciprocity merely in natural products, and that statement being public, I do not see how it can hurt our chances to repeat it. But what can hurt us is to find the hon. Minister of Finance standing up here and giving pointers to the American Government against our case, giving pointers against the only kind of reciprocity we have any chance of getting. He said he was off the track at the time, and I do not doubt that he was. It is quite clear he was, or else he was giving away, in a manner which can scarcely be characterized in parliamentary language, the cause it will be his duty to plead in October next. He tried to point out that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, whether Canadian manufactures from foreign raw material were admitted free or not into the States, in every case the United States would lose by the operation. He concluded by urging that whatever arrangement was made for unrestricted reciprocity the people of the United States must lose, and he said the people of the United States would be fools if they agreed to any such arrangement. I will not call the hon. Minister a traitor, or an intriguer, or a Fagin, who conspires with the Yankees to the injury of Canada; but if any member on this side had got up and deliberately given away his case, deliberately given pointers to the counsel on the other side, as the Minister of Finance has done, he would have been called all these names. We have been called them for an infinitely milder and different treatment of the subject; and although I do not apply to the Finance Minister those names, I must say that he is guilty, if not of a deliberate intention to frustrate the policy the Government pretend to have at heart, then of an indiscretion which certainly unfits him to conduct any negotiations of any importance at all. He must take one horn of the dilemma or the other. Either he does not know what a foolish, injudicious thing it is to give away his case in this manner, or he must wish to give the case away. I incline to the latter view, as I have a pretty good opinion of the hon. gentleman's intelligence, but a small opinion of his sincerity as an advocate of improved trade relations with the United States. The whole course of the Government has shown that they merely tried to steal some of our ammunition, and now, having gained office by that means, they are not prepared to go as far as they led the people to expect they would. They give away the whole case, and make it impossible for us to conclude a reasonable reciprocity treaty in October. There has not been a single gentleman on the other side who spoke of such a thing as practicable, and there never has been such a complete surrender of all chance of argument in favour of free trade with the United States as has been made by the Minister himself this evening. I am very glad he has taken the cloven hoof out of his neatly-formed boot, and let us see it, and we know now that he is riding for a fall and is trying so to manipulate this discussion and the resolution before the House that it will be impossible for us to conclude a treaty in October; and he will then say it was not my fault, but because you talked in a pessimistic way about blue ruin in Canada. Who are the pessimists, and who are those who have confidence in Canada? To put it in plain language, who is afraid of reciprocity and who is not? I say that those who maintain that Canadians are not able to compete in all the walks of life with the people of the United States are the pessimists; I say it is they who are the prophets of blue ruin. It is they who, in a parliamentary sense, if not in a criminal sense, are traitors to their country. They are those who decry their country by saying we are not fit to take our stand among other nations. But on this side we pride ourselves upon being Canadians, and upon the ability of a Canadian to make his way, no matter what competition he may have to encounter. We claim that the Canadian is as good a man as the United States citizen, and a good deal better. We claim that he has the enterprise and the intelligence to hold his own in business against them. We claim that he has fertility of soil and boundless resources in other respect, sufficient to enable him to exercise his intelligence and enterprise to the best effect. We are not afraid to compete with the United States; we are not afraid of reciprocity. We are not afraid even of being seduced into annexation. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have had a good deal of experience with the United States, the hon. Minister of Finance amongst them, seem to be fearful of their own virtue. They seem to be afraid that they will be coaxed into annexation if they should go a step nearer to the United States. We do not find the prospect so alluring. We are satisfied we can resist, and are sufficiently Canadian in sentiment not to go in for annexation. I have heard more annexation talk in my day from Conservatives than I ever heard from any people in the community, and now we find them confess they are afraid to go a step further towards the United States lest they would embrace the Yankees and become united with them. We are not afraid. They are. They have no confidence in their own virtue, and in the virtue of other Canadians, to resist the tempter and to maintain friendship with the United States without the result of political union. As usual, they have all set up the great bugaboo of direct taxation, and they have gratuitously assumed that that must be the result of reciprocity, and have insisted that it would be ruinous to the country. They have not proven that reciprocity would lead to direct taxation; but, supposing it did, in what respect would we be so much worse off? We have to pay the taxes that form the revenue now. All indirect taxes come down at last to the first producer, to the man who cultivates or digs out of the ground, or who cuts out of the forest, our raw products. Taking the case of sugar: if the manufacturer of refined sugar only gets $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound protection, as estimated by the Government, that means an indirect tax of $1,600,000 a year. Although the Minister of Finance claims to have removed a large amount of the sugar duty, we find that $1,600,000 is paid by the consumer, and to whom? It will not go into the treasury or add to the revenue. If we had direct taxation the consumer would pay directly to the treasury, whereas now he pays his tax on sugar to the sugar lords, and he pays for the loss of revenue by an indirect tax on something else. In short, indirect taxation means a double tax, part going to the revenue and part going to the other producers or manufacturers, whose products are raised in price by the indirect tax. But people do not seem to feel indirect taxation as they do direct taxation, and the protectionist takes advantage of that unreasonable state of mind to get in his theories. The position is very much like

that of the Irishman who was riding to market on horseback with a sack of potatoes over his shoulder. A passer-by said: "Why do you not put the potatoes in front of you?" "Oh," said Pat, "the poor cratur has enough to do to carry me, and so I am carrying the potatoes." That is the position. The horse represents the farmer, the miner or the lumberman, who has to pay everything, who has to carry the monopolist on his back, and not only that, but has to carry a load of taxation besides which must be raised for the service of the country. If we could make the rider get down and allow the horse to have nothing to carry but the sack of patatoes we would be in better trim. I have plenty of notes here yet, but the speeches of the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Finance have been so much alike, have wandered so discursively over every ground, except that covered by the main body of the resolution, that I shall not follow them any further, because the House must be wearied of any speeches at this period of the morning, and I know that I am not able to make my remarks as tolerable as they might be under other circumstances. I will close by saying that neither the Minister of Marine nor the Minister of Finance has established in any way the statements contained in the main body of the resolution. They have given no statistics to show that the fiscal policy of the Government has been successful, that the aid which has been given to public works has been productive of benefit to the country, that the management of the finances has been wise and prudent; they have not pointed out the economy which has been observed in the estimates for the present year or in the expense of past years; they have not shown us what articles of universal use, except tea, coffee and sugar, have been exempted from taxation. In short, they have not discussed the motion of the member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), but they have discussed the motion which was before us some time ago. I venture to say I would not be wrong in asserting that the speech of the Minister of Finance was one which he had prepared to wind up the Budget debate last week, because it has all the appearance of being cut and dried as an answer to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and has very little to do with what is before us now. However, after all the stretching and the wriggling, and the display of fireworks, and the clever dodging of the Minister, the country will judge, not by his words but by his acts. I agree with one remark of the hon. gentleman, when he said: "If you want to see the monument of the National Policy, look around." I am glad the hon. gentleman admits that we have to put up a monument to the National Policy. We are in the way of putting up monuments sadly enough. We have to put up one for an occasion which we all regret. The hon. gentlemen says we have to put another. He regrets the demise of that creation of his Government, and he says: If you want to see the monument of the National Policy, look at its results. I am willing to let it go on that issue. Let that be the monument to the policy which is now dead, and in regard to which we can only feel what Sinbad the Sailor felt when he was relieved of the burden of the Old Man of the Sea, a burden we thought we would have to carry all our days, but which now the hon. gentleman who is the stepfather of that policy says we must put up a monument to. I am willing to join issue on the results of the National Policy. Let each elector judge of those results for himself, and that is how it will be decided. This talk from both sides across the floor of the House will have very little effect on public opinion regarding it. Every man knows how it affects his own pocket, and every man will vote accordingly at the next election, because every man knows now where the two parties are in respect to it. One is for that reciprocity which I believe the majority of the people in this country desire; the other, while professing to look towards Washington for relief, talks nothing but pure protection before the House, and have put themselves on record as a protectionist Government, pure and simple. Let the National Policy be judged by its results; let the Government also be judged, not by their words, but by their actions, both during this debate and in the future.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would not trespass upon the time of the House at this advanced hour in the morning were it not that direct personal reference has been made to myself by two members of the Ministry. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his speech which he made some few evenings ago, did me the honour to refer to me as one who had been compelled by the necessities of the occasion to desert my own leader, etc., as he expressed it, to "sail into victory" in the rear of my late honoured leader. The Minister of Finance this evening has also referred to me, and done me the honour of quoting some utterances of mine made during the election campaign in my county, when I was returned again to sit in this House. It is true, as the Minister of Finance has stated, and as I acknowledged myself on the occasion of my nomination, that I declared myself opposed to discrimination against the mother country in the event of any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity being carried in the country. I differ from my leader in regard to that position yet. I am opposed to the passage of any measure which, while offering certain advantages of free trade to the United States, should make it impossible for the mother country to enjoy those same advantages. I also expressed myself on that occasion as not believing that the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, as advocated by those with whose political views I sympathise, necessitated the adoption of any common tariff with the United States. I expressed myself as believing that if the Liberals came into power and proposed any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States they would, as my leader declared it to be his views this evening, retain the control and management of our own tariff. I hold that opinion still. The Minister of Finance, however, could hardly have been serious when he expressed himself as entertaining any doubt as to how I should vote upon the resolutions of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), which are now before the Chair. He knows well enough my opinions as to the character of the administration of the general interests of this country by the party of which he has been a distinguished member for many years past, and he can have no doubt as to what my view would be upon resolutions which would commit this House to an approval of the general financial policy of the Government, to an approval of all the public acts of the Government which have administered the affairs

of this country for many years past. I shall content myself now with saying that while I held the views which I express now with regard to some features of unrestricted reciprocity, I shall have no hesitation in voting against the resolutions which have been presented to the House by the hon. member for L'Islet, containing, as they do, so many declarations of policy with which I have no sympathy.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Baker,	Larivière,
Bergeron,	Léger,
Bowell,	Lépine,
Burnham,	Lippé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonald (King's),
Carignan,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cleveland,	Macdowall,
Coatsworth,	McAllister,
Cochrane,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cockburn,	McDougald (Pictou),
Corbould,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Corby,	McKay,
Costigan,	McLennan,
Craig,	McLeod,
Curran,	McNeill,
Daly,	Madill,
Daoust,	Mara,
Davin,	Marshall,
Davis,	Masson,
Denison,	Miller,
Desaulniers,	Mills (Annapolis),
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Montague,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	O'Brien,
Dewdney,	Ouimet,
Dickey,	Pelletier,
Dugas,	Pope,
Dupont,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Earle,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Roome,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Savard,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Temple,
Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tupper,
Hodgins,	Tyrwhitt,
Hutchins,	Wallace,
Ingram,	Weldon,
Ives,	White (Cardwell),
Jamieson,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—99.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Hargraft,
Allison,	Harwood,
Amyot,	Hyman,
Bain,	Innes,
Barron,	King,
Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Légris,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown (Chateauguay),	McGregor,
Brown (Monck),	McMillan,
Cameron (Huron),	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Monet,
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Christie,	Mulock,
Davidson,	Murray,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edwards,	Rinfret,
Fauvel,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Frémont,	Simard,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Truax,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Watson.—77.
Guay,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. McCarthy,	Mr. Préfontaine,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Adams,	Mr. Colter,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Kenny,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Moncrieff,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Burns,	Mr. German,
Mr. Patterson (Colchester),	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Tisdale,	Mr. Armstrong,
Mr. Wilmot,	Mr. Burdett,
Mr. Skinner,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Mackintosh.	Mr. Spohn.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn), and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) have not voted.

Mr. SPOHN. I paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh).

Mr. LISTER. I paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff). Had I voted it would have been against the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply at its next sitting.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act. He said: This Bill consists of one short clause to be added to the present Act, by which power is given to the Governor in Council to make regulations to exempt wholly or in part the inspection of petroleum oils that are not fit and suitable for illuminating purposes. The difficulty experienced under the present Act is that it makes all petroleum oil subject to inspection, to the flash and gravity tests, which are arranged for illumin-

ating oils. Oils that are used for lubricating purposes cannot be expected to meet these tests. This Bill is to exempt oils from these tests, except such as are used for illuminating purposes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, under such regulations and restrictions as are made by Order in Council, to the producers of any raw beet-root sugar produced in Canada wholly from beets grown therein, between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, and the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three, of a bounty of one dollar per one hundred pounds, and in addition thereto, three and one-third cents per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree over seventy degrees shown by the polariscopic test.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand the Minister of Finance announced to this House, when he first intimated his intention of bringing this resolution before the House, that the bounty would be for one year only. I notice that this resolution says three years. What is the cause of the change?

Mr. FOSTER. It is only usual to discuss these resolutions when we go into committee on them. I have only given notice that to-morrow the House go into committee on this resolution. I will then explain it to the satisfaction of the hon. member for North Wellington.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. The *Empire* newspaper of Toronto of yesterday has a telegram from Montreal stating, among other things, that Messrs. Beausoleil, Preston and Greenshields had been sent there on some mission, that we had met, and had afterwards called a meeting of Liberals to be held at the Windsor Hotel on Sunday, and that we had secured certain letters or documents written by a member of the present Government, out of which we expected great results. I wish to state that although I went to Montreal on Saturday morning, I went home on Saturday evening and remained there until yesterday. I know of no such meeting and no such letters.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this in order?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a personal explanation, denying a serious charge.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. The statement in the *Empire* is a fabrication, and there is not one word of truth in it.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The other day when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) wished to bring a matter before this House, and to deny a statement made in a newspaper published in Toronto of what was alleged he had stated in Toronto, Mr. Speaker decided that my hon. friend was out of order, and he was not allowed to make his explanation. I gather from what the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has said, that this is a case somewhat similar. His explanation does not refer to anything that occurred in this House, but to something that occurred in Montreal.

SUPPLY—TIMBER LICENSES, &c.

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

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you, Sir, leave the Chair, I wish to bring to the attention of the House and the country a matter of some importance, a matter that has been discussed in the House before, a matter on which this House has twice pronounced an opinion adverse to the opinion I believe it should have pronounced, a matter on which I will ask the House to pronounce an opinion again. We have in this country popular government, a government supposed to be by the people, a government the object of which should be to forward the interests of the people. We have a democratic Government essentially, and the public property, the public domain, the public resources, all that constitutes the wealth of the nation belongs not to cliques, monopolies or favoured classes or favoured individuals, but belongs to the people at large; and any conduct of the Government that is calculated to waste these resources, to impair these resources, to take from the people for the benefit of classes, the heritage that belongs to the people, is a policy that should receive the condemnation of the representatives of the people in this House. Money should be providently spent, the taxation imposed on the people should be as light as the circumstances of the people will permit. The public resources should be husbanded—resources in land, resources in minerals, resources in timber, whatever resources of a public character may be in the possession of the people, or of the Government as trustees of the people, should be carefully husbanded and wisely and properly administered.

Now, Sir, we have at the present moment, we had the other day in this House, an instance which showed carelessness at least on the part of the Government in the guardianship of the public rights in the matter of the public domain. We had a land grant put through this House which I do not believe the circumstances of the case warranted. We have a policy, Sir, which is frittering away the greater portion of our vast public domain in the North-West, and by which this Dominion, in the shape of large land grants, is placing in the hands of monopolies, in the hands of charter brokers, individuals who secure charters for railways from this House, and become charter hawkers, carrying charters around the country seeking to obtain purchasers; the Government investing them with the right given by the charter, and endowing them with large land grants in order to enable them to float their schemes and obtain purchasers. The circumstances which attend the administration of affairs by this Government since 1878 have been characterized, I am sorry to say, in many instances by favouritism, by nepotism, by jobbery, by waste of public resources, by corrupt practices, and by practices calculated to debase and debauch Parliament, and to lower the moral tone of the people of this country.

I wish to refer, Mr. Speaker, more especially to the state of affairs that existed from 1882 to 1886 or 1887. On the eve of the election brought on in 1882, we had the Government of Canada making its preparations for the purpose of influencing public sentiment, and of attaching to its standard certain money and social influences that it was believed would be a great service in the approaching contest, and which undoubtedly was of great service to the Government. We had first of all the Gerrymander Act, and that Act was followed by the adoption of certain plans with regard to our public domain in our North-West Territories that were clearly intended, primarily, to secure for the Government different influences; to secure for the Government moneyed and other influential support.

We had first of all the colonization land grant scheme, by which applicants were enabled to secure from the Government grants of land in blocks of townships, at one-half the price at which these lands were offered to settlers. These grants were made upon easy terms of payment, holding out to the speculator embarking in the scheme the prospect of great wealth, in the securing of these grants under the colonization plan at a nominal price of $1 an acre, to be sold by these speculators to the settler at such price as they might deem fit to ask, or be able to secure, while the settler, for the same land, was charged by the Government double the price that the speculator was charged.

Then we had the scheme in regard to mineral lands. We had a scheme propounded by the Government by which speculators were enabled to secure mineral and coal land leases at a mere nominal price by private application, without the necessity of competing with some other person who might want the same coal lands, and in this way the Government attached to its interests a class of speculators who wished to embark in the business of owning coal and mineral lands.

We had also the pasture land lease abuse. We had the Government granting to applicants blocks of pasture land, the only restriction, I think, being that they should not exceed 50,000 acres. We had the Government granting these leases at 1 cent per acre, the interest at 6 per cent. on 16 cents per acre, and in this way millions of acres were granted, far in advance of the wants of stock-raisers, to speculators by the Government, and by this means the Government secured additional influence from that class of men who speculated in these leases.

Then we had the Government policy in regard to timber limits. We had in dispute between the Government of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada a large area of nearly 100,000 square miles, north and north-west of Lake Superior. The Government proceeded to parcel out a very large portion of that disputed territory for which it had no title, and to parcel it out among its favourites, and it carried this policy to our territory in the North-West. The Government policy with regard to the granting of timber limits was that, whenever an application was made, the Government considered that application, and if there was no other application covering the same area and if the person making the application, as I should judge from the returns and results, was of the proper political stripe, the application was granted, and in this way a very large amount of land was granted before the elections of 1882, thereby securing an additional influence on behalf of the Government. We now know of other influences, Sir, that were at work besides these, and we can understand how strong was the position in which the Government entrenched itself, through contract brokerage, through timber limit grants, through pasture land leases, through coal land leases, and through all these plans adopted by an unscrupulous Government in order to strengthen itself and to secure an additional support from the class who could wield influence in this country. Now, Sir, there was a note of warning sounded at this time. There was a note of warning sounded before the elections of 1882, in this House, by the Hon. Edward Blake. It became apparent to keen observers of what was transpiring, that the Government were disposing in a reckless manner of timber limits, of pasture lands, of coal lands, and of other resources belonging to the country, and in March, 1882, the Hon. Edward Blake moved the following resolution in this House:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate consideration to favoured individuals.

"That it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits."

This was a wise and proper restriction, proposed by the Hon. Edward Blake, then the leader of the Opposition, as regards the granting of timber limits in the North-West, and in the other public domain of Canada. Was that restriction accepted by the House; was this resolution adopted by the House?

Mr. DAVIN. In what year was that?

Mr. CHARLTON. In 1882. No, Sir, it was not adopted by the House. On the contrary, at the very outset of this great abuse—which culminated in the year 1884—when the leader of the Opposition warned the country and warned the House of the tendency of this condition of things, this House refused that motion made by Mr. Blake, and it refused it by a strict party vote. And so the Government went on its course without anything to restrict it in this matter. We knew, Sir, what was going on then. We knew what later investigations revealed; we knew that the Government were granting thousands of square miles to its favourites. We knew that individuals who never dreamed of lumbering, and who knew nothing of lumbering, were hawking Orders in Council giving them those limits, up and down the streets of this city and in other parts of the Dominion seeking for purchasers. We knew that the most venal influences were at work, and that a condition of things existed that was in the highest degree detrimental to the public interest. We knew this when this motion of Mr. Edward Blake was moved, we knew it more thoroughly afterwards, and we knew it when the resolution which I shall shortly allude to was moved in 1886.

Now, Sir, I wish to call attention briefly—I will not go to the extent I did in 1886, into this matter, but I wish to call attention briefly to the influences that were exerted upon the members of this House, through these various schemes that this Government had devised; the schemes of making grants of coal leases, pasture land leases, colonization grants, and timber limits. Let us take first the subject of

coal leases. Up to February, 1883, 449 applications had been received for coal leases; and I shall give a list of the members of this House who made private applications for coal leases, which were placed in the hands of the Minister of the Interior and acted upon by him without competition being invited. These leases, when granted, were granted to those parties as favours; they were corrupt influences, which gave the parties an unjust advantage over the public at large. Among these applicants were:

J. C. Patterson	4	applications.
C. C. Colby	7	do
John Haggart	1	do
A. Boultbee	1	do
Thomas Scott	1	do
John Ogilvie, Senator	1	do
Hector Cameron	1	do
J. G. Blanchet	1	do
J. C. Rykert	1	do
R. Doull	1	do
Robert Hay	1	do
George Hillard	1	do
N. F. Davin	1	do

Thirteen applications by men who were or have since become members of this House. There were also two applications by Sir A. T. Galt, who is reaping a fortune to-day from the coal leases granted to him, and two by the Hon. John Norquay. Here were thirteen members of Parliament placed in a position, through favours granted to them by the Government, to seriously interfere with the independent exercise of their functions as members of this House.

Next, let us turn to the colonization grants. Under Colonization Plan No. 1, by which the applicant was enabled to obtain one or more townships on easy terms of payment at $1 per acre, up to the 23rd of December, 1884, 251 applications were made, covering 2,295 townships of land; and I propose to give you the applications made by members of Parliament for grants of townships:

Robert Hay, M.P.	18½	townships.
Col. Williams, M.P.	6	do
Geo. A. Drew, M.P.	4	do
C. H. Mackintosh, M.P., and associates	7	do
John White, M.P.	4	do
Geo. Guillet, M.P.	13	do
C. G. Ferguson, M.P., and associates	8	do
Hugo Krantz, M.P.	5	do
Thos. Arkell, M.P.	6	do
Wm. Elliott, M.P.	5	do
M. H. Gault, M.P.	2	do
Robt. Doull, M.P.	4	do
Geo. P. Orton, M.P.	6	do
P. Valin, M.P.	1	do
J. C. Patterson and associates	7	do
J. S. McCuaig, M.P.	1	do
James Beaty, M.P.	1	do
J. B. Daoust, M.P.	6	do
Clarke Wallace, M. P., and associates	6	do
C. C. Colby, M.P., and associates	6	do
Senator Almon, and others	12½	do
D. McMillan, M.P.	6	do
D. Tisdale, now M.P.	12	do

A total of 132 townships applied for by 23 members of Parliament; and of these applications at least twenty were merely speculative, made not with the intention of settling the land, but as a matter of speculation with the view of selling the grant to second parties.

Then we come to the pasture leases, under which, I think, over 2,000,000 acres of land were granted privately and without competition, at one cent an acre rental, per annum, and with no restriction except that the good boy who stood in with the Government should be limited to 50,100 acres. These leases were granted far in advance of the requirements of stockmen, and in not one-seventh of these cases was any stock placed on the ranches.

Then we come to the most important feature of these abuses, that is, the granting of timber limits. Up to February, 1885—returns have not been brought down to a later period—over 550 Orders in Council had been granted for timber limits of 50 square miles each, covering an area of over 25,000 square miles of timber territory: and the bonuses received for them were practically nil. In cases where two or more parties applied for the same area the Government would allow these parties to compete between themselves as to who would give the highest bonus, and they could easily arrange the matter between themselves. The Province of Ontario has less than one-third of the area covered by these areas under license, and the bonuses which that province has received from putting its timber limits up at public auction amount to over $3,000,000, while the bonuses received by this Government for three times the area were practically nothing. Now, I propose to point out what influence this system has probably had upon the independence of the members of this House, from the facts that were elicited with regard to members of Parliament from the returns that were brought down. Of persons applying for and obtaining limits for themselves, who were then or are now members of this House, there were the following:

C. C. Colby	50 miles.	O. C., June	3, 1883
J. G. H. Bergeron	50 "	" Jan.	24, 1883
N. F. Davin	50 "	" Dec.	15, 1882
L. McCallum	50 "	" May	15, 1884
Hyp. Montplaisir	50 "	" Dec.	17, 1883
Hon. G. W. Howlan	50 "	" April	29, 1884
M. K. Dickinson	50 "	" July	24, 1882
John White	50 "	" Mar.	23, 1883
Hon. W. Muirhead	50 "	" Oct.	3, 1882
Duncan McMillan	50 "	" April	11, 1882
J. B. Daoust & Co	50 "	" May	3, 1883
H. Robillard	50 "	" Aug.	29, 1883
H. A. Ward	50 "	" Nov.	1, 1883
Geo. Guillet	50 "	" Mar.	29, 1883
G. L. Dickinson	50 "	" July	12, 1882
David Tisdale	50 "	" Dec.	6, 1883
W. H. Montague	50 "	" May	15, 1884
W. E. Sanford	50 "	" June	11, 1884
D. H. Macdowall	50 "	" May	14, 1883
Adam Brown	50 "	" Feb.	9, 1885
Hon. A. W. Ogilvie	50 "	" May	9, 1883
L. H. Massue	50 "	" Feb.	5, 1883
John Rochester	50 "	" June	30, 1882

Now, here are twenty-three members of Parliament, —either then or now members of this House, or the Senate,—besides three ex-members, William Elliot, Oscar Fulton and David Blain—twenty-six members of Parliament in all who have received timber limits from this Government on private applications, without being required to compete with others, and paying therefor the nominal rental of $5 per square mile per annum. The course that should have been pursued by the Government at that time was to have placed these limits on the market, to have advertised them for sale, to have invited bids, and to have sold them to the highest bidder; but in place of that, these limits were placed in the hands of these members of Parliament, not one of whom intended to develop them, but only to hold them for speculation and to sell them afterwards for large bonuses to persons who wished to buy them. In the case of the Rykert limit, $150,000 was made on an investment of $250 with the Government, other transactions were made at profits of thousands

of dollars each by limit holders. And all profits, that accrued to members who had made application and received limits, these members of this House were enabled to make, through the Government placing these limits in their hands and giving them this unfair advantage over the general public. Then we had members who applied for limits without success, but there were not many. We had Mr. George P. Orton, then a member of this House, who made application on 21st October, 1884, but the limit he applied for was covered by a previous application. We had Mr. F. Vanasse, who applied on 28th March, 1884, but there had been a previous application, and he did not get the limit. We had Thomas Scott, who made application in August, 1882, but the limit he applied for was covered, and he did not get it. We had the Hon. George E. Foster, now Finance Minister, who made application on 25th April, 1883, but, for the same reason I have just given, failed to get the limit. Then we had a few members who applied successfully for limits on behalf of their friends. I will give you the list. There was Hesson who applied for and obtained six limits for six of his friends.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that the member for North Perth?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; he was member for North Perth at the time.

Mr. OUIMET. Did any Grits apply?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think not; they seemed to be out of the swim. Mr. Hesson secured these limits, one for his son-in-law, and five others for friends of his. Mr. C. H. Mackintosh applied for a limit for a friend and secured it. And I may say here, that perhaps the same degree of blame ought not to attach to members who applied for others which attaches to those who applied for themselves, as perhaps it was natural that a member should use his influence on behalf of his friends, and is not blameable in the same degree. Mr. Hector Cameren made three applications, with success, for friends. Mr. L. McCallum made two applications for his friends, and succeeded. Mr. C. C. Colby made application for one limit for a friend successfully Mr. J. G. Bergeron obtained one limit for a friend. Hon. J. Royal obtained two limits for friends. Mr. J. C. Rykert made a successful application for one. Hon. G. W. Howlan applied for three successfully. Mr. M. K. Dickinson also applied with success for three. Mr. John White obtained five for his friends. Mr. Sproule obtained two, one of which was for his brother.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the hon. member for South Grey?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, the hon. member for South Grey. Mr. Duncan McMillan applied successfully for five limits for his friends. Hon. John Carling applied for four successfully. Mr. Orton obtained five limits for his friends. Mr. Robillard applied successfully for one. Mr. Kilvert obtained five for his friends. Mr. John Bryson applied successfully for two for his friends. Mr. Joseph Tassé applied successfully for three for his friends. Mr. H. A. Ward applied on behalf of his friends for three successfully. Mr. R. Tyrwhitt obtained one for a friend. Colonel Williams applied successfully for two. Mr. Dalton McCarthy made successful application for two. Mr. Hugo Krantz obtained one. Sir Adolphe Caron applied successfully for one, the recipient being a brother-in-law. Hon. John Haggart made successful application for one, also Mr. J. S. McCuaig. Mr. Thomas Farrow made application for three successfully for his friends. Mr. John Small applied for two, and Mr. J. S. Dawson applied successfully for one. We have in these applications made by members of this House on behalf of their friends, a total of 79 applications presented by 34 members of Parliament and covering 3,900 square miles, besides a total of 1,150 miles granted to members for themselves, making a grand total of 5,050 square miles of timber limits granted to members of Parliament on their applications, and we have 57 members applying, either for themselves or friends, for timber limits. The immorality of this does not require to be enlarged upon. To tell me that any man who receives so substantial a favour from the Government as the granting of 50 square miles of supposed valuable territory, has not his independence impaired thereby, is to talk nonsense. Such a practice saps the very foundation of the independence of the House of Commons.

I will trouble the House with a few of the names of the deserving Tories who received limits. We have the name of Sir A. T. Galt, Mr. W. B. Dickinson, Mr. John C. Sproule, O. W. Bailey, of Cookshire, son-in-law of the late Minister of Railways and Canals; John Geary, London; Robert Evans, Hamilton; J. M. Lotteridge, Hamilton; John W. Astley, A. S. Kirkland, William Broder, William Sharples, of Quebec, brother-in-law of the Minister of Militia; Peter McLaren, Archie Farrow, C. C. Small, who was at the time a brother of one of the representatives of Toronto; John Ginty, R. S. White, of Montreal, and I am not sure but that Mr. White is connected with the Montreal *Gazette*; Charles J. Campbell, brother of Sir A. C. Campbell; J. C. Jamieson, son-in-law of the Minister of Customs; J. H. Beatty, of Toronto; Alexander McInnes, whether a relative of the present Senator I do not know; M. Walsh, Ingersoll, who lately contested the riding represented by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); I believe he was unfortunate, as there were previous applications and he was told to make a tender, which he did, offering $50 bonus, and got the timber limit. Mr. A. F. Drummond, Montreal; Mr. Henry O'Brien, Toronto; Mr. J. S. Atkins, Mr. P. R. Blackstock, of Toronto; Mr. G. B. Black, city treasurer, Montreal; Mr. Robert Laurie, of Port Arthur; Mr. Frank Arnoldi and Mr. J. H. Bulmer. These are some of the deserving camp followers and friends of the Government who received these favours in common with members of Parliament and their friends. There is a great number more, but it is not necessary giving the House all the names, or going through the entire list of 550 names, and we might find among these names those of individuals who ought to be mentioned in the House. We might find the names of other members, but this list I have given reveals a state of things in connection with the management of the public domain which I believed then justified me in putting, on the 4th May, 1886, this motion before the House:

"The practice of members of the House applying for and becoming personally interested in the disposal by the Crown of those public resources, which are dealt with by the Executive, or by Parliament on its recommendation, has grown to alarming proportions, is in its nature liable to abuse, has in fact been abused, and should be checked,

in order to avoid lasting injury to the public interest and to restore and maintain the independence of this House."

You would imagine that no member of this House would have voted against that resolution. It did not seem to me anyone could, and yet several did. We had a division taken the same night, and I have the list here. It must have been a strict party vote, for I do not seem to have detached one member from his allegiance to the Government which had been guilty of these abuses, and it was affirmed by this House, by ninety-nine votes against forty-three, that my motion was not a proper one, that these members ought not to be condemned, and this House sanctioned and upheld these proceedings by its vote on that occasion.

In connection with this matter, I may be allowed to deal with a personal charge against myself. One of the parties, whose name I gave in 1886 as an applicant, in company with another individual, a Mr. Broder, for a limit, was Mr. Charles E. Hickey, then a member of this House. This charge was permitted by Mr. Hickey to pass undenied. He was present on the occasion, his name was on the division list, but the charge that he was a co-applicant with Mr. Broder for timber limits he allowed to pass in silence. Four years later he denied that charge, and when the denial was made I, of course, accepted it and I proceeded to search the returns for the purpose of seeing if I had been mislead. The task was a very ponderous one, as the return amounted to about 12,000 foolscap pages. I searched for the letter which I had referred to in the statement I had made in regard to Mr. Hickey and Mr. Broder. Though I failed to find that document, in searching for it I found other applications. I found that my hon. friend Mr. Davin was on the list. I found that my friend Mr. Adam Brown of Hamilton was on the list. I found that the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was on the list, I found that the Hon. Mr. Sanford was on the list, and that Mr. Macdowall and Mr. Bergeron were also on the list, so that the hon. gentlemen whose names appear here may thank the denial made by Mr. Hickey, and a subsequent attack made upon me this session by the Minister of Customs, for the facts which have been revealed as to those who were applicants and recipients of timber limits in the North-West. This letter upon which the charge against Mr. Hickey was based I repeat I have been unable to find. Whether it has been abstracted or not I do not know, but it is not there I believe. I am sorry that I could not find it because I believe that the document would warrant me in the assumption that Mr. Hickey was a co-applicant with Mr. Broder for the limit in question, and, in the absence of that document in its original state, I am obliged to take the version of Mr. Hickey himself as given in a debate in this House on the 7th May, 1890. The letter, as given by Mr. Hickey, and as it appears in the proceedings of the House of that day, is as follows :—

"20th April, 1883.

"SIR,—McMillan having failed in his agreement to have survey of timber limit in on the 17th instant, I claim, on behalf of Wm. Broder, the right to be a co-applicant for the limit covered by the application of McMillan.

"I trust we will get that equal consideration.

"Yours truly,

"CHARLES E. HICKEY."

Now, whether that is the exact language of the

letter or not which I examined when I made this statement, I do not know. I believed that it contained, after "Wm. Broder," the words "and myself." I am sorry that I cannot get the original letter, but I must in its absence be governed by the statement of Mr. Hickey, and I submit that the expression which closes the letter—

"I trust we will get that equal consideration"—

warranted me in the assumption which I made, that Mr. Hickey was interested with Mr. Broder in the application for this limit, and I submit that, after Mr. Hickey, having been present during that discussion, his name appearing on the division list in 1886, did not deny the assertion I had made and only challenged it in this House four years afterwards, I was warranted in supposing the statement I made in regard to him was correct, till it was denied by Mr. Hickey. I believed that it was correct, and if it was not so, Mr. Hickey should have disabused my mind of that impression. Then Mr. Hickey professed to produce an affidavit made by myself. I would like to see the original of that affidavit. I have asked for the original, but it has not been produced. We have what purports to be an affidavit made by me in the village of Lynedoch, in the County of Norfolk, on the 14th February, 1887, before Z. R. Slaghtt. There is no person in Lynedoch of that name. The affidavit professes to say that :

"I, John Charlton, of the village of Lynedoch, Ontario, do hereby solemnly declare and say that I was a member of the House of Commons in 1886. That during the winter of 1886, I made examination of certain returns regarding timber limits. That the returns were voluminous and not printed. That the said returns contained an application from Wm. Broder. That Charles E. Hickey, M. P., was a co-applicant. That the application was made 20th April, 1883, and that an Order in Council for 50 miles on the south side of Lake Kasgaskok was issued upon the said application, 30th April, 1884."

This is the affidavit. That is simply a reaffirmation of the statement I made in this House that Mr. Broder was an applicant for a timber limit and Mr. Hickey was a co-applicant with him. My warrant for this statement was the words which were used in that letter :

"I trust we will get that equal consideration.

"CHARLES E. HICKEY."

I have not the original letter before me, and I am presenting the case on the strength of Mr. Hickey's own statement. Why did I believe that statement? I believe it because the language of the letter warranted that construction, and because at the time and for four years subsequently it passed unchallenged in this House by Mr. Hickey.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). As a matter of fact, did you know it was true?

Mr. CHARLTON. I believed it was true, and I was entitled to believe it was true. When Mr. Hickey disavowed it, I accepted his disavowal and expressed regret that he had not stated that before, and that I should have unwittingly made a charge which was unfair to that gentleman.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That was after the disavowal by Mr. Hickey?

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Hickey should have disavowed this on the 4th May, 1886, but, upon a motion justifying the Government in granting limits to anyone who applied, he voted with them. The course taken by Mr. Hickey is a reflection upon other members of this House. Mr. Hickey assumes in 1890, that I have made a scandalous charge

against him. I simply charged that Mr. Hickey had done what fifty other members of this House had done, that he had done what this House twice voted, and will perhaps vote to-day, that it was right for him to do. The moment Mr. Hickey made his disavowal, I accepted it as I would have accepted it four years before. Mr. Hickey takes the ground that an act performed by Minister Colby, by Minister Foster, by Mr. McMillan, by you, Sir, the Deputy Speaker, and by some fifty other members of Parliament in making applications for timber limits, is corrupt, and that he is not open to the charge of doing just what the others did, and that to charge him with doing what fifty-seven members did, and what this House declared by its vote to be a proper legitimate act is to make a grave and scandalous charge. The House has vindicated Mr. Hickey, Mr. Foster, Mr. Colby and the fifty odd others by a vote of 43 to 99, and that amounts to saying that the action of these gentlemen was proper and right, so I do not know that Mr. Hickey has any ground of complaint for what is alleged to be a perfectly proper and right transaction as declared by this House on two occasions.

This system has always been defended by Sir John Macdonald, it was defended by the then Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. White, who was a most efficient officer and a gentleman whom everybody respected, and it has been defended by the declaration of this House by an overwhelming majority; so that the action of Mr. Hickey in this matter is a reflection upon his own friends. I cannot help imagining that he was prompted in this matter, after four years consideration of these subjects, by a desire to mitigate, to some extent, the force of the revelations made in 1886, after the record of the scandalous revelations that resulted in the resignation of his seat in this House by John Charles Rykert, who was no worse in kind, and possibly not in degree, than many other members, who, at least, sought to make profit out of limits granted to them.

Now, this whole timber limit episode, in the history of this country, is a most discreditable one to this Government and to this Parliament, and it fits in very nicely with the recent revelations made with regard to contract brokerage and all the scandals that have lately been exposed in part, and have horrified the country. As the House has twice refused to stamp its disapproval upon this line of action, as it refused, first, in 1882 to adopt a resolution that declared at the very outset that these things should not be permitted, a resolution which, if adopted, would have prevented all these abuses that followed the offering of that resolution of March, 1882; and as, after the culmination of all these abuses, after 550 Orders in Council had been granted, covering 25,500 square miles of territory, after twenty-three members of Parliament had been implicated in making application for themselves individually, after thirty-four members of Parliament had been implicated in making successful application for their friends—after all these revelations and disclosures were made, the House again, on the 7th May, 1886, declared, by the motion which I have read, that these practices were perfectly proper, regular and right. I propose to ask the House either to reaffirm its position taken in 1886 or to rescind it, one or the other. If it still approves this line of action, let the House have the honesty, the hardihood and the manliness to say so; if it disapproves of it, let it retrace its action upon these two former occasions and cast off its sins in this respect and repent. I move, therefore, that the following words be substituted for the motion placed in your hands:—

That abuses with regard to the disposal of timber limits, mineral leases, pasture leases and other public reserves by the Executive have obtained in past years that were calculated to impair the independence of this House through the opportunity afforded to members to secure grants for themselves and their friends by private application at nominal rates, and without being subject to competition; that many members did secure such grants for themselves and their friends; that the House of Commons in 1882, and again in 1886, refused to condemn such practice; this House nevertheless believes that those practices were not proper and should entirely cease, and that timber limits should be disposed of at public auction to the highest bidder, after being first advertised, and after the lapse of ample time from the publication of such advertisements, to enable intending purchasers to examine the limits offered for sale.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say that until the hon. member came towards his closing remarks upon the question that he has brought before the House, I was unable to see what purpose he had in view. I think that he cannot have attached very much importance to his motion or he would have given notice to myself, who am more particularly interested in this matter, or to the Government, that he proposed raising this question. I thought, also, that he might have given the Government an opportunity of showing how the administration of those lands had been improved from 1883 until 1887, to which period he has particularly referred as being the period within which he considers those improper dealings have taken place with the public domain and the timber limits.

Mr. CHARLTON. Only up to 1886.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Well, I cannot for the life of me see why he should have gone back, at this late date, to such ancient history as that. With regard to the policy of dealing with the colonization lands and timber limits which he speaks of, I may say that, in looking back, I cannot see how the country has suffered from the colonization scheme which was entered into, and which, to a very great extent, as the hon. gentleman knows, was taken advantage of by the people in the interest of colonization. We all know that it did not turn out as we expected, people did not come into the country as quickly as we anticipated, and the colonization scheme did not realize as much for the promoters as was anticipated. But the country has lost nothing by that. The colonization companies who found, after experimenting for some time, that they were unable to bring as many people into the country as they anticipated, came to the Government and said so, and the Government commuted with the colonization companies, and for every settler that was put upon the lands the company received what they were entitled to receive, and the balance of the lands reverted to the Government. In reference to the mineral leases and the coal leases which the hon. gentleman speaks of, I must say that I was unable to understand to what he refers. To-day I do not know of a single coal lease which is in the hands of any member or any company in the North-West Territories. The mineral lands have been sold for a certain sum, and, so far as I know, no mineral lease exists to-day. With regard to the pasture leases, I believe that the Government adopted a very wise policy. It was done for the purpose of affording encourage-

ment and to demonstrate to the world that we had a large pastoral region of the country, unequalled on the continent, and liberal provisions were given by which parties who felt inclined to go into that business were allowed to bring in cattle free for a certain number of years. A large number of applications were made. It could not be avoided that some parties held their leases for speculation, but the principal operators were men of capital who would not have gone into the business unless some inducements had been held out to them. As time went on, it was found that there were persons who had leases under their control who were holding them for speculative purposes, and in those cases they were cancelled, and leases for hundreds and thousands of acres have been cancelled within my time. I fail to see that any harm has been done by that policy. The hon. gentleman has brought forward the names of members of this House, who certainly had as much right to take advantage of the opportunities afforded in the western country as any other people. He has mentioned the name of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with regard to the colonization scheme with which he is connected. That is one of the two companies that exist to-day. The company has been carried on in a business-like manner; it has been successful as far as the country is concerned, and it has returned to the Government what was expected from it. I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman, although he is no doubt aware of it, that during the last few years there has been a change in our policy with respect to timber lands, and these lands since I have been in charge of the department, have been put up at public competition, and we have received very fair prices for them. I am not prepared to say that the policy of selling at public competition is not a better one; I believe it is. But why the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should have gone back to the early days of the North-West, I cannot understand. When the hon. gentleman came down to the personal matter and took the opportunity this afternoon of making his explanation—and I believe that was his only purpose he had in bringing forward the motion—I was sorry Mr. Hickey was not in this House. It was a painful matter when brought before the House on previous occasions, and so strongly did Mr. Hickey feel on the question that I understand that if he had been here another session he intended to propose the reference of this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that the truth might be arrived at. It is a matter in which I am not interested, except as regards the veracity of a former colleague on this side of the House and an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, but I should have liked to have seen the matter cleared up. I do not see any necessity for this motion, nor does the hon. gentleman expect that the amendment before the House is likely to lead to a very long debate, for no member will fail to understand that no beneficial results can be derived from it. The hon. gentleman has submitted a motion similar to one he moved some years ago, which was voted down, and I believe the same views will be held by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as were held then.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. Minister appeard to find fault with the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) because he did not give him notice of his intention to move an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. He assumed, therefore, that the motion was of no importance whatever. I think we have only to look at the history of the last three years to see the mismanagement which has characterized the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite in the North-West matters, to come to the conclusion, not that this motion is unimportant, but that it is of the greatest possible importance. The hon. Minister thinks that no harm has been done by the Government policy regarding colonization companies. That may be his view, but it is not the view which will be held by anyone who has taken the trouble to interview settlers in the North-West. Do we not know that the whole history of this country shows that the desire of the people has been against giving monopolies large tracts of land? I can tell the Minister that man after man has left the North-West because he found the whole territory honey-combed with colonization companies. Settlers desiring to locate on particular lands found that those lands were in the hands of colonization companies who extracted from them the most stringent conditions in regard to settlement. Then the hon. gentleman, answering I think too briefly this very important amendment, said that during his incumbency of office he had put up timber limits to public auction and had realized fair prices for them. I ask if he received a fair price for the timber limits situated at Indian Reserve No. 6, north shore of Georgian Bay, which was sold to an hon. gentleman who now sits in this House? The hon. gentleman says he put up these limits to public auction. How? If I understand the practice aright it is this: An application is made for a timber limit by some person who has become aware of the fact that there was valuable timber there. The Minister then calls for tenders. Tenders are received secretly by the Minister and behind the door of his own office, not received openly so that everyone can bid, as is the practice followed by the Ontario Government. But the Minister says he has received fair value for the limits. Did he receive a fair value for the timber limit on the north shore of Georgian Bay for which $317 were paid for 79 square miles, when at that time the Ontario Government were selling limits for $2,000 and $3,000 per square mile in the same locality? Yet the Minister has the hardihood to say that he received a very fair value for the limits. Why did he say that? Because the men who had a right to complain were not the men who had votes, but were Indians, over whom the Minister was placed in the position of guardian, they being wards, and it was his duty to have done his utmost to obtain the best possible prices for those limits.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was done before my time, and if the hon. gentleman wants to go into it, I can show how his friends treated those very Indians.

Mr. BARRON. Then the hon. Minister endeavours to get out of this iniquitous transaction by saying that he was not in the department when it was done. Then, his predecessor in office was to blame; and out of his own mouth he proves the iniquity of the transaction. Let me give a little attention to this matter. Who asked to buy this timber limit—this timber limit on the north shore of Georgian Bay of 79 square miles, a most valuable limit? Here is the letter from the applicant:

"OTTAWA, 13th Oct., 1885.

"The Minister of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.

"SIR,—We the undersigned hereby make application to obtain privilege of cutting timber on an Indian reserve situated on the north shore of Lake Huron and known as the Whitefish Indian Reserve.

"The accompanying sketch, coloured red, will show the territory applied for.

"Yours respectfully,

"JOSEPH RIOPELLE & CO."

When I read that letter in this House a session or two ago some hon. gentleman said I had not proved that the applicant was an hon. member of this House. Let me read further a document which will show the names of the persons who constituted the firm of Riopelle and Company:

"OTTAWA, 11th November, 1885.

"To the Minister of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.

"HON. SIR,—I take the liberty to remind you of my application for license to cut timber on an Indian reserve.

"Will you please let me know the result of your conclusion in this matter, and much oblige.

"Your obedient servant,

"H. ROBILLARD."

Mr. Honoré Robillard being at that time the junior member for the city of Ottawa; and yet, Sir, when I first of all spoke upon this subject a session or two ago, it was sought to make it appear that Mr. Robillard was not the applicant, but that the applicant was Riopelle & Co. Now, Sir, during that discussion, and that is more particularly why I rise to my feet, because I do think that we should try as nearly as possible to get down to bottom facts in our discussions upon the floor of this chamber, and on that occasion I made the statement to the House on information which I was informed to be true, accurate, and reliable, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robillard) was interested in that timber limit. This is what occurred on that occasion, and I quote from *Hansard*:

"Mr. BARRON. Now, I would like to know from the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) how much money did he get for this?

"Mr. ROBILLARD. I got nothing at all. I had no interest in it more than the hon. gentleman himself.

"Mr. BARRON. Who had? The Government got $316 from the junior member for Ottawa and the property was sold to him, it was sold to Riopelle & Co., and the hon. gentleman was one of that company, and he certainly realized some of this booty out of the sale to Francis Bros. If I am not altogether misinformed, he realized something between $45,000 and $50,000. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

"Mr. ROBILLARD. I say it is false."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, he said that the statement I made was false.—

"Mr. BARRON. Well, I suppose I am bound to take his statement inside this House, but if I were outside this House I do not think I would take his statement.

"Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

"Mr. BARRON. It has been suggested——

"Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

"Mr. BARRON. Withdraw what?

"Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is a very offensive statement.

"Mr. BARRON. I say I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

"Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. member said he would not take this statement outside of this House. That is unparliamentary.

"Mr. BARRON. I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member inside this House, but it is very extraordinary that Riopelle & Co., one of whom was himself, should have got this money from Francis Bros., and he, the junior member for Ottawa, should not have got anything at all."

I have taken the trouble to read that at length, because here I have the statement over the signature of Mr. Latour, a gentleman who can be found very easily, that what I stated then was true and correct, and that the statement of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) was incorrect and unfair to me. Let me read the statement of Mr. Latour:

"OTTAWA, 28th March, 1890.

"I beg to state that learning that Mr. Honoré Robillard has acquired and was owner of one-half interest in the timber license upon Indian Reserve, Treaty No. 6, 79 square miles in extent, from Dominion Government, I met him and offered him for his individual one-half share the sum of $10,000 in cash. I said to him: 'You come up to the bank and I'll give you a cheque right off.' Mr. Robillard replied that he would consult with his partner, Mr. Joseph Riopelle, and give me an answer. I understood at this conversation from Mr. Robillard, that he owned an individual one-half interest and Mr. Riopelle the other individual one-half interest in said limit. Having obtained no reply to my offer and subsequently meeting Mr. Robillard in the lobby of the House of Commons, I mentioned the subject of my offer to him and he then replied that he sold his interest in the limit to Mr. Barnet, of Barnet & McKay, Renfrew, for the sum of $15,000 cash. I reproached him for not giving me an opportunity to raise my offer, and he simply expressed his regret at my disappointment, as he thought it best not to refuse the offer of $15,000. This latter conversation took place after Mr. Robillard's election as a member to the House of Commons. I have reason to believe that Mr. Barnet transferred his half share to one Maguire, who was in his employ, and for whom he bought the half interest. Riopelle and Maguire were then the owners and proposed to work the limit, but receiving an offer for the whole of $55,000 from Allan Francis, of Pakenham, disposed of the limit to the latter for this amount.

(Sgd.) "O. LATOUR."

There, Sir, is my justification for the statement I made, which statement was characterized as false, and that letter also is an answer to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who has said here to-day that he got a fair price for that limit. That letter shows, Sir, that the gentleman who received the limit finally from Mr. Robillard got $55,000 in hard cash for that timber limit, belonging to the Indians, which the Government sold for $316. Three hundred and sixteen dollars, Mr. Speaker! Ten per cent. of it was divided among the Indians, and there being 100 Indians they got 31 cents each; while Mr. Robillard, the member for Ottawa, puts $15,000 in his pocket for which he only gave $316. Then, Sir, we find the Minister of the Interior trying to make us believe a session or two ago, that that was a very laudable and beneficial sale indeed, and that, in his character of trustee and guardian of the Indians, he was looking after their interest so carefully, and was doing all for them that a parent ought to do for a child; then he tells the House: Why after all, although it was sold for $316, it is a grand sale, because in dues the Indians will get $20,000 before the limit is cut. Could there be any more condemnatory statement than this out of the mouth of the Minister himself? If the Indians were to get $20,000 in dues, the timber must have been there to produce the dues, and if the timber was there to produce $20,000 dues at $1 per thousand, there were 20,000,000 feet of timber, and at $2 per thousand, which would be the fair and ordinary price, it would amount to $40,000 which the Minister of Interior out of his own mouth proves he should have got for that timber limit instead of the $316 for which it was sold to Mr. Robillard. What do we find further in connection with this, Mr. Speaker. We find that as soon as the sale was made, Messrs. Francis Brothers who operated that limit, in a letter addressed to the department on the 14th October,

1889, state that in one year, they cut 19,900 pieces of sawlogs containing 2,500,000 feet board measure; 2,095 square white pine, containing 125,000 some odd cubic feet of timber: and 481 pieces of red pine, containing 23,000 or 24,000 odd cubic feet, in one year, which at a fair and reasonable price, would amount to $8,250. In other words, they got $8,250 in one year alone for that which the Government sold without competition for $316 to a supporter of theirs in the city of Ottawa. And yet the Minister says that they have been putting up to public competition the limits that they have been selling. Why, Sir, if they had advertised that timber limit of 79 square miles for sale, they likely would have got a bid from Francis Brothers; and Francis Brothers gave $55,000 to Mr. Riopelle and his friends. Why, in the name of common sense, would not the Messrs. Francis Brothers have given that same sum of money to the Government of Canada, if the limit had been put up to public competition by public auction? But the Government did not do that. They secretly and behind closed doors in a room, sold the limit to Mr. Robillard for $316, and the Indians got the paltry sum of 31 cents each, being a distribution among them of 10 per cent. of this $316. And they are told by the Government to be consoled, to be happy, to go to their camps, to remain happy and contented, to go to their firesides and rejoice with their little ones, because they are going to get $20,000 in dues.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BARRON. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "oh," but I will undertake to say that if they were in the position of these poor Indians; if they were the wards and had a trustee who would do this with their property, they would not rest until they had punished him by the law.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. member not know that they got $13,000 besides the $316. Was he not in the House and heard that last year?

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman says they got $13,000; I admit they got $13,000 in dues.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BARRON. I admit that, and the very statement now made by the Postmaster General, who is always so eager to back up the Government, proves the value of the limit. If they could get $13,000 of dues, surely there must have been 13,000,000 feet at $1 a thousand to produce $13,000; and at $2 a thousand of a bonus, there would have been $26,000 the Indians should have received. Instead of that they only got $316. In the next year the Messrs. Francis Bros. report having cut a quantity of timber which brought to themselves $28,000. In the two years they cut from the property, which was sold for $316, timber of the value to them from their own statements of $36,250. And yet, Sir, the hon. Minister of the Interior, replying to the hon. gentleman who moves this amendment, says that all has been beautiful and lovely, and that they have been doing all that is right and proper and for the best. I will leave it to this House to say whether or not they have dealt fairly in the past, and whether, judging them by the past, they are likely to deal fairly and properly in the future, and to say whether a stop should not be put to the iniquitous system which has been going on in the past. What is more: Hon. gentlemen might find some excuse if they could say that they knew nothing about this territory, that they had not discovered that it was an Indian reserve, and had no knowledge that this timber limit was so valuable. I have the letter of the very agent of these Indians, and I will read it if the hon. gentlemen opposite want to hear it, in which he writes down here to Ottawa, and in which he says: Do not sell that timber limit until you have had it inspected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. BARRON. Here is the letter from Mr. Phipps, written in 1885.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is ancient history.

Mr. BARRON. Yes, the hon. gentleman thinks the letter ancient history, because he knows that ancient history is a condemnation of the acts of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Phipps' letter is as follows:—

"SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of official letter dated 23rd inst., instructing me to report on the application of Messrs. Joseph Riopelle & Co. to obtain the privilege of cutting fallen, dead and green timber on the Indian Reserve at Whitefish Lake. I beg respectfully to state that, although I am not well acquainted with the reserve in question, yet I am satisfied from what I have seen that it contains a large quantity of pine timber, much more than the Indians will be likely to require for their own purposes. I have every reason to believe that the Indians would be willing to agree to the timber being sold by the department for their benefit. The chief stated to me his intention of coming to Manitowaning this fall, and I shall be able then to ascertain his views upon this point. The value of the dead and fallen pine should be, in my opinion, realized as early as possible, as that description of timber deteriorates rapidly. As for the timber, any opinion of mine without a more perfect knowledge of the quantity would be almost guesswork. I would suggest, if the Indians are willing to surrender, that an examination be made by an experienced lumberman."

There, Mr. Speaker, is the letter of the agent, who ought to know all about these Indians over whom he presides as a sort of guardian, and in whose charge this reserve was placed, telling the department down here that the timber, so far as he knows, is very valuable, and suggesting that they should send up a man to inspect that timber limit before selling it to anybody. Did they do that after the manner and example of the Ontario Government? No; but placing a bandage before their eyes, they tell Mr. Robillard that he may have this valuable timber limit of 79 square miles in extent for $316. Now, I see the hon. member for Ottawa in his seat, and I tell him that I have read the statement of Mr. Latour in which he says that he offered the hon. gentleman $10,000 for his half-interest in this timber limit, and that the hon. member for Ottawa refused it, that afterwards he met the hon. member in the lobby of the House, and that the hon. member for Ottawa told him that he had received $15,000 in cash for his half-interest; and it was especially for this reason that I got up on this occasion, because last session he contradicted me flatly, saying that he had no interest in that limit.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I do so again.

Mr. BARRON. Then all I can say is that if he says so, he can fight the matter out with Mr. Latour, who says the very opposite. Now, I think, under all the circumstances, that this amendment is not so unimportant as the hon. Minister of Interior thinks it is, because, forsooth, he states that notice was not given to him that the amendment was going to be brought before the House. I am not altogether satisfied that the treatment

accorded to us on this side of the House has been such this session as to require us to give them notice of amendments on going into Committee of Supply. But in any case the hon. Minister of the Interior is not justified in saying that the amendment is not an important one. What can be more important than the manner of disposing of the heritage of the people of Canada, especially the manner of disposing of the property of the people—not that class who have votes, but those over whom the hon. gentleman presides as trustee and who are his wards. Under all the circumstances, therefore, this is an amendment which ought to commend itself to the fairness and reason of hon. members of this House, and which justifies the hon. member who has moved it in asking that it shall be supported by a very large majority.

Mr. ROBILLARD. Mr. Speaker, last year, when a similar charge was made against me, I rose in my place and made a statement in reply to it; but it seems that the hon. gentleman will not accept my statement, and is bound to convict me whether I am guilty or not guilty. Now, when I deny the charge he refers me to a man from whom he says he got his information. I now repeat what I said last year. People would meet me on the street, and they would have it that these were my limits. I stated that they were not. I wrote a letter to Sir John; I was then a member of the House in Toronto; and the application was not entered in my name. Latour met me and asked me if I would take $10,000 for the limits. Of course I will not give everybody my private business, and I said I would not touch it because the limits were not my own. As for the statement that I got $15,000, I say it is false. Mr. Latour in stating that stated a falsehood, and the man who repeats it repeats a falsehood. I said I had made something from the grant of Mr. Riopelle, who is a Liberal living in this city. As for what I made, it is nobody's business; it is my private business. I defy the hon. gentleman or anybody else to show that there was anything irregular. I never bought a timber limit, and I do not know any man of the name of Francis; I will say that on my oath. I do not know the firm of Francis Brothers. I never saw the limit, I never cut a tree on it in my life or sold a board or log off it or anything of the kind. Mr. Latour is a Grit, of course, of the worst kind, something of the stamp of my hon. friend who has just spoken. I made the statement and I repeat it, that I did refuse $10,000, because I could not sell what I did not own, and as regards the $15,000 I never got that nor did anybody offer it to me. I brand that as a falsehood. The hon. gentleman says to me to go and find out from Mr. Latour, but it is he whose duty it is to go and find out, if he thinks he can prove his false charge. I see by the blue-books of Ontario that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) received $1,500 as lawyer for this firm of Francis Brothers who had a suit against the Government. I do not see why the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is bringing this matter up every year. I repeat it is false that I ever got $15,000; and as regards what little I did get, that is nobody's business. Then I am told by my hon. friend that he is satisfied there was some secret chamber business about all this. Well, I applied for the limits according to the regulations, but could not tell now what the regulations were, but I paid whatever there was to pay. The application stood some six months with the clerk. I went to the department and saw the surveyor's note. The surveyor said it was all water and burnt land; I can give the man's name from whom I got the report. His name is Austin, and he said there was a little timber around the lake, and I bought it in that way. I put in the application for Mr. Riopelle and others. I do not know what is the motive of the hon. gentleman in bringing this matter up every session. I was taunted during the election about it, and I gave the same explanation. I was asked what profit I made? and I replied that, as regards the little profit I made, it was none of their business; and it is none of the hon. gentleman's now. I might as well be asked what money I made in California or Australia.

Mr. CASEY.—The hon. gentleman has certainly not put himself in a better position by his explanation. He has admitted, what he had to admit, that the application was made in his name and the grant was made in his name.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I did that last year.

Mr. CASEY. That is admitted; but he says he did not receive the sum which Mr. Latour says was paid him for his interest. He admits that Mr. Latour offered him $10,000 and that he refused it; but when, in noticing the remarks of my hon. friend, he said that my hon. friend repeated a false accusation, he was not acting in a parliamentary manner, because my hon. friend had every reason to believe that Mr. Latour's information was genuine and correct; and as far as this House knows anything about the matter, it is simply a question of veracity between Mr. Latour and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard). Of course, when the hon. gentleman makes a statement to this House, we are bound to accept it; but, as between him and Mr. Latour, the difference still exists, and individuals outside the House are at liberty to accept Mr. Latour's statement as correct until the hon. gentleman disproves it. We have one admission, however, from the hon. gentleman which is quite sufficient to condemn the Government and himself. He admits that he made a profit out of this transaction, but refuses to tell us the amount, on the ground that it is none of our business and that we might as well ask what he made in Australia and California. I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman. He made this profit in virtue of his position. as a friend of the Government. He was at the time in public life, a member of the Local House, but before the transaction was completed he was a member of this House, and as such profited by his influence with the Government. Why was he asked to put in an application? Because it was known that he had influence with the Government, and was more likely to get the limit than the other parties interested who used his name. It was, therefore, his influence with the Government which he sold, and out of which he made profit. The Government, on the other hand, are convicted, on the hon. gentleman's own statement, of having granted him a limit for $316 which was afterwards proved to be actually worth $55,000. The Postmaster General thought this was a point, for he interposed with one of his habitual interruptions when this fact was brought out. We have no objection to the Postmaster General making these

interruptions, for he never opens his mouth to object without putting his foot in it, and on this occasion he put his foot half way down his throat. He established in the first place that the timber was very valuable, and in the second place he showed a desire to mislead the House, by making a statement which would lead us to believe these $13,000 were paid to the Government for the same privilege for which Messrs. Francis Brothers paid $55,000. If his interruption meant anything, it meant that the Government got $13,000 for that same privilege. I do not object to the Minister making himself ridiculous in this way from a party point of view, but it is certainly rather degrading to the House to see a Minister of the Crown thus endeavour to create a false impression. The fact is Messrs. Francis Brothers paid these $13,000 over and above the $55,000, and the Government might as well have had the $55,000 from Messrs. Francis Brothers and the $13,000 extra for dues, as let Messrs. Robillard, Riopelle & Co. get the $55,000, while the Government only got the $13,000 dues. That is the position, and I leave the Postmaster General to the tender mercies of the Finance Minister, who explained on one occasion that he was a particular friend of the Indians and was very careful to see that the treaties made with the poor helpless creatures should not be broken for the sake of any economy on the part of the Government. I leave him also to the mercies of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who is in a special sense the guardian of the Indians, being the trusted and well-beloved agent of Her Majesty in his dealings with them. I leave the Postmaster General, and the Minister of the Interior, and the hon. member for Ottawa in his hands, knowing that he will mete out to them due punishment. He certainly can never go back and deal with the Indians who have votes in his county in his official capacity as ambassador for Her Majesty while this blot rests on the Government. He can never go back to them and say he supported the action of the Government in selling land for $316, belonging to the Indians, which ought to have brought $55,000. I am sure he will never defend such a transaction, but will mete out full justice to those who have put him in such a false position.

Mr. TISDALE. Judging from the ground taken by the mover of the resolution, he endorses the arguments which have been addressed to the House by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Let us consider whether they are fair or proper arguments for any member of any deliberative body to use. The hon. gentleman's statement was that no friend of the Government should make money out of any public transaction in connection with the Government, because, if he did so, it was a corrupt act on his part, because he used his influence as a friend. He says further, that if he becomes a member of Parliament, so much the greater is the sin. Let me apply that to the brother of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is a respected member of the Local House in Ontario, and is the owner of certain timber limits in connection with his brother. I am not going to adopt the policy of some hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not going to say there has been anything dishonourable in this. I do not think that is any argument, and I do not believe that one wrong justifies another in debate. Following out his line of argument, let us see whether the regulations of the Ontario Government may be—to which I will refer later—if what the hon. gentleman insinuates is true, how that Government can favour the brother of the hon. member for North Norfolk who is a member of the Local House of Ontario. One of the regulations of that Government is that, when you are taking off, as his brother is doing and the hon. gentleman with him, the timber from the land, the duties you are to pay are regulated by the measurements, and the measurements are controlled by the merchantable lumber, and, if the Government wishes to favour its supporters in handling this lumber, the measurement is made out accordingly. I have heard statements made, but I have reason to know that many of the logs were rejected as non-merchantable, which were afterwards shipped, showing that there must be some value in them. Following the line of the hon. gentleman, I have the right to say that the hon. gentleman and his brother are a great deal more open to such accusations, because the transactions are now going on. I would scorn to make such accusations, and I think it is reprehensible to descend to this kind of argument in order to sustain any cause. So much for that. As to the hon. member for North Norfolk, in his dealing with Dr. Hickey, I may point out that Dr. Hickey is not now here to defend himself. When he was here, he was quite able to defend himself; but I think the hon. gentleman was exceedingly unfair. I take the same documents that he did, and I say that no person who reads that letter carefully, no person of ordinary intelligence can come to any but one conclusion. The letter reads:

"McMillan having failed in his agreement to have survey of timber limit in on the 17th instant, I claim, on behalf of William Broder, the right to be a co-applicant for the limit covered by the application of McMillan. I trust we will get that equal consideration.

"Yours truly,

"CHARLES E. HICKEY."

As the hon. gentleman well knows, McMillan and Broder were rivals in connection with this limit, and the language of this letter can have no other fair construction than that Dr. Hickey applied on behalf of William Broder.

Mr. CHARLTON. The phrase is—

"I trust we will get that equal consideration,

"CHARLES E. HICKEY."

Who are "we"?

Mr. TISDALE. The "we" would apply to the member who was interceding for the gentleman who asked to become a co-applicant with another, and if the hon. gentleman will read his own affidavit, he will see that he admits that. I will be very short because this was dealt with at length last year, when the hon. gentleman had the advantage of the presence of Mr. Hickey. He states that Mr. Hickey was a co-applicant. I wish to be fair in this matter, and I do not think the hon. gentleman or any of his friends would go the length of making a solemn declaration by which he is bound in conscience as well as from a sense of fairness to examine into the facts before he makes a statement to be circulated amongst the public detrimental to Dr. Hickey without believing it. I apologize for the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on his own behalf for having made such a weak statement as he did when he said that this could not hurt Dr. Hickey because this House had

justified him. Then, from the hon. gentleman's standpoint, why did he make the affidavit if it was not with the intention of hurting Dr. Hickey in his riding? Why did he publish the affidavit at all? Under other circumstances, I would believe the hon. gentleman under his solemn affirmation, but I think it ill-becomes him to bring this matter up again after he has put himself into such a questionable position by the documents which he himself has signed. We know we have to be patient here; but I am getting tired of listening to ancient history. It is all very well for the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to say that we on this side do not like ancient history. We ought to have no reason to be afraid of it, because again and again the people of this country have proclaimed their confidence in us. But I think we all desire to get through our public duties as soon as possible and get to our homes, and I think this ancient history might be dispensed with. When the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) got those 24,000 —or was it 12,000?—pages of history to read up, how many times have we heard of that and how many times more are we going to hear of it? As to myself, I simply wish to show the wisdom of the policy of the Government which was adopted with regard to timber limits in the North-West in early days. Hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as we do that the policy which would be suitable in old provinces with rich timber districts for sale would not be suitable in a new province with new timber districts, with poor and sparsely timbered districts, and with a large prairie country, and that the policy ought to be different, at all events at the start. The policy adopted had two characteristics. First, to procure cheap lumber for the settlers, because everyone who went in there in the early days knew the enormous prices which the settlers had to pay for lumber. Secondly, it was to attract attention to that country, and in the end that did no injury, either to its development or to its advancement. Now, I claim that that policy has been proven, by events, to have been a wise policy. Have not the events happened that I have mentioned? Why, lumber there is almost as cheap as it is in the old Province of Ontario now. These hon. gentlemen always forget one thing, and it is very unfortunate, because it takes time to correct them and it does not advance their own cause—they always forget to mention the very important condition annexed to all these limits which does not prevail in Ontario, and ought not to prevail in Ontario, because there they sell limits to get money. That important condition is that you must build a mill within so many months; more than that, the dues paid are greater than the dues in Ontario. Now, I would like to ask the hon. member for North Norfolk, how much he would give for a limit in Ontario if he was compelled to build a mill and manufacture lumber within a certain limited time? It is not a fair way to put it. Now, one remark in answer to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), who spoke about colonization, and about timber limits. Let him see what has been the result. How many colonization companies exist now? I think two. How many timber limits have been taken under the original conditions concerning which hon. gentlemen have been crying out about corruption, and about unfairness, and about favouritism? All but about six of them were never worked. Surely if they had been so profitable, surely during all these years that have elapsed, when they claim that the friends of the Government have been running riot in timber limits, and corruptly making great riches thereby, surely somebody would have taken up and worked more than half-a-dozen limits out of all that vast number in which it is alleged such great riches could have been made. Now, as to my connection with timber limits. I was not then a member of Parliament, but I do not want to avoid any responsibility on that account. I claim that, within proper bounds, the public men of the country on either side of the House have just as much right as any other individual to purchase and work timber limits, the same as is done under the Ontario Government, where many members of the Legislature—I was going to say a majority of the Government supporters—have limits, and they have obtained them properly, under the regulations that exist in that province; the same as hon. members on both sides of this House, and a great many people outside, on both sides of politics, have acquired limits in the North-West. This is the way I came to be interested in a limit. There was a number of gentlemen, some Liberals and some Conservatives, who said there were valuable timber limits in the Riding Mountain district of Manitoba. The North-Western Railway was going from Portage la Prairie up into that country, and they claimed it would be a good operation, for the people who had capital, to build a railway from the Riding Mountain down to that road, and, to justify the enterprise, it would require a large body of timber behind it. And so some gentlemen on both sides of politics propounded this scheme and they induced some other gentlemen to enter into it, and went the length of getting a charter from the Local Government for the railway. Then I said: Gentlemen, I think you are going a little too fast. They were assessing us so many hundred dollars apiece, and I wanted a little more information about this vast tract of timber. And so we sent a gentleman up to explore those townships and we found that instead of there being several hundred millions of timber, there were only four millions in the whole tract. So, like a great many other timber projects, it did not meet the anticipation of its promoters. Hon. gentlemen know that at that time there was a speculative spirit abroad, and this spirit seized upon many gentlemen on both side of politics. The Minister of the Interior tells me that not over half-a-dozen of the timber limits taken up have ever been retained and worked by the people who, in that speculative period, were attracted by the glowing prospects of making money in the North-West. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk knows all this, and I blame the hon. gentleman for standing up behind the back of Mr. Hickey, who was then a member, and making, as I think, to put it in mild language, unfair representations, and to single out members of Parliament and speak of them as corrupt. Mind you, for my own part I do not mind it, but here is the disagreeable consequence of his charges. If a man does not get up and deny the charges, they are taken for granted in the country to be true. It is retailed by enemies in his constituency. They say that he is accused of such and such a thing, and accusation is made in such a way that it leads to the belief that there has been something corrupt, and without an explanation on the part of the ac-

cused member, he is likely to suffer. Charges were made against me during my election, and the result was that I had six times the majority I had before, because the people had come to disbelieve all these unfair insinuations; and if you are innocent the people will find it out, and they will reward you by a greater support. Now, one word about the policy of the Ontario Government, because hon. gentlemen opposite are always lauding the policy of that Government, which is controlled by the Liberals. Under that policy the Government have a right to sell the limits by auction. But what has been the result? Why, against the protest of the Conservative party, dating back to the time of Sandfield Macdonald, and in spite of their opposition, what has the Ontario Government done? First, the Local Government took the matter into their own hands, and would not allow the House to say whether these valuable limits, which were the future heritage of our province, should be sold with or without the consent of the House. The Government took the matter exclusively into their own hands. And what occurred against the protest of the Conservative party? They have sold thousands of square miles of timber that stands there to-day untouched and uncut, in danger all the time of fire, the holders only risking the bonus paid the Government. I have the figures and will give them for publication if any hon. gentleman wants to see them. I say if the Ontario Government had withheld the primæval forest, which still stands uncut and untouched to-day, that Government would be richer by $55,000,000, instead of the $7,000,000 which they have received.

Mr. BARRON. Why does not the hon. gentlemen protest against this Government selling limits without the consent of the House?

Mr. TISDALE. I said it is a different policy. Either I cannot make my argument clear, or the hon. gentleman's capacity for seeing it is small. The whole argument is that in the North-West the timber is scattered and the limits are of little value. But in British Columbia they are valuable, and the Government is adopting more stringent regulations. In Ontario there are no conditions whatever; you pay the bonus, a small ground rent, and you can keep it as long as you please. Let me tell you one thing more, to show that the Local Government's method of handling the land is open to abuse. I can prove the facts from the *Gazette*. In a sale they made of a great many square miles, they advertised in August and they sold in October. Now, any one who knows anything about timber knows that it would take a purchaser all that time to go over one or two limits and examine them carefully, and estimate the timber upon them, whereas many limits were so advertised and sold. Now, it has been insinuated that they said to their own friends, quietly, long before the advertisements were published: "We are going to advertise in August and we will sell in October. You boys look through the whole of this, and take the first chance." I say that charge has been made. I know some gentlemen who told me that two limits were the utmost they could explore within the time the Government advertised and the time of sale. So I say it is not proved that no abuses can occur under the system of selling timber by public auction. The only safeguard we have is by keeping the Government up to the mark.

Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. McMULLEN. All these charges about the manner in which timber limits have been handled in the Province of Ontario, of course, are a reiteration of what has been said by the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario House. The policy of disposing of the limits by the Ontario Government has been sanctioned by a very large majority of the Local Legislature, and the country generally approves of the policy of that Government as the most desirable one they could pursue. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that after the decision in favour of the Ontario Government of the question which was in dispute as to whether the timber really belonged to the Province of Ontario or to the Dominion of Canada, a large tract of that land which had been sold by the Dominion Government for a mere nominal sum was afterwards sold by the Ontario Government; they took them out of the hands of the Conservative party and offered them at public auction, and realized large sums for them. The hon. gentleman contended that the Ontario Government should have held their timber limits instead of placing them on the market. What is the fact? After making a thorough and extensive investigation of the timber limits under the control of the Ontario Government, they came to the conclusion that if they were to keep them a large staff of men would be necessary to see that the timber was not stolen and not set on fire, and an enormous annual expenditure would be thereby involved. The Provincial Government, therefore, decided that in order to free themselves from the necessity of those charges, they would place those limits on the market and sell them under the hammer to the highest bidder. It will be remembered that on one occasion when Mr. Pardee, who was Commissioner of Crown Lands for a great many years, and who discharged the duties of the position with great credit to himself and great advantage to the Government, had arranged to sell certain limits, a combination was formed among buyers to force him to grant more advantageous terms than he was disposed to give them. Notwithstanding that fact, he upheld the interests of the province and refused to grant them any concession, and when the sale took place the limits realized prices far in excess of anything the Government expected to obtain. Another point showing the wisdom of the Ontario Government is, that they sold the limits at a time when they were able to obtain outside prices, and they did this under the hammer and not in the miserable, clandestine, secret way in which limits were dealt with by the Dominion Government when applications were made to them by their friends. The question of timber limit selling cannot be brought too often before the House and the country. The hon. member for South Norfolk objects to this subject being brought up to-day on the ground that the people of the country have sanctioned the course adopted by the Dominion Government and have again returned them to power. It must, however, be remembered that the people were so thunderstruck and taken by surprise at the statements made that a great many men were not disposed to believe it was possible that the amount of stealing was carried on that really took place. Since other matters have transpired, since the exhibition of the irregularities during the present session on evidence under oath, the people begin to think that after all we were correct with respect to the steals in timber limits, and that the electors should have given a

more attentive ear to the utterances of those who were exposing this condition of things. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) said this afternoon that he never made an application for a timber limit.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I have not.

Mr. McMULLEN. That he was not an applicant for, and had not received a timber limit. I will read his application as stated in the *Hansard*, which he will hardly refuse to hear. It is as follows :—

"OTTAWA, 11th Nov., 1885.

"To the Minister of Indian Affairs,
"Ottawa.

"HON. SIR,—I take the liberty to remind you of my application for license to cut timber on an Indian reserve. Will you please let me know the result of your conclusion in this matter, and much oblige,

"Your obedient servant,
"H. ROBILLARD."

I should like to know whether that statement is true or not? The hon. gentleman said he never made an application.

Mr. ROBILLARD. I did not make that statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. There may be more than one Honoré Robillard in Ottawa; it may be very convenient to shift the responsibility off his own shoulders. He may, perhaps, have a son of that name, and he may have applied for it perhaps not for himself but for his son. A great many applications have been made in that way. It has been stated that parties who obtained timber limits had in each case to build a mill within 12 months from the time the timber limits were granted. The fact was this had to be done only 12 months after the license was granted. The right of the applicant to cut timber was first acknowledged by the Minister of the Interior, but the time did not begin to count until the license was issued. At the end of a year from that time, if the party was not able to dispose of the limit profitably, he would arrange with a friend who would make an application for the limit. The person to whom the limit was granted would then express a desire to forego his rights, and a second applicant would become owner of the property. If at the end of another year a successful sale was not made, a third party made application, and in this way a limit was kept in the family for several years. We know there have been several cases such as this. With respect to the question in regard to the unfortunate Indians, it is my duty to call the attention of the House to it. I am glad there are no Indians in my riding, if there were I should warmly resent the action of the Government in squandering the property of the Indians. I must express surprise that hon. gentlemen opposite who represent constituencies where there are a large number of Indian voters, such as is the case in Haldimand, should cheer and jeer the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) when he was advocating the rights of those individuals. It speaks badly that a man who is sent here, after using the Queen's name to try and induce those people to return him to Parliament, should jeer and sneer at the remarks of my hon. friend from North Victoria on behalf of the poor creatures who have been robbed of their rights. I am sorry the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is not here, because he is interested in the matter, as there are Indians in his constituency, and he has done them no benefit by jeering the efforts made by my hon. friend in the interest of the Indians. I hope this will be the last sacrifice made in connection with property that properly belongs to those poor unfortunate creatures who are the wards of the Dominion Government. The Government should carefully watch their interests. No doubt there is a large amount of money and property to their credit, but their necessities are large, and if the Minister of the Interior discharged his duty properly he would see that above all other interests in the Dominion the interests of these unfortunate creatures should be carefully and properly respected. But instead of doing so, the Government proceed to improve the financial condition of one of the hon. gentlemen opposite by placing $15,000 or $20,000 in the pocket of a supporter or a friend, by handing over to him, for a comparatively trifling sum, limits which he was able to sell for $15,000 or $20,000, and he was thus able to place thousands of dollars in his pocket without spending one farthing. I say that it stands as a monument of discredit to hon. gentlemen opposite, that they will secretly and quietly try to carry out a transaction of this kind, and ask that the country and this Parliament should wink at such abominations, and allow them to pass without the condemnation they justly deserve. The hon. member in front of me (Mr. Charlton) has done the country a great service in his honest effort to try to put a stop to the abominations in timber limits that have been practised by hon. gentlemen opposite. The more the country knows of such matters as this; the oftener the country is made aware of the transactions that are carried through by the Government, and the abominations that are brought to light from time to time, the better it is for the country. I am glad to be able to say that there are in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite, men whom I believe would not be parties to these transactions; I am glad to say that I believe there are men in the Conservative party who are too high-minded for such things, but I am sorry also to say that there are men in that party who are willing to stoop to these things; and that there are members of the Government who are willing to quietly wink at such abominations and to cheer, and jeer, and whistle, like the hon. Postmaster General, when exposures are made before this House of a character that would bring a blush of shame to any honest, upright and true-hearted Canadian. I said before, the hon. gentleman in front of me (Mr. Charlton) has done a good service in bringing this matter forward. It was he who first exposed this matter; he considered it his duty to the people of this Dominion and to the constituents that he represents to bring this important question before the House. Why, Sir, when he brought it before this House at first he was howled down by hon. gentlemen opposite with a bitterness, I might say with a wickedness, that would have almost annihilated any ordinary man. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has stood manfully to his guns, he has brought up the matter again and again before this House, and I hope that as long as there is a vestige of a justification on which to hang a repetition of these abominations, he will bring it up from year to year. The way in which hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to wink at, and carry

out the sale of the valuable resources of the poor Indians, and the people of this country, the same as we have exposed on the floor of this House for many years past, I claim that the Opposition in this House has done the country a great service this year, in endeavouring to expose these abominations. My hon. friend opposite says he wants to get through the business and go home: but I will tell him that we will sit here as long as we can expose hon. gentlemen opposite and their wrong-doing. We are going to discharge the duties that properly devolve upon us as representatives of the people. We are sorry to say that there are such a tremendous amount of abominations to be unearthed and exposed. We may say that there are mountains upon mountains of iniquity, and the more we go into the whole mass of corruption, the more abominable and more odious it becomes in the eyes of all honest, upright Canadians. We are going to do our duty on this side of the House. It is unpleasant for us, but I have no doubt it is more unpleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite, for I believe that they do wince sometimes. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is anxious to get away. I have no doubt that he feels considerably disgusted at the exposures which he has been called upon to witness both in this chamber and in other rooms of the House, and I dare say that he would be glad to get away to a purer and better sphere than that which he has been compelled to mingle with here. But the hon. gentleman has got a good many more days to spend here, and he has got a good many more obnoxious things to hear before the session closes. I am glad indeed that my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has brought this question up, and I am glad to know that hon. gentlemen opposite feel the sting of this abomination, because you can always tell when hon. gentlemen feel it. They always commence to squeal when they feel it, and the more they squeal the more we know the medicine is unpleasant, and the longer they squeal under it the more they will get of it. Therefore, if they want to see the end of these exposures quickly, they had better take the medicine quietly. Let them repent. There is time yet, but it is getting very short, and if they do not repent they will find that the consequences will be very serious indeed. I consider it my duty to offer these remarks, and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will not forget the lesson that has been taught them this afternoon in regard to these abominations.

Mr. DAVIN. This debate that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has introduced this afternoon cannot, in my opinion, do any possible good. The hon. gentleman brought this matter before the House on a previous occasion, and I really do not see, as an hon. member on the other side has already said, what good he proposes to himself, in the introduction of the subject to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the object of the hon. gentleman in mixing up two sets of cases? One set cannot even in his opinion, even from the lofty standpoint of purity that he takes, could not have the least impropriety attached to it. He mentions the cases of gentlemen who are not members of this House applying for timber limits, and who each got one timber limit. Is there anything improper in that? Before a man could get a timber limit he has to survey the limit. As my hon. friend from Norfolk has referred to the difference between timber limits in Ontario and the North-West Territories, I may say that it will cost some $400 to survey a limit in the North-West Territories.

Mr. TISDALE. Twice that.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, probably; but at any rate it will cost a considerable sum to survey the limit. A gentleman applies for and obtains a limit, and as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has explained, he has to build a mill, and when he has his limit in operation he has to pay dues. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) turns around and he mentions in a cadent voice: N. F. Davin as having applied for and got a limit. That gentleman actually did apply and got a limit. I was going up to the North-West at the time, and I had been up before. We had at that time, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) knows, grand visions about the North-West, and when we spoke about that country it was in the large language of the earlier gods. But, after a time, our high-vaulting ambition in regard to that country took a more sober view of things, and we found that we could not do all we proposed. The limit I got was cancelled, as many a limit up there that was obtained has been cancelled, as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has pointed out. What I want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) is this: What rational object can he have in mixing up two sets of cases? He refers to my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who was not a member of the House at the time. Could there be the least impropriety in that gentleman applying for a limit and getting a limit? There was no impropriety whatever in it, and if you search the records of the Interior Department I venture to say you will find that Liberals applied for limits and got them too. I think there used to be a member of this House the member for Simcoe, and I rather think that his name has been connected with timber limits, and connected in a manner very different from the present case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. DAVIN. No; I was speaking of Mr. Cook. Mr. Cook was a large holder of limits, and had large lumber transactions with the Ontario Government. I remember very well going down to attend a sale of limits which took place some seventeen or eighteen years ago, when Mr. Scott was Minister of Crown Lands in the Ontario Government, and I remember very well that there was a strong suspicion that word had been given to friends of Mr. Mowat, that this sale was going to take place, and it was said they had the advantage, because they had their limits picked out beforehand. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend refers to colonization companies. I know something about these colonization companies, and something about the North-West, at any rate as compared with my hon. friend from North Victoria. What language did the hon. gentleman use? I am afraid that my hon. friend from North Victoria is about to spoil a most promising career. I described him once here as the rising hope of the Reform party; but it seems to me that he is going to spoil the brilliant prospects that were connected with his name, because latterly at any rate he has been hunting on the wrong scent. The hon. gentleman speaks of the North-West having been honey-

combed with colonization companies, so that when people went up there to settle, they could not settle, forsooth, for this reason. What idea has my hon. friend of the North-West, and of the relation of the number of acres which were taken up by a few colonization companies to the millions of acres on which they lay like isles few and far between on the broad bosom of the Atlantic? Mr. Speaker, these colonization companies were separated from each other by long distances; and to suppose them honey-combing the North-West, or that there is or can be any difficulty for many years in getting a homestead in the North-West, is to show an absurd ignorance of that country. Now, when the colonization companies were started, I remember taking the agreement that these companies had to sign before they could get their lands, and showing it to the shrewdest man in Canada. He was then a judge; he is no longer a judge; but he is undoubtedly among the shrewdest men in Canada as a good lawyer, with a large experience in speculation. We read that agreement over together, and we both came to the conclusion that no body of men in their senses would sign that agreement, because if the conditions were carried out not one penny could be made. And what are the facts? With one or two exceptions, all the lands granted to these colonization companies have reverted to the Government; and one of the objects of the Government at that time, as I know from conversations with Sir John Macdonald, was that they should act as immigration agents, and spread abroad throughout the British Isles and all over Ontario a knowledge of the country; and did they not do that? There cannot be the least doubt that these companies were active immigration agents, and that very often they succeeded in bringing valuable settlers to the country who are now on lands which formerly belonged to some of these companies, but which passed away from their control. Now, the hon. member has spoken of grazing leases. Does he know anything about the subject? He speaks as though these grazing leases were of great value, and he dwells especially on the necessity of advertising them. If he will ask the Deputy Minister of the Interior, or Mr. Hall, or any of the officers of the department who have had to do with the matter, they will tell him that the regulation that was forced upon the department to advertise grazing leases has cost the department more than it could possibly gain. If a man wants a grazing lease, he makes an application; he has found out the grazing lands he wants, and instead of the department making a bargain with him, as it could, and demanding a bonus of $50 or $60, it advertises it; and the man sends sometimes only $5. Not another soul applies or competes with him for the lease, because people will not take the bother of going to see these grazing lands. The consequence is that the man who applies puts the department to the expense of $30 or $40 in advertising in the different papers of the North-West for several weeks, and sends only $5 as his bid because there is no one to compete with him. So that when my hon. friend talks as if any great gain could be got from advertising these grazing lands for competition, he does not understand the country. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke here with great indignation; he spoke as a man whose righteous soul was vexed, and as one who you would think would aid in trying to keep down every unnecessary expenditure. But a short time ago when I was forced in one of the committees, by the reason of the case, to take an unpopular stand with the view of keeping down what seemed to me to be an improper expenditure, that hon. member was one who voted for a course which I understood him to say across the table could not be justified.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, you voted for it.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not think it is in order for either of the hon. gentlemen to refer to what took place in a committee.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not refer further than that; but anyway the fact remains. Another hon. gentleman who was there, the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), afterwards told certain persons who were interested in the vote on the committee, that I had abused them, whereas, as a fact, I confined myself to the question, stating that in principle I could not justify the expenditure demanded, and when the vote came to be taken, the committee, by a large majority, supported the view I took. True, the hon. member for North Wellington will come here at times and show the greatest possible indignation at what he calls extravagance; but I venture to say that if his friends were across the floor, he would be very dumb in regard to anything they would do.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a trial.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid I cannot do that; that is for the country to do. But on my honour, if I had it in my power, I would give them a trial, in order to show the country the ineptitude they would display. Although I should be willing to do it, and although I should stump all Ontario and Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, and the North-West and British Columbia, I know very well that although I might combine in myself the eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero, I would not be able to persuade the country they could carry on the Government properly, so that I cannot give you the trial. You will have to remain where you are. I wish I could give you the trial. What a beautiful sight it would be to see my hon. friend here administering a department. We have some other gentlemen who would outvie him, and I say this, that the result would be if you stayed in power for a year or two, the Conservative party would recross the floor with a still greater majority than they have now.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I wish to ask the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) if he used these words: "That C. H. Mackintosh, a member of this House, applied for and obtained limits for himself and his associates, and seven townships in the North-West."

Mr. CHARLTON. My statement with regard to the hon. gentleman in connection with timber limits, was that he made application for one timber limit for a friend, and I prefaced my remarks by saying that I had no doubt many hon. members considered that, in making applications for their constituents, they were performing an ordinary act of friendship, and that it was for the House to judge what blame should attach to such acts. The application was for one limit on the 9th September, 1882.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will find himself very much misreported, if that is what he said.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman said: "Members applying for and obtaining limits for themselves, who were then or are now members of the House;" and then he proceeded to give the names, my name being on the list.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, as I did not state that he had applied for a limit for himself.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If the hon. gentleman is reported as I understood him, I trust he will correct the report.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say so and am not so reported.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I should not trouble the House in the least with regard to this matter, but, as the hon. member for North Norfolk is quite aware, seven years ago I sat opposite to him and explained the whole matter. I gave the particulars and every detail connected with it, and he virtually withdrew the charge. To-day, however, he brings the matter up again, and when pressed says he made no charge. But what has he asked the House to do? He is asking the House, by his speech and resolutions, to stultify itself, by condemning members for what they never did.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is attributing to me what I did not say. I gave a list of thirty-four members who made applications for timber limits for their friends. These applications to the number of seventy-nine were granted, and the hon. member for Ottawa was one of the applicants. I gave his name as one of the members who had made an application for a friend for a timber limit, which application had been granted, and I stated further that I did not attach the blame to members making applications for friends which I would to members making application in their own behalf.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman stated distinctly: All members who applied for and obtained lands for themselves and who were then or are now members of this House. I was not a member at the time I made the application, and I made the application, not on my own behalf, but on behalf of myself and associates, who were forming a society for colonization purposes, to obtain a grant of seven townships, and the application was not pressed. But the language of the hon. gentleman and his resolution are so vaguely worded as to convey the impression that I, with other members of this House, had made an application to the Government for townships and timber limits for ourselves.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be as well if the hon. gentleman would wait for the official report of the debate, as he is misrepresenting what I said.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman made the same charge in 1886. I then explained to to him that, at the time, so far as the limit for which application was made is concerned, I was not then a member nor had I been a member, and was not directly or indirectly interested in obtaining the limit, and had not made the application on my own behalf, and I referred the hon. gentleman to all the papers in connection with that matter, and he expressed himself satisfied that what I said was true. But what does he do now? He again uses my name. He again resurrects the old charge that I, while a member of Parliament, made application for a timber limit and for seven townships in the North-West.

Mr. CHARLTON. My statement covered a list of gentlemen who now were or had been members of Parliament.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman had better change his resolution and his speech also, for he cannot say that I was then or had been a member of Parliament; and when the hon. gentleman makes the bold statement that I was, I ask the House to confirm my statement of the case, because I did not sit in the House until February, 1883. I was elected in June, 1882, and this application was made some time in March, 1882, before I had any idea that I would have a seat in the House. I explained all this to the hon. gentleman, but he returns to the charge again, and when I ask him to withdraw it, he says: Wait until you see the report. When the report appears, he will find that I am right, and that he is insulting the House in asking it to affirm a statement which he knows he ought to withdraw. With regard to the seven townships, I explained the whole matter years ago. At the time there was a craze for colonization societies, and some prominent supporters of mine, wealthy men, asked me to associate myself with them in order to form a local colonization society and obtain a grant of townships for colonization purposes. I said: Very well; and I have here the correspondence which will show the House how unfair is the whole position the hon. gentleman takes. On 1st March, 1882, we, as an association, wrote to the Interior Department:

"SIR,—We, the undersigned, hereby apply for the following townships in the North-West Territories, namely:—

"In Ranges west of the Second Principal Meridian, Nos. 22, 23, 24, Townships 47 and 48.

"In Range 22, Township 49.

"In Range 24*a*, Townships 47 and 48 (being broken townships).

"This application is made under class 2, New Regulations.

(Sgd.) "C. H. MACKINTOSH,
"Ottawa.
" "E. S. SKEAD,
"Ottawa.
" "CHAS. MOORE,
"Ottawa."

Shortly after that a number of gentlemen, Liberals and Conservatives, formed a Press Colonization Society, including almost all the members of the press gallery, and they represented to me that this application of ours would interfere with their association. I at once said: Gentlemen, we withdraw the application; and wrote as follows to the Interior Department:—

"OTTAWA, ONT., 6th May, 1883.

"To the Honourable the Minister of the Interior.

"SIR,—Some weeks since an application signed by C. H. Mackintosh, E. Skead, and C. Moore, was sent to the Department asking for lands, amongst which were broken townships number 49, 48, 47, Range 24, west of the Second Principal Meridian. We beg to withdraw the said application.

"On behalf of applicants,
(Sgd.) "C. H. MACKINTOSH."

And I received the following reply:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.
"OTTAWA, 15th May, 1883.

"SIR,—I have the honour, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your

letter of the 6th instant withdrawing the application of yourself, Mr. Skead and Mr. Chas. Moore for certain Townships in Ranges 22, 23 and 24, west of the Second Principal Meridian, near Prince Albert, for colonization purposes, and to inform you that your communication has been placed on record in the department.

"I have, &c.,

(Sgd.) "A. M. BURGESS,
"*Secretary.*"

Now, the hon. gentleman must see the injustice he does; but he does not get up in this House and say: I find I am mistaken; you have proved your case. Not at all; he is willing to have his speech printed, and these charges circulated during any bye-election or future election, as they were last election, and as they were in 1887. Although I explained the whole matter apparently to his satisfaction, he still returns to the charge, and refuses to do me the justice of withdrawing his remarks. He has made a statement which he cannot substantiate, for he cannot show that during the time I was in Parliament I, on any occasion, directly or indirectly, trafficked in lands or timber limits; and if he could prove that I did, I would be perfectly willing to resign my seat in this House. I think the hon. gentleman should do me the justice of withdrawing his statement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have to say that I made a statement which was true and I have to stand by it. When the report of the debate is published, we will see which of us is right. I did not make the statement the hon. gentleman has attributed to me.

Mr. SPROULE. We have heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) his usual and almost his annual budget on the question of timber limits. On many of the points which he made he has been set right on before, not once, but many times, inside and outside of this House, and yet he comes forward again—I was going to say with brazen effrontery, but that would be unparliamentary, and so I will not say it—but he uses almost the same words and arguments as he did in 1886, and characterizes the conduct of the members of this House and of previous Parliaments as dishonourable and dishonest, because they have been connected with timber limits, grazing leases, or mining lands. The hon. gentleman makes no distinction between members of Parliament doing their duty to their constituents, or doing something which relates to themselves alone. The hon. member is leaving the chamber. He is like the coward who always clears out when you commence to talk to him. That hon. gentleman who attempted to defend his act of perjury when it was brought up against him by Mr. Hickey, then sycophantly whined about it and said he did not mean any harm, but now he again attempts to justify it by a strained and unnatural interpretation of the meaning of the words. Notwithstanding the affidavit made by Mr. Broder that Mr. Hickey had no connection with that timber limit, either directly or indirectly, when that hon. gentleman opposite was obliged to face the matter, he admitted that his information was incorrect, but he now attempts to bolster up his conduct upon grounds which he did not attempt to justify then. Then he attempted to justify his words by the Order in Council, which he said warranted him in making the statement he did. When that statement was brought up on the 11th March, 1890, Dr. Hickey said:

"I understand that, when I was out of the chamber, the hon. member for North Norfolk said that I had been an applicant for a timber limit. I wish to say that I never made an application for a timber limit in the North-West or in any other part of this country. The same statement was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk a few years ago, before the last election, and it was brought up against me in my county, where I challenged the men who brought it up to give any proof of it, and they offered to get an affidavit from the hon. member for North Norfolk, but it was never produced. I did write a letter urging the Government to see what they could do with reference to a claim Mr. Broder had made, and that is my only crime."

The hon. member for North Norfolk then said in his defence:

"I rise to an explanation in answer to the hon. member for Dundas. I did this in discharge of a public duty, and endeavoured to do it impartially; and among the Orders in Council I found one for C. E. Hickey, M.P., coupled with the name of Wm. Broder."

Now the hon. gentleman tells us that he never saw the Order in Council. Then, after this was brought up again by Mr. Hickey and dealt with at great length, the hon. gentleman refers to a letter and says that justifies him in a contention he made, and now, after the abject apology he made for his conduct last year, he comes here again, because Mr. Hickey is not here to defend himself, to attempt to bolster up the charge and the libellous slander he gave vent to against a member of this House. Last year he said the Order in Council justified him. Now he says it was a letter written on the 20th April by Chas. E. Hickey as follows:—

"SIR,—Macmillan having failed in his agreement to have survey of timber limit in on the 17th instant, I claim, on behalf of Wm. Broder, the right to be a co-applicant for the limit covered by the application of Macmillan."

That is, that Wm. Broder, on account of the other tenderer failing to fyle his survey, has the right to be recognized as a co-applicant; and then Dr. Hickey winds up with the usual language which is well known to legal men:

"I trust we will get that equal consideration."

That is what any lawyer would say in regard to his client. But he says distinctly that he is speaking on behalf of Wm. Broder, as Macmillan had failed to come up to the terms of the regulations. The member for North Norfolk to-day repeated his statement; but had to confine himself to the lame explanation and justification of his conduct when he made an affidavit which was in reality a perjury. He attempted that last year, though he said he did it innocently and that he thought it was all right, but now he bolsters up that affidavit and attempts to justify it. Then, again, I have here the affidavit of Mr. Broder in which he says that Hickey had nothing to do with this timber limit at the time or prospectively or in any other way, and yet the hon. gentleman sticks to this statement. The resolution moved at that time contained the following:—

"That the conduct of John Charlton in the premises was and is discreditable, dishonest and scandalous."

To prevent that resolution from passing, Mr. Charlton made an explanation. He says:

"I believed that the hon. gentleman was a co-applicant for the limit on the 20th April, and there was a limit granted on the 30th April."

Then he refers to the Order in Council. Now he refers to the letter. He goes on to make his apology:

"If I fell into errors in doing my duty, I greatly regret it; and if any statement I made is not borne out by a critical examination of the documents, it was made innocently and not with any intention to injure any person."

Does any person think the hon. gentleman can make an affidavit of that kind and send it broadcast over the country without injuring someone? A copy of that affidavit was read on platform after platform in my constituency, and Dr. Hickey was held up to reprobation as a man who was not fit to hold a public position; but, when the hon. gentleman is referred to in a resolution as not being fit to sit in this House, he comes forward and makes an abject apology, and now he makes his charge again in new terms which are just as untenable as those in which he made it before. The hon. gentleman refers to two classes of people, members of Parliament who applied for timber limits or grazing lands or mining lands in the west for their constituents and members of Parliament who applied for themselves and their friends. He makes that distinction in his speech, but in the resolution which he asks this House to affirm, he does not make any such distinction, but simply affirms that these parties are doing something which members of Parliament ought not do. Now, in accordance with his view of what is fair, he reads over a certain number of names of members of the late Parliament and some of the present Parliament, who did these things. I may say that he has used my name in connection with an application that I made for a timber limit on behalf of brothers of mine—at least I am told that was his charge, as I was out of the House when he made it. Now, I want to show the unfairness of the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. When the House rose at six o'clock I was discussing the motion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk regarding the policy of the Government in the past concerning timber limits, colonization lands, grazing land, and other matter of that nature. I said it was the usual budget which we have from that hon. gentleman from time to time, which he had brought up again, in my opinion, more for the purpose of keeping certain things alive before the public than for any public good; and that, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman had at various times been contradicted with regard to the allegations that he had set forth in his speeches upon this subject, and although he had been obliged to withdraw many of his accusations and make ample apologies for them, yet, whenever he returned to the subject he invariably dished them up pretty much on the same lines. I referred to the fact that no longer ago than last year, when a motion was made in this House to declare the hon. member's conduct scandalous with regard to an affidavit which was made, directed against another hon. member of that House, the hon. gentleman was then obliged to withdraw a great deal of what he had said, and to make an ample apology, and to ask the House not to pass that condemnation upon him. But after the House had thus generously consented to the withdrawal of that motion by Dr. Hickey, after a short time had elapsed the hon. gentleman comes up again in this new Parliament and virtually reiterates the statements that he made then and attempts to justify the affidavit which he made.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made no statement regarding Dr. Hickey this time. Last session, on Dr. Hickey's repudiation of the statement that he was a co-applicant, I did withdraw the statement I made then, and I have not made it to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. I may remind the hon. gentleman that he gave reasons why he might be correct, and one reason was a letter which he read, and which I have given to this House, stating that, on the 20th of a certain month, Dr. Hickey wrote so-and-so, and finished up that letter by saying, "I trust we will get that equal consideration." I have that letter here, if the hon. gentleman denies it:

"SIR,—Macmillan having failed in his agreement to have survey of timber limit in on the 17th instant, I claim, on behalf of Wm. Broder, the right to be a co-applicant for the limit covered by the application of Macmillan.

"I trust we will get that equal consideration."

Upon the strength of that single word "we" that Mr. Hickey had used he argues to-night that he was in a measure justified in putting the construction he did upon that correspondence, the construction that Dr. Hickey was interested in a timber limit, and that in face of the fact that Dr. Hickey had placed on record in this House an affidavit from Mr. Broder, on whose behalf this limit was applied for. The affidavit from Mr. Broder declared that Dr. Hickey was not directly or indirectly, at present or prospectively, interested in that timber limit. But to-night the hon. gentleman endeavours to justify his accusations of last year. I read a portion of the hon. gentleman's affidavit, and that of the party before whom it was made, and he says that he does not know that such a party exists. Now, the hon. gentleman did not deny the affidavit when it was under the consideration of this House last year; he did not deny that he made it, but he apologized saying that if he did any wrong to Dr. Hickey he regretted it very much and he did it innocently, because he had no feeling against him. But to-night he pretends to justify his attack by saying that the interpretation which he has put upon this letter justifies him in assuming that Dr. Hickey was in some way interested.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I did not.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that was certainly the tenor of his remarks. Then, referring to the affidavit, he says he does not know that such a person exists. Who made the affidavit? Why, it is signed by John Charlton, and it was distributed all over this country during the elections of 1887. I know it was exhibited on platform after platform in my riding, and I have heard of its being exhibited in various other ridings; therefore, I assume it was used all over the country. Then, the hon. gentleman says he does not wish Dr. Hickey any harm; still he gets up to-night and repeats his attempt to destroy his character and kill his reputation. How would he like to have Shakespeare's language applied to him? Shakespeare makes one of his characters say:

"He that steals my purse, steals trash, but he that robs me of my good name takes from me that which does not enrich him, and leaves me poor indeed."

Shakespeare puts the character of a man who steals a fellowman's reputation even below that of a thief, and I say that this character would, in a measure, apply to the conduct of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member apologized for his offence then and endeavours to justify it to-day. This is not the first time he has had to withdraw un-

founded charges. Only a short time ago he had to withdraw a letter he had written regarding his French leader in this House. It was spread over the country, but he had to apologize for that. His time is largely divided between making allegations and making apologies and withdrawals. Now, what is the hon. gentleman's contention? He condemns a member of Parliament being interested in transactions with the Crown, no matter what the nature of the transaction may be, where regulations are laid down, and where a member of Parliament may do in that transaction the same as any outsider. Moreover, the hon. gentleman condemns a member of Parliament who may attend to a business transaction with the Government on behalf of his constituents, because he says that, in some way, it interferes with the independence of Parliament. Then, he goes on to read a number of names of hon. members of this House who, as he pleases to call them, are sinners in that respect. The hon. gentleman says that he does not think they are equally as guilty as those who ask timber limits for themselves, and he does not put them in the same category. But he still holds they are guilty; he still condemns them as having done something wrong. Now, the hon. gentleman in reading over these names has included mine in the number. And what is the transaction? Had the hon. gentleman not been given an explanation of that circumstance years ago, when he was informed in his place in the House what the nature of it was, and what duty was being performed, I would feel like exonerating him, believing that he did it innocently. But it is not the first, or the second, nor, I think, the third time, that this question has been debated in this House, nor is it the first or second time that I have been obliged to make that explanation; yet, in face of the fact that it has been made, and the hon. gentleman understands it, he gets up and reads again that list of names, in order to lead the public to believe that the members of Parliament, whose names appear there, have done something wrong. He accuses me of sending in applications on behalf of my constituents, many of whom I never saw. I say that out of twelve or fifteen of those individuals, I only saw three or four of them; the balance of the number I never saw, nor would I know them if I met them on the street. These parties wrote to me asking me to do for them a certain duty as a member of Parliament, and because I did it, I am dragged before the country as one who did something that destroys my independence as a member of Parliament. Then he says: "Such and such parties, I understand, are brothers of the member for East Grey." I may say that two of my brothers, whom I had not seen for years, were living in that country, and with an associate of theirs they made an application for a timber limit with the object of taking up a mill and beginning operations there. That application was sent to me, and I put it in in the same way as I did the others, and as other members were doing. An Order in Council was, I think, passed in regard to one, though I never paid any attention to it afterwards. There was no timber limit given, no regulations were carried out, and nothing was done beyond that. But the fact that two of those parties happened to be brothers of mine, the hon. gentleman considers a reason why he should condemn my act as a member of Parliament. Now, let me apply the same rule to the hon. gentleman. Because a member of Parliament happens to have a brother that may be in any way negotiating with the Government, or transacting business with the Government, the hon. gentleman says that such a member violates the Independence of Parliament Act if he appears in any way as a medium between the two. Now, I have here the Parliamentary Companion, and what do I find there? I read there that the hon. member for North Norfolk has a brother, William Andrew Charlton, and the account goes on to say that he came to Canada from the United States; age 50; born on the 9th of May, 1841, married in 1869, engaged in the mercantile and lumber business, and he is the brother of John Charlton, M.P. This is the local member for North Norfolk, who is the partner of John Charlton, M.P., who is member for North Norfolk in the Dominion Parliament. The member in the Local Legislature with his brother in the Dominion Parliament are both interested in timber limits obtained from the Local Government, and the former is no doubt on behalf of his brother negotiating with that Government regarding settlements which from time to time take place. What analogy is there between that case and mine? I never had any interest direct or indirect, present or prospective in timber limits, mining lands or grazing licenses in the western country. But I performed a duty which every member was obliged to do when parties wrote to him, and assisted my friends when they wished to make an application, and I am now held up to execration because I did it. Where is the analogy between the case of an hon. gentleman, whose own brother is in the Local House and is dealing with timber limits sold by the Local Government, out of which both profited very largely last year, and my case? The hon. member for North Norfolk has condemned this Government because they have not sold timber limits at public auction, but if they are not sold by public auction they are sold under certain regulations with which the purchasers are obliged to comply, in a similar manner to regulations laid down by the Local Government of Ontario when they sell timber limits at public auction. We are not so short in memory as to forget some very crooked transactions that occurred with the Local Government. What are the conditions on which timber limits in Ontario are sold? One of the conditions is that a royalty shall be paid to the Crown. Do we forget that only a few years ago when H. H. Cook was dealing with the Local Government, on the same principles and on the same lines, that some years afterwards when the royalty had to be paid on the measurement of the lumber, that gentleman contended that a wrong measurement had been made, and Mr. Cook and his friends applied to the Local Government, who are his political friends, for a remeasurement of lumber which had been shipped out of the country. A remeasurement was made, notwithstanding the fact that it was not there to measure, and he profited by the transaction to the tune of over $2,000. The hon. member for North Norfolk through his brother, I presume, has the same duty to do; I am not saying he is doing it unfairly, but he is as unlikely to do it unfairly as is any hon. member in connection with his transactions in grazing, mining lands or timber limits. Where is the difference? If a member of Parliament is to be condemned for such a reason, surely the hon. gentleman should condemn himself,

because he has gone much further than hon. members have gone and he is entitled to much greater condemnation. Then, again, the hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) treated the House to a great deal of righteous indignation because timber limits belonging to Indians were leased and worked by members of Parliament, and he gave an account of what he termed a shady transaction between the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) and the department. When the hon. member for North Victoria condemns the hon. member for Ottawa, he condemns his own colleague the member for North Norfolk, because he is doing the same thing to-day, that is operating timber limits leased from the Indian Department, and under the control of this Government. I should like to ask the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron)—and I am sorry he is not in the House—a question that I think may be considered pertinent. He treated the House to much indignation in regard to this transaction to which I have referred, and said it was a very serious offence, one that could neither be condoned nor overlooked. I should like to ask him, if it is a fact as alleged that the hon. member for North Victoria was instrumental in securing for a friend a timber limit up in the western part of Ontario from the Local Government for $40,000, which was shortly afterwards sold for $140,000? I wonder if it is a fact, and, if so, will he admit it. It is alleged to be a fact and the information is so given to me. Moreover, I am told that the hon. member for North Victoria got $10,000 out of the transaction for his services. That hon. gentleman was showing some time ago what a great crime was committed by the Government in permitting limits to be acquired by political knaves, members of Parliament, but he altogether forgot to tell the House regarding his own action. Did he give full value for the money when he got these $10,000 out of a timber limit transaction, the limit being bought for $40,000 from the Local Government and afterwards sold for $140,000? Who is most culpable, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) or the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard), the latter of whom declared in his place that he had nothing to do with the transaction referred to, that he was simply acting for another party and that he got no money out of it; while the former got $10,000 out of the timber limit transaction? Could that hon. gentleman condone that transaction when it was much more flagrant in its nature and more injurious in its effects than were the actions of other hon. members to whom he has referred. Then we have the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who denounced the Government in stentorian tones for this extravagance. He is on economy now. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be revelling in scandals, and at this time especially they endeavour to boom scandals because they remember the past, that they once got into power over what they were pleased to call a scandal and they hope and believe they may accomplish it again, and, consequently, they devote their whole attention to scandals. "Like the dog returns to his vomit and the sow that is washed to her wallowing in the mire," they return to their pet hobby. The hon. member for North Wellington treated this House to advice on economy. Only a short time ago the hon. member was dealing with the item of contingencies in the Estimates. He was speaking on the subject of jack-knives, pencils and pens for the senators. He condemned the Government for extravagance, and he said he did not know what 86 or 90 senators wanted with 339 inkstands. He did not know why they required 416 jack-knives or 144 scrap books. He said he did not believe many of those old gentlemen were aware of the fact, and he added: "They quietly take their seats and their knives and their scissors, and knowing a great many as I do, I cannot believe they are winking at the extravagance which is going on in that chamber." The hon. gentleman referred over and over again to the large number of jack-knives they were using, and asked what they were doing with them. He forgot to tell the House that he has already got three jack-knives himself this year. So it is not a good argument for the hon. gentleman to use this jack-knife policy of economy. Although he condemns this expenditure for jack-knives, yet if he keeps on at the present rate until the end of the session he will have used a larger number than does each senator. He wants an argument for next year and he is manufacturing one now, in the same way as he dirtied the napkins at Government House and then came here and condemned the extravagant expenditure for washing them. Is this the kind of argument that should be used by members of Parliament? How did it apply when brought home to hon. members who are perpetrators themselves? These transactions to which I have called attention do not bear the light of day, and the parties deserve condemnation. What does this amendment ask this House to do? In this resolution he asks the House to condemn the principle of selling timber limits except by public auction. Well, timber limits have been disposed of by public auction for the last four years, and I cannot understand why he should ask the House to say this, unless he intends by his argument to wrongfully lead the country to understand that the principle of selling timber limits by private sale which was abolished five years ago still obtains. The Minister of the Interior told him that for the last four years timber limits have been disposed of by public auction, and that should satisfy the hon. gentleman, if anything can satisfy him. I understand that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is the seconder of this motion, and I would like to ask the hon. member for East York, if he were in the House, and the hon. member for North Norfolk: Who first adopted the principle of selling these timber limits by private sale? If I remember correctly it was the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) of which the hon. member for North Norfolk was an ardent admirer and strong supporter, which adopted this principle of selling timber limits by private sale, and there were timber limits sold by that Government by this means, and without being put up to public auction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that this system was introduced by the hon. gentleman from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He is mistaken; it was in vogue before.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, at all events, the Mackenzie Government continued the principle.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) amended the law, and made it conform with the practice. The practice was to sell by private sale, for the simple reason that they could not get bidders.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And the practice was so correct, and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) so fully approved of it, that a statute was passed to make it law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. the Minister of Justice knows that the reason for the continuance of the practice was that there could be no bidders had.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And I think that was a good reason.

Mr. SPROULE. At all events it was practically the same. If the principle was a bad one, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) endorsed it when they were in power, and they carried it to such an extreme, that the system became very injurious to the people, because, under the Mackenzie Government, the regulations surrounding the the transactions were not by any means so stringent as the regulations provided by the Government of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. I find that on the 4th of October, 1878, in the dying days of the Mackenzie Government—and remember that the elections took place on the 17th September, when they were ignominiously defeated at the polls, and were virtually a moribund Parliament, and had no right in all fairness to make any important changes or to enter into any important negotiations at that time—I find that notwithstanding the fact that they expected to leave power in a few days, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) reported in favour of granting 200 square miles of timber limits in the North-West to H. H. Cook & Co. Remember, Mr. Speaker, they granted 200 square miles, as against the 50 square miles that are granted according to the amended regulations of the Conservative Government; and they gave H. H. Cook & Co. the privilege of picking out any part of that territory of 200 square miles during a period of three years, in which they were to make a selection. Not all in one block either, but in blocks of 20 square miles when they could find timber. That was done by a moribund Parliament under the Mackenzie Administration, and by men who were virtually out of power as soon as they could square up their offices and leave their places to their successors. Notwithstanding that, and after they were defeated in the country, they gave to a political friend 200 square miles of land by private sale and not by auction. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that they did that because they could not get bidders, but we must remember that the late leader of this Government gave that same reason; but he lopped off all those objectionable features in the transaction which were found to be injurious, and which were the practice under the Liberal Government. The Conservative Government continued this policy for the purpose of getting men into the country to saw lumber for the settlers, to give them cheap lumber, and because they could not sell the limits readily by public auction. The Conservative Government, however, made the regulation that a person could only get 50 square miles of timber limits, instead of 200 as under the Mackenzie Government, and they further provided that the person who got the limit should build a mill within two years, and saw so much lumber every year for the settlers. In the instance I refer to under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie the person who got the limit had three years to make a selection, and before he had to do anything—and I do not know what length of time he got after that—before he was obliged to turn out a single board of lumber. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen which of the two Governments had the better policy? I say that this Government, finding they could not sell limits to advantage by auction, and that better inducements had to be offered to get lumber for the settlers, devised regulations by which the person taking the limit had to build a mill and turn out a certain quantity of lumber every year for the benefit of the settlers, and they altogether improved on the regulations of the Liberal Government. However, as time advanced and settlement went on, and it had been found that the limits might be sold to advantage by public auction, the Conservative Government changed the regulations and fell back upon the rule, which exists in the Province of Ontario to-day, of selling these limits by public auction. That change was made four years ago, and yet the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) seeks to make the country believe that the change has not been made yet, and that the objectionable practice of selling timber limits by private negotiations is in existence still. In moving such a resolution as this, the hon. gentleman is condemning the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), whom he asked to second the resolution, in stronger language than he can condemn this Government, because the regulations under the Mackenzie Administration were much more objectionable than the regulations under the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald. Timber limits have been sold by public auction for the last four years, and what reason can the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have in wasting the time of the House every year with this resolution, unless it is that he wishes to mislead the country for party purposes. If I were inclined to attribute motives to the hon. gentleman I would say that he has taken this course for the purpose of getting up a little campaign literature for the by-elections, and in order to try to make the people of the country believe that there is something wrong, which does not exist at all. If he wanted to do away with the objectionable practice of selling timber limits by private sale, why did he not do it long ago when his own friends who sit beside him were in power and carried on the objectionable practice? Does the hon. gentleman want to make the country believe that members of Parliament, in doing things which they were perfectly entitled to do, have done something wrong. He has been obliged to withdraw those charges time and again in this House, and what motive can he have in reiterating them now? The hon. gentleman is well aware that were it not for a fact that he is privileged as a member of Parliament, and that whatever he says in this House is surrounded by parliamentary privileges, he would long ago have been brought before the courts of the land for libelling hon. members of this House, and he would be involved in litigation which would not be honourable or creditable to him. If the hon. members of this House should attempt to pass a resolution that his conduct was discreditable, that it was ungentlemanly and uncourteous, and that he was not fit to sit in this House, he would make an abject apology as he did last year when he thought the House was going to pronounce

that sentence against him ; but should the House withdraw it, as soon as the danger was passed, he would attempt to bolster up the course he had taken again. Now, I think it is time that we had a rest from these allegations from year to year. I think it is time that the hon. gentleman dealt more fairly with his fellow members in this House, who are endeavouring to discharge their duties here as faithfully and as honourably as himself. I think it is time that he let ancient or mediæval history alone, because he can scarcely touch a subject in this House without stumbling upon something in connection with his own career that is not impregnable. He is the last man who should come here and talk about inconsistency in members of Parliament. I think it is time the country was treated to something else. But because the Government and their supporters are not inclined to agree with hon. gentlemen opposite, because they are not inclined to sit quietly by and listen to all kinds of abuse and indignities which are heaped upon them, threats are used that we must sit here all summer. It is just as well that hon. gentlemen opposite should know that we on this side of the House are ready to stay here all summer or even till next year in order to discharge our duties, in spite of the vituperations or threats of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think we can hold out as long as they can ; and when we are discharging our duties as faithfully and honourably as hon. gentlemen opposite, we ought not to be subjected to these threats to the extent that we are. I think it is time that we settled down to business and endeavoured to do something useful, for which the country gives us our indemnity. I think it is time that we endeavoured to carry through legislation which will be beneficial to the country, instead of taking up the whole time of the House in fishing out alleged scandals, in making allegations that cannot be substantiated, and in trying to create the impression in the country that there is something wrong at the seat of government, in the hope of destroying the feeling of confidence in the Government which prevails throughout the country to-day. I think it is time hon. gentlemen opposite ceased their attempts to cry down members of Parliament who are supporting the present Government, who are endeavouring to discharge their duty faithfully, honestly, honourably and intelligently, with credit to themselves and with good to the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman, I understand, has stated in my absence that I had secured three jack-knives, while I had complained against senators getting four. I may state to the hon. gentleman that the statement he has made is untrue. I do not charge him with stating what he knows to be untrue ; he may have thought it was correct ; but it is not correct. I have to say this more. I do not know that I should have called the attention of the House to it, only that it has been before the House before ; and my hon. friend can hardly be held responsible for what he says when his mouth starts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has no right to make that remark in connection with a personal explanation.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that I was credibly informed, and if I was incorrectly informed, I certainly withdraw the statement, because I had no intention either of misrepresenting the hon. gentleman or of saying what he says is not the fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman means that he was credulously informed. The statement which he has just now made shows how very credulous the hon. gentleman is. The hon. gentleman has charged the hon. member for North Norfolk with having abused his right as a member of the House, and with having made a most improper attack upon an hon. gentleman who was formerly a member of this House. Well, the hon. gentleman has read the statement upon which the hon. member for North Norfolk proceeded. My hon. friend from North Norfolk read an extract from a letter written by a late member of this House, Dr. Hickey, in which the latter speaks about the claims that "we" will be entitled to under certain conditions ; and the hon. member for East Grey makes a most violent attack upon the hon. member for North Norfolk for assuming that the pronoun "we" includes the person who uses it as well as somebody else. Well, Sir, my opinion is that the hon. member for North Norfolk is right—that he was entitled to assume when Dr. Hickey used the pronoun "we" he intended to include himself along with the other parties named. Now, when Dr. Hickey stated in this House that he had no such intention, but that he had used the word rather in a conventional sense than in its strict literal sense, my hon. friend from North Norfolk accepted his explanation. That was the whole case ; and, when violent attacks were made upon the hon. member for North Norfolk for having made the charge upon Dr. Hickey which he did, then my hon. friend pointed out how it was that he came to make the charge, and that he was to some extent justified in making it, on account of the phraseology of the letter which had been addressed to the department by Dr. Hickey. But, Sir, I am not going to detain the House by a discussion of that matter. The hon. member for East Grey has made a long and a violent speech. His speech possesses all those characteristics which he deprecates in the observations addressed to the House by my hon. friend from North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman, if he was not very strong in his denunciations, was certainly vituperative and very violent, and he intended to be severe. Then the hon. gentleman asked my hon. friend from North Norfolk, what would he think if he applied to him the language used by Shakespeare, that—

"He who steals my purse, steals trash ; but he who filched from me my good name robs me of that which enriches him not, but leaves me poor indeed."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not need to make the whole quotation. The hon. gentleman asks whether my hon. friend is not to be put in a class below those who steal purses. He occupies a lower position than the ordinary thief ; his conduct is more heinous, because he insisted that when a man used the word "we" in a letter, intended to include himself along with the other parties referred to. Then the hon. gentleman has told us that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) had obtained a large sum of money from somebody to which he was not entitled—a sum of $10,000. Well, the hon. gentleman had better formulate that charge and have it referred to a Committee of this House. He had better bring it forward when the

hon. member for North Victoria is in his place, when we will have an opportunity of ascertaining whether the hon. gentleman is undertaking to vindicate the purity of Parliament, or whether he is calumniating a member of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that it was in connection with the Local Government, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman can readily understand that no charge was made in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman's charge was what the law permitted him to make; and there was no moral wrong in itself, if it was a fair compensation for the labour performed. Then the hon. gentleman has accused hon. members of speaking in "thundering stentorian tones," and he also said they spoke "in various stentorian tones." Well, I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman means by this kind of oratory which he has undertaken to characterize by these expressions. The hon. gentleman has also said that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was the first person to introduce the sale of timber limits and mining interests, and so on, in public lands without competition. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There was a law put upon the Statute-book of the first session of the Parliament of Canada, copied from the Act of the Parliament of old Canada, providing that competition should be had in all such cases. Well, when sales came to be made in the North-West Territories, the Government led by the late Sir John Macdonald found that the law could not be complied with, and that if the people there were to have houses or barns and the other necessary edifices for the protection of themselves and their domestic animals it was necessary that lumber should be had, and that lumber could not be had unless certain favourable conditions were furnished to parties as an inducement to erect lumber mills in those districts. The Government of that day then undertook to make, and did make, sales of limits without competition, by private sale, without making any changes in the law. They disregarded the law. They allowed the law to stand requiring the Government to sell timber limits by public auction, but disregarded it; and when Mr. Mackenzie assumed office, Mr. Laird, who was then Minister of the Interior, introduced to the House an amendment which was rendered necessary by the condition of things then existing. That policy was justifiable as long as the condition of which I have spoken continued, as long as we had to hold out inducements to lumbermen to persuade them to erect mills and cut lumber for the accommodation of settlers. Now, I have said there were sales of that sort which took place before Mr. Mackenzie came into office; there was a sale to Turner, to Fuller, to McCaulay, to Dennis, a brother of the then Surveyor General, and the area sold to them was not lots of fifty square miles, but of a hundred square miles. That was the area sold before the law was changed in the year 1873. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to a case which has often been referred to in this House before, and often explained, and that is the sale of timber limits to Cook & Sutherland. Well, these parties aspired for a limit, not on the eve of an election, but early in the year 1878, and there was an attempt made to see whether there could not be found bidders before any arrangement was made with those parties. Communication was had with various lumbermen by the surveyor general, at that time Col. Dennis, and it was found that in the Saskatchewan country, where there were many settlers, who had gone into that district believing it was in the direction in which the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built, it was well nigh impossible to get parties to erect lumber mills and cut lumber for the use and accommodation of the population. Now, the hon. gentleman refers to the sale of a limit of 200 square miles as if it was a very extraordinary sale. In the forest district of Ontario it might be so regarded, but there had been timber limits of half this extent in the North-West sold to parties, which limits had in six years become exhausted. I remember calling the attention of the late Mr. White, when Minister of the Interior, to the case of a party who was well known to him, who had purchased a timber limit in Manitoba and had exhausted his limit, and was asking for another limit before Mr. White himself came into office. What did we provide in the sale to Cook & Sutherland. We provided that not less than ten square miles should be taken in any place, and we made that provision for the purpose of protecting the narrow strip of timber which extended along the borders of the rivers, in some cases a quarter of a mile and in others a half a mile in depth.

Mr. BOWELL. Was it not twenty instead of ten?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; I think so. No portion of these two hundred miles was to be in a block less than twenty miles in extent, so that it was impossible to purchase a fringe of timber without taking an extent of prairie land far in excess of that which was covered by the timber. That was kept in view, and it was rather with the design of preserving a margin of timber along the rivers for the use of the population than for any other reason that this provision was made. Now, what was done after we retired from office? I say it would be an act of cowardice on my part, when these claims had been before the department for several months, to have refused the sale of timber limits for the ordinary accommodation of the population of a country destitute of the necessary material to erect houses for the protection of themselves and families. That sale was made, with the ordinary conditions attached, and there was a provision besides that the lumber was not to be sold beyond a certain maximum price. Now the hon. gentleman says that, under the new regulation, there was a sale of fifty square miles to one party. But what has been done under that regulation? Why, a man makes a survey, it may be of five hundred miles, and he gets five or ten parties to apply to the department, each for a limit of fifty square miles; and the result was, as I know, for I could name the parties, that parties have made applications and obtained limits which they immediately assigned to the lumbermen who induced them to make the application. I could name Edward Farrar and others who were in Winnipeg, on whom a lumberman waited and said: I have surveyed such and such a district in the North-West, and want you to apply to the department on my behalf to obtain this timber limit of fifty square miles; and the timber limit was obtained, and, as soon as obtained, it went to the man who made the sur-

vey; so that not only two hundred square miles, but possibly twice two hundred miles could go into the hands of a single lumberman. Now, under our regulation there was no attempt to sell to any man who was not prepared to erect a mill, but the hon. gentleman treated the timber limits as an article of ordinary merchandise, to be sold to anyone who offered. Mr. Edward Farrer was the editor of a newspaper when he made application for a timber limit. Dr. Schultz, now Lieutenant Governor, when he applied for a timber limit had no intention of erecting a mill. It was simply for purposes of speculation. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was not going to introduce mill machinery on his timber limit and abandon his literary pursuits, and go to the woods in order to make lumber. That was not the intention. That was not the way the business was done. This was just as much a matter of speculation as the railway charters which have been carried through this House have been made a matter of speculation. Then the charges were diminished by one-half. More than that. Our regulation was that no piece of timber lands could be taken unless twenty miles at least was taken. There might be only one square mile of timber, but twenty miles together to be selected. But under the new regulation the limit was reduced to two miles. I pointed out to the late Prime Minister, in a conversation on this subject, that his regulation practically placed the fringe of timber along the rivers in the North-West under the control of the lumbermen, while it was intented by the regulation of 1878 to protect that timber for the use of those who went in to settle in that country. I have discussed this matter before. I say that the regulations offering timber for sale otherwise than at public auction are justified when the country is new, when there is difficulty of access, when you cannot secure competition in the matter, and when you are looking rather at the accommodation of the settler than to any revenue or profit you are likely to derive from the sale. That is a rule of common sense and a practice the Government are justified in applying and continuing as long as that condition of affairs continues. But when the country outgrows that, when you have lumbermen competing against each other for these limits to supply mills, and when lumber becomes an ordinary article of merchandise, then you have reached a condition of things when a change becomes necessary, and then it is the duty of the Government to introduce the system of competition, and do away with the system of sale to private parties and by private arrangement. I think that condition of things was outgrown some time ago. I know that last session, in the discussion which took place as to the timber limit purchased by Mr. Rykert, we had an illustration of the abuse that might grow up and the loss which the public might sustain, without any advantage to the settler, when the country had made such progress that competition was practicable. Reference has been made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) to sales of timber on Indian reserves. I think that should not have taken place. I think the result shows that if there had been a sale at public auction a very much larger sum would have been realized for the benefit of the Indian population than was realized by what was done. I do not charge the Minister with having acted corruptly. I am making no such charge at all; but I say there was a departmental mistake. There was a condition of things that made it right and proper that the system of advertisement and sale at public auction should have been followed, and there is no doubt in my mind that this is the rule which is now generally applicable to every portion of the country which is accessible for settlement, and the rule which I think the Government ought to announce as a rule of public policy, to be adhered to and formulated by legislation, instead of left to departmental regulation.

Mr. BARRON. I rise to a personal explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BARRON. I understand that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when I was absent from the House, made a statement that I had secured timber limits from some Government—I do not know what Government—for which I received $10,000. I ask permission to say that there is not one single word of truth in that statement. I desire to say, furthermore——

Mr. BOWELL. Order.

Mr. BARRON. I desire to say, furthermore, that I have repeatedly had occasion on behalf of my clients, having many lumbermen among them, to apply to the Ontario Government——

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is in order.

Mr. BOWELL. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If there is any question about it, I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARRON. I have always been told by the Ontario Government that no timber limits could be granted except such as were put up at public auction. As to having made any money myself, I state distinctly that, except as acting as solicitor for clients, I have never made a single, solitary cent, and never in the way indicated by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say——

Mr. MACDOWALL. I would not have said anything in this debate——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the member for East Grey desired to say a word or two.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell the hon. member for North Victoria that I did not make the statement he has alleged. What I said was, that if the member for North Victoria were in his place I would ask him if it were true, as alleged, that he had got for a friend of his a timber limit for $40,000 which was afterwards sold for $140,000, and for which it was said the hon. member for North Victoria got $10,000. I certainly accept the hon. gentleman's denial, and I will not do what has often been done in this House, repeat the statement; but I must say that the most incredible thing, to my mind, in the whole statement, was that the hon. member for North Victoria could get such a large sum for his services.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I should not have troubled the House on this occasion if the hon. member for North Norfolk had not mentioned my name amongst those to whom limits had been granted. I do not know in what way he made his enquiries as to the list which he produced. Perhaps, if I tell him my tale of woe, he will understand that there has not been so very much wickedness in obtaining timber limits. The year in which I made the application was, I think, 1882, when I was still a verdant immigrant in the country. I found there were certain regulations under which timber limits could be obtained, and I determined to go through the form of applying for one of them. I had no political influence at all; I did not know a single living soul in Canada when I came here. I had to fight my own battles the whole way through, and I can assure him that the fact of my having adopted one side of politics is not owing in the least to the battles I had to fight in order to obtain these timber limits. Anything I got from the Dominion Government at that time I obtained in a proper and regular manner, and I believe that I had to pay a good deal of money for it. In those days sugar with us was worth 50 cents a pound, bacon 50 cents a pound, pemmican 40 cents a pound, and everything else in proportion: and at that time, also, we could only travel through that country with a dog train. When my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) talked of the expenses of surveying a limit as being $400 I was astonished, because $400 would not even pay the preliminary expenses when I got my limit. At the same time, when I obtained my limit I not only complied with all the regulations laid down by the department, but I did so under very great difficulty, because at that time there were no railways in that country. When I came into the country the hon. member for East York was the leader of the Government, and he had publicly stated in this House that the policy of his Government was such that he did not mean to go through the empty process of driving stakes in the prairie, so as to delude the settlers to take up land or make investments in that country. When I went into that country the course of the Canadian Pacific Railway had not been changed, and when I went to Prince Albert it was with the belief that within a very short time the Canadian Pacific Railway would pass through there. We brought in our machinery for mills at great expense. We had to pay 10 cents per pound for freighting, and some of the castings were over 5,000 weight, and everything was most expensive. I think the tax-payer of Ontario has certainly not suffered by the grant of such timber limits in the North-West. With regard to the timber limits granted to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), they have told you that those limits reverted to the Crown, those limits are still in possession of the Crown. I think if the hon. member for North Norfolk considers these limits are of any value, and if he will make his application to the Minister of the Interior, he will find it just as easy to obtain one of these limits now as it was before, because it is a well known fact that timber limits are worth nearly nothing unless they are worked on mercantile principles, and they can only be worked on mercantile principles when you have a market for the products. When my friends and myself took up these timber limits in the North-West there was no market, and I believe that many of the settlers amongst the older class who inhabit that part of the North-West have had cause to bless the mill that not only gave them the wood to make houses to cover them from the blasts of winter, but also gave them the flour which fed their bodies during the long cold winters, and I believe we have paid, even in that way, a higher price and a higher premium than ever my pure friend from North Norfolk could have demanded from us. Now, the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was speaking when I came in, and I did not hear the full intent of his remarks; but I heard him state that it was shortly after Confederation and under the administration of our late lamented leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, that an Act of Parliament was framed enabling the Government of Canada to give timber limits on easy terms to the people, so as to enable them to settle in that country. I am very glad, indeed, to hear on his authority that that was an act of Sir John A. Macdonald, because, from my long experience as a pioneer in the North-West, I believe it was a wise measure, and the hon. member for Bothwell himself justified it when he said that the practice was to accommodate the settler, and a change should only be made when it became necessary through competition. Therefore, I think he himself endorsed the act of Sir John A. Macdonald. Then, he says that Mr. Laird, who was my opponent during the election of 1887, introduced a modification of the laws, and that it was during Mr. Laird's time that timber limits were given to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland. He says the reason he gave these timber limits to Cook & Sutherland was to enable them to lay out their limits in lots of ten square miles each, or ten miles each; he said ten square miles each. I do not suppose there was any prairie included, because in those days a system of survey was adopted which allowed a great many jogs in the survey, and which would have enabled Cook & Sutherland to take in more of the river bank, which the hon. member for Bothwell says was the very thing his Government endeavoured to avoid. But that system of survey was observed in those days: speak as an old settler and I know this to be a fact. Well, these 200 square miles laid down in limits in that way would allow of Cook & Sutherland altogether avoiding prairie, and it would have enabled them to take in the whole timber from the Rocky Mountains down to the Cumberland Lake on the Saskatchewan. Well, I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell and this House that Cook & Sutherland were not the only applicants for timber limits in that country, and if the Government of the hon. member for East York had really entertained those very generous sentiments towards the people of the North-West they would have looked more kindly on the application of Captain Moore, who went into Prince Albert in 1873. Captain Moore intimated to Mr. Laird, who was then Minister of the Interior, that he was prepared to take a mill across the prairies, and not only to cut the lumber necessary for the settlers' houses, but also to grind their wheat into flour, and he asked Mr. Laird whether his Government would grant him timber limits on the same terms as timber limits were granted to Cook & Sutherland. He could only obtain from Mr. Laird 23 square miles.

How did the Liberal Government show them that they intended to benefit the settlers of the North-West? You simply have to refer to the records of the House of those days to prove what I say is true, that is to say, that when the Government buildings were put up at Battleford, that is, when the old Government House, now the industrial school, and the barracks were being constructed at Battleford, Mr. Sutherland brought down all the timber for those buildings from Edmonton, and if you look into the Public Accounts of that day you will find that the timber cost the country $120 a thousand. And yet Captain Moore offered to lay down timber for $60 a thousand at Battleford, and the Liberal Government would not accept his offer. Therefore, you see how the Liberal Government had been trying to help the settlers and to save the money of the people. They only tried to build up that country when they could help their own friends. I suppose they thought that $120, when it could go into the pockets of a friend, was less than $60 when it went into the pockets of a poor immigrant. The hon. member for Bothwell also said that it would be a cruel matter to leave the new settlers of that country destitute of building material, and I entirely agree with him. And, therefore, I say that the laws ought to have been made so elastic as that they would have allowed people with the necessary capital to go in there and supply the building material. I do not suppose that if the hon. member for Bothwell goes through that country, from Edmonton down to Cumberland Lake, he will find that the confidence of the Government was misplaced, because the people throughout the country have been treated generously. I believe the prices of lumber were high, to a certain extent, compared with present prices. At the same time, you must remember that in Winnipeg, in 1877, when they were selling lumber at $80 a thousand, they were selling it at $40 in Prince Albert. In Winnipeg, however, the people had to pay cash for their lumber, whereas in Prince Albert they could exchange for lumber their wheat and oats, or whatever crop the farmer produced, which was always turned into cash. Therefore, the object was gained that the hon. member for Bothwell desired by the granting of 50 mile limits in place of grants of 200 miles, which latter really meant much more; because, according to that system, it would cover the whole timber country of the Saskatchewan The hon. gentleman has said he believed there had been as much speculation in timber limits in the North-West as in railway charters. I do not know to what railway charters he particularly refers. Perhaps he refers to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway. I do not think there has been much speculation there. There was an attempt made by the original promoters to build it. They have now succeeded in building it, and I am glad to say it has been a very great boon to the country, and I hope the promoters will soon reap benefit from it. The hon. gentleman may have referred to the North-West Central Railway; but it was asserted the other day by the acting Minister of Railways that the company were proceeding with the work and would carry the road to completion. I, therefore, suspect that the hon. gentleman referred to the Hudson Bay Railway, and when he did so he made the greatest mistake in the world, because that railway is of the most material importance to the North-West, and I think, although I have not hitherto spoken of Mr. Sutherland in complimentary terms, I may now turn round and refer to him in complimentary terms. The promoter has shown his determination to build this railway, and during the last three years he has stuck to the enterprise through thick and thin, and made it the one object of his life, and I hope he will carry it to completion. As to speculations in timber limits: if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has objected to such speculation, would go into the North-West and look up those very timber limits respecting which applications were made to the Government, and make a tender for them, I believe he would not find anyone to oppose him in taking them up. In considering this motion I think there are two or three points of view from which it may be regarded. In the first place, there seems to be a certain amount of personal element introduced into the discussions of the House during this session, and I deprecate that very much. It is a very great mistake. If we are to attend here to the interests of the public and the interests of the country we ought to leave personal matters out altogether. We ought to regard all these matters, whether railway charters or steamboat lines, or grants of timber limits, or any other matters of that sort, from the standpoint as to whether they would prove beneficial to the country and would aid in promoting its growth. There is also another point of view. If the hon. gentleman did not mean to make any personal reference, and he stated he did not desire to do so, then the only reason which could induce him to bring this motion before the House was to create an impression throughout the country that here was a new scandal on foot, and that this, although an old scandal, was really a veritable scandal. If it was for this reason the hon. gentleman brought forward his motion. I can only say I deprecate the motion. I think it is one of the indications of the very low state into which our political life is sinking if we are to do nothing more than to bring forward scandals against political opponents. If we are true and loyal Canadians, and believe that our country is worth living in, and that it produces men worthy to live in such a great country, we should be proud if we can show honour among our public men on both sides. But that does not seem to be the view of hon. gentlemen opposite. During the whole session they have been doing nothing but scandal-mongering. What does it all amount to? At the end of the session we will show that it will result in nothing. I believe the bye-elections will show that the Government will be sustained by the people, because the people will not approve this course of political life. It may be called political life, but it is an abuse of the word "political" to use such a term. I consider that, although as I come from the North-West, I may be considered an out-and-out barbarian compared with intelligent members from the east, it is scarcely worthy of the public life of Canada that so much joy should be exhibited in attacking men occupying high positions and in bringing them into scandalous disgrace.

Mr. WALLACE. I was struck very forcibly with the skilful way in which the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) avoided the charge made against him by the hon. member for East

Grey (Mr. Sproule). He has not replied to the charge or the query put by the hon. member for East Grey, and therefore I suppose we shall have to assume that he cannot do it. The charge is that the hon. member for North Victoria had dealings which resulted in his obtaining $10,000 in a timber limit speculation in connection with the Ontario Government.

Mr. BARRON. I ask the hon. gentleman to make the charge.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did you not deny it?

Mr. FOSTER. We will have you before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did the hon. gentleman not deny it.

Mr. BARRON. I will deny the charge, both as made by the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member for West Toronto, if they will only make the charge.

Mr. DENISON. I did not make any charge.

Mr. WALLACE. A good deal has been said about colonization companies and in regard to hon. gentlemen applying for timber limits in the North-West. As I am one of those charged by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as being implicated in applications for land for colonization purposes, I may say that I am not here to deny or excuse my connection with colonization companies in the North-West. If I required authority for the course I took I might refer to the hon. gentleman whom the hon. member for North Norfolk seemed to force into the position of seconding his motion this afternoon—I refer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); for when I first went into the colonization business I had for my guide the hon. member for East York, who was among the first to incorporate a company for colonization purposes in the North-West, of which he was a member and president. The application was made on 10th January, 1882. Alexander Mackenzie was the president of one of the five promoters. Robert Jaffray, the president of the Globe company, was one of the other promoters, and the company was called the British Canadian Colonization Company, limited. The object of the company is thus stated:

"The purposes for which colonization was sought are the acquiring by purchase, lease or otherwise, from the Dominion or Provincial Governments, or any corporation or persons, of land or any interest in land in the Dominion of Canada and the cultivation thereof; the erection of buildings, &c."

Our charter, that of the York Farmers' Colonization Company, was copied exactly from the charter of the company incorporated by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the present member for East York, and the late leader of the Liberal party, and then a member for the House of Commons. There was nothing illegal in the act. In fact, during my career in Canada there is one fact to which I look back with pride and satisfaction, and it is, that when hon. gentlemen opposite were telling the young men of Canada that their only hope of prosperity was to remove to the United States I was instrumental in having our young men settle in our own country and assist in building up and cultivating the land of our own Dominion. In this we were most successful. Perhaps the terms of the agreement by which these colonization companies were organized are not familiar to some members of the House, as it is many years since these regulations were decided upon, and I will just recall a few of them. The lands of the North-West were divided into four classes. Class "A" included lands 24 miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Class "B" included 12 miles on each side of the branch lines. Class "C" included all that land south of the Canadian Pacific Railway and not included in Classes "A" and "B;" and Class "D" were the lands far away from a railway, and to the north of it. The colonization companies were only given permission to have lands allotted to them in Class "D," far away from the railway. Our company selected lands from 80 to 90, and even 120 miles north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We induced many young men from the West Riding of York to go on these lands; we sent immigrant agents to Europe, to England, Ireland and Scotland, and we succeeded in bringing out the finest class of immigrants that could be desired for this country. These, to the number of 200 or 250 families, settled in our colony, and some of these young men went there with very little money, if any, undergoing the hardships that are no doubt common to the first settlers in that country; but we have them to-day the most satisfied, the most prosperous, and the most contented class of people, I believe, that can be found in the Dominion of Canada. And, Sir, when the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) says that the settlers left the North-West because they were honeycombed by colonization companies, I can say, so far as our company, and other companies that I could name him are concerned, that he utters a vile slander upon these colonization companies, and makes statements which he cannot prove, because they are not capable of proof. I will give the hon. gentleman the addresses of more than one hundred of our settlers, in fact, of every one of our settlers in the North-West, many of whom we have aided in going up there, men to whom we advanced money, when they required advances, at the moderate rate of 6 or 7 per cent., men who were assisted in every way, in purchasing oxen and implements; and, Sir, I can tell him that we have built up a prosperous and a happy and contented settlement in the North-West. That, Sir, instead of being open to the stabs of any political assassin, should be something to commend these companies to the Government and to the country. It is true Mr. Speaker, that there is one company, the Temperance Colonization Company, which, I believe, did not from the start, nor up to this day, fulfil the conditions under which they were organized. But, Sir, the fact that one company has defaulted in that respect should not cast a stigma upon our company, who have honestly attempted to fulfil, and have carried out, the duties and obligations which were imposed upon them by the Dominion Government.

Mr. WATSON. How many colonization companies are in existence to-day who have complied with the conditions?

Mr. WALLACE. I have no special knowledge of any company except the one that I belong to, and I challenge the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) to point to a single act in the York Farmers' Colonization Company that has been illegal, or that has not been to the best interests of the country, and to the best interests of the settlers.

Mr. WATSON. There are about three companies out of the whole batch.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not familiar with the working of the other companies, but I have heard the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) make insinuations time after time in this House against the colonization companies of the North-West, and I defy him now to make a single charge against the company with which I am connected.

Mr. WATSON. That is one.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is one that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has been casting slurs against this afternoon. I will ask the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has said that we were implicated in something—it must have been dishonest or dishonourable, when he used the word implicated—to make a single charge of malfeasence or wrong-doing in any respect against our company. He cannot do it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made no charge against the hon. gentleman's company, or against any other company.

Mr. WALLACE. Then what are you doing?

Mr. CHARLTON. My charge is against the policy of the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. The policy of the Government was, I believe, a wise and prudent one in this respect. It is true that the North-West settlers were not so prosperous as we at first expected. Everybody knows that there was a great boom for a year or two, and that it collapsed; but I believe that that policy of colonization companies, in which the Government undertook to become partners with companies who would assist them in colonizing and opening up the North-West, was a good and wise policy. I think that the Government in the course of a few years, when the conditions are somewhat better, would be doing a wise and prudent thing by adopting some such policy as they adopted in 1882. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in trying to defend the Mackenzie Government, and he himself in particular, from the charge of handing over the most valuable timber limits in that country to two men, practically without compensation or without any conditions whatever, made the remark that it would be an act of cowardice on his part to leave the settlers without timber. Does he mean to say that his Government, when ignominiously defeated and driven out of power, and when they were not responsible to the people—does he mean to tell the country that if they did not grant the timber limits to Cook & Sutherland there would be no timber for the settlers in the North-West? Why, Sir, the timber remained there, and it remained under a wiser and better provision, made by the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, than that which he had established and carried out. I say, Sir, that the course of the Conservative Government with reference to the timber limits has been a wise and prudent one. They have brought their regulations up to the spirit of the times; they have acted liberally with the settlers of the North-West, and enabled them to obtain almost as cheap lumber as can be obtained in the older and well-wooded parts of the other provinces. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, I claim, notwithstanding that settlement had been retarded for a number of years in the North-West from a number of causes, that the policy inaugurated in 1882 of establishing colonization companies was a wise and prudent policy at that time, and that the motion condemning the Government for their action in this respect is one which will not meet with the sympathy of the House nor with the sympathy of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am about to speak to the question. I think the discussion has wandered away somewhat from the question, and I wish to make a few remarks that will bear upon it. If I understand aright the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), it is simply asking this House to declare that it believes it is a wise and proper thing that in the disposal of the public lands and timber limits of this country they should be disposed of by public auction. That seems to me to be a fair proposition; and great indignation has been poured out on the hon. the mover of the resolution, who has been charged with making personal attacks upon members of this House. There was allusion made to that, there is no doubt; but it seems to me to have been made by the mover of the resolution to explain why he offers the present proposition to the House. He recited briefly that in times gone by the policy of the Government has not been to dispose of these timber limits by public auction, but to do it in a private way, and that in the disposition of these timber limits in times past many of the members of the House had made application for themselves or for their friends for one or more of these limits. He recited that he considers that policy tends to subvert the independence of the members, though not being contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act. It was first proposed in 1882, by Mr. Blake, that the limits should only be disposed of by public auction, and that this policy that the Government had begun, of disposing of them by private sale, should be withdrawn. That was voted down, the majority of the House on that occasion declaring and giving instructions to the Government that they wished the timber limits to be disposed of in the manner they had been disposed of before. In 1886, if I remember rightly, my hon. friend himself introduced a similar resolution, in which he recited again that many members of Parliament, either for themselves or for their friends, had made applications; and he simply pointed out that that would have a tendency to subvert the independence of members of the House, and proposed in his resolution as a remedy that the plan should be adopted of disposing of the timber limits and of our public lands by public auction. And to-day he simply recites that, I think as a matter of history, in order to give force and effect to the resolution which he submits to the House, and which he asks the House to endorse. Although the House on two previous occasions some years apart had declared that they did not wish this policy to be carried out, but wished the limits to be disposed of privately, he believed that this new House might be prepared to express its opinion, and, if it sees fit, instruct the Ministry that in the future they should adopt the course he proposes. But his statement is met by the announcement of the Minister of Interior that the Government have been doing that for the past four years. Well, if they have, it seems to me that

they themselves have arrived at the conclusion that is the proper way in which the limits should be dealt with ; and that being the case, they will have no difficulty at all in assenting to the proposition of my hon. friend. My hon. friend takes the position that while the Government may possibly have adopted that course by passing an Order in Council, if they have taken that step they have done so in the face of a resolution of the House declaring that the House did not want that course to be pursued. That is the position in which the matter stands. So far as Parliament is concerned, the instruction of Parliament to the Ministers was not to pursue the course which the Minister of Interior says has been pursued for four years, but to continue the practice of disposing of the timber limits privately ; and my hon. friend wants the course which the Minister says has been adopted declared by Parliament to be the course it desires to have adopted. My hon. friend says that if that has been done merely at the will of the Minister it can be rescinded at the will of the Minister, and he desires to have the distinct instruction of the House given to the Ministry to adopt that course. He does not move his resolution for the purpose of making a personal attack upon members of this House. I wish to judge him charitably. I think he recited these historical facts in order to illustrate the propriety of bringing up his motion to-day. And has it not a tendency—and, I think, that is the word my hon. friend used—to subvert the independence of Parliament, for the members of this House to have dealings with the Government? Was not the Independence of Parliament Act passed to prevent anything of that kind? If there was not a danger of that kind, and if it was a right and proper course to pursue, why the sensitiveness manifested by hon. gentlemen opposite when their names are mentioned in connection with it? Why should the hon. member for East Grey get so aroused and wrathful when the hon. member for North Norfolk simply points out that he had made an application for a timber limit for some friend, and said that he had done it because it was his duty to do it, while he was not doing anything contrary to the decision of Parliament or the Act of Parliament; and why does he talk of the hon. member for North Norfolk stealing his character, which is of more value to him than money?

Mr. SPROULE. For this reason: because, when I go into the country parties get up and say: this statement was made on the floor of Parliament when you were there, and therefore it must be correct. This was brought up perhaps fifty times before me in the country, while the declaration I made is conveniently kept back, and the public are given to understand that I have been doing something discreditable.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But my hon. friend can see that the line of reasoning he takes, while exculpating him, if he needs exculpation, would inevitably condemn others of doing what he says he did not regard as anything very dishonest or wrong. But that is not the way this question is put, which ought, it seems to me, to be discussed without personalities. It is the discussion of a principle, of what is the right course for the Government to pursue in this matter. I would fain admit, and the hon. member for East Grey, and every other hon. member on the other side must admit, that the Government having adopted the course recommended on this side, in spite of the contrary instructions of the House, believes that to be the right and proper course to pursue. Does it not carry on its face that that was a wise and prudent course to pursue? If these timber limits and lands are to be disposed of by public competition, where every man would have an equal chance, would there be any necessity for anyone to intercede with a member of Parliament to write to the Government to urge his claim? Is not the very fact that the services of members of Parliament were asked to urge the claims of parties desiring timber limits and lands a proof that the public at least believed that a member of Parliament would have influence in securing that which, according to all principles of right in dealing with the public domain, ought to be as open and free to one man to secure as another, without the intervention or help of any member of Parliament? That very fact carries on its face the idea that the Government were or could be influenced by members, and that in turn they could influence members. I am not making a charge ; but I say that the very fact of friends of members of Parliament asking them to do that is proof that that idea prevailed. I do not wish to go into the revelations of actual transactions that have taken place. I trust that the course adopted by the Minister resulted from the discussion of the matter, showing the evil which was brought clearly before the House, and to which I need not to allude in plainer terms. In connection with that, a violent attack was made upon the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr Barron), because in the illustration of this principle he recited an event that transpired in connection with the management of public affairs, in which an Indian tribe, the wards of the Government, suffered a severe loss from this very cause ; and because he brings that case forward, not to bring up an old charge or to reiterate something that had been said before, but to enforce the desirability of the House adopting the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk and laying it down as a line of policy, the vials of wrath are poured out upon his head by several hon. gentlemen opposite. And I want to say here, that that one instance, if we had no other criticism, demands that the policy propounded by the hon. member for North Norfolk ought to be endorsed by this House, and that would be an instruction to the Ministry stronger and more binding than any Order in Council, which they may adopt and rescind again at any time they wish. What are the facts in connection with that matter? That for $316 the right to cut timber over some 79 miles was given to a gentleman, and that sum went to the credit of that Indian tribe. I was sorry, when this matter was mentioned, to hear on the other side, not from all of those hon. gentlemen, to their credit be it said, but to hear from a good many hon. gentlemen on the other side, loud scoffs, and jeers, and laughter, when this case was mentioned by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). Each hon. gentleman opposite recognizes the position of these Indians. Like the other Indians in this Dominion, they are the wards of the Government, and the Superintendent General is the man, above all other men in this Dominion, who is charged with the management of their affairs. This Parliament and Government withhold from them the management of their own affairs, and entrusts

it to the Superintendent General; and while I do not charge that gentleman with doing anything corruptly, I point out to him that he could not have made the fatal mistake he did, in the interest of the Indians, if the policy were binding upon him which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposed, if it were the law that all sales of Indian properties should be made in open competition by public auction. If that had been the law the Indians would have made tens of thousands of dollars which they have lost, and by which other men have profited. When that is mentioned, hon. gentlemen opposite were found to jeer, and to laugh, and to sneer at my hon. friend from North Victoria. Why, Sir, this is a serious matter. If there is any question which calls for sympathy, and justice, and right dealing on our part, it is a question of this kind. These Indians have no say in this matter, and the Superintendent General alone can act for them; and by acting as he did he only obtained $316 for limits belonging to the Indians, on which the purchasers realized $55,000; and I am told that after working these limits for two years, and paying $13,000 in timber dues, the second purchasers sold them again to another individual for $60,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite scoff, and jeer, and laugh when that matter is brought before them. They ought to remember that these Indians have not a voice in this Parliament, that they are considered by law as minors, unable to act for themselves, and that the Superintendent General is the one charged with seeing that their interests are not neglected. The hon. Postmaster General asked my hon. friend from North Victoria if he did not know that, in addition to that $316, $13,000 had been placed to the credit of the Indian band as the result of dues collected on the timber cut. True, but instead of that being an excuse for the sale it only demonstrates how ruinous that sale was, as far as the Indian affairs were concerned. Why, the very fact of that amount of dues having been collected demonstrates how rich in timber that limit was; and if there had been $100,000 of dues collected and placed to the credit of the Indian band that would only have proved so much more clearly the exceeding value of the timber limits which were sold for $316. Does the hon. Postmaster General not know that if, instead of selling these 79 miles for $316, they had been put up to public auction, those parties who paid $55,000 for them would, in all probability, have bid that at the auction sale, so that $55,000 would have gone to the credit of the Indian fund besides the $13,000. The amount of dues paid does not in the slightest degree lessen the loss to the Indians. Their loss was made in selling the right to cut timber for only $316; when the parties who acquired that right within a very short time resold it for $55,000, and I have been told that the last purchasers, after working the limits for two years, sold them for $60,000. I only use this as an illustration, and that is the reason why the hon. member for North Victoria brought it up, to enforce the desirability of this House adopting the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the essence, the kernel of which is, that in future sales of this kind will be made in the open market to the highest bidder, after being sufficiently advertised. Had we adopted in 1886 that policy which my hon. friend from North Norfolk then proposed, not only the Indians but the public domain would have benefited. It is no answer to say that policy has been embodied in an Order in Council, which the Government themselves have adopted, because they have the liberty of rescinding it at any time. The Government adopted that rule in the face of the declaration of Parliament that it did not want it done; and what my hon. friend wants Parliament to do now is to say that it wants the policy we advocate carried out, and that will be an instruction to the Government to carry it out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Brant always pleases the House, but he has disappointed it this evening very seriously indeed. He promised, when he rose, to speak to the question; he promised, of course, in a humorous sense, because the call for question had been made, but nevertheless we took him at his word and really did believe he meant to speak to the question when he rose. The hon. gentleman did not touch it. He did not deal with the question as he promised to do, for the obvious reason that he was not well informed on the point under discussion. He was probably not in his place during the afternoon debate, and certainly could not have been in the House when the subject was debated in 1886. For example, he commenced with the statement that this was a question which ought not to excite any feeling, about which there ought to be no warmth, into which there could be no personalities thrown, because it was a simple expression of opinion on the part of this House that there should be a disposal by public auction of certain portions of the public domain. I dare say now, after he has finished his speech, he is under the impression that this is all the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk contains; but when he reads the resolution he will hardly be prepared to vote for it, because he will find it is not the resolution he has spoken to, and that while the resolution, for the purpose, perhaps, of creating a favourable impression on the public mind, lays down the principle that there ought to be a disposal of these properties at public auction, the essence of the resolution is an expression of censure and opprobrium as regards the law and the practice which have hitherto prevailed. When the hon. member for Brant declares that this resolution simply affirms the principle of sale by public auction of public property he evidently could not have listened attentively to the resolution itself, and will be surprised to hear that it contains these words:

"That practices with regard to the disposal of timber limits, mineral leases, pasture leases and other public resources by the Executive have obtained in past years that were calculated to injure the independence of this House, through the opportunity afforded to members to secure grants for themselves and their friends by private application, at nominal rates, and without being subject to competition;

"That many members did secure such grants for themselves and their friends;

"That the House of Commons in 1882, and again in 1886, refused to condemn such practices:

"That this House, nevertheless, believes that these practices were not proper and should entirely cease, and that timber limits should be disposed of at public auction to the highest bidder, after being first advertised, and after the lapse of ample time from the publication of such advertisement to enable intending purchasers to examine limits offered for sale."

So that, while the resolution does contain, as the hon. gentleman has said, the affirmation of the principle of sale by auction, it is not by any means

truthfully described as being merely a resolution affirming that principle, but it contains an assertion that practices have existed in the past which have been detrimental to the independence of this House, that many members of this House have availed themselves of those practices in order to obtain limits for themselves and their friends, and this is reprobated, not only in this resolution, but in the very extreme and violent language of the hon. gentleman who moved it, in which he asserted that the conduct of the Government had been corrupt and improper, and that it amounted to nepotism.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not use that language in regard to the timber limit question. I was speaking of the record of the Government in a general sense.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought when the hon. gentleman was making that speech he was moving his resolution, but if he says that the speech in which he used those words, and many more like them, was not applicable to this resolution in regard to the timber limits, to the mineral leases, to the grazing leases, or to the policy of the Government in regard to colonization companies, I have, of course, to accept the hon. gentleman's statement; but I think it will be a great surprise to everyone who heard him a few hours ago. Let me call the attention of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) to another particular in which he is entirely mistaken as to the intent and meaning of this resolution. He asserts that the policy of the Government now is to dispose of these properties by public competition simply as a departmental policy, and he is greatly alarmed—inasmuch as the House in 1886 gave, as he says, a mandate to the Government not to sell at public auction, but to continue the private sale of these properties—that, under the mandate of the House, in 1886, the departmental regulation may change and we may go back to the system of private sale. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there was no such mandate given by this House to the Government in 1886, but that in that year the resolution which was then moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was not what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) supposes it to be, a simple affirmation of the principle that these properties should be sold at public auction, but this was the language of the resolution:

"The practice of members of the House applying for and becoming personally interested in the disposal by the Crown of those public resources which are dealt with by the Executive or by Parliament on its recommendation, has grown to alarming proportions, is in its nature liable to abuse, has in fact been abused, and should be checked, in order to avoid lasting injury to the public interest and to restore and maintain the independence of this House."

So there was not a word in the resolution of 1886 indicating that the practice of selling at public auction should be adopted, and in negativing that resolution the House did not give any mandate to the Department of the Interior to continue the practice of private sales. The resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk to-day, and upon which we are soon to vote, is characterized by language which may well justify a feeling of bitterness and resentment on this side of the House. I shall deal in a moment with the matters of policy which are involved in this resolution, after I have convinced, as I am trying to do, the hon. member for South Brant that the resolution is not what he supposes it to be, and in the next place that the resolution adopted in 1886 by no means contains the mandate which he supposes is pressing with such great weight on the Department of the Interior as to induce it to go back to the previous system of disposing of timber limits by private sale. But, before I do that, I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what the law of the land is now in regard to this subject, because I think, then, the hon. gentleman will see that this resolution is absolutely unnecessary, though it may contain the germ of the system which he admires, but that it would leave the law as it stands to-day. Under the statute we have power to pass Orders in Council which have the force of law, and in 1889, in pursuance of that statute, regulations were adopted, the first words of which are:—

"All licenses to cut timber shall be disposed of by public competition."

And the succeeding words go on to say how advertisements shall be issued, how applications shall be made, and how surveys shall be made on those applications. So, if the hon. gentleman and his friends think, as I am sure my hon. friend from Brant did think when he addressed the House, that this was simply a resolution affirming a principle which he admires, he will now see that first of all it is not a resolution of that character, and, secondly, that it is not necessary, because, by force of law, the principle has been adopted which the hon. gentlemen desires to see affirmed by the House this evening. Now, although I do not at all wish—and it is exceedingly distasteful to me to do so—to go into matters of a personal character which have been brought up this afternoon, I feel compelled to do that in consequence of what has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman was indignant at the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) having addressed some strong expressions to the House in reference to the mover of this resolution, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a very great mistake when he accused my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) of having referred to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in that way. The references he made were to the celebrated affidavit of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has raised that question, I feel compelled to call attention to the terms of that affidavit and to the question which has been raised between that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). My hon. friend from Bothwell stated that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had been misled by an expression in a letter written by Dr. Hickey three or four years ago, and that, as Dr. Hickey had used the expression "we," the hon. member for North Norfolk might fairly have inferred that the application referred to in that letter was a joint application by Dr. Hickey and a man named Broder. I am compelled to point out that that was not the question at all. It would be more pleasant for me and for the House if we had not to refer to the other matter, if we had not to consider the fact of the making of a false affidavit. But the ground the hon. member for Bothwell argued about was not the cause of the controversy, it was not Dr. Hickey's letter at all which was involved, but it was

a solemn affidavit made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, not referring to that letter, not based upon that letter, but swearing that he had carefully examined the record and that he had found that Dr. Hickey was a joint applicant with Mr. Broder, and that upon their joint application an Order in Council had been issued. It was not a mere question of being misled in the accusation in the House made against Dr. Hickey in consequence of his letter:

"I, John Charlton, of the village of Lynedoch, Ont., do hereby solemnly declare and say that I was a member of the House of Commons in 1886. That during the winter of 1886 I made examination of certain returns regarding timber limits. That the returns were voluminous and not printed. That the said returns contained an application from Wm. Broder. That Charles E. Hickey, M.P., was a co-applicant. That the application was made 20th April, 1883, and that an Order in Council for 50 miles on the south side of Lake Kasgaskok was issued upon said application, the 30th April, 1884."——

The person who made that affidavit had or had not made the examination that he speaks of here. If he had made the examination that he speaks of here, he would have found that it was an absolute impossibility for him to swear to the affidavit which he had written. If he had not made the examination, I ask the hon. member for Bothwell what he thinks of an hon. member swearing that he made it and then basing a charge upon it? The member for North Norfolk may well have been mistaken in the session of 1886 in reading the letter of Dr. Hickey and basing his charge upon the use of the term "we," and he might have gone on under that supposition. But when the elections came on twelve months afterwards, and he had had ample opportunity of examining the records for himself, he ought not to have been misled by any chance expression in the letter. He had examined the record; he swears he had; and the record was the reverse of what he said. Now, the letter of the 20th April, 1883, is printed here, but it is not an application at all. It refers to the fact that there was already an application in, and the record goes on to show there was an application made after that, and that all these applications were the separate applications of Mr. Broder, and that the letter of Dr. Hickey of the 20th April, 1883, was not in itself an application, but an allusion to a former application of Wm. Broder, Macmillan, a previous applicant, having failed. Wm. Broder claimed to be a co-applicant for the limit, Dr. Hickey himself did not ask to be a co-applicant with Broder, but he asked, on behalf of Broder, that the latter be allowed to be co-applicant. But, as I have said before, much as the hon. member for North Norfolk may have been excusable as mistaken in the session of 1886, there is no excuse for him when he came to examine the records and found subsequent applications by Broder himself in which Dr. Hickey was in no way concerned, and when, above all, he read the Order in Council of 30th April, 1884, and he found there that it is an Order in Council, granting the area to Wm. Broder, and that Dr. Hickey was in no way connected with it. That is the reason why I think my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) was not far astray when he called the attention of the House to the character of that affidavit, more especially as the House will remember that the hon. member for North Norfolk himself, in moving this resolution, spent one-half the time that he occupied in addressing the House, on the subject of that affidavit,

endeavouring to explain away its terms, and attempting the impossible task of reconciling it with the record, and insinuating, as I think the hon. member for Grey was fairly justified in thinking he did, and as I thought he did—insinuating that the allegations in the affidavit of Dr. Hickey on this subject were incorrect; because, unless I misheard the hon. gentleman altogether, at one stage of his speech he paused and expressed a great desire to see the affidavit which Dr. Hickey had made upon the subject. Now, when the hon. gentleman had had ample time to investigate the record—and he did investigate it, as he swears he did—I think it was hardly to be expected of him that in view of the general election of 1887 he should make such a strange affidavit and send it to Dr. Hickey's county to injure him in the campaign in which that gentleman was struggling to regain his seat in this House. Now, there were a few other observations made by the hon. member for Bothwell which I so fully concur in that really my principal object in rising was to apply them to the subject under discussion to-night. Let me call the attention of this House to what the argument and the statement of that hon. gentleman were. He stated in terms in which I quite agree with him what the law and the practice and the reason for both were in early times. He showed that under the first Administration of the late Sir John A. Macdonald the law absolutely required what we are asked to confirm to-night, namely, that these properties should be disposed of at public auction; he showed that that law was almost futile. Why? For the obvious reason that these areas in the North-West were remote, not only from improvement, not only from use, but from search even. With no railway communication in that country, the task of making explorations sufficient to make an application for a timber limit involved sometimes an expenditure of thousands of dollars, and when the timber limit was located and the application made it had to be followed by a survey, involving hundreds of dollars, and sometimes upwards of a thousand dollars in expense. When that was done the license had to be procured, and this was guarded by terms that not only included heavy charges for the timber cut, but required at the same time that the lessee should cut a large quantity of timber every year, and that mills of certain capacity and dimensions should be put upon the land. These were onerous conditions, and at the same time the country was pressing for the settlement of the North-West, and timber was one of the great requisites of that country. Who would compete, when asked season after season to expend thousands of dollars to search for an area, and to enable the person searching to make his application? If any one were to compete with the discoverer he would be using the expenditure and enterprise of the man who had made the exploration. Therefore, during the régime of the first Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, after Confederation, the practice of obeying the law in this regard fell into disuse, and it was found absolutely necessary to entertain private applications of the individuals who had made explorations and were willing to go on and expend the necessary sum to get out the timber. When the party opposite came into power they concurred in the disuse of the regulation for competition; they recognized the policy which had driven Sir John

Macdonald's Government from an adhesion to the principle of competition, and they passed a statute, as the hon. member for Bothwell described to-night, which has been on the Statute-book ever since, until this regulation was adopted in 1889, allowing such properties to be granted on private application. Now, then, the statement was made in 1886 that the right to make a private application was abused by members of Parliament for their own advantage. We remember the scenes of 1886; we remember the afternoon on which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made his accusation, and, Sir, I remember that when the morning light streamed in through those windows the hon. gentleman was still making apologies for the unfounded accusations he had made against members of this House. The hon. gentleman accused a long list of members with having seized the public domain, with having engaged in what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) described as "the great timber steal," and in the parade of names which he placed before the House then he called up not only my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), who gave us a reminiscence of that debate to-night, but some thirty or forty other members, who had been accused of violating the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, and of attempting to steal the public domain; and it transpired after all that nearly all of them had done nothing more than simply to discharge the ordinary courtesy of a member of this Parliament, who, when applied to by a constituent to forward his application to the proper department, simply encloses it and asks that it should receive proper consideration at the hands of the Minister. I remember, for example, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was accused, and it turned out afterwards that he had not applied for himself nor on behalf of a friend of the Government, but on behalf of a gentleman actively opposing the Government, and a worthy and respectable constituent of Mr. McCarthy, who had desired him to forward his application, not for a corrupt reason, as suggested by an hon. member, but from the supposition that the influence of the hon. member for North Simcoe would expedite the application which he was about to make. Every member of the House will agree with me in recalling experience he has had with his constituents when he has been applied to to aid them in making applications. Applications connected with every department of the Government come to me from my constituents. They know it is my duty to forward them, that it is my duty to press for an early answer; and so it is with the other members of the House. Surely, people are not to be charged with corruption because they desire their members who are in Ottawa attending to public business to forward and advance with speed their interests in regard to their private business with the departments of the Government. The people of this country who are accustomed to avail themselves of the services of their members would be greatly surprised if told that, when they enclosed their applications to their members to be presented to the Department of the Interior with a request that they receive prompt attention, they are guilty of attempting to corrupt members of Parliament and are using improper influence on the Government. I can only say that every day we receive these applications. We receive them with courtesy and attention, as a matter of duty, as freely from members on the Opposition side of the House as from members on our own side of the House, and we recognize that when applications come from them they are as worthy of prompt attention as if they came through our own friends, and the suggestions of improper motive and a desire to use undue influence is utterly out of the question in these cases. And so the debate of 1886 went on. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) found when he had done that he had raised a hornet's nest about his ears, and the men whose conduct he had impugned, men like Dr. Hickey, the hon. member for Ottawa, and the member for North Simcoe, had been simply discharging the ordinary duty of transmitting applications from their constituents, and for this they had been branded in the speeches made in that debate and in the speeches made throughout the country with being boodlers, and men who had taken part in that which the hon. member for North Wellington called the great timber steal, and with being guilty of, to use the words of the hon. member for North Norfolk this afternoon, corruption, jobbery and nepotism. The next question which the hon. gentleman presses upon us is, whether it is proper for a member of Parliament himself to be an applicant in relation to the public domain. It is not necessary to go into this question at any great length; but I call attention to the argument presented by the hon. member for Bothwell, which is this: When an accusation was made, or rather when a suggestion was made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that an hon. member who had taken part in this debate, an ardent friend of the Ontario Administration, had made $10,000 out of the sale of timber limits which had been granted by that Government, what was the answer of the hon. member for Bothwell? His answer was: Even if that were true, the gentleman referred to has complied with the law of the land; he was as much entitled as any other person to make his application under that law. The hon. gentleman has only to apply that language to the cases of 1886 and he will find this to be the case: The persons alleged to have been engaged in this great timber steal, and who are accused of corruption, nepotism, jobbery, and everything of that kind, by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), had made their application in accordance with the law of the land, not with a purpose of stealing the public domain, but, in so far as they had made applications on their own behalf, they had made applications for grants which they could not receive except under very onerous conditions indeed, conditions involving the immediate development of the territory to which the grant would apply. They were required to put up a mill the first year, of ample capacity, according to the size of the area; they were obliged every year to cut a certain quantity of timber, the quantity being prescribed by the license, and the license would be forfeited, notwithstanding the mill, if the required quantity were not cut. Were those hon. gentlemen, then, not complying with the terms of the law? Let me suppose that the principles involved in the Order in Council I have read, and in this resolution, are to be adhered to, and sales of timber limits made only at public auction. Is it to be said that a member of Parliament shall not bid at the auction? Why? Is it because his positions

as a member of Parliament forbid him occupying the relation of tenant to the Crown, thus giving rise perhaps to multifarious questions as regards the timber dues which he has to pay to the Government? Are his relations as a member of Parliament to the Government likely to be affected by the terms and conditions of the lease? As a member of Parliament is his independence affected, perhaps unduly swayed by the Government, in order to get a modification of what may be considered onerous terms? Is this implied? If so, let me ask the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) if he is not in that position himself, if he is not a lessee from the Crown, if he has not had a timber limit from the Crown, if he has not applied to this very Department of the Interior to relax the conditions imposed on him? Perhaps I should not press him unduly for an answer.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am ready to give the answer, if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am perfectly willing for the hon. gentleman to make any statement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am the lessee of a timber limit. It was granted many years ago. I bought it from the estate of R. C. Smith, of Port Hope. I am operating that limit. I have made application to the Crown to have justice done me. I am obliged to deal with the Crown, and I wish the Crown to deal fairly with me. I obtained this timber limit as a private purchase.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am pointing out that the hon. gentleman desires some modifications from the department. Let the hon. member not misunderstand me by any means; I never imputed to him that he acquired his timber berth unduly. I presume he did what was done by those members of Parliament whom he has accused and maligned for acquiring limits—fully complied with the terms of the law. But I want him to remember this additional point, that while he is in the position they occupy, no one in this House or the country supposes that his independence as a member of Parliament has been greatly affected by his relations to the Crown, and he might surely indulge in a small measure of charity as regards members who sit on this side of the House. Without detaining the House longer than is necessary, I want to reply to another observation made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), because he was hardly justified in using the terms in which he has alluded to this House, and the manner in which hon. members received the charges made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) this afternoon. Referring to the subject of the granting of that license, I agree with what the hon. gentleman said as to the duty that devolves upon us as trustees of our Indian wards. No one can help regretting if in that transaction their interests were not as jealously guarded as they should be. The hon. gentleman will admit with me that a transaction of that kind, in which it would appear almost certain that the department had been overreached in some way, is impossible under the terms of the Order in Council of 1889. But what did excite the amusement of hon. members on this side of the House was the manner in which the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) made his charges, if he will excuse me, as I hope he will, if I discuss this matter. He put himself forward, certainly, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Mc Mullen) thought, as the defender of the Indians and Indian rights in connection with this subject; whereas, if I am not very much misinformed, the way in which the hon. gentleman acquired all his valuable information, which he thought proper to communicate to the House, was as solicitor for an individual who, under a grant from the Province of Ontario, claimed the right to deprive the Indians of the timber limit altogether.

Mr. BARRON. I acquired it, Mr. Speaker, from a return brought down to this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, yes; after the hon. gentleman was retained for the patentee he moved in this House for the return. I am sure that the return which the hon. gentleman has got has been a useful one to him, not only because it has enabled him, with great force, to bring this matter to the attention of the House, but also because it supplemented his brief in the most ample and efficient manner. I am sure, now, that when the whole thing is over he will agree with me in expressing great satisfaction that the Indians have after all got that 31 cents each, because if the hon. gentleman had succeeded in the exercise of his professional talents elsewhere they would not have even got that, and the Ontario Government's pateatee would have got it all. I think that a little levity was excusable when we heard him with great vehemence declaring that a hundred Indians divided into $316 amounted to 31 cents per head; and the hon. gentleman not only did that with great earnestness, but with what my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) described, to the disgust of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), "various and stentorian tones." I think, Sir, we were a little justified in professing our scepticism, not at all—as the hon. member for South Brant supposed—our contempt, for the rights of the Indians. I think we are a little justified in being amused at the hon. gentleman's attack upon the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of the Interior had answered the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) assailed him, the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, with all the ardour and fury with which he had assailed his wards, the Indians, in the courts of Ontario; and when the Minister of the Interior rose and indicated that the hon. gentleman was mistaken, and that he had not been Superintendent at that period, and that the fury of his attack must be directed elsewhere, then the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) declared that the whole case had been admitted, and that when the Minister of the Interior had corrected him in point of historical date he had confessed that the whole transaction was a crime and that the Ministry had been condemned out of his own mouth. These were the circumstances, I think, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), if his face had been turned this way, would have been excited at the amusement of this side of the House. It was not by any means as he indicated to the House to-night, and as I would not like the country to suppose, because of the contempt for the interests that were being discussed by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). Mr. Speaker, I would not have troubled the House to address it on this occasion, as this matter has been so frequently discussed, if I had not thought the hon. member for South Brant

(Mr. Paterson) had himself mistaken the purport of the resolution, and had mistaken the record of 1886—or, at any rate, unintentionally presented it to the House in a light in which it was not entitled to be received by the House; nor would I have spoken if I had not thought that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had unduly attacked my hon friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not attack him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Well, we shall say nothing more about that. I would not have spoken if I had not thought that the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had himself, in a moment of frankness, discussed this question in the House in terms which completely defeated all the reason and sense of the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly should not have troubled the House had not it been for the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, nor would I have troubled the House even then if the hon. Minister had abstained from, I think, rather disingenuously representing the real issue before the House. The question which has been brought up by the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), after all said and done, is this: is it or is it not desirable in the public interest, at this present time of day, that we should dispose of the public property by public auction, and in such a way that either the public of Canada at large, or the Indian wards of the Crown, as the case may be, could have a reasonable ground for expecting that they would get the fair and honest value of the property so sold? That, Sir, nothing more and nothing less, is the proposition of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Now, it does not matter one straw to the merits of this question what the law was in the time of Sir John Alexander Macdonald, or how he observed it. It does not matter, in regard to the question, whether it is desirable at this time of day, with all the advantages of transport that we now possess, with all the knowledge that we now possess of this region, to dispose of this property at public auction—it does not matter, I say, a straw, what was the practice under my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or under the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. The question is, whether to-day, at this time, and at this hour, it is desirable that this House should lay down the broad principle that in dealing with the public domain you should dispose of it by public auction, and in such a fashion as to put a stop, now and forever, to divers scandals which only a year ago the Minister of Justice himself agreed with me, for once in his life, in pronouncing corrupt and discreditable. Sir, from the circumstances connected with a certain timber limit obtained by one John Charles Rykert, on which the late House pronounced a judgment, it will appear that there is ample warrant for the motion that my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has placed in your hands. Now, with respect to the preamble which has wrung the withers of the Minister of Justice and so many other gentlemen on that side of the House, what have they to complain of? If their hands are clean, if their consciences are pure in this matter, it does not touch them in the least. The only men it touches are these men, if there be any on that side of the House, or if there were in past times, who used their place and position as members of Parliament to obtain unfair advantages for themselves. The hon. Minister of Justice will not say that he is one of them; he will not admit, I suppose, that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are in that predicament, and, if so, all this virtuous indignation of his about the preliminary language used by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) appears to me wholly and entirely out of place. The hon. Minister, I was glad to observe, admitted frankly and fully that there was very serious grounds for believing that in a particular case alluded to by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) the interests of the Indian wards of the Crown had been gravely slighted. Nor is it possible for any man who considers the facts, for any man who knows that 79 miles of timber limits were sold for $316, to feel otherwise, under all the circumstances which have been detailed. It could not be otherwise, in the face of the knowledge of what the Ontario Government got for similar lands in that locality, of the knowledge that these limits have been sold for $55,000 after large quantities of timber had been cut off them, and as I am informed, and as I think my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated, after two whole years of operations had gone on, and a very large quantity of valuable timber had been removed, what remained was so valuable that it has been sold lately for $60,000. If the hon. Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior want to trace the transaction I may mention that Mr. Saxe, of Albany, the other day, gave $60,000 for what remained of that timber limit after two years' cutting. I say that there is a case which, to the credit of the Minister of Justice be it said, he seems to feel is indefensible. Now, Sir, is it not plain and clear that had the rule asked for by my hon. friend from North Norfolk been adopted by this House that great fraud on the Indians could not have been by any possibility committed? And is it not equally clear and plain that such a deplorable instance as that which stained our annals in the case of Mr. John Charles Rykert could not have occurred if such a rule had been laid down by the House? The hon. Minister of Justice tells us that this is all needless. Why, Sir; because the law has been altered? Not at all. The law, as I understand it—and I am open to correction if I am wrong—stands on the Statute-book to-day just as it did when Mr. Rykert got his timber limit and just as it did when Mr. Robillard arranged his little matter as respects this Indian reservation. But the hon. Minister of Justice tells us that we are to be quite content, because in 1889 a regulation by Order in Council was adopted laying down certain rules, very much in accordance with this very motion. Now, I take for granted that the same power which made could undo. I take for granted that to-morrow, if a less conscientious person than the hon. Minister of Justice were occupying that seat, and it was found desirable or convenient, for reasons of state or of political exigency, that this Order in Council should be altered, while the law remains on the Statute-book as it is to-day, there is nothing to prevent another Minister of Justice, or another Minister of the Interior, from altering that Order in Council. If I am wrong the hon. Minister of Justice will correct

me as to whether he could not rescind that Order in Council to-morrow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes: I presume he could; and the hon. gentleman will allow me to add that the passage of this resolution would not make any difference in that respect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is precisely where I take issue with the hon. gentleman. An Order in Council may be rescinded and nobody, for a very long time and until a great deal of mischief had been done, would be any the wiser; but a resolution such as my hon. friend has brought in—in place of introducing a Bill, which it would be impossible, as the hon. gentleman knows, to get passed this session—remains on record; and I do not think the hon. gentleman or his colleagues would say that if this resolution passed it would not have a directory and binding effect on this Government or on any Government. Of course, if it passes to-night it ought to be followed by legislation at a convenient season; there is no doubt about that; so far I would quite agree with the hon. Minister of Justice. But I do respectfully submit, waiving all these personalities which have been introduced from one side as well as the other, that enough has transpired, enough has been proved at various times in this House, and in those two cases alone to which I refer, to show that there is good reason now and at this particular time for laying down a positive rule that the public domain should be disposed of by public auction. Sir, the record of our dealings with the North-West, as I have often pointed out, has been anything but creditable to our skill in managing a great public domain. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well—there is no need to refresh his memory—that hopes were held out to the people of Canada, times without number, that by the judicious sale of our public lands, timber limits, coal areas, mines, and what not, all the cost, and charges, and the great outlay in constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be repaid to the people of this country, and that many millions of dollars, besides, would come into our coffers. He knows, and we all know, how bitterly the country has been disappointed in that matter. He knows that in place of $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 of assets we have to-day a deficit in connection with the management of the North-West. Now, looking at all these facts, it does appear to me that the time has come—and that is really all, when boiled down, that my hon. friend's resolution declares—when we should use the same prudent precautions in dealing with our public domain which have proven so eminently successful in dealing with the domain of the Province of Ontario. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Justice is aware, but I think I am correct in saying—I speak from memory—that the result of Mr. Mowat's administration of his Crown lands—which are not one-twentieth part so valuable, in my judgment, as those which we inherit in the North-West—has resulted in adding some $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 to the resources of the Province of Ontario during the past dozen years; whereas ours has resulted in a great loss, in place of many millions of dollars being put into our exchequer. That alone is a sufficient justification for the motion which my hon. friend has made; and I am sure, in addition, if we must go into the personal question, that when we heard the letter emanating from Mr. Hickey, which had been read by the hon. Minister of Justice and which had been read before, in respect to those timber limits, although I am now perfectly willing to admit the statement which has been made by the hon. Minister of Justice and others, that, as a matter of fact, Mr. Hickey was not personally interested in that timber limit——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen had better wait. I, myself, in reading that letter, particularly the last line of it—"I trust that we will get equal consideration"—and knowing how common it is for members of Parliament to hunt in couples, after the fashion of Messrs. Rykert and Adams, let us say—would be disposed to put the same construction upon it as my hon. friend from North Norfolk has done. And I must say that, *primâ facie*, I do not think he is at all liable to the very grave charges that were brought against him on the other side of the House, of having wilfully and maliciously slandered Mr. Hickey. My hon. friend stated what he thought, and honestly thought, was the fair construction of that letter; and remembering all that my hon. friend had discovered as to the number of parties who were interested in various ways in Crown properties, and looking at the matter reasonably and fairly, nobody can say that there was any great wonder that my hon. friend was mistaken. My hon. friend tells me that Mr. Hickey at that time did not deny it. That I do not know anything about; but I do recollect that letter being read, and I recollect perfectly well the impression which it made on my mind at the time. As to the statement that my hon. friend has also a timber limit which he bought twenty years ago from another party in the open market, does the hon. Minister of Justice pretend to think that there is any sort of comparison between such an act done in the ordinary course of business, and such a proceeding as he seeks to guard against—a member of Parliament going *in camera*, in the obscurity of the private chamber of the Minister having charge of the public domain, and arranging with him to become possessed of a very valuable tract of property; and he took as an illustration what the hon. member for Ottawa and his friends did. It appears on the face of it that a portion of the public domain, worth certainly not less than $60,000, and worth probably $80,000 or $100,000, if the truth were known—and looking at the prices obtained by the Ontario Government for similar lands, it might very likely have fetched those sums in open market—was parted with, not under the present Minister of the Interior, but his predecessor, to a political friend for $316. That is the fact staring us in the face; and I repeat again that, in the teeth of such facts, it does appear to me a very reasonable request on the part of the hon. member for North Norfolk that the House should declare it is not expedient that such relations should subsist or be possible to subsist again between members of the Ministry and their political friends, either in this House or out of it, and that there is danger to the independence of Parliament if these things are left to hang on the precarious tenure of an Order in Council. I think it is the duty of this House to pass a declaration such as my hon. friend proposes, and I think also that declaration

should be followed up by a Bill strictly defining what ought to be done and restoring the law to the position in which I understand it originally was, seeing that the time has now come when these precautions can be taken, not only without detriment to the public interest, but with the best results to the public service. As to the others questions the hon. Minister has raised, probably he and I would not be found to differ very widely in our interpretation of them. I have always taken the ground —although I admit there are technical difficulties in the way of putting my views on the Statute-book which I would like to see the Minister of Justice use his well-known legal talent to overcome —that the position we occupy here is that of trustees of the public in a very strict sense, and that, as trustees, we certainly ought not to be allowed to make a profit in any shape or form by dealing in the property of our wards. If the property of the country be put up, with full notice, at public auction, then I admit that probably members of this House may bid, as is commonly done in Ontario and elsewhere, for timber limits for themselves, without any very serious risk or injury to the public—although, if it were possible, I would be very glad, for my part, that the law should be so amended that it would be impossible for any of us to be brought in any pecuniary relations with the Government of the country in any way. That is the ideal which we ought to endeavour to attain, and I invite the hon. Minister of Justice to consider whether it would not be possible to introduce and place on the Statute-book some Act which would define better than is now done the position of members of Parliament, and make them in law what they are in reason and equity, the trustees of the people, subject to all the pains and penalties that attach to trustees in dealing with the property of their *cestui qui* trusts.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat commenced with the declaration that my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice had been disingenuous in the manner in which he had treated this subject. If that epithet were applied to the hon. gentleman himself it would have been much more effective and truthful. To establish that point I shall, before I sit down, point out the manner in which I think he merited the epithet he applied to my colleague the Minister of Justice. But before doing so, there is one point in connection with this subject which has not been clearly brought before the House, as I think it should be. We shall have the spectacle in a very short time of seeing those gentlemen who occupied our places a few years ago voting in condemnation of themselves. We shall find them recording their votes in direct opposition to the policy they themselves laid down as the proper one, and which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has to-night so logically, forcibly and well defended. If, as has been pointed out by that hon. gentleman, in the earlier period of the history of the North-West, when very few people inhabited that country, the practice then pursued was the only correct one, surely that reason would be equally forcible when the present Government assumed the reins of power. It cannot be said that the circumstances connected with the North-West Territories were any different in 1878, when the Conservatives came to power, than it was when the hon. gentlemen left office. They argue that it is more venal or corrupt for a member of Parliament to ask from the Government a timber limit now than it was in 1878, when those hon. gentlemen were in power and had the authority to pass, and actually did pass, Orders in Council giving to members of Parliament large areas of the public domain. The hon. member for Bothwell pointed out, in that dexterous manner in which he deals with all questions, the differences between the course pursued by the present Government and that which he pursued. What are the facts in connection with the timber limit to which he referred? One of the gentlemen who applied for that limit was a member of the House of Commons. That hon. gentleman had, the hon. member for Bothwell tells us, been applying for that limit during the earlier months of 1878. I speak now of Mr. Cook, then member for North Simcoe. But it was only after the people of this country had expressed their want of confidence in the gentlemen who are now in Opposition, that the Order in Council giving Mr. Cook and his associates a large timber limit of 200 square miles was passed. True, a member of Parliament had been urging upon that Government for months the propriety, I presume, I may say at least the necessity, of his obtaining the limit which they subsequently gave him. The facts are simply these: In 1878, on the 17th September, a day those hon. gentlemen very well remember, the Mackenzie Government was defeated. On the 4th October, 1878, the then Minister of the Interior, my hon. friend from Bothwell, recommended to the Council a grant to Messrs. Cook & Co. of 200 square miles of timber on the banks of the Saskatchewan, but these 200 miles of timber limits were not to be confined to any particular locality. From the Rocky Mountains to the point where the Saskatchewan empties into Lake Winnipeg they could be selected, from one end to the other. Messrs. Cook & Co. could traverse the whole of that country in order to pick out their limits, and the hon. member for Bothwell told us to-night: I did not think it was as bad as he painted it—that these 200 square miles could be selected in areas of ten miles each. He has placed the matter in a much worse position than I should have done. I was under the impression it must have been twenty miles, but he enabled them to go from one end of that territory to the other in order to select the best timber limits in that country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You reduced it two miles.

Mr. BOWELL. So much the better. Then they could not absorb so much land, because it must be apparent to anyone that the terms upon which those limits were granted in those days absolutely vested in the lessee, not only the timber, but the land itself, and no one could control or interfere with him in the twenty mile area that he might select for the purpose of taking timber. On the 4th October this order was recommended by the hon. gentleman; on the 7th of the same month Council approved of that minute, and on the 8th of the month the hon. gentleman obeyed the mandate given by the people, by resigning. Though defeated at the polls they took advantage of their position, and granted a large limit to a friend and supporter, and a member of Parliament. Yet I presume we will see the hon. gentleman to-night, together with his late colleagues, rising and voting for this reso-

lution, which in express terms condemns their own action. My hon. friend shakes his head. Let us see what the resolution says:

"That practices with regard to the disposal of timber limits, mineral leases, pasture leases and other public resources by the Executive have obtained in past years that were calculated to injure the independence of this House."

Did not the necessity for that system of granting licenses prevail in 1879, 1880-81-82 and 83, as it did in 1878, when the late Government passed the Order in Council granting 200 square miles to one firm? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has denounced, though not so vehemently as usual, this practice, and has asked the House to vote condemnation of himself, for he was a member of the Government who passed this regulation and whom this motion would condemn.

Mr. MILLS Bothwell). Would you allow me to put you a question?

Mr. BOWELL. When I get through.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is too late then.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, bottle up.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) say that the House should affirm this principle. If they sincerely desire, as I suppose they do, to have this principle honestly affirmed, they should have taken some other opportunity to place this resolution before the Commons of Canada. The hon. gentleman knows that this resolution is not only a condemnation of himself as a member of a former Government, but is a direct vote of want of confidence, and he knows that, no matter what view supporters of the Government might take as to the manner in which these timber limits should be sold, he is forcing every one of them to vote against his resolution. It was moved in this way for that purpose. I am not going to accuse hon. gentlemen opposite of inconsistency. Some one has said that there is no animal so consistent as a donkey. I am not going to apply that to hon. gentlemen opposite or to accuse them of inconsistency of the donkey character; nor will I insult the donkey by comparing it to the member for North Norfolk who used the comparison. I have but one other point to which I desire to call the attention of the House, but before doing so I might call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the strong language he used towards the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He accused him of having attributed motives, and insinuated that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was not actuated by pure and patriotic motives. If I am not out of order in referring for a moment to a debate which took place not long ago, the hon. gentleman threw out very strong insinuations, and used language which, if applied to me, I should at once have repudiated or called upon the House to condemn me. Speaking of my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Foster), he said he had been connected with certain subsidies or subventions given to steamers, and insinuated that he had some interest in them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I never insinuated that the Minister of Finance had any pecuniary connection with anything of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose you never mentioned it at all?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said there were departmental irregularities in connection with these mail subsidies, and I said that the hon. gentleman had let the contracts to a member of this House——

Mr. FOSTER. I did not do it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—and that subsequently that member became a member of the company.

Mr. FOSTER. You are quite wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps, when the reports are before the House, the hon. gentleman may find it convenient to make explanations, as other members have done. I called the attention of my hon. friend at the time to the fact that this was an insinuation he should not allow to pass, but he said it was a matter of perfect indifference to him. I replied: "That goes into *Hansard*, and the time may come when it may be thrown at you." When the hon. gentleman referred to steamship subventions he said: "Yes, you have been concerned in granting steamboat subventions of which you will hear more in the future." There was only one conclusion which could be drawn from that because of the introduction to it in the speech of the hon. gentleman. I agree with the remarks made by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), that it would be better if we could discuss these questions without personal references.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Set us the example.

Mr. BOWELL. I would endeavour to do so, but it is too late. I am only following in the wake of hon. gentlemen opposite. I may have spoken very strongly on some questions in this House, but I appeal to the honour and the honesty of the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me if it were not provoked by a personal attack upon myself. If I had been the Minister of Finance, when these insinuations were made last night, I would have repudiated them at once. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that they are too apt to allow their bitter tongues to run away with their better judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. They had not a heavy load to carry.

Mr. BOWELL. I object to my hon. friends laughing, because laughing has become a crime in this House. On two occasions lately I have been chastised for laughing. No one would expect any laughing from the other side, judging from the sour visages which we generally see there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do not slander our appearance.

Mr. FOSTER. We could not do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do not abuse a funeral.

Mr. BOWELL. The good nature of some people opposite is lost when they get on their feet, and if a man dares to laugh at any of their absurdities some one of them at once works himself into a passion and talks about sneering. Well, I did not know that laughter was sneering before, but if it is I can assure the hon. gentleman that whenever I feel inclined to laugh I shall do so, and not follow in their footsteps, and continually look sour and glum, as they do, because they cannot get on this side of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Order.

Mr. BOWELL. Does not that apply to you? Now, the hon. member for South Oxford dealt

disingenuously—I do not desire to use a strong word, but I suppose if I use the word he will not be offended, since he applies it to others—if ever any member of this House treated a subject disingenuously, my hon. friend treated the question of that affidavit as disingenuously as a man could possibly do. The hon. member for North Norfolk may have been led astray, to use a gentle expression, by the use of the word "we," but the hon. member for South Oxford, in the interpretation he gave of that letter written by Dr. Hickey, studiously avoided stating that the member for North Norfolk had sworn positively that he had read the Order in Council, and that that implied that the doctor was associated with the granting of a timber limit. If as he says he had read the Order in Council he could not have been misled, innocent as he is, in reading that letter as pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford. Could he possibly have been misled after he had read, as he swore he did read, the order in which Dr. Hickey's name does not appear at all? I leave this part of his disingenuousness to the hon. gentleman's own conscience; and have the pleasure of seeing him, in a few minutes, voting a condemnation of the policy which he pursued when he was on this side of the House.

Mr. WATSON. I think this motion ought to receive the support of the House. I am not going to discuss what occurred ten or fifteen years ago. There are many new members in this House, and the only benefit to be derived from discussing these old questions is to improve and learn by past experience. If the system which has been in force in the past has not been in the best interest of the country we should attempt to improve it, rather than remain in the position we are in to-day. It has been stated on the other side of the House that the policy that was in force, of granting limits without competition, had been abandoned, and that now timber limits were granted by competition. Well, Sir, timber limits are granted by competition, but in what shape? It is by tenders; it is not by public competition; and for my part, and I think a great many members in this House and a great many people in this country will agree with me, I doubt very much whether applicants would get a square deal from the heads of departments after sending in tenders for timber limits. We have learned within the past few days that tenders have been received and have been manipulated in the interest of certain parties putting in those tenders.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman to name the cases he speaks of.

Mr. WATSON. I will name the cases which have been brought to our notice in the Public Works Department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Tenders for timber limits?

Mr. WATSON. No; I am speaking of the general practice of tenders being received. In speaking of the Interior Department, I will say that away back in the early '80's, while Mr. James Anderson was Crown timber agent in the city of Winnipeg, and when one Laycock was his assistant agent, tenders were manipulated in the interests of the officers who were in charge of the department, and no matter what a man spent in surveying the limit and making an application, he was informed by these gentlemen that certain applications were in before him, when the persons who were supposed to have put in those applications had never seen the limit nor ever made a survey. The result was, that these gentlemen had to receive a certain percentage of the interest in the limits before the individual who had applied and made the survey could secure those limits. Consequently, I say that the proper mode would be to advertise those limits and dispose of them at public competition by public auction. I am not to-day charging that the Interior Department has manipulated tenders, but there are reasons for doubting that tenders will be handled as they should be after the evidence we have heard during the past few days concerning the way tenders are treated in some of the departments. Now, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated that I had on repeated occasions objected to the system of Government granting large tracts of land for colonization purposes. I have done so, Mr. Speaker, and I feel satisfied that I was right in doing so. The past history of that system of granting large tracts of land to colonization companies has proven that I was right in my contention. Out of some 100 colonization companies which have tied up large tracts of land in Manitoba and the North-West for a number of years, I believe only three or four of them have attempted to comply with the regulations of the department, and to-day the Government have seen fit to dispense with the services of the inspector of colonization companies, finding that he had little or no work to do. That goes to prove that it was a bad system, locking up large tracts of land simply as a matter of speculation. Now, we find that proper notice was not given, and possibly the price was not secured that was asked, and I will suggest that the price may not have been secured on account of the attention of the public not having been called to a valuable piece of property that was advertised for sale a few days ago at Paspaschase Indian Reserve. I find by enquiry of the Minister of the Interior that out of some 40 square miles of land that was advertised for sale only some fifteen quarter-sections were sold at auction. Now, I have reason to believe that the reason that land was not sold was because due notice was not given of the sale, and the land was advertised for sale at an improper time, before a railway was secured to Edmonton. Now, I certainly think that in the interest of the country and in the interests of the people wishing to obtain limits or any other portion of the public domain, either of land, timber, or minerals, the property should be advertised for sale and sold to the highest bidder at public competition. Then every person will receive his just due, every person will have a fair opportunity, and the public will realize the benefit of that competition and receive everything that these portions of the public domain are worth. I am certainly in favour of the resolution now before the House, and the principle of granting the limits or leases exclusively by public auction.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Charlton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Hagraft,
Allison,	Harwood,
Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	King,
Bain,	Landerkin,

Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mousseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson.—81.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Baker,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Grenville)
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ryckman,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland)—100.

Mr. WATSON.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. McCarthy,	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Adams,	Mr. Colter,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Kenny,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Moncrieff,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Burns,	Mr. German,
Mr. Ross (Lisgar),	Mr. Edwards,
Mr. McLean,	Mr. Yeo.
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Skinner,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. Kirkpatrick,	Mr. Hyman,
Mr. Bergeron,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Patterson (Colchester).	Mr. Burdett.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member from Frontenac has not voted.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am paired with the member for London.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Quebec Water Police.....$6,300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe a considerable reduction has been made in this item. What is the policy of the Government in regard to the Quebec water police? Is it proposed to abolish the force altogether?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that we abolished the water police in Montreal. In connection with the water police in Quebec, we have watched very carefully the expenditure there, and we found we could cut down the force to one-half the number that was necessary when the shipping at the port was larger. That accounts for the reduction proposed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that about $7,000 will represent the probable future outlay?

Mr. TUPPER. That represents what we spent last year. We are making the present estimate on that expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister does not expect to reduce it further?

Mr. TUPPER. No. There is a tax collected from the shipping of the port which nearly pays this amount,

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers..... $4,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the hon. Minister going to do with this amount?

Mr. TUPPER. It is chiefly used in raising sunken ships. We have recourse against owners, under the statute, when they are known; but when the owners are unknown the expense in connection with removing obstructions is taken out of this vote.

Tidal Observations.....$9,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not recollect this matter being up before, or any statement being made as to what the hon. Minister proposes to do with the vote. I shall be glad to receive an explanation.

Mr. TUPPER. This subject had been discussed for some years. The shipping interests of Montreal, and all those interested in shipping in the River St. Lawrence and the Gulf, agitated the question very forcibly, and eventually it was brought before the British Association of Science, and many of the gentlemen connected with that organization in Montreal took the subject up, and finally the question was pressed upon the attention of the Government, and last year we asked for a small appropriation of $2,000, in order to enable us to obtain in England the apparatus necessary for taking observations as to the rise and fall of tides. The ultimate object of this is that we may ascertain the various currents in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. For instance, there is very great danger in reference to which complaints frequently reach us, there has been a wreck last year and another wreck this year, and many of these accidents are ascribed to the effects of unknown currents in the Gulf, which masters can by no means guard against, unless they have the result of these investigations, such as have been obtained by surveys on the coasts of Great Britain and the United States. Before we can ascertain the movements of the currents we must first ascertain the rise and fall of the tides correctly; so, under this scheme, which is under the direction of Professor Carpmael and Lieut. Gordon, stations are proposed to be established where these tidal gauges will be erected and the observations noted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this likely to be a permanent charge?

Mr. TUPPER. It will extend over a series of years, as explained in the annual report. It is estimated to cost about $140,000, but $10,000 a year will be as much as we can spend in working it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this apply to the Gulf of St. Lawrence only?

Mr. TUPPER. It applies to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts as well.

Salaries and allowances, &c., of light-house keepers.....$ 189,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this increase caused by the salaries of new men, or by the increase in the old salaries?

Mr. TUPPER. The salaries have been increased as usual, in some cases where there has been long service, or where it has been found that the amount at the station was inadequate for the services performed. The increase here is due to the fact that we were in the habit of taking a vote in excess of the sum required, and it was last year cut down too low to provide for the keepers of new lights as constructed from year to year.

Mr. BOWERS. In connection with this item, I would call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the lighthouse at Peters Island, at the entrance to Westport harbour. Here, the lighthouse-keeper has a salary of $300 a year, and he has to attend to a fog-horn, or some article that he has to blow by hand, which requires considerable manual labour. Last year and the year before he had to hire a boy, and pay him forty or fifty dollars to assist him in the work. The hon. Minister will see that this lighthouse-keeper's salary is small enough, without having to pay any extra help, and he should have some better recompense for this. I would also point out to the Minister that the fog-signal used there is not sufficient for the purpose. It is very little better than the horn used on an ordinary vessel, and the hon. Minister should put some more efficient instrument there for the benefit of vessels and steamers entering the harbour in thick weather. There should be something in the shape of a bell that will ring by being wound up, or there should be a bell buoy off the southern end of the harbour. I would ask the hon. Minister that the lighthouse keeper in this case should have some extra allowance. He asked me to draw attention to the fact that he was underpaid when I came here.

Mr. TUPPER. I will investigate the work that is performed by that officer.

Maintenance and repairs to Lights, Fog Whistles, Buoys, and Beacons, and Humane Establishments.....$245,000

Mr. BOWERS. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to this item also. There has been for a long number of years three buoys at Westport harbour; one at the northern end of the harbour, one in the harbour on a ledge, and one off Dartmouth Point. About three years ago tenders were asked for the keeping of these buoys in position, and a gentleman tendered at something like $300 a year, I think. The Minister will correct me if I am wrong in the amount. Ever since that gentleman has taken over the contract for the three buoys, there have been only two buoys there. I put in for the contract myself, with the expectation of there being three buoys to look after, but there has only been two, and I think the department should take some steps towards putting the three buoys down, or paying in proportion to the number placed there.

Mr. TUPPER. That has been brought to my attention lately, and I will look into it.

Mr. CASEY. Under the head of maintenance and repairs for lights, and so on, I see a vast number of supplies noted in the Auditor General's Report, and I wish to ask whether these things needed about a lighthouse are bought wholesale by the Government and dealt out to the lighthouse-keepers, or if the lighthouse-keeper buys these articles himself. Of course, I am aware that with regard to oil there is a contract; but there are a large number of things, such as paint and lamps, and matches, and so on, which I would like to know how they are bought.

Mr. TUPPER. The keepers send in a requisition every year as to what they require for the maintenance of the light, and all the important articles are tendered for by advertisement and contracts awarded. The small articles are kept in stock at the different agencies in the different provinces, and are distributed by the supply steamer on her annual trip.

Mr. CASEY. Are they bought in the first place by tender?

Mr. TUPPER. Those articles too unimportant to be tendered for by advertisement are obtained in the market at the market price, and are paid for on the account being certified in the usual way under the audit, and by the agent of the particular division in which the articles are bought.

Mr. CASEY. Could the Minister state from memory which articles are bought by contract?

Mr. TUPPER. Paint, oil, lamp shades, soap and brooms.

Mr. BARRON. Under this item, perhaps it may be proper for me to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine to the fact that at the entrance to Sturgeon Lake from the Fenelon River, in South Victoria, two lights have been placed, and that, as I am informed, one of these lights, if not both, have lately had to be maintained and looked after at private expense, and I was asked whether the department would not bear the expense, as I understand they did before.

Mr. TUPPER. That subject was brought to my notice some time in May, and I gave instructions to the officers to report upon it. I have not yet received a report.

Mr. CASEY. In connection with the late wreck at Anticosti, it has been stated in the papers that the means of warning vessels from that shore are not sufficient. Has the Minister's attention been called to the matter?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes. There was a wreck there last year, and it has been found that the old Bayfield chart has become misleading, so many changes have taken place since it was made. A survey is required, and negotiations have gone on between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government for a survey under an Imperial officer, the Imperial Government paying half the cost and this Government paying half, and the Imperial Government have intimated their willingness to complete that survey.

Mr. CASEY. Has the Minister's attention been called to the desirability of improving the means of calling attention to the coasts in the meantime? At present it is stated there is nothing but a gun, which is fired every half hour, and which cannot always be heard. It is said that vessels have to go pretty near the Island at that point to get their bearings for their future course, and it is a place where it is very necessary to have efficient means of warning them when they are near the land. I saw in the Montreal papers several statements from captains who said that it was very dangerous, even for steamers, under present circumstances.

Mr. TUPPER. The newspapers of course are not very reliable, and the captains are always very anxious—I am not blaming them—to ascribe a disaster to a light or a fog-alarm if the vessel is near it. We do not pretend that we can prevent a wreck off the coasts, and the best alarms we have are of little use in a certain state of the atmosphere. Last year I sent the engineer of the Marine Department, and Captain Smith, the Chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, to investigate all these complaints made by shipmasters in reference to the rearrangement of the lights of the St. Lawrence all the way from the Straits of Belle Isle up to Quebec; and hon. gentlemen will see that the subject is thoroughly gone into in the report, which has been printed, and we are carrying out their recommendations. With reference to Anticosti, I am not sure that the arrangements there are as represented. We shall have a full report on that subject very soon,

Mr. McMILLAN. I was down at Montreal lately, and in conversation with a captain of my acquaintance, he told me that when the weather became thick the gun was fired every fifteen minutes.

Mr. TUPPER. At certain stations it does fire very much more frequently than at others. I could not say how often the gun at Anticosti fires.

Mr. CASEY. Owing to the want of a survey, I think there should be a more frequent alarm at that point.

Mr. TUPPER. I think there is. I will make enquiries as to that.

Mr. FLINT. I see in last year's accounts a charge of $63.50 for an amateur photographic outfit in Prince Edward Island. That is a little unusual.

Mr. TUPPER. The marine engineer of the department, who does in this part of the country much of the work that is done on the Island by the agent, has a similar apparatus. That is done under instructions. When an officer is at a station he takes a photograph of the buildings; and the engineer at the head office, who has to inspect all the plans on requisition for improvements and repairs, is able to do his work much more satisfactorily by having not merely the formal report of the condition of the buildings, but also a representation of them. We have adopted that plan for about a year.

Mr. FLINT. I think it is an excellent idea, and I trust that the Minister will extend it to the other provinces.

Completion and construction of light-houses and fog-alarms $40,000

Mr. BOWERS. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that two years ago there was a petition from Westport asking that a lighthouse might be erected on the northern end of Briar Island. There is no harbour from Digby to Briar Island, a distance of 40 miles, on the Bay of Fundy coast, and the entrance to Westport harbour is very blind at any time, particularly in the night, as the land overlaps, and in order to get the harbour light you have to be in about a mile and a-half or two miles from the shore, which is nearer than strangers like to approach in making the harbour. A small light on the northern end of the Island would be of great advantage to vessels from St. John and other ports on the Bay of Fundy. It would be also advantageous to our own fishing vessels and to the strangers and the regular steamers which run from St. John to Yarmouth twice a week. If the hon. gentleman would look into this matter, I think he would be apt to put a light there.

Mr. TUPPER. I will look into that, although I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is no record of any application from any of the steamers in the records of the department, so far as my memorandum goes, and it extends over several years.

Mr. BOWERS. I think there was a petition also from the pilots of St. John.

Mr. TUPPER. I may be wrong, but will look into the matter.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the evidence now being taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts in respect to certain payments made in the Post Office Department for extra service be printed for the use of the members of that Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Eleventh Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Maintenance and repairs of Government Steamers..... $128,000

Mr. LAURIER. I notice there is quite a decrease in this item, and it will require some explanation.

Mr. TUPPER. There was an item of $70,000, included last year for the new steamer for British Columbia, and that has been struck out.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many Government steamers are there in use?

Mr. TUPPER. There is the *Alert*, the *Newfield*, the *Lansdowne* and the *Druid* on the east coast, and the *Douglas* on the west coast, in the Marine Department. There are besides the *Acadia*, the *Canadian* and two or three schooners in the fishery protection service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The *Dream* is not a Government steamer?

Mr. TUPPER. No; she is a chartered steamer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman say from whom the *Dream* is chartered?

Mr. TUPPER. From Mr. Thorne, of St. John, I think. I know he is one of the owners, and I think the only owner. She has been under charter ever since I have been in the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman state what amount he pays per year for that vessel?

Mr. TUPPER. I would not be sure, but I think it is $300 per month. I will give him the exact amount later.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like the hon. gentleman to be in a position to be able to state exactly later on.

Expenses of Steamboat Inspection... $26,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How many inspectors are there, and how are they remunerated?

Mr. TUPPER. There is a steamboat inspection board. There is the chairman, Mr. Meneilly, here, two inspectors, I think, in Toronto, one in Kingston, and one other. We have two inspectors in Quebec, and one inspector in the Maritime Provinces. The lowest salary, I think, is $1,000, and the highest $1,600, which is paid to Mr. Meneilly. The Dominion is divided into inspection districts. There is a special report of all these officers from the different districts.

Salaries and disbursements of Fishery Officers, Ontario..... ..... $23,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the duties of these overseers? Do they make reports from their different districts?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes. A synopsis of each report is in the annual report of the Fisheries Department which is laid on the Table each year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are they supposed to look after the streams throughout the Dominion for the purpose of protecting the fish in them?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; they are fishery guardians with magisterial powers, each having the supervision of a specified district, and having within that distance the authority of a justice of the peace.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is supposed to be their duties with regard to preserving the purity of streams?

Mr. TUPPER. The instructions sent to these officers include the Fishery Act and the regulations of the particular province to which they belong, and they are supposed to enforce all these laws. In reference to the pollution of streams, and in reference to fishing at particular times, if they ascertain that these laws have been violated, and detect the offenders, they prosecute them, and report each case to the department. They render a monthly account of their work and their disbursements, which is audited in the usual way. We pay them their travelling expenses in addition to their salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for asking the Minister is this: In the section of country from which I come there are some valuable streams containing speckled trout, and I have heard people complain that owing to the streams being polluted these fish are fast becoming extinguished. There is one inspector in the district who tries fairly to discharge his duty; but I think the Minister should very strongly urge these inspectors to see that the law is rigidly observed, so that the people who live in the different localities may be able sometimes to enjoy an afternoon's angling, which I sometimes enjoy myself. I would certainly like to see such steps taken as would preserve these streams from pollution, for more reasons than one.

Mr. TUPPER. We are doing our best in that direction, and we have had very considerable results. We find that from time to time officers have been lax in their duties, and we do all we can to stir them up. As soon as we find that it is impossible to make them carry out the law, we remove them and appoint others.

Salaries and disbursements of Fishery officers, etc., Quebec..... $15,000

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I wish again to draw the attention of the Government, especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the very unsatisfactory manner in which the fishery regulations are carried out by his officers in the district of Richelieu. The regulations which were adopted in 1887 and suspended in 1888, and re-enforced in 1889 and 1890, have given rise to a great number of abuses.

The law has not been carried out equally. While in some counties the license fee has been collected with the greatest strictness, and the fishing apparatus have been confiscated when the law had been infringed, in other counties no effort has been made to collect the fee, and no fee has been collected. According to a report submitted to the House some time ago, I find that the license fees were collected in the Counties of Berthier, Maskinongé and Nicolet, while nothing has been collected in the Counties of Richelieu, Yamaska and St. Maurice, although these counties are equally large, and their fisheries are of much greater value than the fisheries of the other three counties. I, of course, assume that the figures given to the House are correct, and they show that the regulations have been applied in three counties only, while there has been a thorough neglect to apply them in the other three counties which I have named. Of course, at that time the County of Richelieu was represented by Mr. Massue, a supporter of the Government, the County of Yamaska by Mr. Vanasse, another supporter of the Government, the County of St. Maurice by Mr. Désaulniers, another supporter of the Government. I would like to know if that accounts for the different treatment meted out to those counties by the fishery officers, or whether there are other reasons. Now, I wish to protest against these regulations, which I have always characterized as unjust, and which I now characterize as unjust and tyrannical. Complaints have been made from the beginning by the whole fishing population of that district. The question was brought before this House, and it was promised that changes would be made, but they have never been made. Last year the Government undertook to make an investigation of the complaints brought to the notice of the Government, both by members of the House and by the fishermen. They asked Senator Guévremont, among others, to study the question, to make a visit to the fishing grounds and to report. After going over the grounds, Senator Guévrement has come to the conclusion to recommend the Government to abolish the system of licenses or to make the fees purely nominal. He recommends that the licenses be issued for statistical purposes only, which was the reason advanced for them by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, now Minister of Finance. He said that those licenses were issued for the purpose of obtaining statistics of the value of the fish caught, the number of the fishermen, and the fishing apparatus which they were using. Senator Guévremont, after going over the ground and consulting the fishermen, has recommended the Government to reduce the license fee to 10 cents. He says, with a good deal of reason, that this is enough to compel the fishermen to take out licenses, and this would suffice to obtain all the statistics which the Government requires. Senator Guévremont has also reported that the fish caught in that district is of very little value and of very small quantity, and that it was utterly impossible for a large number of the fishermen to comply with the regulations and at the same time maintain their families. Everybody, upon such a report, expected that, seeing that there was a well-founded grievance, the Minister would take the means of remedying the evil complained of. But far from it. This year the regulations have been enforced as usual, and enforced with a good deal more severity than before. Not only were the overseers instructed to carry out the regulations very strictly, but they exacted their fees with a great deal more severity than before. There was only one surveyor formerly for the district of Richelieu and Yamaska, but they have divided that district into two, and have appointed a man named Lavallée for Richelieu, and a man named Shooner for Yamaska. Mr. Lavallée has taken it upon himself to give the law a new interpretation, and not only to prevent licensed fishermen of other counties from enjoying the benefits they formerly enjoyed of going from one county to another and fishing in Lake St. Peter, but he has refused to grant licenses to outside fishermen to fish in the waters of Richelieu County, and has thus driven a great many fishermen of other counties out of the waters of the Richelieu. Instead of the department doing justice and acting in accordance with the recommendation of the commissioner, they have rendered the regulations more odious, unjust and oppressive than they were before. I believe we have good grounds to complain. I believe that justice is not being done to the fishermen of the district to which I refer as it has been to others, and I hope the hon. Minister of Marine will see the advisability of dealing in a better spirit with those fishermen. They are poor people, as he knows, and as he has been often enough told. The commissioner has reported to him that these people are unable to pay the taxes exacted from them, and that they deserve most favourable consideration at his hands, and all those who have been consulted in the matter agree that the fish caught in Lake St. Peter are of small value, that the fishermen are poor, and that the whole revenue from the tax does not exceed $400. I would urge on the hon. Minister the propriety of deciding that it is better to give satisfaction at once than continue a system which certainly will give rise to complaints every year until remedied. In the Counties of Berthier and Maskinongé put together there are eighty-eight fishermen who have taken licenses for 1890, and the total value of the fish caught by them during the season is computed at $2,000. Out of that they have been obliged to pay over $100 for their licenses, so that these eighty-eight fishermen and their families have less than $1,900 to divide among them out of the proceeds of these fishing grounds, being an average of less than $25 each. In the County of St. Maurice, where no license is paid, but which has cost a much larger sum for overseers than Berthier and Maskinongé, the total value of the fish caught is $49,560. So you see in one county nothing is paid to the Government under the regulations, and no licenses are issued or license fees paid, and the fishermen catch as much as $49,000 worth of fish; while in Maskinongé and Berthier the fishermen have to pay over $100, and their total catch is not worth over $2,000; and this is contended by the hon. Minister to be an impartial administration of the law! I say that a law which is administered in such a spirit is one-sided and unjust, if not in principle at least in execution. It is an oppressive law, which reflects no credit on the officers of the department. There is only one remedy, and that is to revise these regulations, and instead of exacting licenses costing such high fees, compared with the means of the fishermen and the value of the fish caught, the Government should substitute a purely nominal fee, say 10 cents, so that the object for which the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Foster) said the fee

was imposed, namely, the collecting of statistics, may be accomplished. There should be no preference or partiality, but equal justice should be rendered every county, whether it returns supporters or opponents of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman last year, and I think the year before, brought up the same question which he has so kindly explained in English to-day; and I then attempted to convince him that the object we had in view was not a political one. The hon. gentleman has himself, in addressing the House, mentioned the name of Senator Guévremont as holding the same views, and he will therefore see that if there were political motives in the matter I would not be so anxious to go counter to Senator Guévremont's wishes. At any rate, Senator Guévremont, I may tell the hon. gentleman, has been just as energetic and strong in his opposition to the policy of my department as the hon. gentleman himself; and it would give me personally great pleasure to be able to come to a decision satisfactory to both. I felt, however, on going into the subject, that the arguments are entirely against the views and wishes of the fishermen of that district. They practically asked us to abandon the license system, and we have hit on a happy medium, which is this: that with reference to the coarser fish, or the fish taken for local consumption, the instructions are not to charge a license fee; but in connection with the fish for export, and which supply a very lucrative business, the necessity for a license system is just as great as it is in any other part of Canada where that system is in force. I gave to the House last session or the session before the actual amount paid per fisherman, and it was not at all a large fee. It is certainly no larger than the regulation size, but we have made this exception, that licenses for local consumption are granted on the payment of a very nominal fee, and I think I communicated those instructions to the hon. gentleman by letter, in the correspondence we had on the subject. I did not expect this matter would be brought up, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not consider me careless in not being able to give definitely the reasons for the state of affairs which exists in other counties; but I may be able to give him one reason, which may explain the non-appearance of returns of licenses in some of the neighbouring districts. The department has had this trouble in some of the districts, that the opposition to the enforcement of these regulations is so great that the department has been compelled to prosecute and sue for the penalties under the law. If my recollection serves me, we have never yet been able to obtain judgment and execution; but, nevertheless, the instructions from the department have been in those cases, as well as in all others, that where the law should be enforced, and where it turns out that it cannot be enforced at the time, the parties should be prosecuted. I state in the most positive manner that I have not in the slightest degree considered the political representation of those counties. That has not been put before me, and I am not sufficiently familiar with those counties to state who are their representatives. The action which has been taken by the department has been wholly regardless of that matter, but the case of those fishermen in the county of the hon. gentleman, as well as in the others referred to, was represented to the Government, and it was stated that many of them were in poor circumstances, and were fishing simply for local use, so we gave instructions allowing the officer to depart from the rigid construction of the regulations, and to make those regulations as easy as possible in that case. The object of enforcing the system of licenses there is the preservation of fisheries. All our authorities go to show, in regard to the Province of Ontario as well as the Province of Quebec, that we could not control or regulate or preserve the fisheries without such regulations, that our fisheries are exhaustible, and that we could not suspend the law in the direction referred to in the interest of the fishery itself. When the hon. gentleman attacks that policy he opens up a very wide field for discussion, because that is not confined to those counties, but it is a principle which is adopted in that province, and also in the Province of Ontario, by the Local Administration.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like to call the attention of the Government and of the Minister of Marine to the utter incompentency of the overseer of fisheries in the County of Montmagny. He is a young man who took the place of a very competent man who was put out of office simply because he was a Liberal. Mr. Caron, who occupied that office before, had a case against the Tory candidate in the County of L'Islet, and because he lost that case he was put out of his office and Mr. Eugène Pelletier was put in his place. This young man spends all his time in making speeches on the hustings and writing in the newspapers, insulting his opponents. I had to meet him on the hustings, and I was abused by him. I do not complain much of that, because I do not think his speeches or his writings would have much influence with the electors, but I say he is incompetent to fulfil his duties. A case arose in my county that this man had to be sent three or four times to settle, a very small matter, and but for the good will of the Minister himself, who did all he could to settle that matter, I do not think it would have been settled. I have no fault to find with the Minister in regard to this; on the contrary, I thank him for his action, but this fishery officer was unable to settle that matter. I will refer the Minister to his chief clerk, Mr. Bauset, to discover what his capacity is. Mr. Pelletier lives at the extremity of the district, which includes Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet, and a part of the County of Lévis. Mr. Pelletier lives at the end of the County of L'Islet, and the greatest part of his work has to be done in Montmagny, Bellechasse and Lévis. I think that man should be changed. I do not want the change to take place in favour of any one of my friends. I know that the friends of the Government should be appointed. I do not care who is appointed, but I think there should be a man who is able to fulfil his duties and who should not abuse his opponents at election times.

Mr. TUPPER. I will obtain a report as to the manner in which this officer performs his duty. We have no desire to retain any officer who is not only not able to perform his duty, but who neglects his duty, and there certainly is a point in what the hon. gentleman says as to the place of residence of the officer. The rule we have applied is that the officer should reside as near as possible to the centre of his division, and not at the extremity.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine speaks very sincerely when he says he has no intention of employing any but competent officers; but I am sure that, notwithstanding all his good wishes and intentions, he may sometimes be imposed upon so as to appoint men who may be recommended to him by his political supporters. No doubt this officer earned his spurs in election times. No doubt he was very efficient in fishing for votes, and perhaps he showed more capacity for that than for the duties of the office to which he has been appointed. However, in regard to the general question, I will give credit to the Minister for the intention he has expressed, if they continue the license system, of looking to the public interest and seing that rivers and lakes and inland waters are not depleted of fish. I am no judge on this matter. The system may be good or may be bad. I have no opinion to offer upon that. I do not blame the Government for their action in this matter, but the hon. gentleman must admit that, judging by the report which has been laid upon the Table by his own department, the law, good, bad or indifferent, is not administered in all the counties in the same impartial manner. The hon. gentleman states that from this report it would appear that in St. Maurice the value of the fish caught was almost $50,000, and yet not a cent has been levied for licenses in that county, whereas in the County of Berthier and in the County of Maskinongé license fees have been collected to the amount of $125. It happens that St. Maurice is a Conservative county and that Berthier and Maskinongé are Liberal counties. I know that the Minister would not stoop to do anything of this kind because of the political complexion of the county, that he would not countenance orders to comply with the regulations in one county where the people were not of his own stripe of politics, but allow them to remain in abeyance in other counties; but I will not say so much in regard to his officers, and I think it must be apparent to him, as it certainly is to me, that the officers of his department in the County of St. Maurice must be wilfully neglecting their duties when those in the neighbouring Counties of Berthier and Maskinongé are enforcing them strictly. What is the reason? The reason is obvious enough. My hon. friend said the law was unpopular, and the officers, finding in the only county which is represented by an opponent of the Government that the law is unpopular, refrain from creating more unpopularity by not applying an unpopular law; whereas, in the neighbouring county they have no such excuse, and they apply the law. But the result, after all, is that there is discrimination between one county and another, the law is applied in one county and not applied in another. As I said a moment ago, I am quite sure the Minister would not countenance such things if they were brought to his attention; but either one of two things, the law must be applied everywhere without discrimination, or if it is not to be applied without discrimination, the law should be repealed. But if it is to remain upon the Statute-book, then there is only one thing to do, and that is to apply it everywhere equally, whether it makes the Government popular or unpopular.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman accepts my statement as to the policy I have in view in connection with the license system. I have ignored political considerations in the regulations in those districts, and the hon. gentleman accepts my statement. But he thinks there must be a difficuly somewhere, according to the reports. I may tell him frankly that I have not looked carefully into the matter lately, and the only excuse that occurs to me now to offer on behalf of the officers is that referred to by the hon. gentleman who first spoke, who says that the inspector has not collected any fees for the reason that the fishermen rebelled and refused to take out a license. The officer applied for instructions, and the instructions which went from my department to the Department of Justice were to the effect that the necessary actions should be taken, and the prosecutions were begun; and if I may venture to whisper it across the House, the court before which they took one of these cases actually abstained from giving judgment for a very long period, and I think has not yet given judgment, evidently sympathizing, as it would appear, to some extent, with the feelings of the fishermen in connection with the enforcement of this license system. These are the difficulties which probably brought the state of affairs to which the hon. gentleman alludes. But since special attention has been given to the subject, I will undertake to see exactly what the facts are, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Government will not retain any officials who have been treating the regulations as a dead letter, without instructions, or departing from the instructions given them from the department. We desire that no discrimination should be made.

Mr. LAURIER. If the law is such that even courts of justice, which are bound to administer the law, connive at wilful offence against the law, then the hon. gentleman may come to the conclusion that the remedy suggested by my hon. friend had better be applied, and that the license fee be made purely nominal. As I understand the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), he complained that the fees were simply too high. But whether high or low, for the general class of fishermen even a low fee may be a large sum. Even if it be the intention of the department simply to prevent the rivers from being depleted of fish, he will reach his object just the same by keeping the license system and reducing the fees.

Mr. TUPPER. The fee itself is already small. I think the largest amount charged, if I recollect aright, is $6 or $7, and the lowest fees were $1, or $2, or $3 each. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, in reference to our changing the policy, because a magistrate or justice of the peace had neglected to enforce the law, that it would be unwise to change the policy, because we have found the greatest difficulty in enforcing the fishery regulations apart from the fees altogether. It has frequently occurred that a man will go to a friendly magistrate, having violated a regulation, and a very proper one, and presenting his case, will confess judgment and be fined $1, and then when our officers ascertain the violation and endeavour to prosecute the offender in the regular way he pleads a former conviction. Of course, we could not recognize the action of these different authorities as a sufficient reason for changing the regulations. As to the other remarks of the hon. gentleman, I do not think it would be wise to reduce the fees much

below the present rates. We receive, I may say, nearly $40,000 throughout Canada in fees and they go largely to defray the expenses incurred in administering the license system, in printing the licenses, and defraying the expenses of registration, and so on. If we reduce the fees we might produce two results: first, to render the applications so numerous, that the difficulty of restraining overfishing would be very great; and, secondly, there would be a less revenue derived from practically a nominal tax.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I am very glad the Minister admits that the regulations are unpopular. They are thoroughly unpopular all over the district, and I believe it is almost useless to try to enforce those regulations. They are now in force in one district where they have never yet been in force since Confederation, and the people believe that they are new regulations and consider them oppressive. Even though the license fees are small, the fishermen, as a class, are very poor and consider it hard work to catch fish enough to pay the fees and yet support their families. If the Minister will look over the statement which he has furnished of the catch of fish in the Counties of Berthier and Maskinongé, he will find that it amounted to: eels, 3,000 lbs.; bass, 2,500 lbs.; pickerel, 4,900 lbs.; pike, 5,500 lbs.; coarse fish, 37,000 lbs. The whole amounting in value to only $2,009. The Minister will see that there are very few fish caught there, and there is no export of fish at all from these counties. If the instructions which were issued two years ago had been enforced, there would not have been a single license issued in those two counties. Those two counties have been forced to pay in licenses more than all the rest of the district, although they catch a smaller proportion of fish than the rest of the district. There is no justice, there is no impartiality in the administration of the regulations in those two counties. There is only one way in which the Minister can get rid of complaints, and that is to repeal the regulations and substitute a nominal fee of say 10 cents for the present fee of $1 for some kinds of fishing apparatus, and 25 cents for other kinds. Even at present the revenue amounts to only $400, so that a repeal of the regulations would cause no appreciable loss to the revenue, and would give a good deal of satisfaction to the fishermen in those two counties. The Minister cannot hope to have any peace on this subject until those regulations are repealed. At present the fees appear to be small enough, but still some people have to pay $4, or $5, or $6 for their license, and when the catch of fish is so small as it is shown to be by figures supplied by the Minister himself, when a man catches only about $25 worth of fish, and has to pay from $4 to $6 for his license, even that fee becomes oppressive and ought to be repealed.

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the salaries of the fishery officers, I notice their salaries vary from $75 to $300. How are these salaries regulated?

Mr. TUPPER. Practically, according to their relative work in the different districts. The diaries of these offices are kept, and the salary is paid according to the amount of travelling necessary and time occupied in going over the district.

Mr. McMULLEN. The salary in Ottawa, I observe, is $100 and in Hull $300?

Mr. TUPPER. Both these are old offices.

New Brunswick, salaries of Fishery officers $23,000

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I should like to call the attention of the Committee to the importance of the shad fishery of the Bay of Fundy. It is known to those who live in that section of the country that there has been a very serious decline in this important fishery for some years past. The fishery is confined in New Brunswick chiefly to the Counties of Westmoreland and Albert; and in Nova Scotia to the Counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Hants. In looking over the reports I find the inspector of fisheries in Nova Scotia, Mr. Hockin, reports

"The history of this fishery has been one of rapid decline; the total catch for successive three years being:

1878-79-80	19,755
1881-82-83	13,037
1884-85-86	6,192
1887-88-89	1,777

"The catch of 1890 shows a slight increase over the average of the three last years, being 750 as compared with 592 barrels."

The catch for the three last years has only averaged 592 barrels. The report of Inspector Chapman is to the same effect, that there is a very small catch this year in the estuaries in the Bay of Fundy where these fish used to be plentiful. The overseers Goodwin and Cormier report to the same effect, and the overseer of Albert County states that only 10 barrels have been reported in that district during the last year. In looking over the reports I find that this year the inspectors have referred to the cause of this decline at some length. Inspector Hockin says:

"The theory has been advanced that the shad taken in the bay are not the result of spawn deposited in our rivers, but in rivers further south, and that there is no necessity for legislation affecting the spawning season. While it may be possible that all the fish that come into the bay did not spawn in our rivers, still I see no reason for believing that they are not contributing nurseries of the fishery, and that some remedial legislation is necessary. Nearly all the shad taken in Shubenacadie River, for instance, are full of spawn, and the fish ascend the river for the purpose of depositing it. There is, therefore, an immense destruction of ova, and at the very lowest calculation, the catch this year, of 164 barrels, in this river alone, must have destroyed 50,000,000 of ova."

Then I find Inspector Chapman says:

"There is a very small catch this year in the rivers and estuaries at the head of the Bay of Fundy where they used to be so plentiful. There is only one way that will restore these fish and that is, not to allow any to be caught anywhere in this province until the 1st July. I have watch the shad coming into this, the Moncton market from St. John, from the 10th May to the middle of June, and every female shad opened is full of spawn. It certainly seems a great mistake to thus exterminate what was once so valuable an industry, when the cause is so apparent and the remedy so plain."

Inspector Goodwin says:

"Shad fishing in Sackville was fair for a few days in the first part of the season. Those interested complain that the taking of parent fish in St. John harbour, before spawning, is utterly destroying this once valuable fishery. There are no abuses to complain of in this district; the several close times are well observed."

I find also that Overseer Davidson says:

"The great decrease in the catch cannot be attributed to over-fishing, because the apparatus used are small when compared with former years. No doubt, this has had something to do with it; but for a number of years, while the yield in the bay is not one-tenth of what it formerly was, the catch in the rivers during the spawning season has been on the increase. Neither is it reasonable to

suppose that there will be a speedy return of these fish, when they are altogether unprotected during the time of breeding. There should be a close season, both in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, during the spawning season. Were this done, there would soon be a return of this valuable fish."

It appears from these reports that the inspectors all agree as to the destruction of the fish and as to the causes which have brought about the destruction. Overseer Hawkins refers to a theory which I am aware has been very generally held among fishermen for some years, that shad were not accustomed to resort to the rivers along the Bay of Fundy for spawning purposes, that they usually deposited their spawn in rivers further south on the Atlantic coast, rivers in the United States, and therefore no legislation is needed so far as this Dominion is concerned. It appears evident, however, that although this theory may be partly correct, while it may be that the principal number of shad deposited their spawn in rivers in the United States, yet to the River St. John and the Shubenacadie River a large number of shad come annually for the purpose of spawning; and it is well known, too, that under present conditions these shad are destroyed in a wholesale manner at the mouths of the rivers and by those living along the banks, because the regulations do not prevent fishermen along the rivers from placing as many nets in the rivers as they choose for the purpose of catching those fish. I draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Committee to this subject because I consider it is a very important one, and this is a very valuable fish. It is quoted in the reports as worth $10 a barrel. I know as a fact that in my own county it is very difficult to obtain any shad at present and the price is much higher than that I have named, even $12 or $14 a barrel having been the usual price during late years. I do not intend to reflect in any way on the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The idea has prevailed in past years that no regulations in this country were necessary for the shad fishery, but I think the facts brought out in the reports of the inspectors show that some regulations are needed, and that if some regulations were adopted, this very valuable fishery might be restored. I am very glad that the Minister has adopted a more vigorous policy than heretofore, in regard to the lobster and oyster fisheries of my own county, and I hope that he will also deal with this question in the same vigorous manner, and adopt some regulations that will have the effect of preventing these fish from being destroyed as they are at present, and restoring this very valuable fishery.

Mr. TUPPER. The subject that the hon. gentleman has mentioned is, of course, of great importance. We have at present in reference to the shad fishery, as the hon. gentleman knows, a weekly close time in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but St. John harbour is excepted, and I suppose the hon. gentleman would advocate a little more vigorous policy in that fishery district. I may mention, however, that while those interested in the fisheries differ as to the proper time for a close season, the shad have rendered a considerable portion of this discussion unimportant, as this year the shad fishery in St. John harbour has been excellent and much better than for years past. That supports the theory referred to by Mr. Hockin, in his discussion of the question, and which Mr. Hockin rather casts some doubt upon: That these shad which come to our waters for the most part breed in southern waters, and that we, to some extent, benefit by the artificial production of these fish by our neighbours in the United States, for which, of course, we are duly thankful. The question which the hon. gentleman has brought up was discussed by all the fishery officers at their recent conference here, and as that conference only took place a short time ago, I have not yet had time to give the deliberation full consideration, There was, however, a very great difference of opinion between the various officers on this subject, and I fear that at present we have very little evidence upon which we can base a general regulation differing from the present one. There are a great many arguments in favour of enforcing a weekly short time everywhere, instead of making an exception in the most important district. This subject will receive every consideration.

Salaries, &c., Fishery officers, Prince Edward Island..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is quite a discrepancy in the travelling expenses here, from the amount in the other provinces.

Mr. TUPPER. The fishery districts are much smaller and the rivers closer together.

Mr. PERRY. Is it the intention of the Minister to appoint inspectors to carry out the Act preventing the use of purse seines?

Mr. TUPPER. No additional officers are required and none will be so appointed.

Mr. PERRY. Whose business is it to carry out the Act?

Mr. TUPPER. The fishery officers.

Salaries, &c., Fishery officers, Manitoba..... $4,500

Mr. WATSON. In connection with this I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a matter affecting a large number of people in Manitoba. Last year, and previous years, complaints have been made by residents in Manitoba that the licenses granted to the fish companies there were depleting the fisheries in Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba. The Minister very wisely undertook to investigate the causes of these complaints, and the friends of the fishing companies contended that the fisheries were not depleted, while those on the other side of the question contended that they were. A very long report on this investigation by Mr. Wilmot is published in the departmental report. I consider that a very great injustice is done the local fishermen in Manitoba under the regulations at present. I must say that I approve of the act of the Minister in curtailing the limits for which the fishing licenses are granted to these large companies. The fishing companies that are now engaged in fishing in these water are composed almost entirely of Americans. They substituted a Canadian name for the purpose of getting a license, but it is, nevertheless, practically an American fishing company. The license is granted to the fishing company for commercial purposes, and to the residents for domestic purposes. The license to be called a domestic license, is granted to Indians and settlers to carry on fishing for home use and not for export. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that is an injustice to our own local fishermen.

They do fish for export, and they do most of their fishing for export in the winter months. The large fishing companies have got quite a fleet of fishing boats, and they have erected ice-houses, and with their wealth they are able to store the fish they catch in the summer time and export them. But the natives of the country, the Half-breeds and Indians, and the Icelanders who have settled on Lake Winnipeg, are prevented from selling any of this fish which they may catch during the winter months, for export purposes. I claim that is an injustice to the resident fishermen in the Province of Manitoba. These regulations appear to be framed purely in the interest of the large fishing companies, who are able to employ a few people around Lake Winnipeg during the summer months, in catching fish and storing them away, and a very small portion of the profits is realized by these people. Last year there was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $25,000 worth of fish caught under the ice by the Indians, Half-breeds, and Icelanders. It is needless to say that with the exception of the small amount which was received by the men who handle those fish, that amount went entirely into the pockets of the fishermen themselves, and was the means of supporting a great number of families. I do think that this is a matter worthy of the consideration of the Minister, and that these settlers should be allowed to sell their fish for export purposes the same as the large companies who receive the licenses. This is a live question in Manitoba, and we find that the fishermen, even with the restrictions that have been placed on them are catching more fish this year by their operations in Lake Winnipeg, than they were the year before. Their ice storehouses are almost filled with fish to-day. I approve of the Minister trying to protect those fisheries; but instead of encouraging a large American fishing company to fish out our lakes, encouragement ought to be offered to the residents who are dependent upon their industry for a living, especially in the winter time. It can easily be understood that the Indians and Half-breeds are not wealthy enough to erect ice-houses and store their fish, so as to be able to catch them in the summer time. If they were in a position to do that, it would be impossible for them to purchase an outfit to enable them to fish in deep waters. It is well known that the whitefish in the summer time go into deep water. I think the hon. Minister would be doing an act of justice to the Half-breeds and Indians, or to any persons else who wish to catch fish in the winter time through the ice, to allow them to sell them for export as well as a large fishing company, particularly when its profits go almost entirely into the pockets of Americans.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that when this system was introduced—and it has been introduced only recently—it was by no means intended to be an unalterable rule or law, but merely a tentative measure. But before its introduction there was a tremendous outcry in Manitoba that the time had long come for regulations to prevent the overfishing of the lake by gentlemen carrying on very large operations. I did not know they were Americans. Of course American capital may be behind them, though I did not know the hon. gentleman would strongly object to that. But those parties, so far as I am aware, were averse to any interference, and I attributed a great deal of the agitation which arose after the regulations were introduced—not to the Indians or settlers, for we have attempted carefully to guard their interests and to give them the preference—but to the large operators to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded. The hon. gentleman will be glad to know that after the agitation arose against the regulations, and after a full explanation was given of what the distinction was between a domestic license and a commercial license, and of the extent to which we assisted the settlers and the Indians, the agitation has almost subsided. I was glad to see in a Manitoba paper the other day that the people of Gimli, for instance, were quite pleased with the instructions based on these regulations which have been given. For instance, they were very much afraid that we would destroy the winter fishing. It is particularly in the interest of the residents, Indians and half-breeds, that we are interfering; because one of the arguments urged upon the department by the people of Manitoba was the great danger of exhausting the fisheries, and the consequent injury that would be done to the Indians and settlers; and the object of the department, I can assure the hon. gentleman, is not to interfere unduly with the settlers or the Indians, but to restrict as much as possible these large companies. The chief object was to restrict the commercial licenses to certain waters, and to prevent fishing in waters where we had reason to believe the breeding grounds are found, and it is specially for the sake of the settlers and Indians that we have interfered.

Mr. WATSON. It does not pay the fishing companies to bother fishing in the winter time. They want larger profits and a larger catch than the settlers, so that they do all their fishing in the summer time. It appears to me that any person who will go out on the ice, and fish under the ice with a net of a certain length according to the regulations of the department——

Mr. TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the regulations now in force have nothing to do with winter fishing, but refer to the summer season only. The regulations for winter fishing have not yet been prepared, but they are being reported upon.

Mr. WATSON. I can assure the hon. Minister that people in Manitoba are not as well satisfied with the regulations as he thinks they are. I find in very recent papers from Manitoba that correspondents are writing about this matter, and demanding a change. I certainly agree that restrictions should be placed on these large fishing companies, because there was reason for alarm at their operations. They stretched miles of net across the breeding grounds of Lake Winnipeg, and they would in time have depleted the lake of fish, but if the settlers were not allowed to fish for exportation——

Mr. TUPPER. They are.

Mr. WATSON—these companies would have the entire monopoly of the fishing in Lake Winnipeg or Lake Manitoba. What I wish is that the Indians and settlers may be allowed to sell or export the fish they catch in winter. If any money is to be made out of the fish in Manitoba, it should be made by the people of Manitoba. While I do

not object to American capital coming in, I know that down by the sea the hon. gentleman is not willing to allow Americans to fish within the 3-mile limit, and we do not want them to be allowed to fish in Lake Winnipeg or Lake Manitoba either. I think those fisheries should be protected as much as the fisheries down by the sea.

Fisheries, North West Territories..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the regulations with regard to fishing in the North-West Territories? Are they anything different from those in Manitoba?

Mr. TUPPER. The only difference is in regard to close seasons, which vary according to the geographical situation of the different rivers and lakes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think every liberty should be secured to the poor Indians of the North-West.

Mr. TUPPER. They are favoured everywhere as far as possible.

British Columbia, salaries and disbursement of Fishery officers, &c..... $6,500

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to enquire whether or not there are any special reasons for extending the close season in Lake Huron from the 1st of November to the 15th of October. The fishermen complain bitterly that the two weeks of their very best fishing season have been cut off by the regulation.

Mr. TUPPER. The action of the department is based on the report of Mr. Charles Wilmot, who has been collecting fish for some years for breeding purposes. He has been in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay in order to obtain these fish, and he observed the fish were more full of spawn after the 15th of October, and that the previous close season did not cover, as it was intended it should, the larger part of the breeding season. Of course the fishermen are against this, but strong pressure has been brought on the Government constantly, particularly from those waters, to guard those fisheries in the strongest possible manner, no matter how unpopular such action might be. There is no regulation so important as the regulation in reference to a close season, and I think the evidence we have with reference to the proper season for closing those waters is satisfactory, coming from an officer who has spent many years in collecting breeding fish.

Mr. CAMERON. There is no doubt as to the propriety of having the close season sufficiently long for breeding purposes, but if the opinion of Mr. Wilmot is such as the hon Minister says it is, it is not that of the majority of the men engaged for many years in the fishing business. The hon. gentleman ought to consider very carefully the wants and opinions of those engaged in that business, and I am quite sure, if he would visit Lake Huron in the month of November, he would find that, after the 1st of November, fishing is most dangerous and the fishermen have to leave the grounds at that time.

Mr. TUPPER. No doubt, as the water is too rough and breaks the nets.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And they feel bitterly the cutting off of two weeks of their best season. Unless the reasons are insurmountable, I think the hon. gentleman should meet the views of the fishermen.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the course taken by the hon. Minister in extending the close season deserves our highest commendation. That is a subject on which I have battled for many years. I have always contended that the close season should not begin later than the 15th of October. It was put off to the 1st of November, and no wonder the fishermen liked to have it then because that gave them an opportunity for catching fish during the spawning season. Now, the fishermen are, like other people, sometimes a little selfish in their views. They are certainly very short-sighted with reference to this close season, and I am sure the hon. Minister has done perfectly right, and that the action he has taken is entirely in accordance with the opinion of the great majority of the overseers, although those actually engaged in fishing, who want to make the most of the present moment, will not support him in the course he has taken.

Mr. CORBOULD. I would like to know if the item under discussion covers any expenditure that may be required for the encouragement of lobster-breeding in British Columbia? I understand the hon. Minister has had this subject under consideration for some time both last year as well as this, and I see that lately a lobster fishery has been established in the Maritime Provinces. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps to encourage the breeding of lobsters in the waters of the Pacific? I would also like to ask him about the whitefish. Our lakes in British Columbia, as regards the temperature of the water and otherwise, are well adapted for the breeding of whitefish. It appears the industry in this province has been encouraged to a very large extent, and I am sure with profit, and I hope the hon. Minister will see his way to placing a sufficient number of fry or eggs in the British Columbia lakes so that the industry may be encouraged there also.

Mr. TUPPER. Under this vote it will be impossible to provide for any new service, but the subject as to whether lobsters would thrive in British Columbia waters has engaged the attention of the department for some time. We have deemed it wise, however, not to undertake the experiment, which would entail some cost, of transporting lobsters from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in view of the fact that the United States authorities have been engaged in that experiment for some years, and, up to the present, with apparently little success. I will tell the hon. gentleman an amusing circumstance in connection with the efforts of our neighbours, and that is the shad which they have been breeding on the Atlantic coast shows a preference for our waters, and it is supposed that the great increase of that fish in St. John's harbour this year was due to the good work of our neighbours.

An hon. MEMBER. And codfish, too?

Mr. TUPPER. Codfish as well. With reference to the lobsters, the Americans have gone to great expense. Special care must be taken to have the lobsters alive, and to bring them across the continent alive. The salt water has to be at a certain temperature, its saline qualities preserved and so on, and the lobster has to be handled very carefully. The results have been small. The chief

result is that three lobsters have been found on the British Columbia coast which it was supposed had come from the American shore. I believe three lobsters were discovered this season in those waters, and they are supposed to have come from below. That would be an additional argument for waiting for additional results from the United States, because if the result proves that they will do the work, we should be thankful to obtain the result. In view of the experimental nature of this work, and of the fact that their efforts have not yet been crowned with success, it has not been deemed wise to duplicate that experiment, and at present there is no proposition to introduce the lobster into the waters of British Columbia. As to the Atlantic coast, however, it is different. The lobster is already there. What we are doing is this. We hatch the salmon for the Fraser River in order to preserve the fish which are accustomed to that water, but that is a very different thing from the introduction of fish into new waters, as would be the introduction of the lobster in British Columbia. As to whitefish, I have asked the officers of the department, and particularly Mr. Wilmot, who superintends the hatcheries, whether it is not possible to send whitefish eggs from the east to British Columbia. I should be glad to be able to carry that out, and I think that may be done within the amount of our appropriation.

Mr. CORBOULD. I understand that there is no difficulty in transporting the berry, as it is called, of the lobster, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and, if that is the case, I hope the Minister will take steps to have those berries transported to our waters.

Fishways and clearing Rivers..... $40,000

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). What provision has been made for the harbour at Shediac?

Mr. TUPPER. The surveyor has surveyed that harbour and located the sites of the old beds, and it is intended to plant the oysters this fall, and arrange for the collection of the spawn next season in proper time.

Mr. BOWERS. In connection with this item, I would call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the distribution of the fishing bounty. I find there are 597 vessels with 31,077 tons, which received $46,615.50 last season. It is the manner in which the bounty is distributed, that I consider very unfair.

Mr. TUPPER. Do you refer to the principle of the bounty, or to the system on which it is distributed?

Mr. BOWERS. I refer to the principle on which it is distributed. The average is given simply as $3.64 a man; but I find that in Digby County, which I have the honour to represent, the amount per man was only $2.45; in Halifax, $2.54; in Yarmouth, $2.43 per man. On the other hand, the County of Richmond received $4.19 per man, Cumberland County $6.43, Lunenburg $4.54, Queens' $4.18, and so on in different ratios throughout the province. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may say that the division of the bounty is intended to encourage the building of the largest style of fishing vessels, but if he takes half of this amount, $23,307.75, and divides it amongst the vessels at the rate of 75 cents a ton, that would be an encouragement in the same manner to build larger vessels, while he might take the other half and divide it amongst the fishermen. I find that some men received only 87 cents, while others received $16, though those who only received 87 cents may very likely have worked harder than those who received the larger amount. I have an instance in my own Island where a gentleman with only two of a crew fished only three months with a vessel of 25 or 26 tons, and the men received a bounty of $6 or $7 each. The attention of the Minister being called to this, I hope he will try to make some arrangement by which the fishermen of each county will receive the same amount of bounty.

Mr. STAIRS. I have not enquired very carefully into this matter, but I think it is one which requires some consideration on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What the remedy should be I am not prepared to say, but it does seem to be unfair that the bounty received by the individual fishermen should depend upon the size of the vessel in which they fish. I cannot see why a man who is fishing in a vessel of 80 tons should receive more than a man who is engaged in a vessel of 20 or 30 tons. I hope the Minister of Marine will look into this matter and see what remedy can be found.

Mr. TUPPER. It would be very hard to accomplish the object of the bounty in that way. The bounty is intended to induce competition, and it is no argument against it to say that one county does not earn as much as another. The object of the bounty is not the distribution of so much charity, but to give the amount according to the result of the work. If a certain number of fishermen in one district are in the habit of fishing in small boats, they cannot expect the same result as those who fish in larger boats. In the County of Lunenburg, for instance, there is a large distribution. Lunenburg has gone to the front and has built some splendid vessels, and those who advocate the bounty would use that as a justification for granting the bounty by showing that, since we have been paying it, we have been fulfilling the object by getting our fishermen to build larger and faster fishing vessels. They are doing that now, and they will be a credit to the ports from which they come. In fact, we are now the rivals in that respect of the fishermen who set us the example in that matter. As the hon. gentleman has proposed, for tha first time in my hearing, a consideration of the principle upon which that was based, I will carefully consider it, and if I reach a different conclusion, I will communicate it to the House.

Mr. BOWERS. For the encouragement of the larger vessels, half the amount of the bounty could be paid to them in just the same manner. I do not think for one moment it is given in charity. I notice that alongside the County of Digby, in the County of Annapolis, the fishermen get about $1.20 per man per vessel more than the same class get in Digby County.

Mr. TUPPER. Because they fish in larger boats.

Mr. BOWERS. I would remind the hon. gentleman that men who fish in a small boat thirteen or fourteen feet long, get more, on the average, than men fishing in our vessels. They

get nearly $3 per man and $1 for the boat, while our fishermen only get $2.45 who fish in vessels.

Mr. McNEILL. Before this item passes I wish to take the opportunity of correcting a slight error which appeared in the *Hansard* report, of some remarks I made on the last occasion this matter was before the House, in reference to the condition in which fish were landed by these large companies. My remarks had reference to the hot weather; I certainly did not wish to be understood as saying that even in hot whether, all of them, or even the bulk of them, were unfit for human food. What I wished understood was that sometimes the bulk of them were, in my opinion, very unwholesome.

Census and Statistics.....$175,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought you were going to let that stand until we got the returns of population?

Mr. FOSTER. Then we shall have to wait quite awhile.

Mr. CASEY. I think some one of the Ministers ought to be able to give us some information on this point by this time. There is really no reason why we should not have the returns of population before now. I have no doubt they are practically completed by this time, with exception, perhaps, of some districts in Algoma or the utmost parts of the North-West Territories. Surely the mere numerical counting of the heads must be completed long before this. Can't the Minister tell us approximately when the returns will be ready?

Mr. HAGGART. The numerical returns have only come in, the last of them, within a day or two, and the department will not be able to give the numerical return for the whole Dominion before about three weeks, according to the information I have received from the department. The first information the hon. gentleman has mentioned was perfectly correct, as I got it from the department, that we would be able to make a statement at the beginning of this month. Upon enquiry to-day I find, however, that it will be impossible to have any reliable numerical information as to the present population of the Dominion before, at least, two or three weeks.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the Minister to say that the last returns had come in within a day or two.

Mr. HAGGART. So I understood.

Mr. CASEY. If the returns are in, it certainly cannot take the census staff very long to add the last returns to what have been already received. The bulk of the returns must have been in long ago. No doubt the Minister could give us the returns for practically all the provinces. I think it would be well for him to give the House what information he has, reserving the few counties where the figures are not complete, for a future period. But with the large census staff at his disposal it cannot take long simply to count the heads furnished by the last returns and add them to what has already been received. I do not think a delay of three weeks is a reasonable one, if the last returns are in now.

Mr. HAGGART. Some of them only came in this morning from some of the Montreal districts.

Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. CASEY. Even so, it cannot take long to add those returns to what has already been received and counted up. I suppose that practically all the returns have been received from Ontario, excepting, perhaps, the back parts.

Mr. HAGGART. I think Ontario is not complete yet.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the Minister to say that the last ones had come in this morning.

Mr. HAGGART. The last returns from the city of Montreal came in only this morning.

Mr. CASEY. That shows certainly great neglect on the part of the enumerators, who should have been through with their work before now, and the hon. gentleman ought to have seen that they were through with their business before now. It is of extreme importance, considering other questions that may come before the House, to have this information before us during the present session. It seems peculiar and strange, when the session has continued to such an unexpected length, that we should not have them by this time. We talk about the prosperity and progress of the country, and we are talking to some extent in the dark, until we get these figures. The Government do not wish to conceal anything from us, I hope, that we ought to know in this respect; but if they want to avoid the suspicion on the part of the public at large that these figures would not be as favourable to them as they have predicted, they ought to hurry this matter up and bring down as soon as they can the figures, at least so far as returned. For all practical purposes what we have on hand, if they were brought down to-morrow, would be of as much use to us as if we had complete returns. It does not matter, in discussing great questions before this House, whether some particular district in Montreal, for instance, is left out of the returns—although I understand the cities are complete now. But it does not matter whether there is some particular district in northern Algoma, or in the Rocky Mountains, which has not been returned, as long as we have substantially the returns from the great bulk of the districts. These ought to be brought down, and they would be of great use to us in our deliberations.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Certainly we should not be asked to pass this item until we have the information.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think we will let it stand.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This has been promised to us before now.

Mr. HAGGART. As soon as we have the returns of the population they will be brought down immediately to the House—as soon as the calculation is made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister promised first that they would be done in July.

Mr. HAGGART. No; I think I said about the beginning of August.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think that was the second answer, if I remember rightly. It seems to me that we should have them already. Only about a week ago there was a somewhat rude interruption by an hon. gentleman opposite to an hon. gentleman speaking on this side of the House, who was using a set of figures as late as were at his command; and an hon. gentleman opposite, interrupt-

ing him in a rude manner, wanted to know, "What is your authority? What are you quoting from?" The hon. gentleman on this side gave him the answer, which was met with a jeer and a remark from the hon. gentleman opposite: "Oh, you had better wait till we get the official figures." He was asked when they would be ready, and he replied with all the assurance of an expectant Minister: "In about a week." That tallies with the answer the Minister himself gave in reference to it. I submit that the figures should have been entered before now. If there has been delay, as undoubtedly has been the case, blame must rest on the officials of the department, because it was the duty of the department to see that the returns were sent in. There must, at all events, have been sufficient information obtained to warrant the Government laying it on the Table, especially as the public press is making use of it. Information is being given to some people in regard to the returns, and yet those returns have not yet been brought down. If there are persons who desire to learn that no progress has been made in this country, I am not one of the number. I shall rejoice if it can be shown that we have increased in population and prosperity, I hold, however, that outside persons should not be in possession of information when the Acting Minister tells us that the information cannot be given to the House. It is, however, evident that some of the officials have neglected their duties. This is apparent when it is admitted by the department that some returns have just been received, the returns from Montreal. There should have been measures taken to see that the officers in Montreal completed their work earlier.

Mr. HAGGART. The Deputy Minister informs me that no information has been given to anyone outside the office. He further says that every effort has been put forward to get the returns as quickly as possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I recollect that I saw reference made in the press to these returns, especially as regards British Columbia, and it was said they would show the great progress made by that province. There must have been some information given, or we are to suppose that the story was manufactured out of the whole cloth.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the figures given as regards British Columbia?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No. The writer pretended to say that from official information obtained from the department that the returns would show this.

Mr. FOSTER. That appeared in a newspaper. Against that you have the statement of the deputy head that no information has been given to outside parties.

Mr. CASEY. To his knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all a departmental head can do. He can only state what he knows, and take all care possible in order to avoid information being obtained by outsiders. I do not see any reason for asking that this item should stand until some figures are brought down. The work is going on, and is being pushed forward with as much vigour as possible. I know myself that the Minister is anxious to have the returns ready as soon as possible. Why should he not be? Some hon. gentlemen think there is something which causes suspicion that for some reason or other the Minister in charge of the department is unwilling to have the information brought down. What can be gained by keeping back the information five or six days? Do we not know that the information is bound to come, that it will come down to the House as soon as it is ready, that the House will be in session long after the information is brought down? Nothing is being injured in the meantime. I see no reason for asking that the item should stand.

Mr. CASEY. It does not appear to us as if the work was going on. If it had been pushed with ordinary business promptness since April we would have had the returns from a month to six weeks ago.

Mr. FOSTER. It is no child's work.

Mr. CASEY. The delay is much longer than usual, and is an unreasonable time. The Minister has told us that within a few days returns have come in from Montreal. It is absurd to suppose that they could not have been sent before. There must have been delay either from laziness or intentional neglect on the part of some one. We cannot lay all the blame on the department, but a large proportion of it must fall on the department for not compelling the enumerators to send in the returns earlier. In the case of Montreal, the Government would not be open to the suspicion of keeping back the information intentionally, because the cities have probably grown pretty rapidly, and there might be a point to be made for the Government by bringing down the returns for Montreal. There has been scandalous delay in sending in returns from that city. The number of items to be collected from residents in a city is much less than the number in the country districts, and would not occupy one-quarter of the time. Yet we have the admission that the returns from that city were received only a few days ago. The Minister of Finance says it makes no difference when the returns come down, as the House will be in session. What reason is there for believing it? We do not know but that the House will prorogue in three weeks; even if it should continue six weeks we have no reason for believing the returns will be brought down. Whenever we have reached the end of the rainbow it has moved further on. Whenever the time promised has expired we have been told to wait a few more weeks. I venture to predict that these returns will not be brought down until after the session. It makes a great deal of difference to us, as we desire to discuss them. Even if there are not complete returns, I ask the Minister that those returns which are completed should be laid on the Table. Unless there is some satisfactory reason to the contrary, we have a right to demand that these returns be laid on the Table of the House as is any public document.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Speaking from recollection, I think, on previous occasions, when facilities for communication with different parts of the country were vastly inferior to what they are now, we received the information sought for early in July, three months after the date of taking the census. It appears to me that 6th August is a very late date, too late a date, for the Government not to be able to give us, at all events, the returns for the older provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman's statement is pretty near correct. It was some time in July, nearly the end of the month, when the returns of the last census were made known. The department has used the utmost effort to press on the enumerators the necessity of sending in the returns at an early date, and every effort has been made to get the returns in early.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you see any objection to submitting to the House the returns already prepared?

Mr. HAGGART. I was asking the deputy how the figures had "panned out," and whether the figures gave anything like the calculation he had made. He said it was impossible to give me any information as to how the numbers had turned out in the different provinces. I do not know whether the returns for any of the provinces have been made up. All the Deputy Minister states to me is that it is extremely objectionable that any figures should go out until the total result is known, because once a number is circulated throughout the country as the total population, it is very difficult to remove the impression.

Mr. CASEY. Nobody would suppose that this was published as the total population of the province or of the country. What we want brought down is as many counties or districts as are complete. If the provinces are not complete we do not want them. Perhaps the Minister could ascertain from the deputy, who is now present, how many counties or districts are complete.

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy states that a great number of the constituencies are complete. I asked him to give the reason why he could not have the total number ready in a shorter time than three weeks, and he says he may have it ready before that.

Mr. CASEY. We are speaking about such information as is complete.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is extremely objectionable to bring down information without the complete returns for the whole Dominion. I would rather urge upon the department the necessity of making an effort to get it done in half the time and if necessary to employ an extra staff if the House is bound to have the information.

Mr. CASEY. The returns which are complete should be brought down now, unless the Minister can give a stronger reason than the opinion of his deputy. The House has nothing to do with that opinion, and it is for the Minister to say whether he will bring down the returns which are complete or not. The only reason given by the Minister is that incomplete returns might go abroad as representing the total population of the country. No such impression could go abroad if the returns brought down are marked "incomplete." If there is no stronger reason than that, the Government is not acting fairly by the House in not bringing down such figures as are complete.

Mr. McNEILL. What great advantage does the hon. gentleman expect to derive from bringing down these incomplete returns?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They will facilitate discussions in this House. When a gentleman was speaking here, he was rudely asked by a gentleman on the other side what he was quoting from, and when the hon. gentleman replied that he was quoting from the only data available, he was told: "You had better wait until you get the official figures." If we had the official figures even in part, it would do away with a good deal of controversy. I am not referring to ascertaining the population for representation purposes, or anything of that kind, but you ought have completed the returns from many counties and from cities in Ontario which would enable us to give an approximate idea. The gentleman referred to by me pointed out that certain counties had lost their population, when the rude interruption was made, and the gentleman who made the interruption said: "You will get them in a week." He was sitting beside a Minister when he made that statement; he was not a Minister himself, his age and time in the House would hardly entitle him to look for that position. Do you not see that if we had the population of these counties which are completed, discussion would be facilitated and we could have accurate information without any danger whatever to the public interest? I do not understand the returns not being in yet from the cities, for it is very strange that they could not be completed from April to August. I would like to ask the Minister: Have any returns, from the city of Montreal for instance, been received at the office and sent back, for any reason or cause, to the enumerator?

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy says that none of them has been returned.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should not have supposed that would have been permitted. It seems to me marvellous almost, that there should have been no returns received from cities so easy of excess as Montreal up to this present time, without the department finding severe fault with their officers for not having the work done more promptly. If the department had done its duty fully, I think the hon. gentleman must admit that the returns would have been complete long ago.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the information asked for is something unprecedented, and I never heard of such a thing as an incomplete return being asked for in this House. Although some gentleman on this side of the House may have spoken in a manner that my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) does not approve of, I do not see why that is any reason that we should depart from our usual rule. Some of us would like to see the population of the villages and in our counties, and if you ask for this partial and incomplete information, I do not see where you can draw the line. If you bring down incomplete returns from the provinces and some of the counties, we might as well ask for the returns in some of the villages. It seems to me a violation of principle.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend forgets that when the information is published for the use of the House, it is given by counties and villages, and that is the manner in which it is now being prepared in the department.

Mr. McNEILL. But it will be complete.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What difference does that make. The information will be given by districts and each of them will be no more complete than it is now.

Mr. McNEILL. Would my hon. friend go so far as to say that he thinks it would be advisable that we should ask the Government to bring down the census of the population of a village ? It is absurd.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not so anxious to get incomplete returns, but I do think that where a large sum like this is asked for, we ought to know whether it has been carned in a satisfactory manner or not. I know for a fact, in the district in which I live, the enumerator had done the work before this House had met at all. Now, Sir, it would be very satisfactory for us to know where the blame lies. Was it the enumerators who were to blame ; did they neglect their work ; or was it the commissioners to whom they made the returns? I submit that before we are asked to vote such a sum as this we ought to know that. If these men neglected their duty there was plenty of time to appoint others in their place and have the work satisfactorily done. The information should surely be in our hands long before this present time. I think the Minister ought to be able to furnish this Committee with information on the point as to whether it was the enumerators who were to blame for the delay, or whether it was the commissioners, and before we are asked to vote this enormous sum we should know where the blame rests, and take some steps to remedy it.

Mr. DENISON. After all, what is all this talk about ? We have had the census going on for four months, and now the Minister who is acting in this matter tells us that the whole thing can be finally completed in three weeks, or possibly in less than three weeks. He says it may be done in two weeks, and he has suggested that if the House were very anxious to have it through in less than three weeks, some extra clerks could be put on to have the work rushed through so that it could be done in a very short time. I am strongly of opinion that it would be most objectionable to have these returns published in a partial form. I saw in a paper the other day a report, which was no doubt without foundation, that the population of Toronto was in the neighbourhood of 190,000. But that is a newspaper report, and if it should turn out afterwards that the population of Toronto was 195,000, a great many people would have formed a wrong idea. That is not fair to the city, and the same may be said of the provinces. The moment the returns come, they will be added up for each province, and these imperfect figures will be sent out, and the public will take them as representing the population of the provinces. So that the publication of these partial returns would have an injurious effect. But what is all this talk about? The possibility of a delay of two or three weeks, which might be abridged and brought down to one week.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for West Toronto seems to cast a reflection upon the department. He says that if the return is brought down, and they find that it is not right, it will be changed.

Mr. DENISON. I said this was a newspaper report ; and if you would keep your ears open you would hear what I said. As you know, these reports are private until they are given out officially by the Minister, and until then anything that appears in the newspapers is conjecture.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the hon. gentleman represents that the department would bring down an incomplete report of the city of Toronto.

Mr. DENISON. I did not say an incomplete report of Toronto. I said an incomplete report of the different provinces.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is in a very peculiar position. He thinks that if they got a little more time, the population will be increased. I do not understand how he expects that that will be done after the enumerators have finished their work. The enumerators finished their work in Toronto a little after the House met. In the riding which I represent they finished their work in May, and I have an idea that by adding the aggregates of the different places, I could have compiled the population of that district before this myself. I do not see the reason for delay. There are a great many officials engaged on this work, and I think it is reasonable that this item should be suspended until we get the return. If the Government want to force it on, of course they can do so, and we can only discuss it partially until we get the facts and figures before us. If they are bound to force the item through *nolens volens*, perhaps it will be a question for consideration whether or not we should go into a discussion with the incomplete information before us. If the officials are kept out of their pay for two weeks, that is not a serious matter. Many people have to wait two weeks for their pay, and these officials in the census department are not suffering more than others. I think we should let this item stand until we get the information.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Toronto speaks of getting incomplete returns from cities and counties, as if we asked for them to be brought down before they are complete. We have not asked anything of the kind. We do not want the population of any city or county until it is complete ; and the hon. member for North Bruce will see that we cannot have the population of his county without having the population of the townships, towns and villages in it as well. The hon. gentleman says, if it is reasonable to ask for the population of a county, why not ask that of a village, or a township, as soon as it is completed. I think the great body of the House can see the reasonableness of the distinction between the two cases. It is of interest and importance to have the population of large cities, towns and counties, while it is of no particular importance to have the population of a township or a village. Now, the hon. Postmaster General, who has charge of this item to-day, tells us that, after speaking to the deputy, he finds that the return is very nearly complete, and that, by putting on an extra force of clerks, it may be completed in less than three weeks. Well, I have already alluded to the illusory nature of these promises. His remedy reminds me of the usual course of the departments in matters of this kind. They neglect their work till long after it should be done, and then, when the result is called for at short notice, the only remedy is to employ a number of extra clerks and pay out a great deal more money. Now, it is perfectly absurd, notwithstanding what the deputy, the Minister or any member may say, to urge that the numerical count of heads could not have been completed weeks and months ago. In my county, like

others which have been heard from, the enumeration was made before the opening of this session; and I have no doubt that the commissioner, who was my opponent in the last election, and who I know is an active man, sent in his return long ago. Why not bring down those returns which are complete? If all of them are so nearly complete, the districts left uncounted can make no practical difference in the inferences drawn from the enumeration. But even if we had these papers before us now, we still have a grievance, that they have been deferred so late as my hon. friend from South Middlesex has pointed out. Before we vote this item we want to see whether the census officials have earned their money. As my hon. friend from Grey has said, one person working half the time that has elapsed since the enumeration could easily have added together all the returns from the census district to show the total figures for each county and city.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister says that the return will be down before the House rises, and he can shorten the time. I hold it as a reasonable proposition that this item should stand, especially as we will not thereby delay the business of the House. In fact, I do think that to allow it to stand will expedite our work.

Mr. FOSTER. Really, if we are going to ask that items should stand, we ought to do so on some fair and reasonable ground. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not advanced any reason why we should depart from the regular course and not pass this item. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) ought to be happy. He has stated from his place that he has a grievance, and surely he does not want anything more. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat will surely not support the argument used by the hon. member for Elgin and others, that we must not vote this money until we know it has been earned. There is not an item in these Estimates in which we do not vote money for services yet to be performed, and if hon. gentlemen opposite take that ground they will not vote any more money at all. Is it any reason to ask for delay in voting this amount that we should wait until we get the gross figures of the population, or until some one or two members will have their curiosity satisfied as to how the figures stand in certain places? I submit that is not sufficient reason. The information will be brought down none the sooner if the item stands than if it were passed. This item is for a very small amount of the work that the census takers have to do. If any one member has a right to ask that an item should stand, another has the same right, and we must be careful not to fall into that method of proceeding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister is right in saying that an item should not stand unless there is serious reason; but I submit to the hon. gentleman himself that there is really a good deal of ground for asking that this item should stand. There is probably no question in its various ramifications, both politically and as affecting the property of the country, so important as the knowledge of the distribution of population. There is good reason why it should be exhaustively discussed in committee, where a valuable check might be afforded with regard to the results of the enumeration as to numbers alone, and nothing else is asked for. It is the more important we should have this enumeration in view of the fact, which the hon. gentleman must remember, that in opposition to our repeated protests, the Government have not only adhered to the *de jure* system of taking the census instead of adopting the *de facto* system, but have entirely omitted to take any check to show the number of persons counted in our population under the *de jure* who might not be under the *de facto* system. I know very well the general returns cannot possibly be made up for a year or two, but the mere enumeration of the population is a comparatively small matter; and if all the returns are in, and the Postmaster General tells us they are, that could be very easily done within a week or ten days by leaving, as might properly be done, the rest of the business of the census aside until we had that single item, and that would be of very material service in our deliberations. I have abstained, in the hope I was justified in entertaining, in view of the language of the hon. Minister, that we should have this return, from alluding to the population of the country or entering into calculations concerning it, which I assuredly otherwise would have done in the course of the recent debates, had I not expected to have been put in possession of that information long before this. There is no time so convenient for threshing a question out as when we are in the Committee of the Whole, and no doubt this is a question concerning which, under our constitution, publicity should be given in advance, so that, if there is any risk of any serious error having occurred, some check should be applied. I know, as a matter of fact, that in some of our smaller towns people have been counted twice and thrice over, for this reason, that they have occupied during the time occupied in taking the census different parts of the city. For instance, they were enumerated on the 4th of April in one quarter, and on the 14th of April in another. Quite a number of such cases have at various times been reported to me, and under our system protracting unnecessarily the time during which the enumeration is taken, those double accounts might occur to a great extent, particularly in a large city. The editor ought to have furnished the Postmaster General with more satisfactory reasons for this unusual delay. There is no wish to unnecessarily prolong this discussion, but I would suggest, as the matter now stands, that the Postmaster General, who cannot possibly be expected to be familiar with all the details of this matter, should take until to-morrow or the next time we meet, to look into the matter for himself, and make a statement to us as to whether it is at all possible to comply with the wishes of my hon. friends in a reasonable time, or whether it is practicably impossible for him to grant their request.

Mr. HAGGART. I expected that these questions would be asked when I came here to explain these Estimates, and I made particular enquiry on the very point which has been raised by the hon. member for Oxford. I stated that I had given the promise to the House, at the instance of the department, that the numerical returns would be ready at the beginning of August at the latest, and I supposed I would be expected to give some information and would be questioned very minutely as to why the returns were not in, so I desired to have

the assurance of the Deputy Minister, which I might give to the House, that they would be down in the quickest possible manner. The Government cannot have any objection to furnish to the House as quickly as possible the numerical statements in regard to the different provinces. I asked the Deputy Minister what was the least possible time in which this could be done, and he said he would not like to state that he could do it in less than three weeks, though possibly it might be done in ten days. That is the only information I can give to the House. I made the fullest enquiry to-day in order to get the information.

Mr. CASEY. Then I have only to refer to the remark of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who said I ought to be happy because I have a grievance. I am not happy until that grievance is remedied, and, if the hon. Minister thinks it too much to ask that the voting of this item should be postponed until this grievance is remedied, it is strange that he should be so ignorant of constitutional usage and principles as that. The great constitutional principle is that no money shall be voted by the House of Commons until grievances are redressed. That is the reason why an opportunity is given to raise the question of grievances when we are going into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Your grievance is redressed every day.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose the hon. gentleman means that my grievance takes a new form every day. That is almost true. Scarcely a day passes without some new grievance arising against the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we would never get Supply from you.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid, if they never got money until all the grievances were redressed, they would not be able to carry on much business.

Mr. FOSTER. Now your case is all broken down.

Mr. CASEY. The public have been cheated out of the information they should have had by this time, and it is proper to discuss, not only the money we are now voting, but how that money was spent which was voted last year for this purpose. It is perfectly proper to object that we do not get value for that money, and to find fault with the system under which this is possible. The hon. Minister says this is only an attempt on the part of a few individuals in order to find out the population in certain places. That is not an answer worthy of a Minister. The reasons are just the same as those for which a census is required at all. We want to draw a conclusion from the census, and we are informed that it is now very nearly ready. The hon. Minister says the clerks have more work now to do besides counting the heads, and this is the reason for the delay, that, instead of counting the heads first, they have been working at enumerations which are of no use for the present. The Government should have been ready this session with a redistribution based upon the number of the population. No one knows when a dissolution might take place. It might be before the redistribution takes place, and we might be going to our old constituencies without having had that redistribution. The Government should have been ready with their information by this time. There has been either gross negligence on the part of the Government or an attempt to conceal this information from the public. We have a right, when we are granting this vote, to demand some information which is in possession of the Government now, and the Government are not at all advancing business by insisting on this item getting through now. They are compelling a discussion on this subject which might otherwise be very brief, a discussion based on calculations which we may make, and a great deal of time may be lost instead of gained by the course they are pursuing. I think they would consult their interests by giving all the information they have now and by hurrying up the remainder, because this course cannot but give rise to the suspicion that there is something in the figures which they do not want to give to the public.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the contention of the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) is not well taken. It is that, because we have not this return, we should not vote money for the services which are being performed. It seems to me that it would be fair and legitimate to ascertain what is to be done with this money, whether it is to be properly expended, whether too much was likely to be paid for the services or too little; but to say that we have no right to vote money for work which is being done and must be done is unfair and unreasonable. If it was a matter of commerce, I could understand the hon. gentleman should have the information, but I cannot understand why he requires this information in order to enable him intelligently to vote this money. I see a very strong objection to bringing down an incomplete return, because, as many are aware, newspaper men are anxious to give information to the public, and if, say, only forty-six counties were represented in the returns for Ontario, they might add these up and publish it, and many readers would be misled, believing it to be the whole population of the province. How many readers of those newspapers would know that that was an incomplete return? How many would be misled? The hon. member for South Oxford gives another reason. He says that under the *de jure* system we should have this return before this date, as it is four months since the census was taken, but he must have read that the census was taken as to the population on one particular day. The people are asked: Where were you on that particular day? and they have to discover where the party was domiciled on that one day. If the party had moved in the meantime and the enumerator asks where he was, he would have to give that information. He could not give the information where he was living on the 1st of July, because that was not asked; and, therefore, there is no probability of making that mistake which the member for South Oxford said he was very liable to make. I think if he had read the regulations under which the census were taken, he would understand that it would be utterly impossible to make such a mistake, unless it was made by the grossest carelessness on the part of the enumerator. With regard to the time, it was said that the last census were taken and the returns furnished inside of three months. But the hon. gentlemen who say that the present census ought to be completed within as short a time as the last one, forget that there is a great deal more work to be done this time, and

more schedules to go over; therefore it ought to take a longer time to get the work to that stage of advancement which would enable the Government to give reliable information to the country. If there was only the same amount of work as there was in the last census, it is probable that the information would be forthcoming now, but there has been a great deal more work to do. It seems to me it would be most objectionable for the Government to give, at the present time, incomplete returns of the census, and I can see no urgent necessity why we should have complete returns before this House is called upon to vote the usual sum of money for the appropriations of the present year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman on one point. I have nothing to say as to what may have been the instructions given. I spoke simply of certain facts which were given to me by certain persons, saying that the particular error to which I alluded had occurred in some cases. It is utterly out of the question to say whether it occurred in many cases or not. But this much is clear, that if you depart from the principle of taking the population on a given day, and if you allow the population of towns, or of cities, or of places, to be taken over a number of days, just in proportion to the extent in which the population in any given locality may move from one particular city or township to another, or from one particular district of a city to another, will the chances for mistakes be multiplied. Now, that is a matter of fact, not a matter of instruction; and it is a matter of fact on which the statements were made to me, that I have given to the Minister for what they are worth. I do not pledge myself as to their accuracy, but I do pledge myself to the fact that particular instances were given in which that mistake was stated to have occurred.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must remember that the law of averages would apply. If there were three or four in a particular district who did not belong there at the time their names were taken, the probabilities are that three or four others had moved out before and were never taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; as I understand it that does not apply. The information given to me was this: A particular enumerator was to do a special district in a particular town assigned to him; I think the same enumerator had the whole town assigned to him. He begins the town and counts the people in one district, and after the lapse of several days he goes to another part. Remember, he has already taken the people in that one district, and he does not go over it again. He just takes them as they were, and if any of them have moved into another district he enumerates them the second time.

Mr. HAGGART. I perfectly understand the hon. gentleman. He says that parties who are enumerated in the first district had moved into the second district. Now, if a man had moved into another district and been taken again by the enumerator, some other individual may have moved out of this second district into the first district.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is possible. It would not, therefore, make a very large error, but it might make a considerable error *pro tanto*. The hon. gentleman must recollect this, that there is a distinct object, as we all know, in swelling the details of a particular county or a particular province; and it was by reason of the temptation which is offered by the *de jure* system, that it is desirable that the fullest information should be given at once while we are in session, and that the details of it should be laid on the Table of this House and be examined by the members and commented on by the press, if possible, before this House breaks up. The hon. gentleman will understand that, and there is a very good reason for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite right.

Mr. HAGGART. I may state with reference to the position of the Government in this matter, that we are determined to have the census completed in the shortest possible time. Under this vote we are now taking, we shall be able to finish the whole census, and it will be completed in a shorter time than ever a census was completed before. We intend to have the census completed to the end of the financial year. This vote will complete, as I understand it, the financial part of the expenditure, and we expect to have a larger enumeration made and more information taken for the same amount of money, than was taken ten years ago.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMILLAN. The question has been asked why we want any returns of the census before voting this item. We desire to ascertain something as to the way in which the work has been done before voting this large sum, especially when we consider the fact that the returns of the population should have been submitted to the House in July. It is admitted that the last time the census was taken the returns were submitted in July. During the early part of this session the promise was made that they would be brought down during that month, but subsequently the time was extended to August. The returns should have been laid on the Table before now, especially when you consider the work of the enumerators. Each enumerator makes his round and fills up his own rolls and returns them complete to the commissioner. The commissioner on receiving the rolls compiles the returns for his district. These are then sent to the department in this city for final computation. I utterly fail to see what injury or false impression could be created by submitting the returns as far as completed. Some statement was made with respect to the population of a county, to the effect that it would include the population of the different villages therein. In making up his return each enumerator keeps the population of each village separate, and district returns are forwarded to the commissioner. The complete returns thus show not only the population of the county as such, but also of each city, town and village in it. With the large staff at work, I understand 20 hands, the returns should be here in less than 10 days if the work was earnestly entered upon and pushed forward. There should be some further statement made by the acting Minister before the item is allowed to pass.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many commissioners were there for Ontario, and what payment was made to each?

Mr. HAGGART. There were 215 or 220 commissioners. They received $4 for every 100 families; in some districts for 100 families and for others 50 families.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many general officers were there?

Mr. HAGGART. There were 14 principal census officers; four in Ontario.——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How are they paid.

Mr. HAGGART. $5 per day and travelling expenses. They were paid till 23rd May.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are not commissioners still being paid by the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. My information from the department is that their salaries ceased on May 23rd.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the enumeration is not completed and the commissioners' services are dispensed with, was there any necessity for their services at all? How could the Government dispense with them before the returns were all in? I understand the Montreal lists only came in the other day. The chief commissioners have been out of employment since May 23rd.

Mr. HAGGART. Their chief business was to organize and instruct the commissioners.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who instructed the commissioners in the Montreal district, whose reports are just received?

Mr. WATSON. I have seen some of the commissioners around here, and I understood they were at work. Is Rufus Stephenson still in the employ of the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. When did his services cease?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the department that his services ceased on 23rd May.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would be well to allow this item to stand over until full information was obtained without assumptions being made by the acting Minister. I do not blame the hon. gentleman, because he has charge of another department, but the item should stand over until he could look into it.

Mr. HAGGART. The gentleman who looks after that part of the statistics, the census commissioner, states that the commissioners ceased being paid on 23rd May last, Rufus Stephenson among the rest.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand there are both census commissioners and enumerators. To which class does the Minister refer?

Mr. HAGGART. I refer to the census commissioners. The chief officers' duties ceased on 23rd May last.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the allowance paid to the enumerators?

Mr. HAGGART. 3 cents for every name, 15 cents for every farm, 20 cents for every industrial institution.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is allowed for property in town that is not farm property?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no allowance for that, I understand.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose the enumerator takes the number in a certain house, is he not allowed 15 cents for the farm that they live on?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, that is the arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose that man is a tenant, and the enumerator goes to the owner's house and gets information about the farm there; is he allowed 15 cents for that also?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand not.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for putting the question is not to trouble the Minister, but to get information. In my own case the enumerator came along and he took the number in the household, and then he asked me about the farms. I gave him a list of them, and I learned afterwards that he got some 15 cents a farm, or three or four dollars in all. Did the other enumerators who went to the tenants of these farms get an additional fee of 15 cents each?

Mr. HAGGART. The gentleman who is at the head of the census says he is not allowed for that, and sometimes when they send in their bill for it, it is cut off.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are we to understand that it is only in the case of ownership that the 15 cents is allowed?

Mr. HAGGART. He says it is only on the place where the person in occupation gives the information that they are allowed.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose these answers do not prove to be correct, is it he or the Minister that is responsible? I think the Postmaster General, who is acting for the Minister of Agriculture, should give this information on the authority of the Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily understand the Minister finding it necessary to have a person here to give information, and I do not object to that. The Minister says that where a tenant is on a farm the enumerator only gets paid for taking the number in the house, and for the crop, and so on. What is he allowed for taking the crop?

Mr. HAGGART. He gets an allowance of 15 cents where he takes that information from the party giving it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The census commissioners who got $5 a day ceased their duties on the 23rd May, did they not? Did their work commence before the 6th April?

M. HAGGART. Some time in February.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And they got $5 a day from February until the 23rd May?

Mr. HAGGART. For about four months, I believe.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, as I understand the Minister, in addition to that there is a commissioner for each county or city, and he gets besides $4 per hundred names. He appoints the enumerators, and these enumerators get 3 cents per name or $3 per hundred?

Mr. HAGGART. He gets $4 for every hundred names, and a fixed allowance besides.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The enumerators, though appointed by him, have their allowance fixed by departmental order. Do all these different

enumerators in a county hand their list when completed to the commissioner for that county?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, for that district.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the duty of the commissioner to make the additions?

Mr. HAGGART. The commissioner has nothing to do with that; that is done in the office here.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The point I am trying to make is this: There has been very great delay in some districts, as the Minister has stated; is the commissioner, or are the enumerators for these districts, responsible for the delay?

Mr. HAGGART. The commissioner is the means of communication between the Government and the enumerators. If there is any delay the head of the department communicates with the commissioner and urges him to look after the enumerators. I was incorrect when I stated that the whole of the returns were in. I hear from the commissioner that a return from Nipissing, and four returns from British Columbia, are not in yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire from the Minister whether it is the habit of the department to have the names preserved? Are these lists of names as taken preserved?

Mr. HAGGART. The lists of the names are scheduled and they have them for three or four decades past.

Mr. WATSON. Are the returns all in from Manitoba?

Mr. HAGGART. There are two from Manitoba not in.

Mr. WATSON. What districts are they from?

Mr. HAGGART. Selkirk, I believe.

Mr. WATSON. What is the name of the commissioner in that district?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Clifton.

Mr. WATSON. He was a candidate in the last election. I suppose he was too busy looking after the elections to look after the census?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of curiosity, if it would not be too much trouble, I would like to know if my own name is down as one of the citizens of Canada, for I have some considerable doubt that it is?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What instruction is given to the enumerator in reference to non-residents?

Mr. HAGGART. The instructions are printed, and have been published in every newspaper in the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For what length of time do they come under the enumeration?

Mr. HAGGART. The time limit is twelve months.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What does the salary of a sub-commissioner in a riding amount to?

Mr. HAGGART. There are no sub-commissioners. There is only a commissioner for each riding.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are seven or eight chief commissioners, and surely there must be sub-commissioners.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister say how many columns have to be filled up by the enumerators?

Mr. HAGGART. Twenty-two.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If these returns are not in—three from British Columbia, two from Manitoba, and one or two from some other places, how can the department be sure that they will be in within ten days or three weeks?

Mr. HAGGART. We could telegraph to the commissioners and get them, and in that way the chief commissioner might make a return similar to that which was made when the last census was taken. That could be obtained in two or three days.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would not be quite a complete return.

Mr. HAGGART. It would not be quite complete, but it would be the same as the return made at the time of the last census.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend from Toronto would object to that.

Mr. DENISON. No, that would be sufficiently complete for me.

Mr. FRASER. I venture to suggest that no such return should be given. I do not think the department should depend on telegrams for any of the census returns. While I am satisfied that the work might have been completed before this, considering the number of officials at work upon them, I am equally of opinion that it would be a mistake to publish any other than authentic returns. If you publish partial or incomplete returns, we all know that they will be accepted as the correct returns. The census is a matter of great importance to the country, and I do not think any partial return should be made. None but authentic returns should be published, but at the same time I think they should be published immediately, and if there are not enough men employed let the department get more. The census is a matter of too much importance to be kept back, but let it be authentic when it comes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to this vexed question of the *de jure* system, I want to understand from the Minister whether any limitation was laid down in the instructions given to the enumerators as to the length of time they would consider sufficient to warrant them in including a person as one of the inhabitants of Canada? What precautions were taken, in other words, that the *de jure* system should not be abused by persons who did not really belong to Canada?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that instructions given to the enumerators were that no one was to be taken who was absent more than twelve months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that complaints were made, and I think that in some cases they were well founded, that in the last census persons who had been absent from Canada for five or seven years, and in some instances for longer periods, were put down as *de jure* inhabitants of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that a person who was absent for over twelve months, but who expressed his intention to return, would be enumerated. Is that correct?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe it is.

Mr. TROW. I understand that the census enumerators in the County of Perth put no question as to whether any member of the family resided in

the United States or in Timbuctoo. They merely asked whether he had been in that homestead within the past twelve months, and did not ask whether he intended to return or otherwise. So that we shall have included in the census a great number of non-residents, probably as many as 100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I am informed that the enumerators were all instructed to ask that question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that the enumerator in my section in some cases, where any members of a family had been absent a considerable time, put the question whether they intended to return or not; and if the head of the house intimated that they did, I understand that they were enumerated.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that that is correct. That was the instruction the enumerators got.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can the hon. Minister state at what date the county commissioners were appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. About the 9th or 10th of March.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In view of what the hon. Minister has stated, if a parent chose to think or say that he expected the absent members of his family to return, would it not be quite possible for persons who have been absent for more than twelve months, even for five or six years, to be enumerated as citizens of Canada?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the commissioner that there are very few of those cases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But still it would be quite possible.

Mr. HAGGART. What the hon. gentleman wishes would be a column showing the number of those cases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what I did suggest more than once, a year or two ago. It would be an item of information of great value in checking the accuracy of the returns. Is there a possibility of having such a column?

Mr. HAGGART. They are not making a report of those.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They could not possibly do it now?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that they cannot. I understand at the same time that the cases are very rare.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That might be in certain localities, and in certain other localities it might not. Without any intention to deceive the enumerators, it is a natural thing for parents to hope their children will return, and a very considerable number in certain localities might be so included; but, as I understand, the instructions to the enumerators were, that they were not to enumerate anybody who has been absent more than twelve months, unless told by the parents or some relation that they would return.,

Mr. HAGGART. That they were positive they were going to return.

Mr. TROW. Were there any definite instructions given to the census commissioners to direct the enumerators that the roll should be completed on or before a certain day, except in the case of districts such as Algoma, where the settlers are very remote from each other?

Mr. HAGGART. There was no possibility of having that carried out. In some districts it would be totally impossible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is the commissioner for North Brant?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember his name.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was it Mr. Robert Hamilton?

Mr. HAGGART. He was one of the commissioners, but I do not remember whether for North or South Brant.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who recommended his appointment; because he was the Government candidate in North Brant on the 5th of March, and was appointed commissioner on the 9th? He got his reward very suddenly.

Mr. FRASER. Were these census commissioners permitted to take any part in elections, when travelling through the country at the expense of the Government to gain information?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no report as to whether they did or not at the department.

Mr. FRASER. Were the instructions from the Government that they should take no part, either in Dominion or local elections, while travelling in Government pay?

Mr. HAGGART. They had no such instructions.

Mr. FRASER. Such instructions ought to be given them when next appointed, because the commissioner of Nova Scotia did take a lively part in the local election in Antigonish. I think that is a matter the Government should call attention to.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General why these appointments of census commissioners were made during the election, and how it came there happened to have been a convention of them held at Ottawa, no doubt to receive instructions for their conduct during the campaign, and how it came that extreme partizans were appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. I was not aware that any partizans were appointed as commissioners. I thought they were a very efficient body.

Mr. MULOCK. How came it that they met in convention during the election campaign in Ottawa, if they were not intended to be used for political purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as the commissioners were appointed, and they were appointed at the proper time to enable them to get a knowledge of their duties, they were called to Ottawa, and were here for six or eight days, being constantly drilled so many hours a day in their duties by Mr. St. Denis and Mr. Johnson. I know this because the commissioner for New Brunswick, a friend of my own, was here at that time, and I know the number of hours he was engaged in that work every day. It is impossible that these men should perform their work properly without having the preliminary training, and whenever a census has been taken that system has been followed. That they happened to be here just before the election

was not because any new departure was made, but because the elections chanced to fall during that time.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume it was the same sort of coincidence as that which occurred in connection with the payment of the fishery bounties, when, on the eve of the general elections, great activity was manifested in that branch of the service. I think that the whole system of census appointments was made use of as a political lever during the campaign. These appointments were held out and made use of for the purposes of party gain in each locality. That, however, is but in keeping with the general practice of the Administration. Not the slightest public service will be allowed to be discharged unless with the object of helping to keep a dozen men in office. The Government are using the whole public patronage for the purpose of securing votes. You cannot look at any of the papers produced before any of the Committees without finding through them all the determination to sacrifice the public treasury for party purposes. Almost everything that comes from a department is tinged with that motive. You will find, Sir, running through all the documents and communications from outside people the expression: If I cannot take the contract somebody else who is a good Conservative can; and this small matter, as it may seem, of the appointments to the census has been made to do service in like manner. I have been looking through a number of papers during the last few weeks, and in all these papers and in all the transactions they relate to, the same feature is presented of the public resources being used for the sake of protecting the Cabinet.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask the Postmaster General who was appointed the commissioner in North Norfolk?

Mr. HAGGART. The Deputy Minister does not remember?

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. member knows very well.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course I do know. That was another case where the hon. gentleman, as in the case of the appointee in King's County, who he says was a friend of his—a political friend I suppose—appointed another political friend. I suppose all the appointments have been made in that way. I do not know that it is improper, but the appointee in North Norfolk was a candidate leading a forlorn hope in the local contest, and he received his reward by being appointed census commissioner. I believe he is a very decent gentleman, but that has been the course taken by hon. gentlemen throughout. Their appointments have been made more on the ground of political influence than on the ground of efficiency.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that gentleman unfit for his position?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not say that he was, but it is a singular coincidence that in all these cases, the appointments have been made of those who were active party workers, of those who had done or were in the future willing to do services for the party in consideration of their appointment. That has been the whole system of hon. gentlemen opposite, a system simply to advance their own interests. They have that in view on every occasion, from a contract for supplying a cord of wood up to the cross-wall in Quebec. They are wise in their day and generation, but such a condition of things is a proper subject for criticism in this House.

Mr. FRASER. As might be expected, the Government appointed their own friends. I do not find fault with that, but what I would find fault with is their promising to appoint too many. In one district in the county which I represent the old official was promised that he would get his office. He was a poor old man with only one leg, and of course he expected it, so he took the coach to come into Guysborough. He saw the notice that they were all to come into Guysborough on a certain day. A friend of mine was in the coach and the old man asked for a loan of $10. He said he was going to Guysborough to be instructed. Another man was on the coach, and they got into conversation, and it was discovered that my Silas Wegg and the other man were both going by the same coach to Guysborough to get their instructions for the same position. Both these men had received their promises in writing, but the poor old man who was lame had to return home. While it may be bad enough to give these positions to political friends, I would not expect anything else; but I think the Government should not be so profuse in their promises as to make two at the same time.

Establishment and maintenance of Experimental Farms..... $75,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before I commence what I have to say on this subject, I want it to be understood that, while I believe a considerable amount of benefit is derived by the farmers of the Dominion from the experiments carried on with respect to grains and feeding animals and all that, I desire to criticize this expenditure fairly and honestly. In the first place, I will go back and enquire what was the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, when he first asked the House to purchase a site for the Experimental Farm. On the 30th April, 1886, in answer to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he said:

"I think the total expenditure for the Central Farm will be something like $126,000."

It must be understood that I speak subject to correction. Some time ago I called for the amounts which had been expended up to July, but as far as I am aware they have not yet come down. The Minister went on:

"One in Nova Scotia, one in New Brunswick, one in Prince Edward Island, one in Manitoba, one in the North West Territories and one in British Columbia—each of these outside stations will be established at a cost of $25,000 each."

In answer to another question, if he had fully considered what the annual expenditure would be, the answer was:

"Yes; the estimated annual expenditure for the Central station and the other stations will be from $30,000 to $35,000."

Then, I find again in *Hansard*, page 1147, of the 7th May, 1886, the Minister said:

"The total cost for the Central station will be $120,000, that is for purchasing of the land, 400 or 500 acres, for fencing, for buildings, for horses, harness, implements, machinery, trees, shrubs, chemical apparatus and fittings, a propagating house, a house for the director, and houses for the officers, and contingencies."

So this included all.—

"Altogether, I estimate the total cost to complete the central station will be the sum named, that is, $120,000, and the annual cost will be from $12,000 to $15,000, supposing there are no returns from the farm."

I will turn to the sums which have been voted for these experimental farms and see whether the sum stated has not been already voted if not exceeded. In 1886-87 $91,543 was spent on account of purchase and improvements upon the central experimental farm at Ottawa. In 1887-88 there was an expenditure of $65,126. In 1888-89 these items, which previously had been given together, were separated into buildings and maintenance, and I find that that year the amount of $59,006 was spent on the buildings at the central farm and $42,308 for the rest, or in all $101,314. In 1888-90 there was expended for buildings $13,847 and $44,540 for establishment and maintenance, or $58,387 in all that year. So that, down to the 1st July, 1890, we find that the central experimental farm has cost in all $316,370. Now, when we come to calculate the running expenses for three years, we find them to be $42,000, according to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, before the farm was established. When we deduct that sum, we find it leaves $274,373 to be spent in establishing the central experimental farm, whereas the Minister stated that it would be established for $120,000. Why this increase of $154,373 spent in establishing that farm, after taking off $14,000 for annual running expenses? I think, Sir, it is time we should call a halt and have the Government give us some explanation of the changes they have made in their first plan of conducting that farm over and above the expenditure that the Minister stated to this House he would require to establish the farm. That extravagance is something that we cannot stand for any length of time. While I believe that a certain amount of benefit is derived from that farm, that benefit does not correspond with the enormous amount of money that has been spent upon it. Then we find in the other experimental stations that they were to be established for $25,000 each. I find on the Nappan farm there has been spent for buildings, $15,929, for establishing and maintenance, $35,812, or $51,742; whereas the farm was to be established for $25,000. On the farm at Indian Head there has been spent $23,575 for buildings, and $23,364 for establishing and maintenance, or $46,940, when we were told it would only cost $25,000. When we come to Brandon we find that the buildings cost $6,697, establishing and maintenance, $28,488, making a total of $35,185. Remember all this was spent before the 1st July, 1890, and I have not taken into account the estimates voted last year. Then we have in the estimates of last year $23,344.57 voted to the Agassiz farm. Besides, there was spent amongst all the farms for general purposes, $5,928. I find in the Public Accounts of last year three items in the Public Works Department amounting to $938, which makes the total sum expended up to the 1st July, 1890, $480,432 upon those farms. Then I find we paid out last year $110,500, so that $590,932 have been voted for the experimental farms since the year 1886, when the Minister made his statement with respect to the cost of these farms. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is time something was done, and although an experimental farm can never return revenue, it is certainly time that the expenditure was placed upon such a basis that we would have a regular annual vote, and we would not be required to spend every year such enormous additional sums of money. I was very much pleased, when we went out one day lately to examine that farm, to find that it was in very good order: but when I came back and added up the figures, and found that the sum of $4,172 was spent in purchasing manure to put on that farm, I asked myself, where is the farmer in this country who can afford to spend such large sums of money for labour and manure to put his farm in good condition? Sir, we find that only for ordinary farm work, and for the care of stock during the last year $5,677 have been spent, and that does not include several other items: it does not include the horticultural department, nor the botanical department, nor the care of the grounds and of the shrubbery, nor the clerical assistance in the office, all which items are omitted from that amount. Now, I hold it is time the Government should come forward and give some explanation to this House of the change they have adopted in the system of conducting this farm, and why have they made changes that involve such an enormous amount of expenditure. I understood at the time these farms were established that a deputation had gone to the other side and visited many of the experimental stations in the United States, and after coming back had formed a well-matured scheme, which was brought down to this House, when the Government asked for a certain sum of money, and made the statements that I have already read to this House. Now, I would like to know what changes have taken place, and what benefits are to be derived from them beyond what were promised in the original scheme. We know that a large amount of drainage has been done on that farm, and I have never been able, up to the present time, to get any statement of the amount of drains which were made upon that farm, nor their cost. But I find in the annual report of the experimental farm that last year a mile and a-quarter of drains were put in, at a cost, according to the financial statement, of $1,727. I drain largely and am pretty well acquainted with drainage. I have just figured this up to see what it would cost per rod to put these drains in. According to the statement of the department it has cost $4.31 a rod.

An hon. MEMBER. What size?

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot tell. But even if it was a six-inch drain in ordinary clay soil, it ought to be put in for something like $1 a rod, but where there is a three-inch tile two feet or three feet deep, in such soil as that, it ought to be done for 50 cents a rod. I drain largely upon my own farm, and I have kept an account of what it cost me, and I have put in a three-inch tile drain two feet and a half deep for 47 cents a rod, including the freight upon the tiles, the drawing of them to the farm, cutting the drains, putting in the tile, filling the drains, and boarding my men, and that is all that the drain cost me. Where I have put in a six-inch tile three feet deep it has cost something like $1 per rod. Now, I would like to have an explanation of the reasons why those drains have cost so much? I would like, also, to ask whether the work was performed by day's work, or whether the work was let by contract? Let me say that in my experience, where a farmer is going to drain largely, it pays

him better to let the digging of his drain at so much per rod, while he himself sees to putting in the tile, and covering it. That is the manner in which I conduct my own farm. Now, the first question I will put, is in reference to an item of $725 which appears on page C—8 of the Auditor General's Report, for superintending heating apparatus and coal. Will the Minister explain that?

Mr. HAGGART. The coal referred to is used for the office, and for some apparatus for seed testing.

Mr. McMILLAN. Why was this item not charged to the regular expenditure of the farm? And why does it appear under the head of Public Works Department?

Mr. HAGGART. The coal is furnished by the Public Works Department.

Mr. McMILLAN. If such amounts appear under different headings, it is impossible to tell the total sum spent annually on the farm. It is a part of the annual expenditure and should so appear in the accounts.

Mr. HAGGART. The two items of heating and lighting are furnished by the Public Works Department, as is the case with all public buildings.

Mr. McMILLAN. I find also a similar item in connection with the Brandon farm, the amount being $55. I hold it is a wrong system to charge amounts to the Public Works Department which really form part of the annual expenditure of the farm.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly the same thing takes place in connection with other services. Take the post office. By the hon. gentleman's reasoning all the supplies of wood and coal should be debited to the post office, but the items of heating and lighting belong to the Public Works Department. It is so with all the buildings of the public service. It is in one sense a charge made necessary because of a certain branch of the public service, but heating and lighting is under a separate vote and belongs to the Public Works Department. That is the reason why the Auditor General included it under that head.

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General would not have passed these accounts if charged against the farm. They had to pass through the Public Works Department and to be charged in the usual way.

Mr. McMILLAN. I hold, as a farmer, that wherever a farm is established the necessary annual expenditure thereon should be debited to the farm. I am convinced the farmers will not be satisfied if money spent on the farm annually is not included in the regular expenditure of the farm. How does it come about that such a large expenditure has been made to establish the farm, seeing that the Minister said in 1886 that it would only cost $120,000, whereas it has now cost $274,000?

Mr. HAGGART. The expenditure on capital account for the central farm and all the farms, one in each in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, North-West Territories and Manitoba, was $480,000. A return of the exact expenditure is now being prepared, in answer to an Order of the House. The amount stated by the hon. gentleman is nearly correct; but he has not deducted sufficient for annual expenses. The actual amount of capital account is nearly $480,000, or about the same amount as the capital account of the Guelph farm in Ontario. The reason of the increased expenditure over the stated expenditure of the Minister was that there were other lines entered into and other experiments made which were not contemplated at the time.

Mr. McMILLAN. The statement was made that the whole farms could be established for $340,000. I have deducted $140,000 for annual running expenses, and for the first year it did not cost that sum.

Mr. HAGGART. I believe the farms have cost more than was contemplated at the time, on account of experiments being conducted on a larger scale and other lines being entered into beyond those contemplated at the time by the Minister.

Mr. McMILLAN. The cost should have been even less, as implements have come down and were even lower than at the time the statement was made. Farm stock was also lower. Next, in regard to drains, how is it that those drains have cost so much?

Mr. HAGGART. The cost depends on the soil through which they pass. If rock, it has to be blasted and the expense is considerably increased. I understand from the gentleman in charge that 3-inch drains can be laid for from 40 to 55 cents, and 8-inch drains for 75 cents per rod. The expense, I believe, was largely increased beyond the estimate, on account of having to blast through rock.

Mr. McMILLAN. There is no subject on which the farmers of Ontario require more information than on draining. We should have had the cost per rod of all descriptions of drains put in, and a description of the soils and materials cut through and the cost of each.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman can have the cost per rod on the different soils. The head of the farm has kept an account of the actual expenditure.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire an explanation of the item "J. A. Chicoign, lecturing, ten months, $1,000?

Mr. HAGGART. He was employed in the Province of Quebec, for the reason that they had no instructor here who could speak French.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see another item here of $93.69 for expenses of T. A. Sharpe in travelling. What did he purchase at the time he was travelling?

Mr. HAGGART. He is superintendent of the agricultural farm at British Columbia, and he came to Ontario to buy stock for the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see an item here for $367 for John Brennan, teamster, who worked 354 days, and another item for George Davy, teamster, who worked 346 days. How do these men come to work so many days in the year?

Mr. HAGGART. They have to work on Sunday.

Mr. McMILLAN. A teamster does not attend to cattle when they have a special man for that purpose. These men could not be all working on Sunday.

Mr. HAGGART. The superintendent says the men worked on Sundays. One of them drives on Sunday the same as on a week day.

Mr. McMILLIAN. Are they hired by the month or by the day?

Mr. HAGGART. They are paid by the week—$8 a week in summer, $6 a week in winter.

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say here, with respect to the farm at Guelph, that all the hands employed on a farm should work their regular hours except in harvest or spring, and they should only be worked extra when there is an actual necessity for it. This farm should be carried on on the same principles that every judicious farmer carries on his own farm, and there should be no extra time and working late when they are drawing hay or in harvest. These men have not to go out when it is rainy weather. On a farm like this, the hands ought to be hired by the year and not by the day, so that you have their services all the time. How many foremen on the farm altogether?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a stable foreman, a farm foreman, and foreman of the horticultural department.

Mr. McMILLAN. If that is all the foremen you have, I do not find any fault with it. I find here that you paid $203.39 for painting implements. It may be a small item, but it would be very large if it were on a private farm for one year. Are these all implements belonging to the farm?

Mr. HAGGART. Every implement on the farm is painted each year. A painter was hired by the day and the paint bought for him. It costs at least $200 to do that.

Mr. McMILLAN. I run a farm of 450 acres and my implements are painted every year, but they are painted on wet days when the men that work the teams cannot do anything else. If this farm were worked on economic principles the same thing should be done here. I see here an item of $338 for car hire, and I understand that a team runs twice a day for parties wishing to visit that farm. Every year that I have talked about this farm, I have had the experimental farm at Guelph thrown in my face, and I thought I would go to that farm this year. I found that something like $30 was spent on the Guelph farm for car hire this year, and with the exception of $5 or $6 of that amount, the remainder was spent in taking out the Tenant Farmer Delegates when they visited this country. Seeing that a rig runs twice a day, I would like an explanation of how so much money is spent.

Mr. HAGGART. The cab-hire was for the Minister himself, and as you all know he takes out a lot of visitors almost every day to see the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN. I find that you paid $350 each for Holsteins. I have been paying considerable attention to the sale of first-class animals in the old country, and I saw within a few months first-class animals sold for something like £50 there. However, perhaps they could not be got much cheaper in this country. I see $297 for freight on cattle and expenses, and $20.29 charged for delivery of cattle.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the high price that the hon. gentleman thinks was paid for cattle, I am informed that they are from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper than they could possibly be got by the hon. gentleman himself. They were given at that reduced price for the purpose of having them placed on the experimental farm. The freight was for the whole lot of animals at different times which were brought to the farm and the Auditor General has put them all in one amount.

Mr. McMILLAN. I find that $409.78 was paid to a brewing company for loss in testing Scotch barley.

Mr. HAGGART. It was a loss caused by instructions which were given by the Minister to those brewers to purchase a certain amount of Scotch barley in order to test it for purposes of comparison with the six-rowed Canadian barley. The Canadian duty on it I believe was over $100. The amount was 500 bushels.

Mr. McMILLAN. There is a charge here for teaming drain tiles. It is only $18; but upon a well-conducted farm, that is something that ought to be done at a season when the teams are not otherwise engaged. On a farm where there are so many teams as there are on that farm, there should not be an item of this kind; and we believe that this farm should be conducted on economical business principles all through, and stand as an example. On the Nappan farm there is a charge for eighteen steers, costing $557. I see among the returns from the farm a small sum from sales. Every farm ought to give an account of the animals bought, the amount of feed they consume, and the prices realized for them, so that we might know whether it was making money or losing in these purchases. That is something that would be beneficial to the farmers of the locality where these cattle are bought, because it would enable them to test the system of feeding pursued.

Mr. HAGGART. These are the same kind of cattle as were on the central experimental farm. The returns from them were sent into the Receiver General, but the Auditor General does not publish the details of the amounts received. If they are wanted, they can be got from the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN. On each farm, when animals are purchased, I think it would be well to state their cost, their age when purchased, the cost of feed, their weight when they are sold, and the prices realized. These are points of information which would be valuable to the farmers of each locality. I see that on the Agassiz farm in British Columbia, the labourer was paid $356 for 173 days. For a labourer, that is a very large sum. How does it come that he gets so much more than the other labourers?

Mr. HAGGART. Labourers command higher wages in British Columbia. They have to be paid $1.75 per day, and sometimes in harvest time from $2 to $2.25.

Mr. MARA. I may say that if the managers of the experimental farm got labourers last year for $1.75 per day, they did better than ordinary farmers. The general rate is higher than that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may be permitted to say a word in regard to this matter. I have not the slightest doubt that the gentleman in charge of the experimental farm and the Government are putting forth their best effort to benefit the agricultural interest; but I am afraid that the sum added annually on capital account to the cost of this farm is a little in excess of what it should be. Now, that

most of the buildings are built that will be required, I think great care should be taken by the Government to see that the expenditure is kept down. I understand that there is a portion of the farm that may require draining, but that should be done as economically as possible. While I think that this side of the House would be quite ready to encourage every reasonable experiment on this farm for the benefit of the farming community generally, at the same time it is their duty to see that money is not squandered or extravagantly expended. The remarks made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) come from a person who is perfectly cognizant of all the necessary expenses connected with the management of an institution of this kind. Being a practical farmer, he is able to speak from a practical standpoint. I notice by the estimates that there is a considerable increase in the vote, some $15,000 more being asked this year. Now, I am pleased to notice the experiments made on that farm; I have been out there and had a look over it; I think the general manager is making an honest effort in the interest of the farming community; but at the same time I think it is quite in place that we should strongly urge that the expenses should be kept within reasonable limits, and that we may not be called upon year after year to add largely to capital account, and thus swell up the amount that will be sunk in that institution. If hon. gentlemen keep on asking the House from year to year to grant largely increased sums, I am very much afraid that we may make another Langevin block or cross-wall, or a dredging contract of this. We do not want anything of this kind in connection with the experimental farm. We want it conducted in such a way that we shall not need to bring its secrets before an investigation in a committee room upstairs, which will be unpleasant for us and unpleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. Minister who is now representing the department is, I suppose, only there temporarily; but if he expects to answer for it in future, he will undoubtedly require to post himself in regard to it better than he is now, if he is going to meet all the questions put by my hon. friend from South Huron. While we are all anxious that the experiments conducted may be turned to good account in the interest of the farming community, we are equally anxious that no squandering of money or unnecessary expenditure should be permitted to take place in connection with that institution, so that we may not wake up at some future time to find that an enormous sum of money has been buried there without the country deriving an adequate benefit from it.

Mr. MARA. There is a good deal of dissatisfaction in British Columbia owing to the slow progress made on the experimental farm in that province. The returns which I moved for in the early part of the session have not been brought down, so that I am unable to ascertain what has been paid on capital account on each farm. But there is a feeling in our province that moneys which have been voted for our farm have been expended on other farms. I know there are some excuses for the delays that have occurred, but I hope to have the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture that the works will be prosecuted with vigour and that the sum voted will be expended.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that a Mr. Borthwick purchased from the Ottawa farm stuff to the amount of $626. What stuff was contained in that, and who is Mr. Borthwick?

Mr. HAGGART. It was strawberries and raspberries that were sold to him. In answer to the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, the amount expended on the experimental farm in British Columbia is about the same as that expended in each of the different provinces.

Mr. MARA. The buildings have not yet been erected, although the money was voted three or four years ago.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not in this vote. I believe we will take a vote for that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How comes it that Mr. Borthwick gets all the berries? I understand a number of the other dealers complain that he is a favoured man. Are tenders asked for?

Mr. HAGGART. The first year tenders were called for, and his was the highest. The next year there was not much demand, and he was the only one who offered. This year tenders were asked, and I believe he was the highest.

Mr. DALY. I wish to express my views in connection with these experimental farms. I take it that the criticisms extended by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) were made in perfect honesty and candour. That hon. gentleman has been a very successful farmer, and I am sure he is only desirous that these farms, established in his interest, and that of the other farmers throughout the Dominion, should be a success. I have not heard from the hon. gentleman that he believes they are carried on in an extravagant manner. From my personal experience, I am perfectly satisfied that the farms at Brandon, at Indian Head, and also at British Columbia, are most carefully and economically conducted. In fact it is a matter of remark to every person who visits the farm at Brandon that the manager could not conduct it more carefully and economically if it belonged to himself. I would like to direct the attention of this House and the country to what the Government have been doing in this matter. We have but to refer to the reports contained in the blue-book printed this session, in which you will see what is being done on the several farms. Our friends opposite are fond of talking about the poor farmer; but, strange to say, this item to be voted now, the total amount of which is $105,000, meets with extended criticism and objection on their part. I do not know whether the criticism of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been adverse to the vote or not; but it seems to me an extraordinary thing that when the Government have been making every effort to benefit the farmers by means of these experimental farms, these hon. gentlemen should continue, year after year, to criticize adversely the course taken by the Government. To such an extent have they carried their objections that this vote last year excited one of the longest debates we had. They appear to overlook the fact that these farms have only been established during the past few years, that the expenditure thereon has been an extraordinary one, mainly on capital account, and differs entirely from the expenditure which the hon. member for Huron and others would make in matters of this

kind. The hon. gentleman has told us that he owns a farm of four hundred acres, and I am aware that his farm is not surpassed by any in the portion of Ontario from where he comes; but it has been built by the industry of himself and his family during thirty or forty years, and the expenditure on capital account is the result of the savings during these years. But the expenditure on capital account on the Government farms has been made during a few years; and I defy any hon. gentleman opposite from Ontario to come forward and say that the expenditures on the farm at Ottawa or on the other experimental farms have not been made as economically as they possibly could be. I can assure you, Sir, that the farm at Brandon is recognized by the farmers of Manitoba to-day as one of the greatest boons granted them by this or any other Government. Sir, it is a matter of common occurrence to have from fifty to sixty visitors every day at that farm. People come long distances from every part of the province, and special rates are given over the trains to those who so desire to visit it. Frequently picnics are organized in the region of the farm, so that people may visit it, and benefit by the experience they thereby acquire. Let me refer briefly to the report of Mr. Bedford, the superintendent of that farm, with reference to the question of wheat. He says:

"Sixty varieties were sown in large plots on the experimental farm this year, thirty varieties on the higher portion of the farm, and 30 acres in the valley. The stronger lands of the valley averaged the largest yields, but the uplands gave the best samples; very little, if any, of the grain from the higher land was injured by the frost of 22nd and 23rd August, but its effects were plainly seen on the late varieties in the valley. A very striking difference was shown in its effects on different varieties of wheat maturing at the same time, the close and heavy chaffed varieties appear the least liable to injury from this cause. White fife and white connel are striking examples of this, for although neither of these varieties were much earlier than the red fife, the samples were much better.

"Tests were made of cutting wheat at different stages of ripeness, but owing to the exceptionally cloudy and wet weather prevailing during harvest, the tests were not reliable for average years."

From that quotation alone any person conversant with farming in Manitoba or the North-West will see that, in the working of these wheat tests, that farm is doing something that will be of infinite value to the farmers. Coming to the next item, which is the most important one, the question of fodder, it has been a matter of difficulty on the part of the farmers in Manitoba and the North-West, to provide every year, season in and out, whether it be dry or wet weather, fodder for their cattle. The natural grasses of the prairie give the richest possible fodder which cattle can live upon. Unfortunately, we have had dry seasons there, and in these years when farmers have not had the advantage of hay lands on their farms and have sown timothy and other grasses, they have not had the results from those grasses they would like to have. One of the experiments at the farms at Brandon and Indian Head was to find the natural grasses that would give the very best results in the feeding of cattle. Now, I find from the report of Mr. Bedford, that, in relation to the cultivation of grasses, he says:

"Of the 12 varieties of cultivated grasses sown in 1889, only the following survived the winter: Tall, Hard and Meadow Fescues, Timothy and Kentucky blue grass. The Fescues made very little growth, and were only fit for pasture. The Timothy yielded about 1½ tons per acre. The Kentucky Blue grass was very thin in spring, but thickened out during summer and remained quite green until late in November. This is a very promising pasture grass. Of the clovers sown in 1889, Common Red and Lucerne, being somewhat sheltered, survived the winter and gave two cuttings, but the plots were too small for accurate returns to be obtained."

In reference to this question of clover, I may say that up to the time of the experiments which were made on the farm in Brandon, no farmer in Manitoba believed that we could successfully grow red clover or Lucerne in the province, but this shows that the farmer may be able to grow grasses of that kind in our country. Mr. Bedford says:

"In May of this year, twelve varieties of grass and nine varieties of clover were sown with spring wheat: all germinated readily and were looking thrifty when winter set in."

Now, as to native grasses, and it is to this particularly that I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen, he says:

"I have pleasure in reporting continued success with the cultivation of native grasses. The six varieties mentioned in my last report as having been grown successfully in 1889, survived the past winter, and have given a fair yield of fodder. All were permitted to ripen their seed. We were, therefore, unable to test their value for feed. A considerable quantity of seed of these varieties has been secured, which will be sown next spring. During the past season, several additional varieties have been sown, some of which are promising. Below will be found the names, height and estimated yield this year of the seven varieties of native grasses sown in 1889. One variety (*Agropyrum tenerum*) was omitted in my last report, but is included in this."

I will not burden the House by giving the technical names, but I will ask hon. gentlemen to look at the report, and they will see the results in regard to the height and the estimated yield in tons, and this will show that the question, which has been a serious one for the farmer in Manitoba, of having a proper grass for his cattle, has been satisfactorily settled by the experimental farm at Brandon, so that our farmers need not wait for timothy or other grasses, but can get grasses growing on the prairies which will yield, as has been shown, to the extent of two or three tons to the acre. Another question is that of fodder corn. I am glad to say that by the experiments which were made last year on the Brandon farm, it has been established beyond a doubt that we can raise fodder corn in our province as successfully as it is raised in Ontario, and giving, I am glad to say, a better yield. Mr. Bedford says:

"Thirty-two varieties of fodder corn were grown on the farm during the past season. The seed was sown on 31st May, with a common wheat drill, in rows three feet apart, and the plants thinned out to about six inches apart in the rows. Weeds were kept down with the horse cultivator. The season being favourable, the growth was very rapid and the yield large. All the varieties were cut on 29th August. It was then cured in stocks of about 600 lbs. (green weight). The cured fodder was readily eaten by both horses and cattle."

Among these varieties was the thoroughbred white flint, which was sown on the 31st May, came up on the 13th June, and yielded 46 tons 400 pounds to the acre in tassel. That is to be found on page 254. It is certainly an extraordinary yield, but hon. gentlemen will see from that, that Manitoba cannot give way to any province in the Dominion, or any state in the Union, as far as production of fodder corn is concerned. Then as to the question of forest trees and shrubs. We find from Mr. Bedford's report, the following very interesting statement, and it is very important to the farmers in Manitoba and the North-West that they should be able to surround their homesteads with trees,

and to beautify their grounds with shrubs, and so enjoy the same privileges in this respect as those which are enjoyed in the older provinces. We find this in his report :

"During 1889 nearly 12,000 forest trees and shrubs were planted on the farm: the greater portion of these were used in planting a windbreak on the west boundary. Owing to the drought of the summer of 1889, followed by a severe winter, 7,378, or over 60 per cent., of these have died. During the present year, 21,271 trees, &c., were received from the central farm, Ottawa, and from Nebraska; of these, 2,224 have died. The loss, however, of about 1,400 of these was, no doubt, attributable to heating in transit, leaving a loss of only 783 trees, or less than 4 per cent., chargeable to the climate.

"The trees planted in the shelter belt, on the west boundary of the farm, in 1889, were placed 9 feet apart; this year an additional tree has been placed between these, making them 4 feet 6 inches apart, and 738 yards of additional belt, 50 feet wide, has been planted. A large proportion of the trees used in the belts this year were native varieties raised from seed on the farm, and are likely to prove hardy. On this farm the following varieties of trees are found to succeed best :—native ash-leaf maple, native ash, American elm (from native seed), Russian poplars and willows, cottonwoods (northern grown), alders, birch and white spruce.

"Of shrubs, the following have done well :—Asiatic maple, caragana arborescens, flowering currant, cytisus capitatus, lilac's spiraea opulifolia, bilardi and nobleana."

Now, in reference to what Mr. Bedford has stated here, there is sufficient evidence for anyone who looks at it from the proper standpoint, to show that from the experiments in regard to trees and shrubs which have been made by the farm at Brandon and the farm at Indian Head, those experiments have indicated to the farmers of Manitoba, who are most interested in this matter, that they can grow certain varieties of trees, and anyone who knows the matter and, as my hon. friends opposite have done, have farmed, will know that in the summer season, when everything is in the rush with the farmer in Manitoba, he has not the time, even if he had the means, to experiment upon these matters, and I say that in the matters to which I have referred, in wheat, in grasses, in trees, the experimental farm in Brandon has fully paid its cost in the past, and for many years to come, in giving the information to the people which it has supplied. There is another matter to which I might refer, of which Mr. Bedford speaks under the head of "Visitors to the Farm :"

"I take pleasure in reporting a rapidly-increasing interest in the work of the experimental farm, as evidenced by the large and increasing number of visitors during the summer months.

"Since the completion of the different railroads centreing in Brandon, the advantage of this location as a site for the experimental farm is very apparent. It is within easy reach of farmers living within all portions of the province, and the system inaugurated last year by the different railroad companies, of granting reduced fares on special days, enables all to visit the farm at very little expense.

"In July the county council of the municipality of Cornwallis visited the farm in a body, and at their next meeting passed a resolution strongly endorsing the work of the farm, and advising all in their municipality to visit it.

"The British delegates, with their friends, paid a visit to the farm in September. As the harvest was about over, and there was no opportunity of examining the growing crops, samples of the produce of the farm were displayed in the new barn. All expressed a deep interest in the work of the farm generally, but particularly in those experiments connected with the culture of grasses, roots and fodder plants."

Now, another matter that will show the amount of work done upon that farm, is the correspondence. Mr. Bedford says :

"The correspondence between the farmers of the province and the experimental farm is rapidly increasing. In 1889, 467 letters were received : 1890, 842, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent. Many of these letters are of such a nature as to occupy considerable time in answering. The correspondence and the book-keeping connected with the farm has so far been carried on by the superintendent."

Then there is another benefit that the farmers have derived from this farm, and that is the distribution of seed grain. In reference to that matter, Mr. Bedford says :

"During the early spring of the past year a number of farmers throughout the province were supplied with promising varieties of seed grain grown on the farm, the amounts sent to each applicant varying from 3 lbs. to 2 bushels, quantities of 1 bushel or more being charged for at market rates. The reports so far as received from these farmers are such as to lead us to hope that the farm will prove very useful in distributing throughout the province new and improved varieties of seed grain.

"The quantity available for distribution this year is much larger, but judging from the number of applications already received, all will be applied for."

Then another matter which has been a benefit to the farmers at large is the exhibits made at the different fairs. On this point Mr. Bedford says :

"Some of the products of the farm were exhibited at the following summer and fall fairs :—Brandon, Pilot Mound, Deloraine and Killarney.

"Samples were also sent to the Manitoba Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and were exhibited by them throughout the Eastern Provinces. The exhibit from the farm shown at the International Exhibition, St. John's, N.B., by the Manitoba Government was awarded a diploma for the best collection of farm produce."

Then another matter is the establishment and carrying on of the various institutes, concerning which Mr. Bedford says :

"During the present winter an excellent Farmers' Institute has been formed at Brandon, the meetings are well attended and much interest shown in the subjects under discussion. Other institutes are being organized throughout the province and will no doubt be productive of much good.

"Papers on the following subjects were read by me at the Brandon Farmers' Institute: 'Notes on some of the varieties of wheat tested on the Experimental Farm,' and 'The selection, treatment and method of sowing grain.'

"I attended a very interesting meeting of the Manitoba Dairymen's Association held at Portage la Prairie on January 15th and 16th, at which the following papers were read: 'Canadian Dairying,' by Senator Boulton; 'Dairying in Manitoba,' by Professor Barre: 'Grasses and Forage Plants suitable for Manitoba,' by S. A. Bedford, Superintendent of the Manitoba Experimental Farm.

"Interest in dairying and mixed farming is increasing throughout the Province, and many enquiries are received regarding the work to be undertaken in this line by the experimental farm."

Sir, I apologize to the House for having spoken at such length, but I am endeavouring to establish by these extracts from Mr. Bedford's report, that the work he is doing and the work that has been done by the central experimental farm at Ottawa, and by the farms at Brandon and other places, is bearing fruit a hundred fold, and I say that the Government did a wise thing in creating these farms, and no greater boon has ever been conferred upon the farmers in every province in this Dominion, than has been conferred by the establishment of those farms. I have proved from the report of Mr. Bedford alone that in the Province of Manitoba the farmers have received an incalculable benefit from that farm, and I am satisfied, from my knowledge of the manner in which Mr. Bedford has managed that farm, that it has been managed as economically and at as small a cost as possible. In this connection it would seem to me, from what I have seen of that farm and from what

practical farmers have told me who visited that farm, that it is only right that the Government should recognize Mr. Bedford's efforts in this connection, and his good management of that farm, by increasing that gentleman's salary, and giving him more assistance than he has at present. I will say in conclusion, that I do not think the Government of this Dominion have ever made an expenditure from which the farmers of this country will reap a greater benefit than from the expenditure they have made upon the Central Experimental Farm, and upon these other farms throughout Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to the hon. gentleman I wish to say that if he understood me as being opposed to the expenditures on these farms, he misunderstood me. I am quite willing to encourage experiments in the interests of agriculturists of the country, and I give the Government credit for the honest effort they have made in that direction, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be still more successful. At the same time, I repeat that I hope such an economy will be practised in the future as will prevent the necessity of coming down yearly and asking for additional expenditures. I would like to ask the Minister if he can tell me the name of the person who did the painting.

Mr. HAGGART. We hire a painter by the day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who did the painting last year?

Mr. HAGGART. The farm foreman hires the painter. We do not remember the name.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was out at the farm the other day and went over it, and I want to say that I saw some very fine varieties of grain, which, if spread among the farmers through the country, will be a great benefit to them. I see that $444 worth of grain was sold on the Indian Head farm last year, and I would like to ask if this grain was sold for seed purposes, and what system was adopted in selling it, and at what price it was sold?

Mr. HAGGART. The usual system adopted is to charge five to ten cents a bushel above market price so as to place the grain at the disposal of the farmers.

Mr. McMILLAN. There is not an unlimited quantity of grain, and I have not the least doubt that there will be a large number of applications. I will suggest that no grain be distributed until a certain time during the winter, and that the public should be notified that the grain is for sale; that no farmer will be allowed to get too much, and that he shall not get over a certain amount, according to the applications that are put in, and thereby the benefits will be spread among a larger number of farmers. I would like some explanations on one or two other items. I find at the Indian Head farm that $44.80 were received from an agricultural society. I hope the Government is not purchasing blooded stock and carrying it up to that country, and showing it against the farmers, and carrying off the prizes. I think that would be an unwarrantable proceeding. I find this item on page E—110, the first item of revenue from the Indian Head farm.

Mr. HAGGART. That is grain, I am informed, sold by the agricultural societies.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is all right. I thought if that sum came from the source I supposed, it would be a very improper proceeding.

Mr. HAGGART. It has never been done.

Mr. McMILLAN. Very well, I believe the central farm, if conducted properly, will be a great benefit to the farmers, especially in the experiments with grain. I was very much pleased the other day in examining the different varieties of grain, and ascertaining the experiments that are being made, which I think will be a great benefit to the farmers. But the farm now has a good stock of cattle, it has a good stock of implements, and everything else, and the expenditure should be brought down to a regular basis. I would like to ask to what purpose the appropriation that is asked for this year is to be put?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not got information with regard to the buildings, for the particulars will appear under Public Works appropriation. I can give the general expenditure for this year, the total amount of which is $39,200. About $6,500 is for distributing literature. A considerable amount is for harness, &c.; then there are amounts for salaries, drainage, feed, repairs and other items. There are wages, $4,500; care of stock, $1,500; horticultural department, $1,500; botanical department, $500, and others items. With respect to the distribution of grain, I may say that the managers of the farm are very careful in that regard. About 17 or 18 tons were distributed in small parcels through the post, and where there was much demand the utmost sold to any one individual was two bushels.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the farm should cease spending money on purchase of manure. If the farm is to be of practical benefit to Ontario farmers, if large sums are to be paid for purchasing manure, besides all that is raised on the farm, then the farm can afford no guide to the practical farmer. In case they sold a large amount of seed grain a certain quantity of manure might be purchased. It must always be remembered that the ordinary farmer cannot obtain more manure than is made on his own farm. That would be in the line of the most advanced farm in the Province of Ontario, and unless the manure question on the farm is conducted on the system I have indicated, the farmers of the province will not be benefited. I desire now to call attention to a matter which is rather a disagreeable one to myself. I called in the early part of the session for a statement of the conditions under which entire horses were stationed at the experimental farm. I was told if I wanted that statement that I should have to ask it by order of the House. I did so, and the correspondence has been brought down. I was very much astonished when I read it. I have not been so much surprised at anything which has come under my attention for a long time. The best plan to adopt in regard to it is to read a part of it to the House. The first letter sent to the Minister of Agriculture is as follows:—

"The Honourable JOHN CARLING,
"Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

"SIR,—The Haras National Company has had the honour of your visit accompanied by Professors Saunders and Robertson; you have visited our establishment in detail, you have ascertained what we have done, what kind of horses we have imported and if those horses are likely to improve our breeds in Canada; you must have left with the impression that a large capital has been spent

in the purchase of those valuable animals as well as in the erection of spacious and comfortable quarters.

"If you have visited the large stud establishments of the Government in France which have been so effective in creating, improving and maintaining the famous breed of horses of that country, and making them the principal item of exportation of agricultural products, you must have remarked that we are following closely in the footsteps of the motherland of a great many amongst us. We have a Haras now in Canada, if not as numerously stocked as those of France, at all events head for head as well selected.

"For this section the Haras company has relied on the very men who for years and years have been connected with the administration of these Government studs in France and who have also had the direction of the largest and most important agricultural societies of that country. *La société des Agriculteurs de France.* The names of the Baron E. de Mandat-Grancy and of the Baron de St. Preuve, the former, president of our French section and the latter a large shareholder and our purchaser, are in themselves a guarantee that our importation will continue to be made with science and care.

"Allow us to remind you of the flattering remarks to our address, of His Excellency the Governor General, the Honourable the Secretary of State, Hon. Senator Cochrane, and others who with a number of members of the Senate and House of Commons visited our establishment last spring.

"In order that the country might benefit at once and more largely by our first class establishment, and in order also that we should receive the encouragement we deserve and which will secure to Canada large French capital as well as skill now at our disposal, it is proposed that you should kindly favour us in the same manner as we have been favoured by the legislature of the Province of Quebec and thereby extend still more to the Province of Quebec, where there is at present no experimental farm, the beneficial influence of your agricultural experiments already so much welcome by all.

"Should our demand excite envy or jealousy in certain quarters we would humbly suggest as an answer that few, if any, in the Dominion, will venture in our footsteps by the expenditure of an equal capital be put in a position to solicit equal favours.

"We will put at the disposal of your department, to be transferred to the Government farm or anywhere else you may direct, every spring, during six years and for the period of the season, six stallions, selected by you in our stables, for the sum of $6,000 per annum. The horses to be brought back after the season and to remain all the time at our risk; in case of death, the horses to be replaced.

"You may rest assured that we will always keep our establishment in as good a footing as at present, improving it whenever possible, so that, in the eyes of all, it will deserve the public support received and be a credit to the country.

"Should our proposal be agreeable to you, will you be kind enough to inform us at your early convenience, as we must make preparations at once for the coming season.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) "LOUIS BEAUBIEN,
"President, Haras National Company.
"MONTREAL, 30th January, 1891."

I will read a paragraph in another part of the correspondence to show the conditions. It is as follows:—

"To provide each season six thoroughbred stallions for the improvement of stock in the rural districts, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture and to the places mentioned by it; each mating not to cost more than $4; each horse to be taken at the places stated by an employé of the owners, at their expense, which horse will be kept and fed by the owners, and will remain all the time at their risk."

The correspondence embraced here is a correspondence which passed between the Haras Company of Montreal and Premier Mercier, the company having sent a certain number of entire horses to the Province of Quebec under the same conditions as are proposed, and it appears that this document must have been sent to the Minister of Agriculture in order to influence him to enter into a similar arrangement for the Province of Ontario. Now, I will read another letter:

"OTTAWA, 10th February, 1891.

"Honourable L. BEAUBIEN,
"President, Haras National Company, Montreal.

"DEAR SIR,—In answer to your letter of the 30th January last, addressed to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, submitting a proposal of your company to place six of its horses at the disposal of the Government for the use of the different experimental farms and asking for an early reply, stating you have to prepare at once for an early spring; the terms of the agreement your company proposes being the same as those agreed to by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec for the same number of horses, also by the County of Hochelaga Agricultural Society for last summer's season, I am directed to state that the Department of Agriculture will accept your offer subject to such conditions as the Minister of Agriculture may make. If this answer is satisfactory, by your informing the department that it is so, you may make the necessary preparations for the coming season. You will be informed in time when and by whom the selection of the horses will be made and how directed to the several experimental farms or elsewhere at the option of the department.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant.
(Sgd.) "H. B. SMALL,
"Secretary, Department of Agriculture."

I may say that the selection was made by Professor Hodgins and Mr. T. G. Hodgins, of London. Another letter is as follows:—

"MONTREAL, 11th May, 1891.

"DEAR SIR,—I was very glad to-day at receiving a letter from Professor Saunders, in which he says he is well satisfied with the choice he made of our horses, I am sure they will be a credit to you wherever they go, more especially the two going to Ottawa."

So it appears the two for Ottawa are the best of the lot—

"I shall tell our man to parade them now and then, about three in the afternoon around the parliamentary buildings, where the representatives of our country may see them and carry their fame to distant lands."

I am only sorry, Mr. Chairman, that we have never had the honour of a visit from these horses being paraded around the Parliament buildings—

"Those two horses are perfect beauties, you won't hear a word said against them. I have received my enclosures returned by you, and your letter in which you say our contract with your department is for five years. Although my letter of the 30th January last stated that the horses were offered for six years, and the letter of your department signed by Mr. Small, dated 10th February, said that the company's offer was accepted, the details of course to be settled by you, and to be similar to those of the Quebec arrangement, yet I am perfectly satisfied that the terms of agreement shall be for five years instead of six as above mentioned.

"The contract, therefore, is to be understood for five years, and I am not at all uneasy about this question when the time comes. I am very confident that we will have then given satisfaction to those honouring us with their patronage.

"When I next go to Ottawa, I will make it my duty to present you personally my respects.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your most obedient servant,
(Sgd.) "LOUIS BEAUBIEN,
"President, Haras National Company.

"The Hon. JOHN CARLING,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

"OTTAWA, 20th May, 1891.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Minister of Agriculture to acknowledge your letter of the 11th instant, stating that you are perfectly satisfied the terms of agreement shall be five years instead of six, and that the contract is to be so understood.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) "H. B. SMALL,
"Secretary, Department of Agriculture.

"The Hon. LOUIS BEAUBIEN,
"President, Haras National Co., Montreal."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Government has to pay $1,000 per annum for each horse; two to be stationed at the experimental farm at Otttwa, two at Brandon, one to be stationed at the experimental farm at Indian Head and another at the Nappan experimental farm in the Maritime Provinces. Those six horses are each to get a bounty of $1,000 a year or in all $30,000 is to be given to these six horses for coming to these stations for five years. This $1,000 is for each horse and the company are to let the horse serve for the sum of $4 each mating; that is each time that a service is rendered the sum of $4 is to be paid to the groom, the money going to the company besides the $1,000. Now, I have gone out to the Experimental Farm and seen these horses. I have examined them very closely, and I have ascertained how they have been appreciated by the farmers around the experimental farm. I have learned that the Percheron has served forty-four mares, and the other horse has served fifty mares, a small number indeed when we consider the small amount that is charged for a single service. I believe it is the duty of the Government to encourage improvement in every direction in agriculture and in breeding, but wherever private enterprise in any part of the Dominion of Canada has taken any question up, and has filled the bill as far as any class of animals is concerned, it is certainly not the duty of the Government to interfere with private interests, which I contend has been done in this case. I have put myself to a little trouble to ascertain the facts, and I find that there are over twenty registered entire heavy draught horses situated within a radius of ten miles of the experimental farm, and they are horses in every way superior to the heavy draught horse there. That animal is a Percheron, and let me say that every country and every part of a country adapts itself to animals best suited to the wants and interests of the farmers of that country, or that part of the country. The farmers of the Province of Ontario have had a trial of the Percherons years gone by. Being honoured with a seat on the board at the time the agricultural commission sat in the Province of Ontario and hearing the evidence of many of the best breeders of that province, the general evidence given was in favour of the Clyde or Shire horses. The evidence was that the Percheron itself was a nice animal, and that colts from the Percheron will thrive very well until they are two years old, but after that they did not come up to the standard of the cross of our Canadian mares with Clyde or Shire entire horses. Let me say from my own experience of breeding horses that these Percheron horses will not bring in the market —unless there is a very great change indeed—more than from $70 to $100, whereas crosses from a first-class Clyde will bring from $110 to $140. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time under the McKinley Bill the horse that you will buy for $70 will pay the same amount of duty to be taken out of the country as the horse that you will buy for $140. The United States are our market for our heavy draught horses, and they are taking them from the County of Huron yet, notwithstanding the heavy duty. From my knowledge of breeding horses I say that the introduction of such an animal as the Percheron, an animal of his weight, of the amount of bone that he has got, and his general get up, that he will do more to stop the export of horses from Canada to the United States than the McKinley Bill ever will do; because, when the American comes across to buy horses, he will get a class of animals that he will purchase and pay duty on. They are not fit for drivers and they are not heavy draught animals. Public opinion is one of the best criterions you can get with respect to the efficiency and profit on any class of animals when once introduced to any country. My remarks apply entirely to the Province of Ontario; the Percheron may be a good horse for the people of the Province of Quebec, but the mares that we have got to breed from in Ontario he is not the horse that is suited to us, and public opinion has so stated by them disappearing from many sections of the country where they were once used. Let me say with respect to the other horse on the experimental farm that he is not a horse that should be introduced to improve the stock of this country. There is a class of horses for which we have a profitable market in Great Britain if we had the proper stamp to send to that country. The kind of horse we want is a horse from 15½ to 16½ hands high, weighing from 1,200 to 1,400 lbs., with good flat bone and muscle, and well up in the withers and in the neck. An animal of good quality and good substance will find a ready market in England when taken there. But let me state that this carriage horse that is stationed at the experimental farm will not produce horses of this class. In the first place he is too small. He has a very nice bone and a nice body; but when you look at his front, he has not that fine appearance that a carriage horse should have; he does not show the fine neck and head which is necessary in a carriage horse going to the old country. I have a brother-in-law who has been in this country from January to the present time buying horses for the British market, and out of 125 which went to Britain 90 were taken by him to that market; so that I am well acquainted with the kind of horses required in Great Britain; and both of these animals are such that they would not be of any benefit to the individual who owned them or to those who use them for breeding purposes. Any farmer who uses heavy draught horses and raises mares from them will never sell his stock. It is the greatest folly to bring these horses to this farm that has ever been perpetrated in connection with it. I speak of the Province of Ontario. I know nothing of the other provinces, and I am certain that when the farmers of Ontario find it out, they will be very much displeased at the action of the Government. There is another view of the question. Some heavy draught animals were purchased in the old country market at high prices, and every farmer in Canada had an opportunity of having their service; and at the present time there is a superabundance of heavy horses all over the country. The business is being overdone. We have animals standing all over the country this year at from $5 up to $14. I saw two animals that only served some ninety mares and earned only some $900; and yet we find the Government paying $2,000 for inferior animals stationed at the farm, so that it has cost the country $31 for every service that these horses have given, independent of what the owner has to pay. I hold that it is a system that ought not to be followed. It is an injustice for the Government to do anything of this kind. I see the hon. Minister

of Finance and the hon. Minister of Justice derisively smiling at what I say. It only shows the ignorance of these hon. gentlemen. It is an injustice to gentlemen who have spent large sums of money, to bring these animals into their locality and give them an inferior service; and an individual who would state that these animals are perfect beauties and that they would please the people, states what no experienced horseman in the Province of Ontario will admit. I visited that farm in company with one of the most successful owners of entire horses in the Province of Ontario, and I hope he will give his opinion on this subject. My opinion is that this horse should not be used for breeding purposes. As a carriage horse he is too light; he is not a fast horse; he is a very poor travelling horse; he throws his front feet in such a manner that he will never command a high price. This is a question to which I have paid considerable attention. When I first heard that these animals were placed at the farm, I thought that perhaps they were to be given their keep with the man, during the season; but I find that this is not the case, but $2,000 annually is to be paid for them; and so far as the interests of even the farmers around Ottawa are concerned, they had better put their money in the stove. This is a matter of no personal interest to me, but I speak advisedly, from my knowledge of the class of horses that are being exported from this country. The breeding of horses is one of the most peculiar businesses in the country. It requires a very large amount of experience and knowledge, and I know that not one in ten of those who go into that business succeed. The breeding of heavy draught horses in the country is overdone at the present time, while there is a lack of good carriage horses. But we do not want such animals as these. We want an animal which can be sent out at four years of age, standing 16 hands high and weighing 1,400 to 1,500 pounds. The British people do not want horses so much for speed as for good action as carriage horses and cavalry horses; and this is the only kind of horse which we can profitably breed for the British market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Everybody knows that there is no better practical agriculturist in Canada than my hon. friend, and his criticisms on this subject certainly deserve attention. But, looking at the matter simply from a business point of view, it does appear to me to be a very imprudent act for the Government to enter into an agreement by which they will pay $30,000 for six horses for five years.

Mr. HAGGART. I may state that this subject does not properly come under this vote. A separate vote will be taken for these horses in the Supplementary Estimates. However, I may state that the Government have been impressed with the necessity of improving the breed of horses throughout this section of the country. They may have made a mistake; I am sorry to hear from the hon. member for South Huron that the breed they have selected is not the best; but he must remember, if he has read the communications addressed to the Minister of Agriculture on the subject, that out of about fifty entire horses, they made a selection of those which they thought the best. The price is the price which is fixed in other countries. It is the same as the agricultural societies,

I believe, in Lower Canada pay. It is the price that the Government of Quebec pay, and I have been informed that it is the same price which the European governments pay for the same purpose. I suppose there is a good deal of truth in the remarks of the hon. gentleman who seems to be thoroughly posted on the subject, and I should suggest to the foreman of the experimental farm that, in making a selection next year, he should make a selection of horses which perhaps would be more suited to the wants of the country than those which the hon. gentleman complains of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that cannot be done, as you are bound for five years.

Mr. HAGGART. No; we have the selection out of some fifty horses and can choose the six best among them.

Mr. ROWAND. It is quite true you can select from the same stable, but you cannot change the kind of horses.

Mr. HAGGART. I think so.

Mr. ROWAND. Does this company keep Clydesdale and Shire horses as well.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand they have only Percheron and carriage horses at present, but they are making importations of other kinds, and we will be able to make a selection to satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ROWAND. Would it not be well for the Government to consider whether it is wise to spend the country's money on those animals in competition with private individuals. I have seen horses in this vicinity which would be a credit to any neighbourhood—horses imported, and for which have been paid $2,000 to $2,700, and I am told there is not sufficient employment for them. We have had Percheron horses in the west and have tried them. I know a gentleman who sat in this House not long ago, and who spent a good deal of money in trying to introduce the Percheron horses, but he lost heavily and got out of it. That has been the experience all round in connection with this horse. As the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said, public opinion will decide what is best, and the market demand is the best test. It has come to be understood that the Percheron is a very good agricultural horse, but he is not a dray or a driving horse, and there is no market for him at all, either in the United States or in Great Britain. You cannot send the crosses from this horse with common mares to Great Britain at all. I have seen the Normandy horse, and although he would make a nice little driver he has neither the size nor the style to cross with our mares and produce the horse wanted in the British market. If you are going to carry on this thing, you had better try and find the kind of horse most popular in the country, and that kind is the Clydesdale or the Shire. For the last twenty or thirty years, those are the only horses we have a steady market for. Now, that a duty of $30 is imposed on horses under the McKinley Bill, if we wish to export to the United States we had better cultivate animals which are high priced and realize $140 for a horse instead of $70. With regard to competing with private individuals, I have had a good deal of experience in riding and agricultural societies, and I remember that in Bruce at one time we gave up

the exhibition and used the money in purchasing stock; but we had not done so many years when we found private enterprise met the want, and we went back to the exhibition again. The Government will find that private enterprise is ahead of them, and that the expenditure they are making now is an expenditure which the people will not appreciate. They will find that it is an unnecessary expenditure, and that they are entering into competition with men who have been paying high prices, and have gone to a good deal of trouble to bring in such animals as the country requires. There are many of our farmers who are not good judges of a horse or of any other kind of stock, I am sorry to say, and who, if they can get their foal for $4, will never pay $10, and that is the class which will patronize these horses on the farm, and the Government will find they will derive very little credit from the results of the enterprise they have gone into. With regard to farming in general, I was glad to hear such a gild-edge account of the Goverment farm of Manitoba. Some of the statements of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) did strike me as extravagant; for instance, his statement that 46 tons of corn to the acre were obtained out there. That is away beyond anything I ever heard of before, and I think, if the hon. gentleman who made that statement had been candid enough and read the foot note appended to the report, he would have shown how that result was obtained. He would have stated that corn in the field cannot be compared to corn in a small plot. If you take two rows of corn and plant them in a plot ten or twelve feet apart, you will get double what you would get if they were planted in a field. Twelve to twenty-five tons per acre is a fair crop in Ontario, and I have seen Manitoba and think we can grow as heavy crops in Ontario as in Manitoba. I am interested in these farms just as the hon. gentleman for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) is, and I want to be able to defend the expenditure when I go before the people. There are not many farmers in Ontario who would not laugh at anyone who would tell them that he could grow forty-six tons of corn to the acre, because it cannot be done in the field. This statement which the hon. gentleman read applies only to small lots, and yet he wants us to infer that in Manitoba you can grow forty-six tons to the acre. It would be better to put things in their proper light if these Government farms are to succeed and to make such statements as we will be able to defend when we go before the country.

Mr. DALY. I merely quoted from the blue-book the evidence, and if the hon. gentleman will take the report he will see in it a statement showing the results of twenty varieties of corn and the yield given by each variety, and that will satisfy him as to what the country can do in the different varieties of corn. I recollect seeing the corn myself, and I think if the hon. gentleman will communicate with Mr. Bedford, he will get full particulars and will see that the actual weight was forty-six tons to the acre. I have nothing to say with reference to the productive qualities of the soil in Ontario. I only say that is an example of what we can do in Manitoba. I am satisfied from all I can see, that Ontario is going to have a good harvest and I can assure hon. gentlemen that, from all indications, we will see the same result in Manitoba. My whole desire, in bringing this matter up so fully as I did, was to quote from the report of Mr. Bedford, which is very seldom read here, and to show that, so far as the experimental farms are concerned, they are a good investment on the part of the Government. In all the provinces they are managed by first class men and are economically conducted, and I am satisfied four-fold returns will be made to the people from the expenditure.

Mr. ROWAND. I would like to read the foot note to Mr. Bedford's report for the benefit of the House:

"[NOTE.—The weight of each variety as given is accurate, but it must be borne in mind that it is seldom that a large plot or field will give returns per acre equal to a small plot, where special care is given to the growth of the plants.]"

To promote the dairying interest of Canada in affiliation with experimental farms, including establishment and maintenance of branch experimental dairy stations..... .....$20,000

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to know where the experimental stations are to be situated, and whether they are for the purpose of improving the quality of butter and instructing the farmers with regard to that article?

Mr. HAGGART. They are intended to be itinerant, travelling around, and for this year they are intended to remain five or six weeks at each place.

Mr. McMILLAN. What localities are they to visit? I suppose the Government has a scheme, or a system.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand there have been five locations selected in Eastern Ontario, and five in Western Ontario, covering the principal dairy counties. They cover the whole province. The only places the superintendent remembers are Pembroke, Belleville and Peterborough in the east, and London and Dunnville in the west, and there is also one in the Orangeville district.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do I understand that they will be established for five or six weeks in each locality they visit?

Mr. HAGGART. For the first year it is intended that they shall remain for only five or six weeks in each locality, but next year or the year after, it is intended to fix a locality and place them there.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been long interested in butter-making, and also in cheese-making—I am a shareholder in a cheese factory. I believe that the system of bringing the farmers together and instructing them in regard to dairying is a more efficient system than to establish one of these at any one point, because if you have only six localities in the province, and the instructors are there for only six weeks, it is only a certain number who can meet and from within a certain distance; but, where they can change from day to day and from place to place, where they can get up in the morning and make their butter, and give lessons to the farmers in the different systems of skimming or putting the butter into prints or tinnets, I think that was the best scheme. That would be more beneficial than establishing stations all over the country, because the farmers are, I believe, going to continue to make a large amount of their butter at home, and that system would be more satisfactory than to establish stations.

Mr. DEVLIN. Why is it that the Government have established no stations in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. HAGGART. The instructor and special dairy commissioner are travelling in Quebec in the same way as in Ontario and are visiting all the sections.

Mr. SCRIVER. Perhaps the Minister will state in what part of the Province of Quebec this instructor is travelling now?

Mr. HAGGART. At present, or lately I believe, they have been working in the Eastern Townships.

Mr. SCRIVER. That is a pretty wide region.

Mr. HAGGART. It is, but that is as specific as I can get it. They have been down at Chicoutimi, I think.

Mr. SCRIVER. That is hardly the Eastern Townships.

Mr. FLINT. How is it there are none in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe there are two or three working in the Maritime Provinces on the same plan.

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand that a good deal of the instruction to be given is for the purpose of inducing the farmers to make butter in winter. I hold that the instruction given by parties who are sent out from the experimental stations should be based on the experience obtained from what they have done on those farms, what they have done in the way of winter dairying, and what they can accomplish in making good butter for the English market. There is a dairy out at the central farm which I believe is doing very good work, but I think a few firkins of that butter ought to be sent to the English market to see how it would sell there. There is no fair criterion obtained of the quality of the article unless you take it into the markets of the world, where it will meet the produce of other countries. I hope the manager of the experimental farm will see that this is a proper suggestion and one which ought to be adopted.

Mr. HAGGART. The manager says it is the intention to do that.

Mr. DEVLIN. I should like to ask if there has been a station in the County of Ottawa at any time?

Mr. HAGGART. That is one of the points which has been selected, and I believe there will be one there in the course of a few weeks.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is very fortunate, because that is a more important agricultural district than Chicoutimi.

Immigration $197,025

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have been sitting here pretty late night after night and I think we ought to adjourn now. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman taking this vote on immigration if he reserves the final item, which is the large one, and it is understood that a full discussion of the whole matter may take place on that item.

Mr. HAGGART. We will leave the last item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You might state whether any changes of importance have been made in the other items?

Mr. HAGGART. Only the three additions which appear in the Estimates.

Mr. BARRON. Who is the agent at Winnipeg?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Tetu.

Tracadie Lazaretto $4,500

Mr. SCRIVER. Can the Minister inform me how many patients there are in that institution?

Mr. HAGGART. About twenty.

Mr. BAIN. I think there were reports last year that the disease had broken out again in other localities.

Mr. HAGGART. It has been reduced.

Mr. BAIN. There are no new cases?

Mr. HAGGART. There have been two or three within the last couple of years.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Mondays for the remainder of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, that he ought to give us at least next Monday, as there is a good deal of business on the Order paper to be disposed of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must remember that on the last two Mondays we did very little business in the evening. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be satisfied if Government Orders came after questions by members? The notices of motion were called two or three times, and we were asked in the case of several to allow them to stand.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course, I understand that the House is with the hon. gentleman, and if he presses his motion we will submit. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, that he should at least give Monday afternoon next, and allow us to have questions by members on every Monday as usual.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will agree to that, and the motion may be amended in that sense.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the Return to an Order of the House of the 5th May last, for copies of the tenders asked for to construct

a graving dock at Kingston; the tenders received: the reports and calculations made by the engineers of the Department of Public Works made and based on these tenders; the contract which has been entered into: the reports of the engineers which may have been made on the carrying out of the works; or the changes which may have been made in them; and also, a statement of the sums paid out to the contractors up to date, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Twelfth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER (for Mr. BOWELL) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, on Monday next, to consider the following resolutions:—

Whereas subsidies to the extent of $1,500,000 were voted by Parliament in the years 1884 and 1885, to be used in such manner that the city of Quebec and other portions of the province north of the River St. Lawrence should be reached and served by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the then existing North Shore Railway to be utilized for that purpose, and that its road-bed and other properties, as well as its equipment, should be improved so as to make that portion equal to the other portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway system: and the Government, in 1885, made an arrangement concerning the acquisition of the North Shore Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the aforesaid purposes, by which it was agreed that in the event of the net receipts arising from the operation of the said railway, after paying the operating expenses thereof, proving insufficient to meet the interest on the mortgage bonds of the said North Shore Railway Company, including those held by the Government of Quebec as collateral security for the balance of the price of the said railway, the Government would apply the interest on the said sum of nine hundred and seventy thousand dollars, at the rate of four per cent. per annum, in whole or in part, as might be required, towards the payment of the deficiency; but that if, or when after payment of all such deficiencies, the net receipts of the said railway should be sufficient to pay the interest on the said bonds, the company would cease to have any further claim or demand upon the Government in respect of the said sum of money, provided, as regards operating expenses, that the cost of no new works or renewals of a more expensive character than existing works were when new, should be accounted as forming part of such operating expenses, unless the previous consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals had been obtained to the construction.

And whereas subsequently, with the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Government applied the sum of $970,000, part of the said subsidies, to the purchase of the bonds of the North Shore Railway Company, to the amount of $1,108,626, said bonds forming part of the issue of about $5,000,000, secured by mortgage on the North Shore Railway, the balance of the purchase price of that railway by the North Shore Railway Company amounting to $3,500,000, being secured by a first charge on the said railway in favour of the Government of Quebec as vendor's lien (*privilège de bailleur de fonds*) and, therefore, ranking before the charge in respect to the bonds so held by the Government as aforesaid, such purchase being made on the understanding that the interest on the bonds purchased should be applied in whole or in part, if required, in payment of deficiencies in the same manner and to the same extent on the interest of the said sum of $970,000 would have been applied under the said agreement above mentioned.

And whereas since the said arrangement the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not become liable under its provisions to pay, and has not paid, interest on any part of the bonds so held by the Government as aforesaid, the return of the company to the Government showing that the net receipts arising from the operation of the railway after paying the operating expenses thereof as above mentioned has proved insufficient to meet the interest on the mortgage bonds of the North Shore Railway Company as provided for in the said agreement, and that the deficiency was $534,368.36 up to the 31st day of December, 1890, of which amount a considerable portion was expended in bridges and permanent improvements of the said railway, and the effect of the said agreement has been to remove any incentive for the company to improve the road-bed or other properties included in the lien by which the said bonds are secured, or the equipment and service of the railway between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, inasmuch as the expenditure thereof, although in the interest of the public, would not result to the benefit of the company, and consequently the city of Quebec and other portions of the Province of Quebec have not received the benefit which Parliament intended them to receive from the subsidies so voted.

And whereas it appears, that under the circumstances it is improbable that the company will ever become liable to pay interest on the said balance, and that in the meantime the object of the said subsidies will not have been attained, and it would be in the interest of the country that the said bonds so acquired by the Government, with part of the said subsidy, should be cancelled, as being an obstacle to the improvement of the road and to carrying out of the true intent and purpose of the said several subsidies.

And whereas the company has made certain renewals of a more permanent and expensive character than the works which were replaced by such renewals when new, and the company has proposed that if the said bonds so held by the Government should be cancelled, the company would execute a deed of arrangement in such form as might be determined by the Government, binding itself to complete and provide with all due diligence, the following works and improvements, namely:—

Rolling stock, including sleeping cars, day coaches, baggage, mail and express cars, locomotives and freight cars, of a standard equal to that used on other portions of the company's railway system, involving an outlay of about $350,000.

Improvements over the whole line between St. Martin's Junction and the city of Quebec, of such a character as to bring that section up to the highest standard of the other Canadian Pacific sections, including additional accommodation for passengers at nearly every station, and increased space for the handling of freight, the lengthening of platforms and sidings, the furnishing of new sidings for the development of stone, lumber and other traffic, the substitution of iron for wooden bridges on the line of the North Shore Railway, and the construction of the following specific works, that is to say:—

(1.) In the city of Quebec:
- (*a*) One grain elevator.
- (*b*) One flour shed.
- (*c*) Such local improvements and facilities as are necesary for the handling of the traffic of that city.

(2.) In Three Rivers:
- (*a*) One small elevator.
- (*b*) Improvements over the loop line.
- (*c*) Improvements on the Piles Branch.

The said improvements over the whole line involving an outlay of about $300,000 in addition to the said outlay on rolling stock.

The whole to be completed to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways.

1. *Resolved*, That under the circumstances, the release of the said obligation and the cancellation of the bonds would not take from the Government an asset of any real value, but would enable the company to raise the funds necessary to accomplish the said works and improvements, and thus carry out the intention of Parliament in granting the said subsidies.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that on the execution by the company and the Government of a deed of agreement in such form as shall be determined by the Government, effectively binding the company to commence forthwith and to complete within such time as shall be prescribed in such deed the execution of the works and improvements, as well as to furnish the rolling stock and equipment hereinabove detailed in the fifth resolution, and on the Government being furnished with proof that the sums required to be expended under such deed of agreement, together with the sums already expended by the company in bridges and other permanent improvements of the said railway, amount to at least $970,000, the Government be authorized to cancel and destroy the said bonds so purchased and now held by the Government as aforesaid, and to discharge the company from any liability in respect thereof.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION ON PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COLTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to state that my attention was called yesterday afternoon by an hon. gentleman to a statement which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of yesterday, and to a very offensive article

which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of the same day, in which I was accused of having broken my pair with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams). I simply wish to state that I paired with that hon. gentleman up to ten o'clock last Tuesday evening, and no longer. When coming up on the train on Tuesday an hon. member of this House informed me that the hon. gentleman told him that he thought it was till Wednesday, so that I did not vote in the vote which was taken early Wednesday morning. Some time on Wednesday I saw the principal whips of the party and informed them that I had paired with that hon. gentleman only till Tuesday at ten o'clock p.m., the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) came across the floor of the House to see me, and I consented to continue the pair till Wednesday at ten o'clock. Now, as the article in the Montreal *Gazette* is a very offensive one indeed, I wish to contradict it. I paired with that hon. gentleman only till Tuesday at ten o'clock p.m.

CARLETON BRANCH RAILWAY.

Resolution reported from Committee of Whole, 9th July, was read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) to authorize the sale, to the city of St. John, of the Carleton Branch Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Resolution reported from Committee of Whole, 31st July, was read the second time, concurred in, and referred to Committee on Bill (No. 116).

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act (Mr. Costigan).

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause enacts very much more severe penalties than now provided. In addition to the many fines, there is imprisonment as well. I suppose the Minister has given that serious consideration, but the point to which I desire particularly to call his attention is sub-section two of this section. Is it his intention that these severe penalties shall apply to anyone except the compounder himself.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; it says to anyone who exposes or offers for sale.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I thought. I think the Committee should give that some consideration, because it certainly appears to me to be a very stringent clause, where an innocent person might become a purchaser of some article not properly labelled, and might offer it for sale, and render himself liable to a penalty of $250 and imprisonment besides. I think that clause should not pass in its present shape. I am not finding fault with the imposition of a penalty on the compounder, whose duty it is to comply with the law, but I think it is a dangerous provision to visit with such a severe penalty an innocent purchaser who may know nothing about it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is something in the same line as the Act as to illicit distilling. The law is very severe against the illicit distiller, but to make the law effective it is equally severe upon numbers of innocent parties. If a still is found in the possession of a man, though it is not proved that he has used it illegitimately, he is liable to the penalties. That appears to be severe, but it is the only way in which you can enforce the law. Of course this appears to be very hard, and perhaps we might get over the difficulty if the clause were amended. Perhaps we might strike out the words "who sells, exposes or offers for sale," and let the clause read simply "every person who removes from any warehouse." Then of course any man who would remove from the bonded warehouse of a compounder would be liable to the consequence in the same way as the compounder himself, and that would free the retailer from the consequences.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No doubt that would be better. As to the illicit still, the law is very severe, but it would be known generally that anyone who had a still in his possession would not have it legally. This, however, applies to general articles of merchandise, and the purchaser cannot possibly know whether the provision of the law has been complied with or not. I do not think there should be any penalty put upon them at all, or that they should be bound to guard against that, but I have no objection whatever to have the penalty made as large as you like in regard to the man himself, the compounder, who knows what he is doing. In the old Act I think that was guarded against. It says:

"Every person who exposes or offers for sale, or who removes from his place of manufacture, any compounded article——"

And so on. It seems to me that that section confines the penalty to the manufacturer alone, whereas here it is provided that:

"Every person who sells, exposes or offers for sale, or removes from any place of manufacture, store or warehouse, any compound article——"

That is, that an individual purchasing from a store, or the drayman who carries it away, is as much liable as the storekeeper himself. That cannot be the intention of the Minister, and I think it is sufficient that penalties should be imposed on the manufacturer, who is the only one who deliberately violates the law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will the hon. gentleman be satisfied if I substitute the old clause?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like the opinion of some of my legal friends on that subject.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Now, not only the manufacturer but anyone else who aids and abets the manufacturer might be punished under this section. The hon. gentleman will see the effect of this sub-section as it now stands. If he would strike out the word "any" and put in the word "his," then it would confine the provision to the man who manufactures. Then, further, he might strike out the words "sells, exposes or offers for sale."

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am disposed to go as far as possible to meet the views of my hon. friend from Brant. I think, however, that if we were to strike out the word "any" and insert the word "his," it would be open to all sorts of abuse.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand, the contention of this Bill was to increase the penalties.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then it is unnecessary to make the Act more extensive in regard to the persons affected than the former Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman will see that under section 2, it is not confined to manufacturers. It says: "Every person who exposes or offers for sale" is liable; or, who removes from his place of manufacture.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is just the point I want to be sure about. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Every person who exposes or offers for sale is liable, as well as every person who removes from his place of manufacture. But every person who offers for sale, though he does not remove from his place of manufacture, is liable under the law as it now stands.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I doubt if the hon. gentleman's construction of that clause is correct. I read that it would apply only to the manufacturer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. Minister is correct in his view, I want it altered. I would like to have the section amended so that it may not embrace a class of innocent persons.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Then the suggestion I made with regard to the clause in the new Bill will cover that ground, and would exempt persons who offer for sale. The hon. member for Huron wishes me to say: "Every person who removes from his place of manufacture." I cannot go that far, because it would be opening the door to abuses.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The objection of the hon. member for Huron comes in there. A person who removes from any place of manufacture might be a drayman. A merchant may send one of his clerks to the manufactory to bring him a dozen bottles of essences, or something of that kind, and the Minister brings this clerk or drayman under a penalty. I think the Minister should not try to enforce this penalty upon anyone except the compounder himself, who, knowing the law, violates it; and there should be no danger at all to an innocent person who has no means of knowing. How would an innocent person even, purchasing an article, know whether the proper brand or label was upon the article or the bottle? He would have no means of knowing. The only man who can know, the compounder himself, is the man who contravenes the law. I am not objecting to increasing the penalties, but I do not want any innocent person made liable.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The way the clause reads now would make an innocent man liable. A drayman, or any person who is carrying stuff from a warehouse to a place of business, and who may not be able to distinguish whether there is a label on the bottle or not, or, if there is a label, he may not know what it consists of, under this clause, would be liable to a penalty. The hon. gentleman should frame his clause so as to embrace only the man who has an intent to commit the fraud.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this point, as a layman seeking for information. I would call his attention to the clause succeeding the one we are discussing in the new Bill. The point is, that the compounder himself will know whether the article he is offering for sale, is a compound article or not. Some individual may be dealing in articles that are not compounded articles. There are certain articles concerning which it is not required to state that they are compounded, even in this very Act, and an innocent person purchasing that is liable to a penalty of $250, or to imprisonment. That is something the Minister should not insist upon. This clause ought to be framed so that the compounder himself, who is the only man who transgresses the law, and who will know that he is transgressing the law, shall be visited with penalties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Would the hon. gentleman suggest an amendment?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would propose an amendment to cover the compounder alone. The point I take is that under the wording of this clause an innocent person is liable to the same penalty that a guilty person is, and that should not be.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it is desired to exempt all who have not actual knowledge, we might insert the word "knowingly."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How will that help the hon. gentleman? Everybody who sells does it knowingly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Everybody who knowingly sells or removes an article compounded under the provisions of this Act for which a license ought to be taken, contrary to the provisions of this Act, ought to be punished, whether he is a drayman or anybody else.

Bill reported.

SCRIP TO VOLUNTEERS—REBELLION, 1885.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved concurrence in certain proposed resolutions reported from Committee of Whole, 29th July.

On resolution 5,

Mr. DAVIN. Before that resolution is adopted, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether he has asked the opinion of the Department of Justice in regard to the claims of the St. Albert Volunteer Company?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention when this resolution came up to tell the House that I did submit the claim of the St. Albert Home Guard to the Department of Justice, and upon the report of the Department of Justice, it was and is still my intention to deal with it as I intend to deal with the other corps mentioned in this resolution. But I am dealing in this particular case under the last resolution, and, as I explained the other day, I consider that the resolution is quite sufficient to cover the case of the St. Albert Company.

Resolutions concurred in.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 159) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRAUDULENT MARKING.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 140) an Act in restraint of fraudulent marking.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This Act, I understand, is just confined to the two articles that are mentioned in the schedule meanwhile.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is all. It takes power to add, of course.

On section 3,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would ask to amend that clause so as to read as follows:—

Any Order in Council made under the provisions of the next preceding section shall have effect only until the end of the next succeeding session of Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That means it has force only until the next meeting of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It drops unless a statute is passed carrying it forward.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How will the public be aware of that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is to be published in the *Gazette*.

On section 4,

Mr. CURRAN. Before the Bill is reported, I should like to say that I presume it is understood that before the Bill is read the third time parties who are interested in the manufacture of white lead will have opportunities of making representations to the hon. Minister in reference to it. The first clause of the Bill is considered by many in the trade to be too extensive. It is thought that the word "pure" should alone be used as the legal term to express unadulteration. The term "genuine" and certain other expressions having a legal value have a different value in trade, owing to certain brands of white lead having been sold under these terms, and as such having acquired a large value in the market, after having been introduced at great expense; and they contend that this Bill is likely to injure those brands considerably. Their conclusion is that the word "pure" should alone be used in the law as a common description to indicate unadulteration. There is also a representation with regard to the last clause of the Bill, which is held open to some objection. So that I trust that if the hon. Minister has not these matters already under consideration, he will kindly take them under consideration, and that those who are interested in this legislation may be heard before the Bill receives its third reading.

Bill reported.

DECK AND LOAD LINES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. I may say that this Bill has been before a Select Committee, and, as it concerns a very important subject, it has received the careful attention of that Committee. It is also acceptable to the shipping interest, so much that the only two or three suggestions which were received from that interest, were in accord with the Bill, and there is only one amendment made by the Committee.

Bill reported.

QUEBEC SKATING CLUB.

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

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to convey to the Quebec Skating Club certain ordnance lands in the city of Quebec, subject to such provisions and conditions as the Governor in Council deems proper.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year I introduced a similar Bill, but there was some objection taken. One objection, I think, was that the Bill should be introduced by a resolution; another was that we were dealing with ordnance lands in an unusual way, by making free grants when it was understood they should be sold at public auction. I withdrew the Bill, and now I propose to introduce a resolution asking power to introduce a Bill, and I may state that since last session I have communicated, through the High Commissioner, with the Imperial Government in reference to the matter, and they have answered that they have no objection to our dealing with the lands as proposed. The Quebec Skating Rink Company applied a year and a half or two years ago for a piece of land to erect a rink on, with the understanding that they abandon the old rink which had been reported as being inconveniently placed as regards both the fortifications and the Parliament Buildings. The Local Government of the Province of Quebec also offered, in consideration of this change being made and of the hall being kept for an exhibition hall, to give $5,000 towards its construction. This offer still stands, and the object of the Bill is to authorize the Government to transfer this piece of land upon which the new hall is to be built.

Mr. LAURIER. What becomes of the property now held by the skating rink next to the wall? Is it transferred to the Local Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not to be built upon.

Resolution reported.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 138) to amend the Act respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very important measure and one which will require some consideration. The only remark I intend to offer to the Minister of Justice is in regard to sub-section 6 of the proposed section 37:

"The opinion of the court upon any such reference shall not be considered an authoritative decision as to any ques-

tion involved therein, but shall be taken and held to be advisory only; provided that, for all purposes of appeal to Her Majesty in Council, such opinion shall be treated as a final judgment of the said court."

As I understand the wording of this Bill, it is proposed that on all questions arising out of the appellate jurisdiction given to the Government and to Parliament, where the provision regarding separate schools in the provinces is concerned, on all such questions which may be referred to the Supreme Court the decision of the court is to be final and binding on the Government. That is, whatever the legislation referred to may be under such circumstances, if it is pronounced by the Supreme Court to be legal or not legal, or within the power of the province, that decision shall be binding on the Government, and that shall be an end of the question; but that upon all other questions arising out of the power of disallowance now possessed by the Government, if any such question is referred to this tribunal its decision shall not be final, but it shall still be in the power of the Government to exercise the right of disallowance or not. The discussion of this question may be a long one, but I submit to the Minister of Justice that at present, as the powers of the Government have been construed since Confederation, the power of disallowance can be exercised in two ways. It can be exercised for political reasons, and it can be exercised for judicial reasons also. If the Minister of Justice is of the opinion that an Act passed by a Local Legislature is not within the powers of that Legislature he can report to that effect to the Government, and the Government will, upon his report, disallow the Act. That is a judicial decision. On the other hand, if for reasons which are purely political the Government choose to disallow an Act, they can do so whether it be or be not within the powers of the Local Legislature. This is a political power, and is exercised under a responsibility to Parliament, because Parliament may subsequently approve or disapprove of the reasons given for the disallowance. In like manner the Minister of Justice, or rather the Governor in Council, upon the advice of the Minister of Justice, can give his opinion that any Act passed by the Local Legislature is not within the powers of that Legislature, and disallow it. This is a power, I submit, which, in time past, has been exercised, and, without venturing at all any criticism, has been exercised in a manner which sometimes may have been open to doubt. For instance, when an Act of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario has been passed, and when this Act has been pronounced beyond the powers of the Ontario Legislature by the Minister of Justice, however weighty the opinion of the Minister of Justice may be, the opinion on such questions of Mr. Mowat, who is the Attorney-General of that Province, is also one which is equally entitled to great consideration. I submit that there is good reason to believe, notwithstanding that the Minister of Justice, whoever he may be for the time being, has pronounced such an Act to be beyond the powers of the Legislature of Ontario, there is still reason to believe that after all the question is not free from doubt. Now, as I understand it, it is that class of cases which it is intended by this Act to refer to the court for their opinion upon them. So far, it is very proper; it is proper that this power of disallowance should exist—that is to say, the power of deciding whether an Act is within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature or not should be determined upon by judicial authority after the provinces have had an occasion to be heard, and after counsel has been heard on both sides. But I submit to the Minister of Justice that if, after this has taken place, after the court has given an opinion that the Act, for instance, is within the power of the Local Legislature, if he still keeps to himself and exercises the power of pronouncing against the opinion of the court, which may take place if this section is not modified, the evils which now exist will be intensified instead of being remedied; because, certainly, if the Minister of Justice gives an opinion against an Act of the Provincial Legislature his opinion, at all events, will be challenged by the Legislature, and the Attorney General of that Legislature will pronounce in favour of his Bill. But, after all, it is only putting one opinion against another, and the prevailing authority rests with the Minister of Justice. But if, after the Act has been pronounced constitutional by the Supreme Court, the Minister of Justice takes it upon himself and reserves to himself the power to pronounce against it, it seems to me that he is defeating the very object of the Bill. The hon. gentleman will understand that I do not at all refer to political power. If the hon. gentleman has disallowed a Bill for political reasons it is of course beyond the question which is here involved; but I submit to the Minister of Justice that whenever the constitutionality of an Act has been proposed to the court for decision its decision should be binding and final, not only upon the appellant jurisdiction of the Government on matters of education, but on all other questions as well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman has been somewhat misled by the language of the section which he referred to, and which is not satisfactory to me; in fact, I had drawn an amendment for it which I will read presently, although, even as it stands now, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me, on reflection, that the section is hardly open to the objection which he urges. Now, it is not intended by this Bill in any way to limit the power of disallowance which is conferred by the British North America Act. All that we propose to do in this Bill is to provide for greater facilities in investigating constitutional questions than we have had before, and this will, to a great extent, lead to the settlement of these legal questions by other means than the mere report of the Minister of Justice. Under our present system the power of disallowance is exercised, as the hon. gentleman says truly, in two classes of cases; the first being cases where an Act of a Provincial Legislature is deemed to conflict with Dominion policy, or with Dominion rights, or with Dominion property. In that case an Act is sometimes disallowed. The other class of cases covers those in respect of which we deem that the Legislature has exceeded its powers. We have dealt with that class of cases nearly always on the mere report of the Minister of Justice, as the hon. gentleman has said. We have not used very much the power which now exists of referring a case to the Supreme Court for its opinion, principally because under the present practice the judges give no reasons for their decision; they simply answer categorically questions propounded to them by the Governor in Council,

and their decision, therefore, is of little importance as a guide. The conclusion of the court may be arrived at by a mere majority; it may proceed from the fact of different reasons influencing different judges, and so on. But another difficulty about the reference to the Supreme Court, especially in educational questions arising under the British North America Act, has been that there is no power to take evidence on questions of fact—as, for instance, in the case arising in Manitoba under an Act passed during the session before last by the Legislature of that province, concerning which it was contended that that legislation injuriously affected the rights of the minority. The rights of the minority had been secured by an Imperial statute which prevented any encroachment on any rights which the minority had in that province, as a matter of fact, whether under sanction of law or not, at the time of the Union; and, therefore, in submitting that Act to the Supreme Court to decide as to whether it was constitutional or not, it was absolutely necessary that there should be some investigation of the questions of fact. As to matters of that kind, therefore, the Act must be amended as we propose to do here, so as to enable the court to take evidence on questions of fact. But how does the matter arise in regard to the exercise of powers in relation to provincial Acts which are deemed to be unconstitutional? At present, in nine cases out of ten we leave to their operation Acts which are of doubtful validity, in order that the parties interested may raise the question before the courts in the ordinary way. But in cases where we think an Act is unconstitutional and its operation would create public inconvenience we recommend its disallowance. After the passage of this Bill, I take it for granted that in nearly every case of that kind, reference to the Supreme Court will be had, with a view of ascertaining what the constitutional rights of the Legislature are. Now, we must remember that in all cases referred, whether referred, as such questions were at one time, and for a long time, in England, to the judges attending the House of Lords, for their opinion, or whether referred since under statute to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or whether referred, in Canada, to the Supreme Court of Canada, the judgment of the court is advisory only to the Executive, and the bare power of disallowance for constitutional reasons would still remain. The Executive, for instance, would ask the Supreme Court whether a statute of the Province of Ontario were constitutional or not; if the court pronounced it to be constitutional it would be most absurd, and practically impossible, for the Minister of Justice to advise that it should be disallowed, after the highest tribunal had decided that the Act was within the powers of the Provincial Legislature. Now, what we meant by putting in that section was not at all to give any kind of sanction to the disallowance of an Act on constitutional grounds, which had been declared to be constitutional, but it was intended to provide that inasmuch as by the constitution an opinion given by the Judicial Committee, or by the Supreme Court, is only advisory, no appeal to Her Majesty in Council would lie against the decision of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the object of this clause is not to make it advisory, but to make it a final judgment for purposes of appeal. At the same time the clause is awkwardly expressed, and I have had this amendment drafted to express more clearly what we do mean:

"The opinion of the court in any such reference, although advisory only, shall, for all purposes of appeal to Her Majesty in Council, be treated as a final judgment of the said court between the parties."

We simply want to make it clear that there is an appeal in so far as we can do so, but not make it less effective and authoritative.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section enables the court to be held on 1st Tuesday of October, instead of 4th Tuesday. At present, immediately after vacation, which lasts to 1st September, there is practically another vacation till the 4th Tuesday. This was arranged to suit the convenience of the bar of the different provinces, but we have arrived at a satisfactory adjustment, after consultation with different members of the bar of the provinces, by which the courts will sit on the first Tuesday of October. That will suit the bench, I think. It will also suit the bar, for the bar of Ontario asked for the change, and all the bars are agreeable to the change, if the Maritime cases come up last.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The first point aimed at in this section is to obtain an appeal on the judgment of the court below granting a new trial. At present, from the refusal of the court below to grant a new trial there is an appeal; but if the court grants a new trial there can be no appeal, except on the ground that the judge trying the case has not ruled according to law. For instance, if a new trial be ordered on the ground that the verdict was against the weight of evidence no appeal would lie. So, a court below can go on ordering new trials without the possibility of the aggrieved party having any redress. We want to establish that the court has jurisdiction in cases of *certiorari* and prohibition.

Mr. LAURIER. In what cases? At present the court has jurisdiction in matters of *habeas corpus*, but only in certain limits, as I understand the Act. I suppose the hon. gentleman means that the court should have equal power to issue *certiorari* or prohibition in cases of the nature in which it can now issue writs of *habeas corpus*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. By the legislation of some of the provinces, especially New Brunswick, the courts have power to review on *certiorari* a great many matters in which the superior courts have no original jurisdiction. For instance, important questions of assessment and taxation are reviewed by the Supreme Court of the province under *certiorari*, involving thousands of dollars, and there is no appeal from the judgment of the court, because its jurisdiction was originally exercised by *certiorari* and the suit did not begin in the court itself.

Mr. LAURIER. Is this power as to *certiorari* and prohibition to be exercised by way of appeal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it the settled opinion of the Minister of Justice that a judge

should express his dissent when he does dissent? Would he not prefer the system that prevails in other courts, of having the report of the court, and not the opinion of Mr. Justice so-and-so, and so-and-so, who may dissent. In the Privy Council and in the *Cour de Cassation* in France, the question is deliberated upon by the judges—and I presume that they have to settle amongst themselves that the majority must rule—the report is given as the opinion of the court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would not make it compulsory for the judge or judges who dissent to give their reasons, but I would allow it to be obtainable for them. We will say:

That any judge who differs from the opinion of the court may, in like manner, certify his opinion and his reasons.

And substitute the word "may" for "shall."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think that would be a mistake. If this were a court of final resort, and if there was no appeal from it, then the suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) would be quite correct; but this is not a court of final resort, and therefore the opinion of the dissenting judge or judges, and their reasons for dissenting, and the authorities upon which they dissent, should be given as a guide to litigants as to whether it would be judicious to appeal or not. In every other court that I know of, from which there is an appeal, the judge who dissents gives his reasons, and as a general rule gives his reasons, perhaps, more fully than the judges in the majority. I do not see any reason why the same rule should not apply to the judgment of this court, when it is not final.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There may be a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and if he can convince the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), I have no objection.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be in favour of the French system and the system of the Privy Council. I do not attach sufficient importance to it to make it a point, but if the Minister of Justice and my friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) are satisfied, I have no objection.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When I consented to change the word "may" for "shall" I was quite convinced that any judge who dissented would regard it as an instruction to him to give his reasons.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is the section to be changed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No; it remains as it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to move the addition of another clause. Section 29 of the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act makes provision for appeals from the Province of Quebec, involving less than $2,000, and there are these restrictions: the appeal must involve the question of the validity of an Act, or relate to a fee of office, duty, rent, revenue or any sum of money payable to Her Majesty, provided such appeals shall lie only from the Court of Queen's Bench. Under the present judicial system, other matters in which Her Majesty's rights and revenues are involved to the extent of $2,000 and over are sometimes adjudicated upon in other courts, and I want to give an appeal in all such cases to the Supreme Court of Canada by adding this section:

Where the matter in controversy involves any such question, or relates to any such fee of office, duty, rent, revenue or sum of money payable to Her Majesty, or to any such title to lands or tenements, annual rents, or such like matters or things, where the rights in future might be bound to, or exceed the sum or value of $2,000, there shall be an appeal from judgments rendered in said province, although such action, suit, cause, matter or judicial proceeding may not have been originally instituted in the Superior Court.

I may state that this amendment was suggested by an eminent member of the Quebec bar, who was one of my predecessors in office, and that it was shown to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who submitted it to his brethren and they recommended it.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the object to be this. The circuit courts, whose jurisdiction is limited to $100, in some such cases may adjudicate on a question where future rights are involved, or upon municipal assessments, amounting perhaps to thousands of dollars, and their judgment is final; but this, I understand, is to give an appeal to the Supreme Court, though there is now an appeal from the Queen's Bench.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At present there is no appeal at all to the Supreme Court here, if the cases do not originate in the Superior Court.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask that the third reading of the Bill be deferred long enough to admit of this being submitted to some members of the Quebec bar.

Bill reported.

THE INDIAN ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 144) further to amend the Indian Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister should explain why he has found it necessary to propose such a stringent amendment to the Act. He will see, by comparing it with the Act as it now stands, that it gives very great powers to one individual. The section to which it is added provides that in cases of the kind, when complaint is made to a Superintendent General, he can take cognizance of it and depute some person to attend to it. That precaution is taken, that is, that the Superintendent General himself sees that a complaint is made before he gives authority, but we amend this by giving power, if I understand it irghtly, to any Indian agent or the chief of the band, or a coustable, to do what the section previously, in the wisdom of Parliament, saw fit to order should be done only after formal complaint had been made to the Superintendent General and his own notice taken of it. It seeems to me these are very great powers. If any person fails to comply with the order of that constable, &c., he shall, upon summary conviction, be liable to a penalty of not less than $5 and not more than $20 for every day during which such failure continues. That summary conviction will mean simply that this constable tells that man to get off the land, and that, failing to do so, the man would be fined and im-

prisoned. I do not know what could have induced the hon. Minister to require such extraordinary powers. This will also cover the case of an Indian of the band. I know that the first section alludes to any person, or an Indian, other than an Indian of the band; but the same section to which this is added also provides that any Indian of the band illegally in possession of any land may, on complaint of the Superintendent General, have his case looked into and be removed. The hon. Minister no doubt will know that on a reserve parties may be residing on a plot of land to which, after investigation, it may be found they had not a legal right, but still it will be a very peremptory thing that any constable should have the right to go to that Indian and order him off the land.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This amendment is for the purpose of imposing a fine on trespassers who, after they have once been removed from a reserve, return the second time. There is no means by which a fine can be imposed, and very often trespassers who are being put off their reserve escape without any penalty at all because of the cumbersome process necessary to be used—that is, by the Superintendent General issuing his warrant to the sheriff or some other agent appointed by him. Section 22 provides for the removal of an Indian, or any person or Indian other than an Indian of a band. Section 23 provides only for imprisonment, and then, in case the party returns, he will be notified to do so, either by the Indian agent, or constable or chief, and if he does not remove, of course he has to stand his trial before a magistrate, and on summary conviction will be fined. There is no special hardship in this, and it is necessary in many cases in the west in order to get rid of bad characters on the reserve as soon as possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The words in the amendment "Indian aforesaid" may be taken to apply to an Indian of the band, and I would suggest that the words be added "other than an Indian of the band."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the Minister does not intend to adopt as a policy the right of giving the privilege to hunt and fish. Where does this apply—in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; principally in Ontario and Quebec. I do not know whether we have any leases in Quebec, though there was an application recently, but in Ontario we have three leases on Walpole Island, one on the Caradoc reserve, and one on the Oneida.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do the Indians want this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and it is in their interests that this is introduced as much as in the interest of anyone.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the license be revoked at the will of the Superintendent General?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and they are only short-term leases. Our object is to protect the game and keep poachers off, and that is as much in the interest of the Indians as of the sporting community.

Mr. DAVIN. While this subject is under discussion, I would call to the attention of the Minister a matter with which he is conversant in the North-West Territories. This and other clauses assume, and, I think, properly assume, that the Indian is capable of realizing his responsibility to the law, and the Minister knows that in the North-West at all times the Indians are allowed to shoot game and to take the eggs of game, and the result is a great destruction of the game there. I think the time has arrived when we ought to make the Indians in the North-West amenable to the game laws. Quite recently an immense quantity of eggs of game were found in the possession of Indians coming from the south of Regina, and in that way the game is being destroyed. I think that, as the Indians are found capable of obeying the law under such a clause as this and the second clause of this Bill, we might consider, and I urge it now on the Minister and on the Government that we should consider, whether the Indians should not be made amenable to the game laws as the white settlers are.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might ask how is the Indian going to get his living if you do that? The larger portion of the Indians live on the game and eggs which they get from the creeks and lakes and along the edges. What are they going to live on if this course is going to be adopted? Not altogether on the bacon you send out to them from Regina, which is sometimes a little rusty, and when you send them bacon they might be allowed to have an egg or two with it. When the game there is large enough to fly it generally goes to the south and is killed across the border, and I do not see why our people should not have some of it. The game laws and the fish laws do well enough in some districts, but not everywhere. Take the fishing laws: In our section of the country the people on our side of the river may use four, or five, or six nets, while on the other side they may be using one hundred and fifty nets. We are preserving the fish for the different states on our borders. They have Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and Michigan, which have each the right to make the laws they see fit, but we are preserving the game and the fish for the benefit of the people of the south. I think the Indians should have the privilege of using the game in the season when it is in their district, before it goes to our American brothers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says in some portions of Manitoba and the North-West Territories; where the Indians are becoming to a large extent self-supporting they realize that good results flow from protection, and in some places they are quite willing and anxious to refrain from shooting the game, especially the prairie chicken, on the reserves, and to help us to protect the game. In the far north it is very different, where the Indians are thrown almost entirely on their own resources, and it would be a great hardship—in fact, it would be impossible—to prevent them from killing game. We tried that some years ago in regard to the buffalo and found it impossible, and so it will be as to the other game. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is a great number of Indians who do appreciate the necessity of preserving the game, especially in those districts where they are becomiag self-supporting.

Mr. McGREGOR. The hon. gentleman knows that prairie chickens form a very small portion of

the food of the Indians, and it would require a great many of them to afford the Indians any considerable portion of food. Prairie chickens are becoming acclimated to the North-West and they do not go south in the winter. But wild geese, wild ducks, and game of that kind do, go south, and I think we ought to let these people use them.

Mr. ROOME. I think we must remember the interest of the shooting clubs in the different parts, and I would like to add the following words to this clause: "any person or persons."

Mr. DAVIN. With reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor), I may say that the game is best preserved by the game laws, and it is bad food when out of season. He speaks about taking the eggs of prairie chickens.

Mr. McGREGOR. No; I said it made no difference about them.

Mr. DAVIN. I presume he would approve of the Superintendent General adopting the policy of preventing the taking of the eggs of prairie chickens, but allowing them to use eggs of ducks and geese. But he forgets that the Indians kill a tremendous quantity of ducks and geese, especially ducks, and they are good food, not only for Indians, but for the white settlers. Geese, duck and prairie chickens have been a great aid to white settlers, and constitute almost the staple food of the Indians at certain times. I agree with the Minister of the Interior that some of the Indians do appreciate a restraint like this; in fact, a man who has observed the Indians for some years back becoming traders, and bringing hay to Regina and selling it on their own behalf, and the good sense they show, and their appreciation of a civilized bargain, will come to the conclusion that they would very soon learn it was to their interest to submit to a restraint such as I have suggested.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no objections to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from North Middlesex (Mr. Roome).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty is that the Interpretation Act would exclude those words. If we put them in here we would have to put them in everywhere.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 152) to amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels. He said: This Bill, as I explained in Committee on the resolution, is simply for the purpose of increasing the fishing bounty from $150,000 to $160,000. That is based practically on the expenditure that has been made since the Act was introduced in 1882.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

On the order to resume adjourned debate on second reading of Bill (No. 151) respecting The Ontario Express and Transportation Company, being read,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the time has come when this Bill may be properly read the second time and referred to the proper Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PICTOU HARBOUR.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 150) respecting the harbour of Pictou, N.S.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain the object of the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. It gives the harbour commissioners borrowing powers.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does this Bill create a new corporation?

Mr. TUPPER. The harbour is now under an Act creating commissioners. These commissioners are charged with certain duties, but have no power to borrow money whatever.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has this Bill been asked by the harbour commissioners?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes. The draft Bill was sent by the harbour commissioners to me as Minister of Marine, with a request that it should receive the sanction of Parliament. Clause 3, as in the draft, I hold over, in order to recast the clause in the form usual in harbour commissioners' Acts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the estate vested in the harbour commissioners?

Mr. TUPPER. Under clause 2 the commissioners will have power to obtain real estate on which to erect wharves.

Mr. FRASER. I should like to ask if there is any need to borrow this money?

Mr. TUPPER. The necessity of the provision is apparent from the report of the commissioners. There are practically no funds available at present, and they are pressed for improvements in East River particularly, and at other places.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am only concerned in taking care that we in no sense, impliedly or directly, become in any way responsible for any money they may borrow.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no application to me to that extent whatever. The only powers asked are the ordinary powers vested in harbour trusts where local improvements are carried on by such trusts.

Mr. FRASER. Perhaps there is no need for this money. I know that the wharves about Pictou are in a deplorable condition. The ballast wharf and the wharf at Abercrombie Point both need repairs. I understand there are $3,000 or $4,000 at present in the hands of the commissioners, and they should utilize that money before borrowing more.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Harbour Commissioners' Report he will find that the amount was only $72.26.

Mr. FLINT. It is advisable to add to this clause that the mortgages should be subject to the Governor in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. That is in the preceding sections 2 and 1.

Mr. FLINT. It should be added to clause 4 as well, especially as it gives the commissioners quite extensive power.

Mr. FRASER. I think the wharves at New Glasgow need improvements. Efforts have been made for some time to obtain money to improve the wharves. The people are satisfied there is money in the hands of the commissioners. If the commissioners state in their report that they have no money, and that all the money received by them has been expended except $72, I have nothing to say. But I am satisfied that there is money that should be utilized.

Mr. TUPPER. There is an uncollected amount of $2,000, to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. FRASER. Who is the creditor?

Mr. TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the collector of Customs for the port of Pictou is accountable for a large amount of money to the commissioners, and if the hon. gentleman wants the full particulars in relation to it I can give him the answer that the collector has made. The late secretary is also accountable for a certain amount. They have been embarrassed in that harbour for several years for want of funds, and the public are demanding the conveniences, while the answer of the commissioners has been that they cannot make any improvements there, as they have not the available cash. They ask for powers that every other board has been given without question in this House, and a year or two ago I put through a Bill for that purpose.

Mr. FRASER. I am not objecting to the appropriation.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no appropriation; this is not asking a dollar.

Mr. FRASER. I mean the appropriation by the commissioners. I know Parliament is not voting them any money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All I am afraid of is that they will have to, one of these days.

Mr. FRASER. While I fully agree that the improvements are necessary and ought to be made, I think the Government should call upon the commissioners to see that all moneys were collected before they empower them to borrow more. I am satisfied that if this money is borrowed it will have to be paid, and this money will never be collected.

Mr. TUPPER. I may say that the department has given full instructions with reference to the amount due.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FEMALE OFFENDERS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 143) respecting certain female offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia.

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

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may explain briefly that an institution for the reformation of female convicts has been formed in the Province of Nova Scotia by the community of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, a branch of the organization which exists at the city of Ottawa; and the scheme proposed by the Bill is that female prisoners who are sentenced to the ordinary penal institutions in Nova Scotia may be transferred to this institution, and kept under the restrictions which are imposed in the like institutions in the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and Manitoba. The institution being formed under the auspices of ladies who are connected with the Roman Catholic Church, the operation of the Bill will necessarily be confined to convicts of that faith, and the like provisions exist, as far as that province is concerned, in relation to the Protestant Industrial School, the Roman Catholic Reformatory, and in the Province of Ontario the Mercer Institute. The Bill was introduced in the Senate, and the gentleman who introduced it there has satisfied me that every provision of the Bill is taken from some other that has been already adopted and tried under the like circumstances.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I saw in the newspapers that there was some opposition to the Bill in the Senate. Does the hon. gentleman know what the nature of it was?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As far as I have gathered from the debates of the Senate, there seemed to be some impression there that the institution might be made use of in proselytizing. I am not able to understand the force of that, and I do not think that it is open to that objection; but I think that the principal objections made in the Senate were afterwards withdrawn.

Mr. DENISON. I have no objection to this Bill, but one or two things have been pointed out to me that might be altered with benefit. For instance, in clause 2, and all through the Bill, they use the word "woman" or "girl," and it was suggested in the Senate that the word "female" would be better, because it is a term used in cases of that sort in all statutes, and it is an advantage always not to depart from old-established usage in a matter of that kind. I also notice that according to clause 9 a young offender would receive a light punishment, but not go to the institution, while an old offender would receive a heavy punishment, and go to this institution. A young girl who is committed for one year would not go to this institution because she would not come under clause 9—because, according to clause 9, if under the age of 16 the sentence must be for over two years, and not exceeding five years. The effect of that is this: that a young offender, and one who, to my mind, would be more likely to be influenced for good in an institution of this kind, would not go there, while an old offender, who would get a heavier punishment on account of being an old offender, would go to this institution. Then I think clause 13 might be altered. It reads:

"If any respectable and trustworthy person, being a Roman Catholic, is willing to undertake the charge of any girl committed to the Industrial Refuge, when such girl is over the age of twelve years, as an apprentice to the trade or calling of such person, or for the purpose of domestic service, and such girl is confined to the refuge by virtue of a sentence or order pronounced under the authority of

any Act of the Parliament of Canada, the superintendent or superior of the refuge may, with the consent of the stipendiary magistrate of the city of Halifax, bind such girl to such person for any term not to extend, without such girl's consent, beyond a term of five years from the commencement of her imprisonment, and the stipendiary magistrate shall thereupon order that such girl be discharged from such refuge on probation; subject however, to the provisions of the next preceding section: Provided, that any wages reserved in any indenture of apprenticeship made under this section shall be payable to such girl, or to some other person for her benefit."

This clause is confined entirely to Roman Catholics, and as the institution is, I understand, supported by the whole community, it seems to me proper and right that any person should be allowed to apprentice a young girl if respectable and trustworthy and to the satisfaction of the superintendent of the institution, no matter what religion such person may profess. It is only reasonable to allow that to be done, as this clause applies to girls over the age of twelve years; and I think, there would be little danger of proselytizing being done against the interest of the Roman Catholic Church. We know that many girls over the age of twelve years go out to domestic service, and are allowed to worship at the altar of their own church without interference. It seems to me the Committee might well consider whether this clause should not be made more general, especially for those who are over twelve.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is another objection which I see to this Bill. We are giving to this private institution the power of dealing in a very summary way with criminals. We are handing over to a private institution powers which properly belong only to the Government; and, if that is to be done, I think the institution ought, at any rate, to be subject to a much more severe and thorough inspection than is provided for by the Bill. The only clause which provides for any inspection is clause 15, which says that such reformatory and such industrial refuge shall at all times be open to inspection by an officer appointed by the Governor in Council. Now, what is the business of nobody in particular is seldom done at all, and the probability is that under this Bill there will be no inspection of this institution. I say that inspection ought to be peremptory. If you are going to give the institution the power of dealing with criminals in the way proposed, then the Government ought to take the responsibility of having a thorough, careful and regular inspection of it made; otherwise, you are opening a door to great abuse. Something that happened in the Province of Quebec a few years ago showed the need of this. An asylum of great value was burned, and statements were made, which I never saw contradicted, indicating that in that institution, which was carried on by the Catholic Church, there were not such methods in use as are applied in all modern institutions and by modern principles of government. There had been no inspection, or if there had been it was not sufficient; and that institution was very inferior in all particulars to other similar institutions in the Dominion. This institution being conducted on somewhat similar principles it is necessary, and I think this House should insist that there should be established a thorough, regular and efficient system of inspection. Under no other circumstances would I vote to hand over to any institution, Protestant, Catholic, or otherwise, such powers as are proposed to be given by this Bill. With all the best intentions in the world on the part of those by whom the institution is to be conducted, it is quite possible, I will not say that abuses may arise, but that there may be various defects in the mode of conducting it which would be remedied if it were properly inspected. Therefore, when we reach the 15th clause I will move—unless the Government take the matter up—to the effect that there shall be such an inspection as will make the Government thoroughly responsible for this institution.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) as to the expediency of changing the word "woman" or "girl" to "female." I do not quite appreciate the force of the objection raised, I think, in the Senate, on that subject; but there may be something in it. As regards short-term and long-term prisoners, this institution is entirely voluntary; it is established altogether for charitable purposes, and we could hardly compel its managers to accept any class of persons whom they do not want; and it seems they do not wish to take girls unless they are sentenced for at least two years, so that they may remain long enough to become reformed and to learn some useful occupation. If the city of Halifax should contribute something out of its funds towards the support of these prisoners it will do so, and if not, it is not obliged to do so; but the city has acted on the principle of giving to such institutions about $60 for each prisoner sent there from the police court. With regard to inspection, I am entirely willing to accept any suggestion for full inspection by a competent authority. I am not acquainted, except through the newspapers, with the particulars of the case to which the hon. member for Muskoka refers. I did not gather, however, from the account published, that in that institution the defects arose from the want of inspection, but I gathered that they existed notwithstanding that there was a system of inspection. However, I am entirely willing to accept an amendment on that subject. I think there cannot be too complete a provision for inspection of institutions to which persons are sent by the courts of justice. As regards clause 13, to which the hon. member for West Toronto has referred, enabling the ladies of this institution to bind girls as apprentices, I shall not be able to accept his suggestion either that a Roman Catholic institution should be at liberty to bind children, male or female, to Protestant guardians, or that Protestant institutions should be able to bind Roman Catholic children. This is simply an enabling clause to enable articles of apprenticeship to be entered into. They do not desire, and would not accept or use any authority in any other way than is provided here; and the provision is a safeguard against any class of persons, or any voluntary institution of this kind, obtaining such power as in any way to change the religion of the prisoners under their control.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thoroughly agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Muskoka, and I am very glad indeed that the hon. Minister has recognized its importance. I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman intends to move an amendment to the Bill, that it should be carefully prepared, and that he should not rush it through in a hurry. The Bill should not pass through to-night, but the hon. gentleman should give notice of

the amendment, so that we can see exactly what sort of inspection this institution shall be subject to. There is no doubt that where you permit the sentencing of criminals to private institutions of this kind it is essential in the public interest that the state should maintain the right to have the strictest supervision over the persons imprisoned in them; and we should see that this is carried out, not by a clause merely giving power of inspection, but by a clause so drafted that an efficient inspection shall be maintained at all time. With that safeguard, I think the general scope of the Bill is one to which no objection should be taken. I would suggest to the hon. member for Muskoka that if he has not a clause of that kind drawn he should confer with the Minister of Justice in reference to it, as I consider the matter very important.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I hope the Minister of Justice will draw such a clause. As he has accepted the suggestion, I hope he will carry it out.

Mr. FRASER. I think the clause should be in the direction of providing for this institution the same inspection as all the other institutions in Halifax are subjected to—for example, the poor asylum, the Victoria hospital, and similar institutions. And all the other institutions in Halifax are subject to inspection; and I think it should be handed over to the same power to make an inspection. That would be more effective than if the Government took charge of the inspection, and I am sure to the citizens of Halifax that would be thoroughly satisfactory, because the competency of the board that makes the inspections of all these buildings will be relied upon by all the citizens of Halifax and the province.

Mr. DENISON. As the Minister of Justice has an official now for inspecting the prisons, Mr. Moylan I believe is his name, that officer might be used for this purpose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will be no objection to that.

On section 1,

Mr. DENISON. That is a clause to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister. When any woman or girl above the age of sixteen is sentenced to two months' imprisonment she may be sent to this institution; but a young girl who would be amenable to discipline, and perhaps be influenced by good example, is not allowed to be sent there, but has to go to the common gaol, and she may be sentenced to imprisonment for any term up to two years. If there is any class in the community that requires protection it is that class of innocent girls, if I may use the term, who commit their first offence. Before a criminal becomes hardened you can do something with her, but the oftener a criminal is convicted the more difficult she becomes to deal with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When I find institutions willing to receive these persons I shall be glad to ask Parliament to give power to send them there, but this institution is not willing to receive them.

Mr. FRASER. I had not noticed section 15 when I spoke, which I find will suit the very point raised, because they have very stringent rules in Halifax with regard to the inspection of buildings, think that will cover the difficulty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think it is sufficient.

On section 5,

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would ask whether the term for which prisoners are sentenced in these reformatories differs from the terms to which they are sentenced if sent to a common prison?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; we must not make it so, and I will look carefully through the Act to see that it is not made so.

On section 15,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to let that section stand, as, in providing for the inspection of this institution I propose to provide for the general inspection of any institution which possesses such power.

On section 16,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would call the attention of the Minister to the terms of this section, as I do not understand it:

> If an offender detained in such reformatory or such refuge becomes incorrigible, she may, on a certificate of the superintendent or superior, be removed to a penitentiary, as provided in the Penitentiary Act.

It could never be intended that a person convicted of an offence against some statute should be sent to a penitentiary on the mere *ipse dixit* of the superintendent of an institution. If the magistrate has not the power to send the person to the penitentiary it would never do to give the superintendent of the institution that power.

Committee rose and reported progress.

INSPECTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 149) respecting the Inspection of Ships.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the Minister made a short explanation when this Act was introduced. I have really forgotten it.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that the unions of ship labourers have, for some years, been petitioning this House, and sending delegations pressing for some legislation by which the safety of seamen can be better secured, in respect, particularly, to the defective rigging of vessels. I do not think that many complaints have been made concerning vessels that are engaged in ocean navigation, but in the inland waters there have been constant complaints, and the records show on some vessels that very distressing accidents have occurred. This Bill is introduced for the purpose of preventing those accidents, if possible, and we propose to take powers almost similar to the general clauses of the Steamboat Inspection Act. That applies only to boilers, &c., but this gives us charge over the whole ship. In order to prevent the necessity of imposing more dues on shipping, the hon. gentleman will see that I have avoided that by making the violation of the law a penal Act, and have imposed the duty on our officers of making inspections, and we also impose the

obligation on owners, when they become aware of defective rigging, of taking the necessary precautions to repair it; and in that way I hope we will be able to meet the wishes of the sailors, and give them more protection for their lives, without at the same time imposing any burden whatever upon the ship-owners, simply insisting that they shall take every possible precaution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the ship-owner to pay for making the inspections?

Mr. TUPPER. No; the hon. gentleman will see that we put upon him the necessity of seeing that the ship is all right, and if he does not do that a penalty is exacted. Our officers, on complaint or on rumour, have power to go on board and inspect, and we notify the owner that unless he takes the necessary steps, he is liable to prosecution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no such Act I suppose, in force in the mother country?

Mr. TUPPER. There is no Act like this, but they have an Act that answers the purpose. They can stop vessels, and under their Safety of Ships Act they have greater powers in that regard than we have.

Mr. STAIRS. Does this Act apply to steamships?

Mr. TUPPER. To all ships.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How are the inspectors to be paid?

Mr. TUPPER. They are paid now. The hon. gentleman will see that this enables us to give additional authority to the officers we have now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But don't you propose to give them additional pay?

Mr. TUPPER. No; because the additional duty would be very small. When they are on the ship now, they inspect the hull, the engines, &c., and they can, without much trouble, do all the additional duties that we impose upon them here. For instance, I could send a general officer of my department, who is paid a salary, off to inspect a ship, but I cannot do that at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am perfectly satisfied the hon. gentleman will be disappointed. I do not want to see a large army of office-holders created, but I am sure, if these additional duties are thrown upon these men, the chances are that the duties will be performed perfunctorily.

Mr. TUPPER. It may be so, and we may have to come to Parliament again.

Mr. FLINT. I notice the Governor in Council is to make regulations from time to time with regard to these matters.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the usual clause in Bills of this kind; that is in the Steamboat Inspection Act. The reason is, that it is found sometimes that circumstances occur in which it is difficult to enforce the regulations, as sometimes they may be entirely too stringent. Enforcing these regulations might bear with great hardship upon the interests affected. In this way we are able to change the regulations. We proceeded in the same way in reference to other legislation of this character.

Mr. FLINT. I am afraid this measure will not receive very warm acceptance from the ship-owners. It seems to me to a large degree unnecessary, although I was not present when the Minister introduced the Bill, and had not the pleasure of hearing his reasons for its necessity. Now, it is well known among those who are conversant with ships under the rules of the French and English "Lloyds," and the French "Bureau Veritas," and the "American Record," that the surveyors of these various companies inspect the ships every two years, and also inspect them under certain other circumstances when their attention is called to them. Unless the ships and vessels so surveyed and inspected through the agency of these companies are kept in first-class condition they are liable to lose their classification, and liable to lose their rating in the insurance companies. Unless a strong ground is made out by the Minister of Marine for the passage of an Act of this kind I very much fear that he may be bringing into operation a machinery that is likely to become very embarrassing, either to the public treasury or to the ship-owning community; because, if it is enforced to any extent these surveyors and inspectors must be paid; otherwise there will be a revolt, because extensive fees are now demanded by the surveyors of the companies I have alluded to.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has spoken on behalf of the very class of ship-owners who will not be affected in any respect by this Bill, because we do not want to get at ship-owners who keep their vessels in good condition, but those ship-owners who are so reckless they care not whether the lives of the sailors are lost or preserved. It is at that utterly reckless and almost criminal class this Bill strikes. This Bill is an answer to the appeal of seamen whose fellow-workers have lost their lives from the neglect or carelessness of ship-owners. It is quite certain that none of the ship-owners of the class to which the hon. member for Yarmouth alluded, ship-owners who have their vessels classed, will find any difficulty in connection with this Bill.

Mr. FRASER. In view of the fact that the Bill gives power to the inspector to board the ship and interfere with the captain and owner, it might be well to exempt any ship holding a certificate from Lloyds'. There was apparently no need for inspection by a Government officer when the captain presented a certificate of inspection from Lloyds' agent.

Mr. TUPPER. I made a mistake in saying, some time ago, that this Bill applies to steamers. It applies only to sailing vessels.

Mr. FRASER. I really think that vessels holding Lloyds' certificates should be exempt from this Bill, as under it a ship might be detained.

Mr. TUPPER. No inconvenience would be suffered by them. A vessel would only be detained in case the Government officer found it was not in a condition to go to sea. All the facts will have to be stated in each case.

Mr. FRASER. No doubt. But after an inspection by Lloyds' agent, who is a much better authority than any of the officers mentioned here, an inspection by the Government officer is unnecessary. A Government inspector may think a vessel

is not seaworthy when she has been declared seaworthy by Lloyds' agent and a certificate given.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not agree that Lloyds' agents are such wonderful authorities as the hon. gentleman appears to think they are. I do not consider they are to be placed ahead of the officers we employ, and pay according to their professional knowledge, and each of whom had to pass a very difficult technical examination. Officers in the service of the Department of Marine hold a position certainly not such as the hon. gentleman conceived it to be. We do not propose to interfere with ships such as he has described. The reasons have to be explicitly given before any interference is made. Take a case in point. A ship is classed, and the owner supposes she is in perfect condition. When our officer inspects her and points out defects—for example, such an officer as Capt. Smith of Halifax or Lieutenant Gordon—the owner may say: "I have my ship classed, and I do not care for these defects." It is to prevent that recklessness and to compel owners who fail to put their vessels into proper condition, and thoroughly equip them, that this Bill was framed. I cannot conceive a case where the owner of a vessel that has a good class would not, on defects being pointed out, proceed to remedy them.

Mr. FRASER. I submit that my point is established. I hold that, speaking generally, the harbour masters of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not as capable as the officers I mentioned. I therefore hold that if a captain presents a Lloyds' certificate the vessel should not be subjected to inspection by a harbour master, who may override the agent's decision and declare that the vessel is not fit to go to sea. He may telegraph to the Minister of Marine, and the vessel may be detained. I know that very many vessels go to sea that should not be allowed to do so, and I admit that the object of this Bill is a good one, but it gives too great power to the Government officers. No vessel should be detained from going to sea if she has a Lloyds' certificate.

Mr. TUPPER. This clause is almost identical with that of clause 50 of the Steamboat Inspection Act. That is really the clause that affords a guarantee for the safety of sailors. The hon. gentleman can understand that no department of the Government would interfere with a ship unless it was an extreme case, and reasons for detention have to be given in detail by an officer, and a competent one. Of course, if the hon. gentleman holds that our officers are incompetent, and cannot properly deal with these nautical matters——

Mr. FRASER. No.

Mr. TUPPER. It will be difficult to discuss it. Our legislation under those circumstances must be of a dangerous character, for we are entrusting the Government officers with great powers. The situation would be different if any charges could be brought against any of the departmental officers, to whom we pay large sums.

Mr. FRASER. I am not saying anything about the officers.

Mr. PUTNAM. Does this Bill apply to sea-going ships?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. PUTNAM. After our vessels are inspected by Lloyds' agent and by the inspectors of other underwriting officers they should be in a position to go to sea without being submitted to further inspection.

Mr. TUPPER. I know that ship-owners are against any legislation in reference to their shipping. Most of them in Canada, I believe, are perfectly fit to be trusted with the management of their own property, and in their own interest they will take care of that; but the trouble is, that Parliament has found years ago that some ship-owners are not so careful, but are reckless, and given to speculating, and so on, and it was for that reason that Parliament has interfered with the management of their ships to such an enormous extent. I do not think that the hon. gentleman from Hants (Mr. Putnam) has carefully read the Bill through, or he would see that a ship properly classed need not be detained for a day; but if a report would be made by an officer of our department that the rigging is insecure and inefficient I have no doubt whatever that the captain of the ship would be glad to remedy that before putting to sea. It is not only that there is some slight defect, but the reason must be given that the ship cannot proceed to sea with safety, and without endangering life or property. A certificate from Lloyds', or a policy, or anything of that kind, would not avail for such a defect as I have referred to, and that is the only case where we could stop a ship. However, we had better discuss the clauses in order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose it would have been better to discuss the principles of the Bill before we went into Committee, but I honestly confess I did not give it the attention I ought to. The Minister's object would be attained, I suppose, by applying this to ships on inland waters only. I understand that the complaints that brought about this legislation arise from the defective gear of the ships on the inland lakes, and I assume, from what the Minister said, that no complaints have been made from seaport towns with reference to sea-going ships. Of course, there could be no desire on the part of the Minister or anyone else to put harrassing stipulations or conditions upon the owners of ships. There are two or three guarantees that the owner of the ship will not send his vessel to sea in an unseaworthy condition. In the first place, we have the guarantee, and a very high one it is, of the inspection by the officer of Lloyds or the Bureau Veritas, and in the second place, if a ship-owner sends a ship to sea in an unseaworthy condition he has to lose his whole insurance. In addition to that, we have the experience of a great many years that no complaints have been made that unseaworthy ships have been sent to sea. We have had this legislation because complaints have come from certain labour societies that the ships on the inland lakes are sent to sea in an unseaworthy condition. I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is wise to include that large class of sea-going ships, with respect to which we have several and sufficient guarantees that the owners will not send them to sea in an unseaworthy condition? We know that there is nothing that a ship-owner or merchant dreads so much as incessant inspection of his property. You may say that no harbour master would improperly detain a ship, but if you invest these

jacks in authority with a lot of power in an outlying port, and the ship-owner is not on good terms with them, they can put him to almost incalculable trouble and expense. Unless there is real necessity for it, I would impress upon the Minister the desirability of applying the Act to the evil which he seeks to cure, in reference to ships on the inland lakes.

Mr. TUPPER. I can inform the hon. gentleman that the request for this legislation has come from all parts of Canada, and I think petitions from Halifax are before the House. When I had in my mind accidents confined to the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario last year I by no means say that these dangers exist only in these provinces. While much of the hon. gentleman's contention is correct with reference to the object of a cautious and honest ship-owner or captain, there are reckless persons connected with the shipping, and they are not confined to any particular province. I see no reason why we should not protect the lives of sailors in sea-going vessels as well as sailors on the inland lakes. I recollect last year, for instance, and it seemed to me an extraordinary state of affairs, that there were very serious complaints in connection with the condition of a ship in Quebec, the name of which I have forgotten. The captain, for the sake of saving the expense, was anxious not to repair at Quebec, but to patch her up there and take her across the ocean. Representations were made to me in reference to this by a good many authorities—I think the Board of Trade at Quebec was one—and I found we had not power to detain the vessel. Her class would not make any difference, because she met with this accident and damage coming up the river.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was she an English ship?

Mr. TUPPER. I have forgotten. I am most anxious not to put any difficulty in the way of shipping, but I cannot see that this Act is giving that extraordinary power to the officers which the hon. gentleman is afraid of. It is not in the power of an officer in an outside port to vent his spite or his ignorance in the way mentioned upon the ship, by saying that he will detain this vessel, for he must give us his reasons for the detention. Let me read section 9, which says:

> If an inspector reports to the Minister in writing that he considers that any ship liable to inspection under this Act could not make a voyage or trip from any port or place in Canada without endangering life or property, stating the facts on which his report is based, the Minister may direct such ship to be detained, and the inspector may thereupon detain such ship and notify a chief officer of Customs at any port; and no ship so detained shall go on any voyage or trip as aforesaid, or be used for the purposes of navigation, until permitted by the Minister.

That means, of course, an examination by our nautical experts, who will not be under such influences, and the hon. gentleman will see that an officer cannot detain the ship unless he gave his reasons that in permitting the ship to go to sea it would endanger life and property. There could not be any such misrepresentation, except in very rare cases indeed. The case I have in my mind is where a vessel is patched up in a careless way, and for the sake of saving a few dollars puts to sea in that condition. While the ship was engaging her crew and getting ready for sea there could be the fullest investigation and no unnecessary detention. I do not think there is an opportunity, therefore—and the hon. gentleman's argument is directed to that—of a sudden action on the part of a comparatively irresponsible officer. We have against that the fact that the act of the officer would be reported to the department, and the hon. gentleman can understand how carefully the whole case would be weighed before any Minister would take a step that would lead to such a consequence as the stopping of the vessel. But it is just in view of the fact that lives have been lost for the want of this legislation——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I confess that I had not in my mind the particular clause to which the hon. gentleman refers, nor was I so much afraid of an improper exercise of the power vested in him as the Minister of Marine. The hon. gentleman has defended the Bill chiefly on the ground that the equipment of the vessel might be out of order. But he goes further; he not only provides for the inspection of the apparel of the vessel, but of the hull.

Mr. TUPPER. We have that power now as to hulls, boilers, engines, and so on, and we propose to extend it to tackle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quite recognize the propriety of all the provisions in the Steamboat Inspection Act, and I admit that steamers carrying passengers ought to be subject to a most stringent inspection at the hands of the Government. But I fail to see that there is any analogy between the inspection of steamboats carrying passengers and the inspection which is proposed with reference to sea-going vessels. The 4th section empowers the officer to inspect the hulls; the 5th section empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations for that inspection: the 6th section requires the master to make his report when anything goes wrong; the 7th section authorizes the inspector to go on board the ship and to inspect and examine the same at any time, and he may require the unloading or removal of any cargo, ballast or tackle. This is a great power to vest in a harbour master.

Mr. TUPPER. We have that already.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; in the Steamboat Inspection Act; but I deny that there is or ought to be any analogy between the inspection of steamboats, which are authorized to carry passengers on the inland waters of Canada, and the inspection that we ought to require of sea-going ships.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a straight denial of the petition of the seamen. The seamen say: Our lives are just as important as the lives of passengers, and you have protected passengers; we have lost many a fellow labourer from the recklessness of the ship-owner and the carelessness of a shipmaster; and we ask you to prevent that as far as you can. We, therefore, in this Bill extend our authority—which now exists, so far as the inspecting power is concerned, to the hull of a ship—also to the rigging up which these sailors are bound to go, subject to imprisonment if they refuse. Therefore, they say: Before we are compelled to do that, we want you to see that the ship-owners take the necessary precautions to have all the rigging safe and secure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I need not repeat the argument I urged before, that you have already the inspection of Lloyds' surveyor and the Bureau Veritas, the further fact that the owner is in danger of losing his insurance, and the further guarantee

that sailors are not bound to go to sea in an unseaworthy ship; under the Merchants' Shipping Act they can refuse. I was pointing out that the hon. gentleman is vesting enormous powers in officers, such as port wardens, harbour masters, &c. They can stop a ship which is just ready to go to sea, order it to be unloaded, though after it is unloaded it may turn out that the hull is all right; and they may exercise this arbitrary power in a manner which will be very oppressive to the ship-owner.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not at all disposed to press the exact wording of these clauses; I am only too glad to get the assistance of the House in improving them. The hon. gentleman, however, seemed to me to be discussing the principle of the Bill, which is, after all, that we have reached a point where we must interfere in the case of sailors as we have interfered in the case of passengers. There has been a distinction drawn in our legislation hitherto. More severe safeguards and more stringent regulations have been applied to the owners of ships carrying passengers than to ships carrying freight. That has been the spirit of our legislation. This Bill, however, is founded on the request to go a step further and in certain events to interfere for the protection of the life of the sailor. I would suggest that we should assume that the principle of the Bill is approved, and go on in Committee, and deal with the language and the powers granted in each clause; then, on the third reading the whole measure may be discussed, and the House will be in a position to take such action as it deems necessary, either to reject the Bill or to propose substantial amendments.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I want to call the hon. Minister's attention again to the question I asked before, as to whether the case referred to in Quebec was the case of a classed vessel or not. I understood him to say that it did not make any difference. In my humble opinion, it makes all the difference in the world. If that vessel was in Quebec undergoing repairs, and was a classed vessel, she would have to undergo those repairs under the inspection of a Lloyds' inspector or an inspector of the Bureau Veritas, and that inspection surely would be sufficient to ensure the safety of any crew that might afterwards go to sea in it. If, on the other hand, she was not a classed vessel, she would come under the operation of this Bill if the proposal of the gentlemen who have spoken to-night should be carried out. It does appear to me that the position taken by several hon. gentlemen to-night is really a sound position, that this Bill should not apply to vessels which are classed either under the English Lloyds' or under the Bureau Veritas. With regard to the petitions the Minister has referred to, so far as I am informed, these petitions have originated altogether in the west. I know that some petitions were circulated in the locality where I live, and were signed by some of the labouring associations there, but I do not know of a single case in which they were signed by those who had any interest in this matter, or knew anything about shipping at all, and the petitions which were signed there were sent by the organizations in the west for the signatures of those associations in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think there can be no doubt that the Government had better allow the business of inspection of vessels by Lloyds' agents and underwriters to remain as they are. This Bill proposes to create a class of port wardens, harbour masters and inspectors of hulls, whose function will be of an inquisitorial character, and the results will likely be of a most vexatious kind. I do not think the Government has any cause to find fault with the classing of vessels under insurance regulations, and if they attempt to take that matter into their own hands they will expose shipowners to vexatious detentions and give opportunities to ill-intentioned persons to injure owners by means of collusion with those officials in many cases. I do not see any necessity for having two sets of machinery to secure what is sufficiently well secured already by the operation of the insurance companies. I quite agree with the hon. Minister as to the necessity of having this law uniform as regards both sea-going vessels and vessels navigating inland waters. If precautions are necessary in one case they should be applicable in all cases. I doubt whether, in drawing up the provisions of this Bill, the interests of vessel-owners have been very much considered by the hon. Minister. He must have been influenced by petitions from sailors' unions and organizations of that kind. The object, of course, is laudable, that of making proper provisions for the safety of the lives of sailors, but it is proper also that we should consider the rights of the owners. I see in sub-section (*a*) of section 2 that this Bill includes tow barges. I suppose the hon. Minister of Marine is aware that, particularly in inland waters, the kind of vessels that are not classed are used for the business of transporting lumber. They are made up in tows and loaded with lumber, and towed by steamers, and a number of those constitute what is called a tow. The business of towing lumber is one in which the risk is comparatively small. The cargo itself ensures the vessel against foundering in the charge of a good staunch tow boat, and the risk is comparatively trifling. The vessels go down with a cargo of lumber and come back light on those short lake trips, and the provisions of this Bill will simply put an end to that branch of lake commerce.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would remind the hon. gentleman of a loss that occurred on Lake Ontario three or four years ago just in consequence of defects this Bill is intended to remedy. I well remember the circumstances, as it was very notorious at the time.

Mr. CHARLTON. What was the name of the vessel?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not remember, but the circumstance is very fresh in my memory.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the business of transporting grain and lumber is not unattended with risk.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This was a case of pure neglect.

Mr. CHARLTON. But this branch of business is a very extensive one, and the casualties in proportion to the amount of business transacted are very light, lighter, I venture to say, than in almost any other branch of lake commerce.

Mr. TUPPER. The only case this Bill reaches is where it would not be safe for life and property for a tow barge to put out. Surely the hon. gentleman does not wish that such a tow barge should be permitted to go out. The small loss of life is due to the small number of men on each tow barge.

Mr. CHARLTON. If this tow barge was not a vessel that would meet the requirements of the inspection such as he provides it cannot go into business at all; and if the provisions of the Bill are carried, it would simply shut out a very large class of lake marine from participation in the business of carrying lumber.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the same rule should be applied to sea-going vessels as to vessels navigating inland waters. What ought to govern legislation proposed in this House is whether such legislation is required. The point taken by those who are opposing the application of the Bill to sea-going vessels is that it never has been shown that this legislation is required; and with all deference to the opinion of the hon. Minister—and I agree most heartily in all that he has said with regard to our taking every precaution to secure the safety of seamen, for their safety is just as well worthy our attention as the safety of passengers—I think the hon. Minister should show that the seamen of the Maritime Provinces have asked for a measure of this kind and have themselves felt that their safety is endangered, owing to the difficulties or troubles he now purposes to remedy. I am confident that throughout all the different ports in the Maritime Provinces the Minister will not find that there is any feeling, either among fishermen or seamen, that their lives have been endangered owing to unseaworthy vessels, though no one can deny that unseaworthy vessels occasionally may sail. With respect to what the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has said about petitions, I am confident that those which came from Halifax and were presented by my colleague and myself were all inspired in the west, and were sent down by the different labour unions in the west, and did not come from the sailors and those more particularly interested in this matter. I agree very strongly in what was said by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) It is desirable the hon. Minister should try and exempt sea-going vessels for the reason given, and that is, that the provisions which exist for securing the seaworthiness of these vessels and the tackle they use are amply sufficient for the purpose. I would also suggest in this connection to the hon. Minister, that if he should consent now to except these vessels he could easily, at any time in the future, should it be found that life is in danger on the ocean owing to the unseaworthiness of vessels, strike the exception out, and make the Act apply; but up to the present, I submit, that this has not been shown, and he ought to give consideration to the representations made this evening and see if he cannot exempt these vessels.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to say a few words with respect to the petitions which have been presented. Hon. gentlemen have stated that these petitions emanated from the west entirely. I beg to differ from these hon. gentlemen in that statement. Last summer a large number of men from all over the Dominion assembled in Ottawa, and among them were a great many sailors, and it appears that the sailors agreed that, owing to the unseaworthiness of vessels leaving certain ports in the Dominion, the only hope they had of saving life was to present petitions to this House, so that this House might pass legislation in the interests of sailors, though not against the interests of owners. As I understand, the sailors are very willing to recognize all the rights of the owners, but at the same time they ask to be protected in their work of sailing vessels for the owners. These petitions were circulated all over the Dominion, wherever sailors were to be found, to be signed, and they were signed, and on the strength of these petitions the Minister has framed the Bill. I remember that in the early part of this session a deputation came down and saw the late Premier and other Ministers, and the late Premier promised the sailors that a Bill of that kind would be introduced. I believe one or two years ago a model of a hull was brought to Ottawa in order to show members of Parliament the kind of hulls that were allowed to be put in the water. It is only just that the sailor's life should be protected, notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island says steamers should have all the protection because they carry passengers; but I take it that the lives of sailors are as important as those of passengers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent me. I did not say the lives of sailors were not as valuable as those of passengers. I only said it was not fair to draw an analogy between the sea-going ship guaranteed by Lloyds' agents, and carrying an enormous number of passengers, and the small steamers which may be paddling around in the inland waters. It does not necessarily follow that the same rule should apply to both. I have always lived in a seaport town, and I know that, between Lloyds' agent, who is generally a very exacting man, and the insurance companies, you have enough security, and I think you will do well if you adopt the suggestion of the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) in regard to vessels which are certified at Lloyd's, or the Bureau Veritas, or the American Record, and I think that would be sufficient in their case.

Mr. TUPPER. I will consider how far we can do that, but my difficulty is, that though a vessel may be of the best class, the accidents which are aimed at in this Bill in one or two sections may have occurred, and have occurred. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he is not going to say that because the vessel is of the best class that will prevent accidents from occurring.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). She will not go to sea again. She has to be repaired under Lloyds' inspector, and she loses her class if she is not repaired to his satisfaction.

Mr. TUPPER. If she does not do everything proper in that respect she may not only lose her class but also the lives which we want to protect. The hon. gentleman from Hants (Mr. Putnam) has sailed a ship and knows that he can be detained at any British port until the officers are satisfied that his ship is fit to proceed to sea. They will not recognize the certificate in England if any defect exists in the vessel, but I do not include that part in this Bill. I will investigate and see how far it is safe to exempt vessels of a high class. The hon. gentleman has referred to tow barges. I could give him some appalling instances of the accidents in those tow barges. We have no desire to hamper them, but when we find that a barge

is nothing but a rotten tub or coffin, we are not going to allow the owner to make a lot of money and to run chances in regard to loss of life. The evidence is overwhelming from all parts of Canada, for this legislation has been suggested by labour unions, whether they were composed of sailors or others. They are acting all for the same purpose, for the protection of their co-workers. The hon. gentleman asks whether the sailors of the Maritime Provinces have petitioned, but he knows that a large number of those who are employed on the vessels going to sea from the Maritime Provinces are foreigners, and are not like those out west, who are Canadians, and who are able to co-operate. The only organization for those living in Halifax, for instance, and going to sea as seamen, is the general labour organization. A whole string of petitions came into this House on the 14th May of this session, including the Bricklayers' and Masons' International Union of America, of Halifax.

An hon. MEMBER. Were they seamen?

Mr. TUPPER. No; but seamen are members of these organizations. These are the labour organizations, and while the name of some are not nautical names, they are, I believe, the only associations to which the sailors have access. Then there are the Steamboat Longshoremen's Union, the Ontario Trades and Labour Union, the Shipwrights' Association, and others of British Columbia, and many others to the same effect. We find them not only on the Atlantic, but we find that from the Pacific and the west petitions have been sent to this effect, though, of course, the petitions are not the only basis of the Bill. The petition goes for what it is worth, but the appeal which it makes seems to require attention at our hands. As to whether we should take power to exempt the high class of vessels, though there is a possibility of danger in regard to them, on the understanding that we come back to Committee to consider a clause in that respect if I feel I can do that after considering the arguments, we might go on with the other part of the Bill and report progress.

Mr. PUTNAM. I believe this Bill is all right so far as the inland waters are concerned. The barges are not now inspected at all, but that is altogether different from the sea-going vessels, which have to be inspected every two or three years, and if not in proper condition we are compelled to put them in order, and if we do not we cannot get our certificates. I think this Bill is entirely unnecessary in regard to sea-going vessels. I believe there is a sort of inspection by underwriting agents for vessels on the lakes, but nothing more. We are subject, in the first place, to the surveyors of the English and French Lloyds, and in all the different ports underwriters' agents visit the vessels almost every day.

Mr. SPROULE. In the consideration of this Bill we have very much the same arguments presented by those who oppose it that we had in past years, when Bills relating to shipping were introduced into this House. The Bill for the purpose of inspecting boilers was fought with great persistence. The same arguments that were urged against that are being urged to-day, namely, that it was an annoyance to shipowners, expensive, and liable to cause unnecessary delay. However, that Bill was passed, and found to be useful. Then, when it was proposed to extend the inspection to hulls the same arguments were used and the same objections urged as against the present Bill. I think no person can deny that the petitions which have been poured into this House during the last two years, asking for such a measure, and very numerously signed, ought to receive some consideration at our hands. I know these petitions came from my part of the country in large numbers, not only from seamen, but from labour unions, whose members or friends were employed in navigation. Now, it was held that ships that were repaired under Lloyds' survey could not, for that reason, be in an unseaworthy condition; but, notwithstanding that survey, it has been found, from time to time, that accidents have occurred on those ships. I have not the reports before me, but I know they have been cited in this House, and we know that many deplorable accidents have occurred within the last few years. What has happened before may happen again. In regard to towing barges on the upper lakes, we know that accidents have happened more than once, and those accidents have been attributed to the fact that the barges were not fit to be taken out. I think that if that has been found to be the case there is very strong reason why we should go further and inspect them. I understood the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) to say that he could understand why steamships that carried a large number of passengers should be inspected, but he did not think that reason should apply with the same force to ships that only carried their crew. Now, surely the lives of a crew are just as valuable as the lives of the same number of passengers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, I hope, does not want to misrepresent me. I urged the same arguments that are urged on the other side. I said there was no reason to apply this to efficient sea-going ships that are already under efficient inspection.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not referring to what the hon. gentleman may call sea-going ships; but that is not the line of argument he took. He could understand why it would apply to vessels carrying a large number of passengers, but he did not think it should apply with the same force to ships that only carried a few passengers, or the crew. Now, in my opinion the life of one is just as valuable as the life of another, whether he be a poor unfortunate sailor or a millionaire. Now, in the interest of humanity I think a change is needed, because the history of accidents shows it is needed I do not see how this House could well ignore the petitions sent here year after year asking for further legislation, nor do I think the arguments that have been advanced against this Bill are any more forcible than the arguments that were advanced against the inspection of hulls or boilers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the hon. gentleman comes to consider the suggestion I made I hope he will bear in mind that he has already introduced a Bill this session providing that in addition to the present inspection sea-going ships will be subject to a load-line marked upon them.

On section 5,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not quite sure whether the hon. gentleman would not do better to report progress, and come to some conclusion as to

whether this Bill is to be applied to sea-going ships before we go through the other sections. If the Bill is to be applied to sea-going ships some of these sections must be critically examined. There are some things in them which we cannot allow to go; and if it is not to be applied to sea-going ships I fancy the Bill will be pretty generally accepted.

Mr. TUPPER. I think we can save time by going on now. There will be very little trouble if we make provisions for exemption.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the exemption is granted.

Mr. TUPPER. We will go on with the understanding that we can bring up any clause when we come back to the Committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would suggest after the word "inspector" we add "or to a collector of Customs," in the thirty-fifth line. It is much more easy for the master to report to the collector of Customs than to an inspector. He may not know where the inspector is.

Mr. TUPPER. We will make that change.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I would suggest to the Minister whether in the twenty-seventh line we had not better make that penalty not to exceed $100. This clause fixes an arbitrary penalty.

Mr. TUPPER. Very well.

Mr. STAIRS. I ask, what would happen in case of vessels subject to the inspection of the Lloyds' inspector, if there was a conflict of authorities between that inspector and the Government inspector. They might differ in opinion as to what should be done. It would be necessary, in the interests of the shipowner, and in order to secure the insurance, that the recommendations of Lloyds' inspector should be carried out.

Mr. TUPPER. This point will be considered.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. S. W. McCULLY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Have the services of Mr. S. W. McCully, an employé of the Intercolonial Railway, been dispensed with, or has he been notified that his services will not be required? If so, what were the reasons for his dismissal, and has Mr. McCully been informed of these reasons?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. McCully never was what was understood to be an employé of the Intercolonial Railway, and consequently could not have been dismissed. He was, however, when his services were required, employed in the repairing of clocks at the stations on a section of the Intercolonial road where there was work to be done. A portion of this work having been given to a Mr. Gould has, I suppose, led to the charge that Mr. McCully had been dismissed.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PRINTING.

Mr. JONCAS asked, 1. What was the amount paid last year by the Government for the printing of time-tables, blank books of all kinds, cards, account books, bills of lading, &c., in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and other Government railways? 2. To what printing establishments was this amount paid? The name of each establishment, and the respective amount paid to each of them?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount paid for the printing was $44,336.12. The following sums were paid, as per rates established by the Queen's Printer:—

Moncton *Times*, Moncton	$ 12,691 48
Herald Printing Co., Halifax	8,515 28
Sun Publishing Co., St. John	12,093 21
Yarmouth *Times*, Yarmouth	3,026 80
John Foote, Quebec	2,259 45
Barnes & Co., St. John	3,220 61
Examiner, Charlottetown	1,178 55
Summerside *Journal*, Summerside	743 52
Herald Publishing Co., Charlottetown	617 25

CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, What were the amounts of receipts and expenditures respectively of the Caraquet Railway for the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1890, and 30th June, 1891?

Mr. BOWELL. Earnings 1889-90, $20,256.31; expenditure, $25,616.14. The returns from the company for 1890-91 are not yet made to the Government, railway companies having until October in each year to make such returns.

MONTREAL AND SOREL RAILWAY.

Mr. MONET asked, 1. Have the Government made arrangements with the Great Eastern Railway Company for the completion of the Montreal and Sorel Railway, in accordance with the subsidy granted in 1890? 2. Are the Government aware that that road has been closed to public traffic since the 27th June, 1891, and for what reason? 3. What sum have the Government paid to the Great Eastern Railway Company out of the subsidy of forty thousand dollars, and why was that sum paid? 4. Have the Ottawa Government received a report from their engineer relative to any work done on the Montreal and Sorel Road, and have the engineers stated what work has been done? 5. Did the Government pay, during last winter, and during the last Dominion elections, to the Great Eastern Railway Company, or to C. N. Armstrong, its managing director, any sum of money for the benefit of the Montreal and Sorel Railway, and if so, what amount of money was paid, and for what purpose? 6. Are the Government aware that the Montreal and Sorel Railway was closed to the public during a period of about two months during last winter, and why traffic was so suspended on the said railway, when a subsidy of $40,000 had been voted to complete the work to be done on the said railway? 7. Has a statement of account been filed by the Great Eastern Railway Company, or by any other person, for any outlay on the Montreal and Sorel Railway, and if so, when; and what is the amount of the account so

filed? 8. Are the Government aware that during the last Dominion elections a sum of four or five thousand dollars, or any other sum, was paid to the Great Eastern Railway Company, or to C. N. Armstrong, for the purchase of an engine, and that the said engine was taken away and is being used by the said C. N. Armstrong for his own personal service?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. Yes. 2. The Government is not aware that the road has been closed. If closed, have no knowledge of the reason of such closing. 3. The total amount paid was $23,835.37. The reason for such payment was that after inspection by an engineer of the department it was found to have been earned. 4. Yes. The following amounts were paid to the company:—On 2nd December, 1890, $1,697.50; 4th December, 1890, $5,184; 4th March, 1891, $4,000. The payments in December, 1890, were for work done on account of subsidy. The payment in March was for a locomotive purchased and delivered. 6. Yes. The Government is aware the road was closed for some weeks. Understand the reason for such closing was that the road was blocked with snow. 7. No such account has been filed in the department. 8. The above-named sum of $4,000 was paid to the Great Eastern Railway on account of the subsidy for an engine. The Government is not aware that Mr. Armstrong removed the engine and is using it for his own personal service.

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR COMPANY.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to grant permission to "The International Abattoir Company" to import cattle from the United States to be slaughtered and the meat exported?

Mr. HAGGART. It is at present under consideration of the Government.

LABOUR STATISTICS BUREAU.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to put into operation the Act of 1890 creating a Bureau of Labour Statistics; if so, when do they intend to commence the organization of the said Bureau?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention of the Government to put into operation the Act creating a Bureau of Labour Statistics. The statistics which were collected by the census, forming the basis of such Bureau, are being compiled as rapidly as possible. When such compilation is completed the Bureau will be organized.

MONTREAL LETTER-BOX CONTRACT.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, Whether the Government have renewed the contract for the service of letter-boxes in the city of Montreal, and for what period of time? Had they called for tenders, had they awaited the expiration of the previous contract, and were they aware that several parties had manifested an intention to compete for that service?

Mr. HAGGART. The contract for the street letter-box service in Montreal was renewed with the present contractor for four years from the 1st September proximo. Tenders were not invited. It is not the practice of the department to await the termination of a contract before making new arrangements, as these arrangements require time. The department was not aware of a desire on the part of anyone to tender for the service in question.

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, What are the names of the steamers visited by Dr. P. A. Gauvreau, of Rimouski, in pursuance of instructions from the Government, since the opening of navigation this season? On what dates were such visits made? In what manner and by whom were the Government informed that Dr. P. A. Gauvreau, of Rimouski, visited certain steamers, as stated in the answer made by the Government to an enquiry in this House, on the 27th of July, 1891?

Mr. HAGGART. No steamers have been visited by Dr. Gauvreau at Rimouski since the opening of navigation during the present season, for the reason as stated, that no mail steamers have called there. It was not stated, in answer to a question on 27th July last, that Dr. Gauvreau had visited certain steamers. The answer then furnished was that "Dr. Gauvreau now claims the yearly salary, notwithstanding the non-calling of the steamers, in his quality of quarantine officer."

MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The names of those civil servants superannuated in the Montreal Custom house since the first day of January, 1891; the number of years of each in the service; the retiring allowance granted to each.

Mr. BOWELL. Knowing the thirsty desire of my hon. friend for information, I have added the amounts of salaries, and other information that will make the return more complete. The following is the list of those asked for:—

Name.	Salaries.	Years of Service.	Age.	Retiring Allowance.
J. F. Hilton	$1,800	12 years.	61	$540 00
Edward Meyer	1,400	38 "	68	980 00
Jas. Stephenson	1,800	11 "	61	396 00
F. Crispo	2,000	46 "	72	1,400 00
J. P. Purcell	1,600	36 "	66	1,120 08
O. Bouiez	700	27 "	55	336 00
A. Moir	1,800	14 "	70	504 00
	$11,100			$5,276 08

CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, Whether the Government has acquired the steamer *Keewatin?* If so, when, from whom, and on what terms?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware of any steamer of that name belonging to the Government.

TAY CANAL.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked, 1. How many locks are there on the Tay Canal? How many men are employed in connection with each lock, and how much is each paid? 2. How many bridges span the Tay Canal within the limits of the town of Perth, and without? Of what materials are they built? How many of them are swing bridges, and what distances are they apart? 3. How many men are employed in connection with each bridge, and how much is paid to each? 4. What sum was spent last year (up to 30th June, 1891) in the management and working of said canal, apart from construction expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that: 1. There are two locks on the Tay Canal. There are two men (a lockmaster and a labourer) employed on the two locks and the swing bridge at the locks. The lockmaster is paid $1.25 per diem. 2. There are three bridges within the town of Perth, and one without. Three of the bridges are of steel and iron and one of wood. The four are swing bridges. The distance from the wooden bridge at the locks to Craig Street bridge is about six miles. From Craig Street bridge to Beckwith Street bridge is 1,600 feet. From Beckwith Street bridge to Drummond bridge is 500 feet. 3. Two men for the three bridges in the town of Perth since 1st August, 1891, at a salary of $1.25 per diem each. 4. The total sum paid for the year 1890-91 was $743.75 for maintenance and working of the canal.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does that include the bridge under contract?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say, but I will enquire.

REFRESHMENT CONTRACT ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has Joseph Fortin, of Lévis, a contract with the Government for the sale of refreshments, newspapers, &c., on the Intercolonial; if so, was the contract awarded after tenders had been asked for, when does the contract expire, and what is the price thereof?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Joseph Fortin has the contract. Tenders were invited in May, 1880, for the whole line of the Intercolonial Railway, the highest offer being $1,200 per annum. The contract was awarded to Hamilton, who performed the service very unsatisfactorily and the contract was cancelled. The road was then divided into two sections, the contract being given in 1883 to the Dominion News Company between Halifax and Campbellton for $900 per annum, and to Fortin between Campbellton and Lévis at $300. In 1885 the rental of the Dominion News Company, now the Canadian News Company, was increased to $1,200 and Fortin to $400. The Canadian News Company in 1889 were called upon to pay $1,418.96 per annum on account of an extension of the road, which they are now paying. Fortin's last contract is dated 1889 and it had been renewed from year to year. Fortin's contract expires on 1st July, 1892, and he is notified that the service will be put up to competition from that date. Fortin now pays $400 per annum.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Are the Government aware that the following notice has been posted up in nearly every department of the Government Printing Office:—

"Employés are requested to have their newspapers, letters, &c., addressed to their private residences or boarding houses. After this date, all mail matter addressed to the Printing Bureau will be returned to the post office, and this department will not be responsible for the same.'

"A. SENÉCAL,
"Supt. of Printing."

If so, by what authority was the said notice posted up, and what is the reason thereof?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I authorized the Superintendent of Printing to take the measure which he has taken in that direction.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. What is the reason?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was informed that it involved a great deal of loss of time in the department and a little loss of money to the treasury.

LUNDY'S LANE BATTLE—MONUMENT.

Mr. GERMAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to erect a monument on Drummond Hill, at the village of Niagara Falls, to commemorate the battle at Lundy's Lane, and if so, when?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. An amount has been placed in the Estimates for that purpose. Since then, the parties representing the petitioners who applied for a grant of money towards the Lundy's Lane memorial fund, have asked that the monument be not now erected, as they intend to obtain subscriptions which, added to the Government contribution, would enable them to erect a larger and more elaborate structure. The amount is still at their disposal.

DAMAGES TO LAND ON THE RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. BAIN (for Mr. DAWSON) asked, Have any claims for damages to lands adjoining the Rideau Canal, by the owners or occupiers of such lands in the Townships of Kingston, Storrington and Pittsburg, been presented to the Government, within the last five years? 2. If so, by whom? When? What amount of damages? The nature of the same, and how disposed of? 3. Has the Government, within the same period, purchased, or leased, or otherwise acquired any lands in the said townships? If so, from whom? When? For what purpose, and what consideration? 4. Have any of such claims been rejected? If so, whose claim, and for what reason? 5. Have Alexander Martin, Patrick Blake, John Hogan, John Brannington, Christopher Langwith, Daniel Hugh Folland and Joseph Folland presented any claims to the Government for damages to land adjoining or near to said canal? If so, for what land? For how much land? What was the nature of the claim of each, and how was each disposed of, and when? 6. Were any of such claims rejected? If so, whose, and why? 7. Who investigated such claims, and who finally disposed thereof?

Mr. BOWELL. That question involves altogether too much to enable me to give an answer for some days. I would suggest, therefore, that it be brought down by return.

Mr. BAIN. Will you accept the question as notice?

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection.

EXTRADITION OF LÉDA LAMONTAGNE.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the Government now taken any action upon the petition presented for the release of Léda Lamontagne, now detained in the gaol of the district of St. Francis, Province of Quebec?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Is the Government now prepared to lay down the correspondence exchanged between the American Government and the Canadian Government on the subject of the extradition of Léda Lamontagne?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; probably in the course of the present week.

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN CANADA AND SPAIN.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Is the Government aware that a reciprocity treaty has been lately concluded between the United States and Spain? 2. Is it the intention of the Government to resume negotiations for a reciprocity treaty between Canada and Spain?

Mr. FOSTER. To both questions the answer is, yes.

SEIZURE OF THE IRON BRIDGE OF WALKERTON.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Did Mr. Michael McNamara, Sub-Collector of Customs at Walkerton, receive from the Government, in addition to his salary, in the year 1888 or 1889, the sum of $236.44 as his share of the seizure of the iron bridge at Walkerton? If so, what service did he render for this amount, and what amount of undervaluation was found to exist in the bridge materials?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 3398 of the Official Report, he will find an answer to that question. I have answered it already. If he desires further information I can inform him that the $236.44 which was paid to Mr. McNamara, and which appears in the Auditor General's Report of 1887-88, had no connection whatever with the seizure, or with the difficulties that arose in connection with the iron bridge.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not answer what service was rendered for this amount.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not ask it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. No, he does not. If you will look at the question you will find that it refers to the seizure of the bridge and the iron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, what service did he render for this amount of $236.44?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I answered the question fully, and more than I was asked.

PURCHASE OF TYPE FOR THE PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. TROW) asked, What is the total amount paid by the Government for type purchased for the Printing Bureau, and what commission was paid to deliver such type into the Government Office at Ottawa?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. $116,005.24. The account for commission has not yet reached the Department of Printing.

WHARF AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) (for Mr. LISTER) asked, What amount has been returned to the Government by the wharfinger of the Government wharf at Sault Ste. Marie, as tolls or fees up to the 30th June, 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. Nothing has been returned, merely a claim in reference to the subject, which is now being investigated.

SURGEON OF INFANTRY SCHOOL AT ST. JOHN'S, P.Q.

Mr. DELISLE asked, 1. Whether the Government require that surgeons appointed to the military schools shall reside in the barracks of the said schools? 2. In the case of the Infantry School at St. John's, P.Q., is the surgeon a resident? 3. Is it true that Dr. F. W. Campbell, surgeon to the said school, resides at Montreal, and that he draws his rations as though he lived in barracks? 4. Do the Government intend to require that he shall reside in barracks, and, on his refusal, to call upon him to resisign?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Surgeons appointed to the military school, as a rule, have not been required to reside in the barracks. 2. In the case of the Infantry School at St. John's, P.Q., the surgeon is not resident. 3. It is true that Dr. F. W. Campbell, surgeon of said school, resides at Montreal. Information has been asked as to his drawing rations. 4. I am not aware that the Government intend to require him to reside in the barracks, and on his refusal to call upon him to resign, as the service has been efficiently carried out.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, 1. Have the Government been notified of the death of the Honourable the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec, Sir A. A. Dorion? 2. Is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy so created in the said court, before the next terms of the Court of Appeal in criminal matters sitting at Montreal and at Quebec? 3. Are the Government aware that the number of judges sitting in the Court of Queen's Bench (in appeal) has been but four, during several terms or portions of terms of that court during the past two years, counting judges *ad hoc* appointed temporarily to replace judges on leave or absent?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have been notified of the death of the chief justice, and it is the intention to fill the vacancy before the next term of the Court of Appeal for criminal matters. I have not been informed that the number of judges sitting in that court has been but four during several terms.

CAPTAIN BERNIER, OF CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Why was Captain H. O. Bernier, of Cap St. Ignace, notified to attend at Quebec for the 10th April last, in order to undergo an examination in reference to his application for the command of the *Alert*, inasmuch as, when there, he was not called upon to undergo the said examination? Is it the intention of the Government to repay him his travelling expenses?

Mr. TUPPER. I am very sorry that I cannot speak with the accuracy, with regard to this question, that the hon. gentleman desires; but I may say in advance of the exact answer as to this particular candidate, that the different applicants who have applied for that office were notified that on a certain day of this spring an examiner, in company with an officer of the Marine Department at Quebec, would examine such as desired to present themselves. If this candidate presented himself at the office for examination, I know no reason why he was not examined. The matter was purely voluntary on the part of the candidates for the position of master of the *Alert*. There is no intention, nor was there any intention, that their expenses would be paid by the department. It was simply an opportunity offered to all intending candidates to come forward and show their qualification. I will ascertain the reason why this candidate was not examined.

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That the evidence taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts in connection with the item Kingston Graving Dock, "B" of the Appropriation Accounts for the year ending 30th June, 1890, be printed for the use of members of that Committee, and that Rule 49 be suspended, in accordance with the recommendation of the Fourteenth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC LANDSLIDE.

Mr. FREMONT moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, memorials, correspondence and documents respecting the rock-slide from the Citadel at Quebec, on the 19th of September, 1889.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to call the attention of this House to a question which is of great importance to my fellow-citizens of Quebec, I do not speak without a certain apprehension, and I feel the necessity of asking the kindest indulgence of the hon. members of this House. They will bear in mind that I am labouring under various disadvantages. I am addressing this House in a language with which I am far from being familiar, and though the object of my remarks is worthy of the profoundest sympathy of the House and of the country, yet I feel difficulty in stating it as clearly and fairly as I would desire to do. Everybody knows, and I think there is not a single member of this House who has not read or heard the lamentable story of the disastrous accident to which I am about to refer. It is commonly known under the name of the Quebec land-slide, and occurred on the night of September 19, 1889. A portion of the rock over which is built the citadel of Quebec became detached, and rolled down the mountain side. In its fall it crushed and destroyed several houses, occupied by a large number of families. Nearly 50 persons were killed, several others crippled, and many were more or less seriously wounded. The disaster has been a great one, and the worst of it is that there is much that cannot be restored. The lives destroyed cannot be restored, and many have lost some who were near and dear to them. Those who were taken alive from the ruins lost all they had, their furniture, and even their very clothing. They have been thrown on the streets, obliged, as it were, to begin life over again and to earn the very first necessaries. Some are not only penniless but are incapable of earning their living, being wounded or crippled. Let me mention one single case to illustrate the unfortunate condition of these poor victims. Among the families so cruelly afflicted there is one of the name of Black. Mr. Black was a very respectable citizen of Quebec, and before the landslide he earned his living honourably and easily. He was proprietor of a foundry. His family consisted of his wife and a young girl 10 or 11 years old. The foundry has been destroyed; the father has been killed; the mother was withdrawn from the ruins disabled and the poor little child was made a cripple. They have lost a comfortable home, and now they are not only penniless but incapable of earning their living. The following letter Mrs. Black wrote to a friend some time after the accident:

"Will you kindly send me answer if you have received any word as to whether some assistance will be given to us, or have they (the Government) really decided against us. I am anxious to know, for I intend taking a step towards trying to waken them up to a knowledge of my real position. I do not intend to die of want, or yet to let my child suffer deprivations without making an effort to help her. I once thought of going to Ottawa and taking her with me. Do you think it would do any good to let them see what a wreck she is. I am altogether out of means, and but for a neighbour who suspected how it was with us, I would have never let it be known myself, but she found it out and has been very kind to us. At her instigation, the ladies of Chalmers Church have arranged to pay my rent, and we have to get along as best we can to live. You can understand what this must be for us who had a comfortable home and a kind husband and father. Sometimes I feel as though I must sink under the weight of my trouble. Why I am letting you know this is that you may urge the Government to do something at once for us. Please excuse me for writing, but I am not able to walk, and I have no longer the means to drive."

This case which I have just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is not an exceptional one; there are, alas, too many such cases, as the result of this accident. Many demands and claims have been made; several petitions and memorials have been sent to the Government on behalf of the victims, but up to the present moment the Government has refused to do justice to the families and survivors of that awful accident. The Government has even refused to take steps to prevent a recurrence of similar disasters. Of course, there is much that cannot be repaired, although the accident could, perhaps, have been prevented, but now we can by no possibility recall the valuable lives which have been sacrificed. The Government can never compensate the bereaved families for the loss of those who were near and dear to them, but it was expected that the Government would be prompt in coming to the assistance of the survivors. Immediately after the accident a sum of $5,000, I believe, was collected in Quebec to provide for the immediate and pressing wants of the victims. The citizens of Quebec held a public meeting, and some expressed an opinion that a public subscription should be opened to assist the poorest and the most

needful, but it was then and there stated by very influential persons, and friends of the present Administration, that the Government, who was responsible for the accident, would not deny such responsibility, and would not only come to the assistance of the poorest sufferers, but would repair the loss so far as lay in their power. However, nothing has been done, and the Government seemingly felt satisfied that they had fulfilled their duty in sending engineers to the scene of the accident. Major-General Cameron and Major Mayne, both of the Royal Military College, Kingston, were sent to Quebec with the following instructions: First, to report on the extent of the damage; second, to report on the probability of any further landslide in that locality; and third, to offer any recommendation for precautionary measures to prevent any further loss of life and damage to property. I have not had the privilege of reading Major General's Cameron's report, but I have the good fortune of having in my hand Major Mayne's report. He has not given any details as to the extent of the damages caused by the landslide; he simply mentions the quantity of rock by which a number of houses were destroyed, and I believe the approximate loss of life. He examines the geological causes of the accident and reports fully as to the second and third parts of his instructions. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is about the entire extent of the assistance offered by the Government to the victims of the land slide. I am told that the contention of the hon. the Minister of Justice was that the Government is not responsible for the accident, and further that there is no obligation on the part of the Government to take any steps to prevent a recurrence of such a lamentable event. The hon. Minister of Justice will allow me to say that the whole population of Quebec was deeply moved when the news spread that such was his opinion, Last year delegates selected from the City Council of Quebec came to Ottawa; and they were received by the Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and by the Minister of Public Works and by the Minister of Militia and Defence. They urged upon the Government the necessity of coming to the assistance of the victims. If my memory serves me right, the late Prime Minister, without acknowledging their claims, stated that he was not ready to say that the matter was to be settled on strict principles of civil law, but that he was willing to consider the question from an equitable point of view, and that the matter might be settled provided that there would be sufficient ground to show a a good *bonâ fide* case before Parliament. We returned to our homes satisfied, we were confident that some relief would be given, but the session came to a close and nothing was done. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is my duty to bring the matter before the Government, the House and the country, and I feel confident that the hon. members of this House will be convinced that it is not only a *bonâ fide* case, but that the claim on the Government is just and reasonable. I maintain that, in justice, the victims of the landslide are entitled to an indemnity by the Government of Canada, and, moreover, if the question is viewed from a humanitarian and philanthropic point of view, I contend that it is the duty of the Government to improve, as far as in their power lies, the unfortunate condition of the victims and to make good the loss which can yet be repaired. I say further, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases claims have been settled by the Government which were not placed on as good and as solid a basis as the present claims, and I will add that it is the bounden duty of the Government to take immediately such steps as will prevent further accidents of a similar nature in the same locality. I have said at first that the victims of the landslide are entitled in justice to an indemnity from the Government of Canada. I am quite aware that a contrary opinion has been expressed by a high and respected authority. It was stated that the catastrophy was due to the natural formation of the rock, or to forces of nature, or to both. It was also said that it did not result from any act of man, and supposing that such was the case, the hon. Minister of Justice stated that there was no liability under the civil law, or at common law, on the part of the Dominion Government, as the owners of the land. This opinion is based on the supposition that the catastrophe is due wholly and entirely to natural causes, without any intervention of man. Now, it is generally said in Quebec that there are several acts of man which might have caused, and indeed have contributed, to the great misfortune which befell Quebec that night. Formerly, at the foot of the mountain over which the Citadel of Quebec is built, there was a row of houses. Further on, ran Champlain street, on the other side of which were the houses destroyed by this accident. Some years ago, the houses at the foot of the mountain, but on the north side of the street, were demolished by the order of the Government. No doubt it was a humanitarian act on the part of the Government to cause the people living at such a dangerous spot to move away; but I believe it was a grave error on the part of the Government to have these houses removed. Had they been allowed to remain, but unoccupied, they would have receive the whole avalanche of stones and rocks, and would have to a great extent acted as a buttress, and prevented the rocks rolling as far as they did; they would have been a shield and protection to the other side of the street. This argument is based on Major Mayne's report, which recommends that in future such a plan be followed. Here is what Major Mayne recommends:

"That all houses and even offices under the dangerous portion of the hillside, should be evacuated but not removed, for they will assist in catching falling debris and preventing it reaching the whaves."

The above facts, Mr. Speaker, cannot be denied. It is a well-known fact that the houses at the foot of the mountain which I have mentioned, formerly existed, and everybody in Quebec knows that these houses were removed by order of the Dominion Government. The only point which might be questioned, is what would have been the result had these houses remained. To make this point clearer, I have asked the opinion of an engineer I wrote to, Mr. Charles Baillairgé, city engineer of Quebec, who knows the locality perfectly well, and who is a very well-known engineer, being a member of the Royal Society of Canada, and being also a member of various scientific societies both in England and elsewhere. Here is the letter which I wrote to Mr. Baillairgé—it is a translation from the French:

"OTTAWA, 16th July, 1891.

"CHARLES BAILLAIRGÉ, Esq., City Engineer, Quebec.

"DEAR SIR,—Major Mayne in his report on the giving way of the rock at Quebec, recommends that the houses

in Champlain street should be emptied of living tenants, but should not be pulled down in order that they may become retaining walls and ramparts in case of a fresh downfall of rock. Formerly there were houses on the north side of the street. These houses were demolished, by order of the Government, several years ago. Is it your opinion that if these houses had not been pulled down they would have served as buttresses and protected the houses which were destroyed by the landslide of the 19th September, 1889? In case you are not of this opinion in its fulness, do you agree with it so far as to consider that it would have had the effect of lessening considerably the destruction on the south side of the street, and probably of sparing the lives of a good number of the victims?

"You would oblige me by sending me your opinion in this matter to Ottawa, at your earliest convenience.

Believe me to remain,

"Yours truly,

"J. FRÉMONT."

Here is Mr. Baillairgé's reply:

"ENGINEER'S OFFICE, CITY HALL,
"QUEBEC, 18th July, 1891.

"J. FRÉMONT, Esq., M.P.,
"Mayor of the City of Quebec.

"SIR,—In reply to yours of the 16th instant, respecting the landslide from the Cape on the Citadel front, at the south-western end of Dufferin Terrace, which occurred on the 19th September, 1889, I am strongly of opinion that if they had done at that time what I then recommended in my report to Sir Hector, dated the 21st January, 1880, no slipping of the rock would have taken place. I refer to the building of a certain number of buttresses to shore up the rock at that time in a state of stable equilibrium, a vertical line drawn through whose centre of gravity passed wholly within the base.

"I will say further, I am persuaded that the party walls alone of the houses would have shored up the Cape strongly enough to have prevented its fall for a long time; and the report of Major Mayne, of 1889, only corroborates the conclusions formed by me some ten years previously.

"In fact, if you examine, in the office of the Public Works Department, the plans made by me to accompany the report I have above-mentioned, you will see that the houses, nine in number, at the base of the fallen rock, give ten gable ends or party walls at a mean distance of 47 feet apart, sufficiently close to underprop the rock and keep it in position, the effect of which would have been in all cases to have rendered the slipping slower, and to have held back its motion to such a degree that the debris would not have reached the opposite side of Champlain Street.

"Your obedient servant,

"C. BAILLAIRGÉ."

But there is more, Mr. Speaker. It has been stated to me by well-informed parties in Quebec that the Government have constructed on the hillside certain drains which do not carry the water to the public drains of the city nor to the River St. Lawrence, but convey the waters to the vicinity of the crevices which exist in the mountain. Now, it seems quite clear that whatever be the theory accepted as to the causes of the landslide, water and its freezing in the crevices have contributed largely to the catastrophe. I might refer again to Major Mayne's report, in which he says:

"Water and melting snow has passed down them and freezing has in time forced some of the layers apart. Into these openings earth has fallen, which, by its being swollen by water, has assisted in still further forcing apart certain of the layers. This action may have been still further assisted by the hydrostatic pressure exerted by any water which may have filled the openings from time to time when the rainfall has caused more water to run in than the joints and fissures have been able to carry away, and also by the softening powers of the water which causes the joints to yield more readily."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the engineers believe such to be the effect of rain, would not the waters brought into the crevices artificially by means of these drains in much larger quantities, contribute a great deal more to the forcing of a way through the layers of shale which exist in the mountain? This is an act of man which has contributed largely to the widening of the crevices and to the landslide; and I think for the above reasons the Government should consider themselves in justice responsible. But if the hon. members of this House examine the question from a humanitarian and philanthropic point of view, they will see on the one side a class of poor people who were unable to take any steps to prevent the possibility of such an accident; and on the other side, a wealthy and a powerful Government which is proprietor of the rock that caused the whole harm, and which, for military reasons, I presume, will not permit outsiders to interfere with the rock in question. Now, the catastrophe by itself, without taking into consideration the question of liability, is of such a nature and of such an extent that I think the Government should have been prompted by more generous motives and should have acted thereupon. For this, there is more than one precedent to invoke. In several cases in which there was no question of liability whatsoever, but simply of a frightful disaster, the Government of the country has come to the relief of sufferers. This was done some years ago, in the case of the fire of Hull and in that of the great fire at St. John's; but I might go still further and say that, in some instances, the Government have considered it just that the party aggrieved should be relieved, although the grounds were not so strong and pronounced as in the present instance. I might mention one case, and I am told that there are many others. The case I refer to is one with which the members of this House are familiar, because it is one in which they were invited, some weeks ago, to consent to this vote for relief of which I speak. A civil engineer of the name of Dufresne obtained from the Government a contract to make a certain survey in the North-West Territories. While camping on the prairie with his men his foot got badly hurt by an axe falling on it. No medical assistance could be had, and the wound became worse and worse, and when he was brought to the hospital in Winnipeg he had to undergo an operation and lost his foot. He has been rendered unfit altogether to practise any longer his profession, but undoubtedly the Government were in no way responsible for the accident, still they gave this unfortunate man a berth in the Civil Service at Ottawa, and allowed him a sum of over $1,200 as indemnity for the accident. Well, I feel confident that when the hon. Minister of Justice will compare these two cases, the case I have just mentioned, of Mr. Dufresne, and the case I alluded to in the beginning of my remarks, that of Mrs. Black and the other sufferers by the landslide, I feel confident that the hon. Minister will admit that if there is a *lien de droit* between the sufferer and the Government, it is a great deal stronger and more pronounced in the case of Mrs. Black and the other victims of the slide than in the case of Mr. Dufresne and others, however deserving these latter cases may be. Before resuming my seat, there is another question to which I desire to call the attention of the Government, and that is the immediate necessity of taking such steps as will prevent the recurrence of other landslides in the same locality, or at least prevent further loss to life and damage to property. That there is immediate danger that at any moment there may be other landslides and further loss of life, is a fact which everybody knows. What are the necessary works to be done is a matter not to be settled by me, but by the en-

gineer. I may refer to Major Mayne's report as to the immediate and constant danger of other landslides. Here is what he says :

"But if the fall of the rocks has been occasioned by a sliding movement of a mass of rock behind, as I consider is the case, then the danger is a constantly threatening one and should be dealt with as soon as possible to prevent any destruction of the wharves and any danger to the Citadel above, besides possible loss of life.

A little further on he continues :

"In any case, on account of the formation of the rocks described on page 3, I do not think that there is any fear of the landslide extending in the future, any further than a few yards to the west of its present western limit, but I fear that it may extend eastwards in time to as far as the first kiosk from the west end of the terrace.

"There is, however, one piece of rock which seems to be coming out of the face of the cliff, and which should be carefully watched and even blasted out now."

This report was sent to the Government two years ago and yet no action was taken. Now, as to the necessary work to be done, I might cite the Order in Council, dated 16th January, 1890, which is as follows :—

"The Minister states that the engineers who have inspected the scene of the disaster have made the following recommendations, which are now submitted for the information of His Excellency :—

"*First.*—That all the houses and even the offices under the dangerous portion of the slide be evacuated, but not removed, for they will assist in catching any falling debris and preventing it reaching the wharves.

"To aid in this purpose, and to prevent their reoccupation the roofs might be removed and these houses filled with bricks and stones and with the rubbish of the fallen houses.

"*Second.*—That the present debris be left in place to act as a natural buttress to what remains standing, so as to prevent as far as possible any further falling or sliding, and that the road be made to pass round the foot of it as far from it as possible.

"It is also recommended to fill the gap where these houses have been swept away and to construct a strong rampart of built up loose stones at least six feet wide at the top and ten feet high above the curve of Champlain street to prevent falling rocks reaching the wharves as they might easily do, to the damage of life and shipping.

"*Third.*—That a part of the mass of rock now left standing and all the terrace on it as far as the first kiosk, from the west end of the terrace, be removed. The mass of rock to be removed should extend the whole length of the dangerous portion and start from above half way down the face of the standing cliff, and be gradually sloped upwards to the edge of the large crevasses about 80 feet in rear, the excavated material being thrown on the debris below to add to the strength of the buttress formed by it, and so to still further add to its resistance to any sliding movement of the mass of rock in rear.

"This last-mentioned work would be of dangerous execution, and, according to engineers, might be done by a company of royal engineers who could be brought from Halifax; nevertheless, the Minister of Militia and Defence is of the opinion that under the superintendence of an officer belonging to the Royal Engineers such, for example, as Lieut. J. T. Lang and others at present in Canada, and who superintended important works since they have left our Royal Military College, this work could be done without asking for a company of Royal Engineers."

The above quotations contain, to my mind, conclusive evidence that there is immediate danger of other landslides in that locality, and that there are certain necessary precautions to be taken to avoid further loss of life and damage to property. Now, the only question which remains for us to examine is who has to perform the works. To my mind this question has never presented the slightest doubt. I think that the same rule which applies to ordinary cases should apply to this one. If a house is in such a position as to be a danger to the neighbourhood, it is the duty of the proprietor to take such steps as will remove the nuisance. In the present case, the nuisance is Government property, and I think the Government should take such steps as will remove all danger in the future. The Department of Militia and Defence have acknowledged that such is their duty, since the Order in Council, to which I have referred, mentions that in the past the department always performed the work they thought necessary. I may mention that part of the Order in Council. It reads as follows :—

"The Minister desires to add that, since the Department of Militia and Defence has taken over the control of repairs to militia properties in July, 1884, whenever reports have been made to that department by the civic authorities of the city of Quebec regarding the dangerous state of any portion of the fortifications and that these works have been deemed urgent to prevent lives being endangered, and within the superintendence of his department, he has given immediate instructions to the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence to have the work done."

The civic authorities in Quebec since the landslide and before, have often notified the Government of the present danger, so that the Government cannot plead ignorance. I have stated that it is the duty of the Government to make such works, and I add that it is not in the power of any other person or body to do so in the present instance. The Department of Militia and Defence has always refused to allow any other person to interfere with the rock in question. I remember some years ago, when a passenger elevator was under construction, not very far from the scene of this landslide, that the Government kept a guard from "B" Battery on duty in order to prevent the rock from being touched. As the Government did not take any precautionary measures in this case, we in the city of Quebec had the rock declared dangerous and a public nuisance, under our city charter, and we notified the Government of that, but the Government did nothing. I then wrote to the Department of Militia and Defence, asking that the action of the city authorities be not interfered with, if the city authorities took measures to prevent further loss of life or damage to property, but I have not yet received any definite answer to that communication. In conclusion, I say this matter cannot be left aside any longer. Some parts of the rock are crumbling day by day, and the danger is increasing. On the 17th July last, the Quebec *Chronicle* said :

"THE DANGERS OF THE CLIFF.—The Cape Diamond cliff shows signs of uneasiness, good sized pieces of rock are continually falling and under the influence of the recent rains quite a quantity of material has been washed down."

I feel confident that the Government will appoint a commission to investigate the causes of the accident, and the amount of damages to be awarded, and further will take such means as will prevent as much as possible any future loss of life and damage to property.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat as usual has argued his case with an ability which we all recognize in him, but, in putting it as strongly as he has put it, it seems to me possible to differ with him as to the course which has been followed by the Government in this matter. It might possibly have been more convenient to have postponed the discussion until the papers which the hon. gentleman is seeking to have laid upon the Table were produced, and to the production of which there is no possible objection. However, I am quite prepared, and in doing so I shall be frequently speaking from memory, not having the documents before me, to go now over the ground which the hon. gentleman

has covered. It is hardly necessary for me to express to Parliament and the country the deep feeling of sympathy of the Government in regard to the loss of lives which took place in Quebec in consequence of that accident. However, as often occurs in matters of importance, it is necessary, in our positions as public men occupying the positions of administrators of public departments, not only not to give way to our sympathies but to see that the public are protected against the manner in which public money might be distributed by the men who are at the head of the various departments and trustees for the public. We felt, immediately after the question arose, that we should investigate, and that without the least possible delay, the causes which had led to the unfortunate catastrophe in Quebec, and, immediately upon our hearing of it, I despatched to the spot two gentlemen who were considered in the department to be the best authorities from an engineering standpoint. The one was Major Mayne. Before he came here and was appointed an instructor in the Royal Military College, he had a reputation in the old country which placed him among the gentlemen who were at the head of their profession. He was sent there and also Major General Cameron. After having ascertained the damage which had been committed and after having the opinion expressed by these two experts, what where the means that could be adopted to prevent the recurrence of such a catastrophe, it became the duty of the department to ascertain how far the responsibility and liability of the Government were concerned, so that we might, if it had been decided that the Government were responsible, discuss the damage, the *quantum* of damage, which the Government were responsible for if called upon to pay. We were receiving some claims every day, claims covering large amounts of money. It was evidently the bounden duty of the department to ascertain the legal responsibility of the Government as far as the damage was concerned, and means were taken to ascertain how far that responsibility went, and upon the report of the Department of Justice it was decided that the Government were not legally responsible. It was shown that the landslide had not occurred from any fault or negligence or carelessness on the part of the Government. That it was an accident in the ordinary sense of that word, an accident occurring by the will of God, and that we should not and could not in any way saddle the responsibility of any act of carelessness on the Government. This point having been cleared, it was ascertained that the Government could not be held responsible for the damage. Several deputations interviewed the Government, some of which I had the honour of meeting in Quebec, and others of which, as my hon. friend has stated, came up to Ottawa for the purpose of interviewing the late Prime Minister and also the members of the Government whom he has mentioned, my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and myself. After meeting the deputations I again submitted to Council a report, without admitting in any way responsibility for past damages, for the purpose of trying, so far as it was possible for the department, to avoid any recurrence of the accident for the future. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we pulled down some houses on Champlain street which might have been some protection against the avalanche or the landslide, and preventing it from crossing the street and destroying other houses. Well, I think that would have been a very problematic remedy; and in any case it does not often occur that houses are kept standing for the purpose of preventing rocks from rolling across the street. If the houses had been left standing, the landslide which occurred would have swept the houses away as it crossed the street. Now, the hon. gentleman, in the course of his interesting speech, has given several cases, and he quotes one, that of Dufresne, as a precedent which might be utilized for the purposes of his argument in favour of the Government assuming responsibility in the case of this landslide. Now, Sir, there is no parallel between these cases. According to the instructions we have received the landslide occurred without any fault of the Government. In the case of Dufresne, he was injured in the service of the Government, and we gave him that consideration which, I think, any public servant situated as he was, would be entitled to. I see no parallel whatever between these cases. Dufresne was injured in the service of the Government, through an accident, and being unable to receive medical attendance upon the spot, he had to be removed, to a great distance to receive that medical attendance as far as I can recollect the case, and unfortunately lost his foot and was taken care of by the Government. The hon. gentleman says, in quoting some of the reports of my department, that we did all the necessary works which were required by the corporation, when reports were made as to the danger arising from certain of our military works to life and property in Quebec. I admit that, but I see a great difference between this case, and the cases of the landslide. In the cases in which instructions were given to comply with the demands of the Corporation of Quebec, we recognized that it was our own property, and we considered that, therefore, we were bound to protect the lives of the citizens from any accident that might occur. Such is not the case with the landslide, according to the advice we have received. Now, I desire to tell the hon. gentleman that so far as the papers are concerned I shall have them brought down as speedily as possible. I would like to read to him a report which I made to the Council, and which was embodied in the Order in Council which has been signed by His Excellency, and which, for the future, may relieve his mind and the minds of our friends in Quebec, from apprehensions of the possibility of a recurrence of such accidents, by reason of the effectual precautions which we have taken:

"The Minister recommends, although he does not consider the Government liable in any way for the catastrophe, or the results, that the Government, as to contribution, should do the work above-mentioned, provided always that the city of Quebec shall undertake to relieve and to hold harmless the Government against any obligation towards any person, to carry away the debris, and will secure the Government against any damage which may occur while the work is being proceeded with by furnishing the necessary police force to warn the people off, and by causing the tenants of the houses in dangerous proximity to the work, to vacate their residences during the process of such work, and preventing traffic in such portion in certain streets and at such times as may be considered dangerous for the lives of the citizens; and provided the civic authorities undertake to use every precautionary measure requisite to ensure the work being carried on successfully and without danger."

Now, the intention of the department is to carry out the suggestion made by Major Mayne and to have that portion of the rock, which is now con-

sidered threatening, removed under the supervision of one of the skilled officers of the Royal Military College and to have that portion of the rock cut down.

Mr. AMYOT. What is the date of that report?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Order is dated on the 18th July, 1891. The hon. gentleman knows well that Major Mayne has always been of the opinion that the debris should not be removed, but that it should be left there for the purpose of forming, as the hon. gentleman correctly stated, a kind of buttress to prevent the danger that may arise from any further landslide occurring. I am prepared to carry out that suggestion, and it was my intention to see the hon. gentleman and to give him a copy of this Order in Council, which I shall send to him, and as soon as the city and the department can agree as to the conditions to be observed, I shall be prepared to give instructions to have the work carried on.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to offer my very sincere congratulations to my hon. friend from Quebec County for the very able and lucid manner in which he has presented this case to the House. If the Minister of Militia will permit me to say so, it seems to me that he has not at all answered the argument of my hon. friend, in urging that the Government is not responsible for this accident, because, although it occurred on their property, it was, as he says, an act of God. In one sense the occurrence did take place by the will of God, but the hon. gentleman will admit that this is a very vague explanation. It was an act of God, no doubt, but had the hon. gentleman exercised the slightest prudence the injury to life would not have taken place. It was an accident against which human prudence might have found an escape for life and property. Every one knew, from the reports of the Geological Survey, what was the structure of the rock, and every one had seen the crevice that had been existing there for many years, and the Government must have known that some time or other the landslide would occur which actually did occur. The very precaution which is now taken by the hon. gentleman to prevent a recurrence of the accident would, if carried out previously, have, no doubt, prevented the occurrence of the accident. Under such circumstances, it seems to me to be quite a debatable question as to whether the Government would not be responsible in a court of justice from this very fact, that, though the accident occurred from the nature of the ground, still it was of such a nature that it could have been avoided with human prudence. But whatever may be the legal aspect of this case, everybody is aware that the people who suffered from this accident have been reduced to such penury that it was impossible for them to seek a remedy in the courts. Then they must apply to this Government for a remedy. The hon. gentleman, as I understand him, places himself simply behind the legal aspect of the case, and because he had the advice of the Department of Justice, that it was an accident arising from the laws of nature, out of the nature of the ground, for this reason, he says, the Government are not responsible. Well, that may be so. Let us say that in the point of law the people who suffer from this accident would have no remedy. There is another aspect of the case. A part of human justice arising out of the law of the land—which perhaps may shield the Government in this instance—suggests another and a higher aspect of the case. If the Government are blameless, then I concur with the hon. gentleman that the Government are free from responsibility. But if the Government are not free from blame and have neglected to take the precautions which the very nature of the case should have induced them to take, under such circumstances should not the principles of humanity lead them to give the assistance to those people to which they were entitled? The hon. gentleman has referred to the case of Dufresne, adverted to by my hon. friend; the Government had assisted Dufresne simply because the accident he met with occurred while he was in the service of the Government. Far be it from me to blame the Government for having assisted that man; on the contrary, I think they did well. But, if the principles of justice and humanity dictated to the Government to act in such a way when one of their officers received an accident, through no fault of theirs whatever, but while he was in the service of the Government, there is far more reason for the Government to come to the rescue of those who suffered from this disaster, if the Government were not altogether free from blame. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. He cannot overcome this objection: that if he had taken the precaution which he now suggests the Government will take, if he had had the rock blown down and the deposits left at the bottom to act as a buttress, not only the chances are, but it is almost a certainty, that no accident whatever would have occurred under such circumstances; and although the Government might in a court of justice evade responsibility, there is even greater reason to compensate these victims than there was to compensate Dufresne for the accident he met with while in the service of the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should like to join the hon. gentleman who has just spoken in congratulating the member for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont) on the way he has presented to the House a case, which certainly must have enlisted his sympathies very strongly indeed, irrespective of the duty he holds as a member of this House, to those connected with that great catastrophe. I am certain nothing has been said by the Minister of Militia as to the extent to which this calamity has been deplored that is too strong, and nothing has been said by him that cannot be joined in by any person from any part of this country. The question, however, which arose in connection with the landslide and with the damage which resulted from it was not a question of humanity and was not a question of charity. Very extensive claims were laid before the Government in connection with that matter, and it was absolutely necessary that the Government should deal with the matter on the basis of right. It is true, as the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont) has said, that there have been instances in which the Government have come to the relief of communities when there was no question of right involved; as, for instance, the case of the city of Hull, and the case of the city of St. John. Those were cases in which there was not merely individual disaster but in which the whole community was involved in an overwhelming calamity, and under circumstances of that kind it

has been felt occasionally that the call for assistance on the ground of humanity was one applying to us as well as to the provincial authorities. In the case of the unfortunate sufferers in Quebec, it was not a matter of a whole community being overwhelmed, it was not a matter of irreparable pecuniary loss, because the great city of Quebec, I have no doubt, as far as humane treatment is concerned, is amply able and willing to deal with any call of charity. We have to deal with the matter on the ground of right, not only on account of the extensive nature of the claims which arose, but on account of the very important principle involved. We are vested with the title to enormous tracts of country, subject to the same accident as occurred at Quebec, which may involve disaster at any time, not only to the inhabitants of the locality, but to the public works of the neighbourhood, railways, &c.; and it is impossible to admit this claim, unless it is held that, with respect to all these properties, we are under a liability to keep up the formation of the soil and of the rock, irrespective altogether of the forces of nature. The question which was submitted to us was this, whether, under the circumstances of the case, as stated in the reports presented, there was a liability on the part of the Government. The reports prove beyond any doubt, if they are credible, the fact that the disaster which occurred at Quebec arose from the forces of nature, and not as the hon. member for Quebec has expressed it, as the result of the work of man, or as the result of negligence on the part of the proprietor. The hon. leader of the Opposition has intimated that the Minister of Militia has almost admitted that there must have been a default on the part of the Government, because he said, if the same precautions had been taken which are about being taken, namely, the precaution of blowing down all rock which by any possibility would seem liable to fall, the difficulty would not have occurred. But the hon. gentleman will see that it is one thing after a great mass of rock has fallen from the Citadel and caused fissures to appear which make it probable that a further fall may take place, then to take precautions for the removal of that rock; and it is quite another thing to have foreseen that which the reports of the best experts we had to investigate the cases declare could not have been foreseen and could not have been provided for by any human prevision. Under these circumstances, dealing with the matter not as one of charity but on the reports we have had, we feel that no fault rests with the Government in connection with this matter; we feel all has been done in the direction of duty, and we are of the opinion that before the large claims that are involved are dealt with even on humanitarian principles we should have a decision of the court on the question of liability involved. It is stated that those who are most aggrieved have not the means to carry on the litigation. But if I remember aright, the city of Quebec has itself instituted an action which is going to trial, and no doubt in that suit all the questions involved will be fully tried and determined. If the result of that investigation into the facts or into the legal question involved should be unfavourable to the Government it will be unnecessary that individual sufferers should incur expenditure for litigation. I am sorry that the member for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont) seems disposed to think that I had given an opinion that there ought not to be any work undertaken by this Government for the prevention of future accidents. He was somewhat misinformed upon that point. The slide having occurred, it became manifest to the experts who were employed that a further slide might be expected, partly as the result of the first one, and partly because the fissures had so developed that it became apparent that the danger, as regards the remaining rock, was more imminent than it ever had seemed to be before. Under these circumstances, it is not a question of mere liability on our part, nor is it a question of mere humanitarianism, it is obviously the duty—the moral duty at least—of those who have the proprietorship of a piece of property which is liable to fall, even without fault on the part of the proprietor, to do all they can to avert disaster to life and property from that fall. It was with that view, that as regards the future, we had determined to do all that is possible in the way of removing the superincumbent mass of rock, which is likely to be detached in the near future. But as regards the past, for the reason I have stated, and without any want of sympathy at all for those who were concerned in that great disaster, we have felt it absolutely necessary that our liability on the subject should be put to the test in the courts of justice.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. Minister of Justice seems to forget that in 1880, the Government was notified of the state of that place, and that they received a report of one of the most able engineers in the country upon it. I think the hon. Minister of Justice is very generous in assuming the responsibility as to that, because it does not belong to his department, and I do not think he was in this House when that report was officially sent. I presume it is due to his spirit of fairness and justice that a petition of right has been granted, and that the fiat of His Excellency has been given. But the hon. Minister will doubtless remember that this accident occurred two years ago, and if the parties, very poor as they are, continue to go on suffering for a much longer time, they may die before the remedy is applied. The hon. gentleman says that a report has been made by engineers. Well, I do not believe in these *exparte* reports, and I think it should have been the duty of the Militia Department to have a contradictory report, because only one side of the question has been presented. As far as I can remember, I do not believe there is a word in these reports, as to the firing of the guns morning and night from the top of the Citadel, and although every stranger who visits our town, every intelligent man who was walking on the terrace when these guns were being fired twice a day, and sometimes twenty-one times a day—every one used to say: This is shaking the cliff, and we will see one day or other some accident arising from that. That was very well known in Quebec, and it is one of the acts of man which makes the Government responsible. But there is another point. The rock of the Citadel is not now as nature made it; it has been changed, walls have been built on the top of the cliff, the Citadel itself has been built, large ditches have been constructed, and the entire form of the ground has been changed. It is not now as nature made it, and the works which have been erected, as well as the water coming from the melt-

ing snow, have contributed to this accident. I say that it would lie with the Government to prove that these works did not contribute to the accident in order to avoid any responsibility in the matter. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to join in the praise so well deserved by the hon. member for the County of Quebec (Mr. Frémont). I am glad to say that, although he is not the member for the division in which this accident occurred, he has had the courage and the capacity to work this case up very well, and to present it ably and forcibly to this House. I hope that two years more will not elapse before the works begin, and before the Department of Militia tries to obtain that agreement with the Corporation of Quebec which has been spoken of. I hope that the Minister of Militia will not take so much time over this, as the time he has taken to make terms with the Corporation of Quebec to supply pure water to the volunteers when they are drilling, and without forcing them to drink water which has remained in a barrel for weeks. I hope he will also succeed without further delay in getting a supply of water in the drill shed for the use of the volunteers, so as to make the place healthy. I hope the Minister of Militia will pay immediate attention to that, and that at least for the future, whatever may have been differences of opinion in the past, his action will be immediate, and such as to avoid any further loss of life and property.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—CASE OF J. J. GRANT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for :

Return of all the correspondence in the case of J. J. Grant, N. ½ Section 30, Township 20, Range 21, W. 2nd Meridian, in connection with his settlement thereon, and purchase of the house left by the settler who had abandoned the homestead; all letters and telegrams respecting the same which passed between H. H. Smith, Commissioner of Dominion Lands, and His Honour Edgar Dewdney, then Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories; between William McGirr, or His Honour Edgar Dewdney, and any official of the Department of the Interior; between J. J. Grant and any official of the Department of the Interior; between the said H. H. Smith and any official of the Department of the Interior; between the said H. H. Smith and Nicholas Flood Davin, of Regina; between the Honourable Thomas White and Nicholas Flood Davin; together with all reeeipts for money paid into the Dominion Lands Office, Regina.

He said: I proposed this motion last Monday, or the Monday before, I forget which; and I was about to propose it without making any comments, but the hon. Minister of the Interior said that he wished the motion to stand as he wanted to make a statement. Since that time, circumstances have occurred in the North-West, and statements have been made in regard to this motion which make it necessary that I should take up the time of the House for a short time. I furnished myself with the original documents that were in the hands of Mr. Grant, also with some original documents that were in my own hands, and I have a précis of other letters, all of which we shall want. I may say here that I have a two-fold object in moving this motion. I want to make it a basis, either this session, or if I am spared, next session, of a motion that will affect Mr. Grant. I want also to make it next session one of the bases of a general motion dealing with the Government of the North-West Territories. I shall not waste the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, by making many comments, but I wish to say that the first official document I have here is a receipt for bond fee from the Department of the Interior at Regina for $20 to John J. Grant for the entry for the N. ½ Section 30, Township 20, Range 21, West 2nd Meridian.

Mr. DEWDNEY. What date is that?

Mr. DAVIN. It is the 27th June, 1887. It is signed W. H. Stephenson, agent of Dominion Lands. The second document is a letter from W. H. Stephenson, dated Dominion Lands Office, Regina, 28th June, 1887, and addressed to John J. Grant, Regina :

"SIR,—I have the honour to enclose herewith bond fee receipt for $20 in connection with the cancellation of the N.½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd M."

Then, on the 30th June, 1887, a telegram comes from Winnipeg :

"Do not grant re-entry for land without referring to this office."

On the 17th of July Mr. Burpé wrote Mr. Stephenson, saying :

"Give Grant right to enter, subject to payment of $20 and $300 for the house, which latter sum you can pay over to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney."

On 11th July the Hon. Edgar Dewdney writes to Mr. Stephenson applying to buy the quarter section. On the 12th of July, 1887, Mr. Stephenson writes to Mr. Grant, as follows :—

"I have the honour to inform you that you can now obtain entry for the N.½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd M., upon payment of $20 for inspection, in addition to the usual entry fees of $20. You will also have to pay $300 for the house built by Cowan and the value of any other improvements, which amount is to be ascertained by the affidavits of two disinterested parties to be procured by you."

At the same time, I may tell you that Grant was there with his two sons, and he obtained authority to enter for them; and I may add that subsequently they came up, and these sons are now among our most industrious farmers, and he himself is on the half section he wanted at that time to procure. On 2nd August, 1887, Mr. Burpé, Secretary of the Dominion Lands Commission at Winnipeg, writes to John J. Grant :

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, and am directed in reply to inform you that it will be impossible to alter the conditions in regards to the terms of re-entry to the north half sec. 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd, as communicated to you by the agent at Regina."

The next document is a receipt for conditional entry, dated 24th August, 1887 :

"Received from John J. Grant, sr., of Craven, in the Province of Assiniboia, the sum of $340, being for conditional entry on N. ½ of Section 30, in Township 20, Range 21, W. 2nd Meridian."

On the 1st October, 1887, Mr. Burpé writes to Mr. Grant from Winnipeg :

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo and am directed to inform you that on the receipt of the homestead Inspector's report on the N. ½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd, the agent at Regina will be instructed in regard to the conditional entry granted you for the above land. Instructions to inspect the improvements were given some time ago."

On 2nd November, 1887, Ruttan, who is in the office at Winnipeg, writes to Stephenson, saying : Roger's had reported the building on north half of Section 30, in Township 20, Range 21, west 2nd Meridian, to be worth $660, $300 more must be paid in order to acquire entry; also, to ascertain from Mr. Dewdney if he is willing to purchase the land if Grant fails. On the same date, H. H. Smith, of Winnipeg, telegraphs John J. Grant at Regina :

"Entry will be confirmed if you pay immediately for buildings, but not otherwise, value $660."

About this time Grant was brought up to me by a prominent supporter of mine, and I said to him: "Don't pay a cent more than the $300; I will see that you will get your homestead on paying the $300;" for at that moment and up to quite recently the practice was that whatever was given for a house to the outgoing settler, that amount was all that could be charged to the man coming in. Thereupon I at once wrote to Mr. White, then Minister of the Interior. On 7th November the Hon. Thomas White wrote to me:

"My Dear Davin,—I have yours with its enclosure in relation to Mr. Grant's entry for a cancelled homestead. I have sent to Mr. Smith for an explanation, and will let you know further as soon as I hear."

On 9th November, 1887, there is a letter from Mr. Dewdney saying that he is prepared to buy the land; he thought if he could not purchase the ground, he would be able to remove or sell the house. On the 10th of November, 1887, Mr. Smith, the Commissioner of Dominion Lands in Winnipeg, wrote to me as follows—this is the original letter, of which there is no doubt a copy in the office in Winnipeg:—

"Dear Mr. Davin,—Mr. White has forwarded me your letter to him on the 3rd inst., respecting John J. Grant's entry for the N. ½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd M. It seems that the former homesteader of this land, Mr. Cowan, desired to dispose of his buildings and abandon his entry; and, as Lieut. Governor Dewdney was then thinking of building a country house at Long Lake, he decided to buy Cowan's building and remove it. He completed the purchase, paying Cowan $300, but afterwards abandoned his intention of removing it to Long Lake; and in June last, during my absence in Ottawa, called at this office and asked Mr. Gordon, the Acting Commissioner, that on Cowan's land being re-entered for the money he had paid might be collected for his benefit. This was agreed to, and when Grant applied for entry for the land, he was told he could do so subject to payment of $300 for the house and a certain amount for the other improvements. Grant continued to correspond with this office, with the view to obtaining more favourable terms of entry, and eventually an inspector was sent to report as to the value of the improvements, with a view to seeing whether anything could be done to meet Mr. Grant's wishes. He reported the house to be worth $650, and a stable valued at $10. The arrangement with Mr. Dewdney did not appear on the fyle, and as Mr. Gordon and Mr. Burpé, the only ones in the office who knew anything about it, were away at the time, Mr. Grant was telegraphed to that he would have to pay $360 extra. Mr. Gordon arrived in the city to-day, and I have discussed the matter with him, and have discovered the arrangement in question. Although the house is worth $650, and Grant could not well grumble were he asked to pay the full amount, I have no objection to his retaining it for the $300 he has already paid, provided Mr. Dewdney is agreeable to that arrangement. Of course, the house being the property of Mr. Dewdney and not of the department, any decision made must be subject to his approval."

I may say here what I have said again and again in dealing with these matters, a house is realty, and the moment a man abandons his homestead, the homestead reverts to the Crown, and all the realty on it is the property of the Crown, and nobody else has any right whatever to it, as in fact is acknowledged by the arrangements made by the department within four or five months, namely, that any money paid for improvements, such as houses, ploughing or stables, and so forth, shall go, not to the settler who has left, but to the Government. There is a man named Young in Regina who wants to get the value of his improvements, but I have a letter from the Minister saying that he cannot get the improvements because he abandoned his farm and came into Regina where his wife is teaching school. The policy of that course may be open to question; but, as a matter of legal right, no doubt the Minister is quite right. It may be a question whether it is a benevolent policy or not; but as a matter of right the department was perfectly justified in dealing with improvements in that way.—

"If Grant will fyle with the agent at Regina a document from Mr. Dewdney to the effect that he will be satisfied to accept the sum already paid, I will instruct the agent to confirm his entry.

"Yours truly,

"H. H. SMITH."

Then, on 17th November, Mr. Smith writes as follows:—

"Write full particulars of difficulties about Grant's entry, and state why matter was not arranged."

On 21st November, Mr. Smith sent the following telegram:—

"Reserve north half of 30, 20, 21, and wire me."

A letter of the same date, signed Ruttan, set forth certain arrangements for Mr. Dewdney, and Mr. Stephenson writes from Regina on 2nd December, 1887, to Mr. Grant, as follows:—

"I have the honour to inform you that the commissioner advises that it being contrary to the practice of the department to make any refund of office fees, except in very special circumstances, which do not appear in your case, no refund can be made. Be good enough to inform me if I am to cancel your entries for the S. ½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd M."

What that means is this, that when Grant found he could not get his entry without paying $600 he wanted to go back. He wanted the $20 he paid himself as an entry fee and the $20 paid for each of his sons, making $60. They gave him back his $300, but refused to return the fees he had paid for himself and his sons. They handed him $300, and Grant cleared out, the department at Regina keeping the fees. That year in which Grant was kept out was the best year we had in the North-West; and if he had been allowed to go in, he would have had the advantage of that year. He subsequently came in, and in the meantime I was at the department but could never get anything done until the 12th of June, 1888, when the Hon. Mr. Dewdney was about to become Minister of the Interior, and then I got a letter from Mr. Smith to the following effect:—

"In reference to your recent note to Mr. Burgess, I have had a letter from Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, saying that if Mr. J. J. Grant is prepared to pay $300 for his house on the N. ½ 30, 20, 21, W. 2nd M., he is willing to sell it to him at that figure. I think that if Mr. Grant really wants the building he ought to close the transaction immediately, as the matter has already been in abeyance so long."

I myself used any other influence I could have, but I could not get it for Grant for the $300, no matter what I did; and there was no more right in the hon. gentleman, as he knows now—I do not think he knew it then, from the tenor of some of his letters, and I do not say there was any blame for his not knowing, as there was nothing in his position of Lieutenant Governor to call his attention to the law respecting Dominion lands—but I say this is the serious thing that the department is so managed in its most influential branch—aye, and is so managed here, for I spoke to Mr. Burgess about it—that it was ready to put through a transaction like this for a person outside, who ought to have had no more influence in the department than anybody else. He had no connection with the depart-

ment and no authority whatever, but for some reason his wishes were considered in this matter. I do not blame him, but I say that it lays the foundation for a proposition which I have indicated here and will lay down here next year, and that is, that the department requires reform. I do not think that is very wild proposition to lay down.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A few days ago, when there was question of this motion being dropped, I stated I preferred that it should stand, as I wished to make a few remarks in reference to it. The hon. gentleman, when moving a motion of his, a short time ago, in reference to a land matter, endeavoured to show, by a transaction which had taken place with reference to the purchase of this house of Mr. Cowan's, that I had treated settlers unjustly, and gave that transaction as an example of how the settlers were treated in the North-West. Well, I think I showed that, in the first place, instead of doing an unjustifiable act to one of the settlers I did him a favour; and, in regard to Grant, if he had only acted in a straightforward way, he would have been in possession of that house and lot months and months before he was. Mr. Cowan, I must inform the House in the first place (and I do not think the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) knows it), had special permission from the department at Winnipeg to remove his house from his lot. If he had not had that permission in the first place he could not have sold it, and the extensive improvements which he made would have had to be dealt with in the same way as other improvements are generally dealt with on a cancelled homestead. But he had special permission granted to him to remove this house, and if he had not received that permission he could not possibly have sold it; but he obtained this permission from Mr. Smith, and, when he was hawking this house about for sale, he had to state that he had this permission or no one would have purchased it, and Mr. Grant, when he came in on the cancelled homestead, would have had to pay the valuation of the improvements to the Government. It appears that a valuation was made, of which I was not aware until the hon. member spoke of it, and that the homestead inspector valued the house and improvements at $650, and that would have been the amount which would have had to be paid to the Government by the person who got the section. When I purchased the house from Mr. Cowan I intended to move it, and I could have moved it within twenty-four hours, but I did not, and Mr. Grant could have got that section at once; but when notice was given to the department that that house was sold, and that I had purchased it, it was right for the Dominion lands to hold it over until the difficulty was satisfactorily settled. Mr. Grant asked me what I would take for the house, and I offered it to him for $500, and he would have been willing to pay that sum if he had not received subsequent information that, if he could get an entry for the land on which the house which I had purchased stood, he had me in his power, and could have brought me into any terms he chose. Mr. Grant did not act in a straightforward way, and when I found that, I said I would not sell the house unless I received what I would consider a fair price for it. That dispute led to the delay, and it went on from month to month until, I think in the month of June, he received his entry and made a deposit of $300 for the house, which was the amount which I had paid. If I had not been leaving for the East at the time I would have rather pulled the house down and removed it off the lot; but, as I was leaving for Ottawa, I preferred to take just the amount I had paid. I have here a letter from Mr. Cowan which I desire to read to the House:

"I regret to notice in the newspapers that a charge has been made against you by Mr. N. F. Davin, M.P., in connection with the purchase by you from me of my dwelling house at the time of my removal from the Regina District to Alberta, and fearing that you may suffer from the charge which has been made I deem it my duty to state the facts as they are and as I recollect them. When I decided to leave the Regina District for the District of Alberta it was necessary for me to realize upon whatever property I had in that district, and I offered my house for sale at $300 to several parties, namely, N. F. Davin, M. P., Mr. J. W. Smith, Regina; Dawson Bole & Co., Regina, and others (after having received liberty to dispose of the same), but could not sell it to any of them at that figure. I then offered to sell to you at the same price, when you replied that you could make no use of the building for yourself, but would endeavour to send me a purchaser. About a week or ten days later I again met you, when you asked me if I had yet found a purchaser for my dwelling and I replied "No; it seems impossible to dispose of it," or words to that effect. You then ask me how much I asked for the house and I said I had been asking $300 for it, but was willing to accept $250 rather than leave it there unsold and uncared for. Without any further negotiations you then said you did not wish to see me go away out of the Regina District without realizing something upon the house, and at once wrote out your cheque for the sum of $300 and handed same to me, saying you would take the house. Whilst I must admit the property cost me considerably more than that sum, I was at that time very glad to receive $300 for it, and I did not at the time, and do not now, think that you had any particular use for the building, and believed that you purchased same merely to assist me and not to benefit yourself. The transaction was a perfectly open and honourable one on your part, and I considered you did me a great favour at that time in taking the house for $300, and I do not believe I could have obtained that sum for it from any other person at that time." I might further remark that Mr. J. Grant, whose name is mentioned in relation to this matter, and who entered for the land upon which the house is built, received the benefit of all the other improvements I made on the land gratis—consisting of about 35 or 40 acres of well cultivated land ready for crop, and a bank stable 32 feet by 40 feet, with stoned well inside."

I read that letter in order to show that, as far as Mr. Cowan was concerned, he considers that I did him a favour in purchasing the house, and that it was simply because I knew the position in which he was placed. As to Mr. Grant, I have no sympathy with him at all. I consider that he got a very good house and property for the money he paid, and, if I had not been going to Ottawa at the time, I would have insisted upon getting an amount which would have been a much more fair one; but, when he found that he had me at his mercy in that respect, he refused to give more than I had given myself for the house. I am not at all ashamed of my action in the matter, and I do not think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) can show that the transaction was one that would indicate that I was in the habit of doing any injustice to the settlers in the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course I have not said anything as to the action which took place between Cowan and the then Lieutenant Governor. I have only referred to it as leading up to what I think is a thing to be condemned, and that is that the department should make itself subservient to the speculations of anybody, I care not who it may be,

whether a Lieutenant Governor, Indian Commissioner, farmer, or anybody else.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is done every day.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I am very sorry to hear it. This is the transaction as I understand it: Grant wants to go in on that section. The amount of $340 is accepted from him by Mr. Stephenson, land agent at Regina. Clearly Mr. Stephenson thought that was the proper payment to be made, and, without even that, as the correspondence will show, they thought at Winnipeg that it was sufficient. But what happened? If you look at the dates and observe what Mr. Smith says in his letter, you will find that in the meantime the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories called at the office at Winnipeg and then it was that the telegrams were sent and the correspondence took place preventing the settler from completing his settlement or entering upon his lot; and for what reason? The hon. gentleman says he is not ashamed to state that the reason was that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories wanted to make 100 per cent. out of an incoming settler. He is not ashamed of it. It would bring good profit and would be a good bargain, and that is the sort of thing which would commend itself to his heart and his conscience and his intellect. I cannot complain of that. What I do complain of is that the Ontario farmer going up there to settle and having received his entry, a man who was to take any part or act in regard to settling the territories should have been a friend and director of the settler instead of, as he says himself, trying to make a good bargain for $500, though Mr. Smith is kinder to him than he is to himself, because he says it was worth $600 and that this amount must be paid to Mr. Dewdney unless Mr. Dewdney is willing to take less. Suppose the additional price was only $200, that was a pretty good thing to ask as a profit on $300 on a new settler. This settler would have the amount handed back to him for which the house had been purchased, but he would not get his fee back. He would not get his fee, and unless such an accident had occurred, for instance, as the hon. gentleman becoming Minister of the Interior—he will pardon me my presumption in calling it an accident—if an accident like that had occurred, then to this hour, probably, we would have been corresponding about that, and the North-West would have been without a settler, and a settler would have lost a good place, because the place is well fitted for agriculture, and he has grown good crops on it since. I hope that the day is past when the public of Canada, or the Parliament of Canada, will think that any such transaction as the hon. Minister says he is not ashamed of, would meet with any sympathy at the hands of this House. When the papers are fully brought down, probably next session, I may refer to this matter on a much larger scale, with a view of dealing fully with the whole management of affairs in the North-West.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no desire whatever to enter into the personal matters in which the Minister of the Interior is involved. But there is a question of policy suggested by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to which the House cannot be indifferent. That hon. gentleman has stated that the land department of the Department of the Interior at Regina, is made the vehicle whereby certain parties can be made to pay their debts. The Minister of the Interior says that is done every day. If that is the case the House must certainly come to the conclusion that that is a most vicious principle. Settlers going to the North-West ought to be given every facility to make their entries, and if, instead of finding facilities to make their entries, they are met at the doors of the department with a collecting agency, or with the officiousness of some officer who tries to collect the debts which may be due to some other party, be they high or low, it is a practice which everybody must acknowledge is detrimental to the settlement of that portion of the country. Everybody must agree that it ought to be the policy of the country to give every possible facility to settlers coming in, and not throw obstacles in their way. Then there is another statement made by the member for West Assiniboia, to which no answer has been given by the Minister. I understand from the member for West Assiniboia that this Grant had to pay $60 when he made his entry, $20 for himself and $40 for his two sons. I shall not enter into the reasons given by the Minister of the Interior so far as to say whether they are good, bad or indifferent, in justifying the action of his department. But it appears that when this man found he could not complete his entry, he asked back his money and could not get it. If that statement is true, it is surely an intolerable act, it shows maladministration in the department, and is one which, it seems to me, cannot be justified under any circumstances. If the facts are as stated, the member for West Assiniboia was perfectly right in saying that the manner in which the department has administered the affairs of the North-West ought to undergo the most careful scrutiny.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that he had asked back his money and could not get it. He never asked to have that entry cancelled.

Mr. LAURIER. That is what I understood.

Mr. DEWDNEY, If he had, it would have been done within 24 hours. It was the house that he wanted, and as long as he thought there was a chance of getting that house for a song, he held on to that entry. It was not the land he was after, but it was the house, and if we charged $1,000 for it, it was nobody's business.

Mr. DAVIN. What I stated was that the fees amounting to $60 were not returned to him. How could he cancel the entry? I do not blame the Minister for not knowing anything about the Department of the Interior before he came into it, I do not blame him for not knowing anything about the land law, but I wonder at the Minister stating that if he had cancelled the entry that man could have got his money back.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If he applied to have it cancelled.

Mr. DAVIN. That is to say, to have his entry cancelled.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If he had applied to have his entry cancelled.

Mr. DAVIN. That is exactly what I understood you to say. But, Mr. Speaker, the man could not do it, because the man had never got an entry.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You said he had, just now.

Mr. DAVIN. He paid the fees, but you prevented him getting the entry. He got an additional entry; the fees on that additional entry were taken, and he was prevented by the Lieutenant Governor of the territories from getting his entry, and when he left the country he could not get back his fees.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Everybody must agree that settlers going into that country ought, as the leader of the Opposition has said, to receive every facility for settlement. There is another class of people who are also entitled to the protection of the Government, and that is the settlers who are there. This appears to have been the case of a man who put up a house on a lot and was not able to continue to hold it. It would have been very much to the advantage to any party entering into that country to have purchased that land, house and all, from the Department of the Interior, for either $20, $40 or $60, if he could. If the Department of the Interior managed affairs in that way, I, for one, would be very much ashamed of it. But I understand the Minister of the Interior to say that the department endeavours in such cases to see that he gets the full value of the improvmeents made by the out-going settler from the in-going settler. If a man is not allowed to get such a house and lot free, I think it is a very wise administration.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister is quite under a misconception in thinking that I said he was going to get them for $40 or $60. These were the fees. He had paid $360; the $300 were returned to him, and the $60 for fees were not returned.

Mr. LAURIER. The man deposited $60 to make an entry, that was the fee, but the entry was not made, and if the entry was not made, surely he was entitled to get his money back.

Motion agreed to.

ACCIDENTS FROM CAR COUPLING.

Mr. INGRAM moved:

That, in view of the great loss of life resulting to employés of railway companies in the coupling and uncoupling of railway cars, it is the opinion of this House that a sum of money should be set apart by Parliament to be offered as a reward for the invention of the best and most satisfactory self-acting car coupler calculated to obviate such accidents, and that means should be provided by the Government to pass upon said inventions and report upon the same to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or such person or persons as he may designate to receive such report, and to make the award as provided for in this resolution.

He said: The interest which has been shown in this House in the discussion this afternoon concerning the loss of life and limb by an accident in the city of Quebec, encourages me to suggest to the House some means by which the loss of life and limb can be prevented upon our railways in the Dominion. It may not be a matter of much importance to some hon. gentlemen, but I may say that in several states of the United States legislation has been sought for upon this very question. I find that the President of the United States, in his message to the 2nd session of the 51st Congress, has made reference to this matter:

"It may still be possible for this Congress to inaugurate, by suitable legislation, a movement looking to uniformity and increased safety in the use of couplers and brakes upon freight trains engaged in interstate commerce. The chief difficulty in the way is to secure agreement as to the best appliances, simplicity, effectiveness, and cost being considered. This difficulty will only yield to legislation, which should be based upon full enquiry and impartial tests. The purpose should be to secure the co-operation of all well-disposed managers and owners, but the fearful fact that every year's delay involves the sacrifice of two thousand lives and the maiming of twenty thousand young men should plead both with Congress and the managers against any needless delay."

In looking over the blue-book and reading the list of accidents that occurred on railways for the year ending 30th June, 1890, I find in the summaries of accidents, that no less than 1,052 occurred, from the following different causes:—

"1. Fell from cars or engines: 2, jumping on or off trains or engines when in motion; 3, at work on or near track, making up trains; 4, putting arms or heads out of windows; 5, coupling cars; 6, collisions, or by trains thrown from the track; 7, walking, standing, lying or being on the track; 8, explosions; 9, striking bridges; 10, other causes."

Now, Sir, my chief reason for bringing in this motion is the fact that after carefully looking into the figures I find that no less than 765 railway employés were killed or injured out of the total number of 1,052 persons, and of the former number no less than 366 persons were injured in coupling and uncoupling cars. When I further refer to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals I find that the Chief Engineer and General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway makes the following recommendations to the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals. He says:

"With a view to the better protection of the travelling public and the employés, a system of heating by steam from the locomotive, and lighting by electricity, is being introduced into the passenger car stock, of which 102 cars are now fitted with appliances for steam heating and 81 for electric lighting. The air brake has been applied to 464 freight cars. The maintenance of these improvements adds materially to the operating expenses, the working of the electric light being very costly. I am, however, strongly in favour of the extension of these improvements to the entire car stock, and I accordingly propose to ask the right hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to place a sum in the Estimates for these purposes for submission to Parliament. The steam heating is said to work admirably, but the electric light has not proved to be altogether reliable, for although it is an excellent light while burning, it is apt to get out of order on the journey, partly from the motion of the train, in which case the old system of lighting by lamps has to be resumed. I hope, however, that both this difficulty and the excessive cost may eventually be overcome. The air brakes on the freight cars have proved of great advantage, and I trust the day is not far distant when they will be in general use upon the railways of Canada."

In this recommendation, in which there is much to approve, I find, however, there is not sufficient attention paid to the appliances for coupling and uncoupling cars. The total number of accidents on the Intercolonial Railway during the year ending 30th June, 1890, was 186, of which 166 were to employés, and of that number 51 were injuries by coupling and uncoupling cars. That seems to me to be a very large proportion of employés to be injured in that way, and for that reason I maintain some inducements should be held out to the inventors to invent an automatic coupler which would be the means of preventing this enormous loss of life and limbs. This is a question which affects every member of the House. It will be remembered that not many years ago when hon. gentlemen came to Ottawa to attend their sessional duties they travelled on passenger cars held by the ordinary brake, and on those passenger cars were to be found the old fashioned coupler. Many hon. members will remember when they had to take a very long step to pass from one car to another.

Mr. Miller invented a platform and car-coupler, which is now used on all railways in the land, and it is owing to that invention hon. gentlemen can have the pleasure of having meals on the train without being disturbed, and berths and other conveniences such as can be had in any house. In the State of Michigan a law was passed compelling the railways of the state to adopt certain safety appliances on the roads, but after some years' experience, it was found by the state commissioner that they could not be made workable, because the state had not control over the cars passing from one state to another, and he therefore suggested to the Governor to ask the passage of concurrent resolutions by both branches of the Legislature with the view of sending them to Washington, and bringing before Congress a resolution to secure the adoption generally of greater safety appliances on the different railways in the United States and Canada. On examining the statistics of the railways of the United States, for the year ending 30th June, 1889, it appears that 300 employés were killed and 6,557 injured in coupling and uncoupling cars, being 56 per cent. of all accidents happening to trainmen. In the same year 551 employés were killed and 2,307 injured by overhead obstructions or by falling from trains and engines, being 23 per cent. of all accidents happening to trainmen; or in both countries, 307 were killed, 6,916 injured, or a total of 7,223 employés killed and injured, caused by coupling and uncoupling cars. Hon. gentlemen may ask, are there not sufficient inventors to invent some appliance that the railway companies could adopt? It may surprise hon. gentlemen to know that during the last 15 years over 3,000 automatic car-couplers have been invented, and at a convention of master car builders, held three years ago, of all that number only seven were considered worthy of notice and only three deserved consideration. To-day the railway companies have only three types of couplers, namely: first, the old link and pin; second, vertical plane type, as represented by the Miller, Jernacy, Cowell, &c., couplers; third, the horizontal plane type. Take the ordinary old coupler, and it must be said they cause great loss to railway companies. The link and pin type are dangerous as regards coupling the trains and very often accidents occur to trains from improper couplings, whereas if an automatic coupler were employed many of the accidents could be avoided. Some critics say that railway companies are soulless corporations and are not prepared to adopt anything of this kind, even although it would benefit them. From that I beg to differ, for this reason: The railway companies of the Dominion and of the United States have their superintendents' associations, train despatchers' associations, master mechanics' associations, master car builders' associations. All these assemble at different periods of the year at different places and discuss among themselves what measures they believe to be for the best interests of the higher railway system of the two countries: and, as I have said already, when they discussed this question of automatic couplers in the master car builders' association, they came to the conclusion that there had been nothing effective yet invented, and that it was impossible for the companies to adopt an efficient uniform appliance until it was first invented. The Dominion of Canada owning and operating a railway covering 1,200 miles, it is the duty of the Government to place a certain sum in the Estimates for the purpose of encouraging inventors to invent some coupler that would prevent the accidents and loss of life, or at all events diminish the same both in the United States and Canada. They should test such inventions on the Government railways, and after satisfying themselves that they had struck the right one in the shape of an automatic coupler, it would then be well to place an Act on the Statute-book, compelling all the railway companies to adopt it. When the hon. member for South Leeds introduced the question of an alien labour law, he was requested by the Minister of Justice to defer his Bill until another session, or at all events until such time as would allow the Government an opportunity of bringing the matter before the authorities at Washington. I now point out to the Minister of Justice and to the Government that while at Washington this matter which I have brought before their attention is worthy of consideration as one affecting both the people of the United States and of Canada, and besides it is not a question that can be decided and dealt with unless a certain course to be agreed upon were adopted by both countries, owing to the fact that interchange of cars through different states of the union and these provinces is not affected by state or provincial laws. A few years ago an hon. member in the Ontario Legislature introduced a Bill to compel all hotels and public institutions to adopt a fire escape. That appeared to be quite a hardship to individuals; but in a few weeks after the Bill had become law several inventors of patent fire escapes visited Toronto, and there was adopted the escape which will be found on all hotels and public buildings in the province; and no one can say but that it was a step in the right direction. I have to thank the House for its indulgence but this is a matter of very great importance, and I was anxious to bring it to the attention of Parliament.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 140) in restraint of Fraudulent Marking.—(Mr. Costigan.)

THE EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section refers to the provisions of the 7th section and the object of the 7th section is to give the court jurisdiction in case of claims to public lands, where there are conflicting claims to patents of such lands. There is outstanding an old statute of Ontario giving this jurisdiction to the Ontario courts; but of course since the union of the provinces that has not been exercised, and questions have not been referred to the courts under that statute. It is

considered a desirable provision to have that jurisdiction in relation to the Exchequer Court. Under this Bill :

"The Exchequer Court shall have exclusive original jurisdiction, at the suit or upon the application of any person claiming to be entitled to public lands, for which no patent has issued, as being the heir, devisee, representative, or assignee of the original grantee of the Crown, or as having derived a title or claim from or through any such heir, devisee, representative or assignee,—or at the suit or upon the application of the Attorney General of Canada, in any case in which public lands are claimed by any such person,—to ascertain, determine and declare who is the person to whom the patent for such lands ought to issue: 2. The court shall decide all such cases as in its judgment the justice and equity of the case demand, and shall report its decision to the Governor in Council, and letters patent may issue granting the lands in question in accordance with such decision.

At present these matters have to be settled altogether by departmental enquiry, and the department in so settling them has not facilities for taking evidence and, moreover, the parties are not bound by the decision and can always litigate among themselves.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of the third section is to make provision for a judge *ad hoc* in cases where the judge of the Exchequer Court is interested. The present statute provides that the Governor in Council may provide a substitute when the Exchequer judge is disqualified. That disqualification, as members of the legal profession know, arises only from relationship, or some pecuniary interest in the result of the litigation. There are cases, however, not quite coming up to that disqualification, in which it is desired on the part of the judge himself that he should not sit; as, for instance, cases in which he has taken an active part on one side while in the Department of Justice, and has given an opinion. Cases of that kind are now pending in the court, in one or two of which his name appears in the correspondence as having advised in one way or the other; and it is therefore proposed, instead of power simply to appoint an *ad hoc* judge when the Exchequer Court judge is disqualified, to exercise power at any time to appoint an *ad hoc* judge without its being necessary that he should have absolutely no jurisdiction. So that in any case in which the judge feels as a matter of delicacy or propriety that he should not sit, we shall have power to appoint a judge *pro hac vice*, even though he be not disqualified in law from sitting.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this clause is to conform to Bills which we have already adopted in relation to patents, copyrights and trade marks. Jurisdiction was given to the court last session in cases in which the Attorney General might intervene as representing the Crown, even though on the relation of a subject, and it is proposed by this clause to widen that provision and give the court jurisdiction in all cases of conflicting applications for any patent of invention, or for the registration of any copyright, trade mark or industrial design. I propose to amend section c slightly. The words here would seem to include jurisdiction on contracts relating to these subjects, but it is only intended to apply the jurisdiction to cases arising out of copyrights, trade marks or patents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

On section 7,

Mr. LAURIER. Is the object of this clause to substitute judicial action for departmental action?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 8,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this section is to adopt the interpleader practice in the Exchequer Court. At present there is no system by which the Crown can have interpleader there.

Mr. LAURIER. I confess I do not understand the term interpleader.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It sometimes happens that, for instance, a station master on the Intercolonial Railway finds a person claiming goods who is not the consignee, but claiming under bankruptcy process or otherwise. He has no means at present, nor has the Crown any means of calling on the parties claiming the goods to litigate between themselves, and the Crown has to bear the weight of the litigation, and has to deliver up the goods at its own risk, and to compensate the other party if it should turn out that the person receiving the goods has no title to them. Our interpleader practice is simply to enable the Crown to call upon the claimants to enter into litigation between themselves.

On section 9,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no provision in our present expropriation Act for considering what is called in the United States the betterment by a public work; as, for instance, when a piece of land is taken for the construction of a public wharf, the benefit to the surrounding land is to be considered in ordering compensation for the part taken.

On section 10,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is to provide an appeal in all these cases in which we have given jurisdiction on that subject.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 157) to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. As the Act now stands it requires the inspection of all petroleum. We find great difficulty, under a fair interpretation of the Act, in the inspection of lubricating oil that would not come up to the test required for illuminating oil, and, strictly under the law, must be condemned. It is, therefore, necessary to authorize the Governor in Council to exempt by regulation, wholly or in part, from the provisions of the Act as regards inspections, any oils of a nature not suitable for illuminating purposes, and which are used entirely for lubricating purposes.

Mr. LAURIER. Would it not be better to exempt such oils altogether by law?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The present lubricating oil cannot be used for illuminating purposes, but it might be possible to produce a lubricating oil that might be refined and used as an illuminating oil.

It will be safe to leave the matter in the hands of the Governor in Council to deal with by regulations, which may be changed from time to time as required.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 138) to amend chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to pass the third reading this evening as the Bill introduces an important amendment in the law of Quebec, and I have communicated with the Chief Justice about it. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 156) further to amend the Customs Act (Mr. Bowell) was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC SKATING CLUB.

Resolution reported from Committee of Whole August 7th was read the second time and concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) to authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain ordnance lands in the city of Quebec,

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 8, sub-section 3,

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand this clause, when the judges disagree upon any point, the party may appeal to the Supreme Court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Wherever two judges sit and they disagree there is no judgment, and therefore there is nothing to appeal from.

Mr. LAURIER. The intention of the law is to have the case determined by two judges finally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If they determine it as an appeal.

Mr. LAURIER. That is to say, their ruling, whether they come to a conclusion or not, is final; there can be no appeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If they come to a conclusion there is an appeal.

Mr. LAURIER. And if they do not come to any conclusion there is no appeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me this law is subject to criticism. If two judges have come to a conclusion there is an appeal. When they both agree upon the one point as to whether the election is void, there is an appeal, and if they do not agree at all, then there is appeal. It seems to me that it ought to be quite the reverse. If you have the unanimous opinion of two judges who try a case, then it seems to me the balance of authority ought to be that the case has been properly disposed of, and there should be no appeal; but if, on the contrary, the case is so dubious that the two judges do not agree, that they cannot come to a unanimous conclusion as to whether the election ought to be voided or ought to be maintained, under such circumstances you do not allow an appeal. Certainly this is not in accordance with logic or with sound legislation. The Minister himself must admit that if the case is so clear that two judges can agree, that is a presumption that they are right, and there ought not to be an appeal; but if it is of such a nature that they cannot agree upon it, then certainly there ought to be an appeal. If you grant an appeal when they are unanimous, *a fortiori* you ought to grant an appeal when they are not unanimous.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman's reasoning would be very good if he started a little further back. The theory underlying the Bill is that the disposal of an election petition is a matter which should not rest in the hands of one judge, but should rest in the hands of two; therefore, no charge made in a petition ought to be considered as sustained unless the petitioner can get the consent of both judges. If the matter rests in such doubt that the judges are unable to agree that the petitioner has proved his case, then it will stand that he has not proven his case. In England, at first, trials were held before one judge, but when the system was changed and two judges were required to try a petition, this is the very enactment that was adopted.

Mr. LAURIER. And what about the appeals?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The petition drops unless the two judges agree.

Mr. LAURIER. Then there is an appeal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an appeal when the two judges concur.

Mr. LAURIER. It does seem to me, notwithstanding the authority of the legislation in England, that this provision is quite contrary to what we would expect. If you suppress an appeal when the two judges cannot agree, it seems to me more natural and more logical that you should suppress an appeal when they do agree.

Mr. FLINT. I assume, from the explanation of the Minister of Justice, that where the two judges disagree, it is equivalent to the Scotch verdict of not proven; the petitioner fails to prove his case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Notwithstanding the authority of the Minister of Justice and of English legislation I cannot see the wisdom of this provision. You provide that if the two judges agree that a member was not duly elected then the election is to be deemed void, but if one of the judges says he has been duly elected and the other says he has been unduly elected, the case is evidently open to

doubt, and still you allow the election to stand, and you refuse an appeal. When the balance of authority would appear to show that the decision is right, then you allow an appeal ; but, on the other hand, when the case is of such a doubtful nature that the two judges cannot come to a conclusion, then there is no finding at all, and the party who feels aggrieved is shut out from a remedy. If you maintain an appeal to the Supreme Court you should maintain it everywhere. If you maintain an appeal to the Supreme Court when there has been a decision, certainly you ought to apply it as well to the party who feels aggrieved from the absence of a decision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no other way of doing it. Cases occur frequently where the court is equally divided. If a suit is argued in the Supreme Court of a province before four judges and the court is equally divided, there is no appeal, and the original judgment stands. If the case is heard by these judges and they are unanimous, there is an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. So it is with similar tribunals where three or two judges sit and are unable to agree, the case stands without appeal, simply because there is nothing from which to appeal.

Mr. LAURIER. I think in such a case it would be better to leave the law as it is, and have the case tried by one justice.

Mr. AMYOT. Are the preliminary proceedings to be taken before two judges ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No ; only the trial.

Mr. AMYOT. As to the question of cost, what will be the result if the judges do not agree ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one would get any costs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From what source did the idea come of having the trial before two judges instead of one? Was it suggested by the Committee to which the Bill was referred ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid there will be anomalies. I am glad the clause will be allowed to stand.

On section 9,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a provision in the present Act that notwithstanding the service of the petition, the petition shall be advertised. My attention has been called to the fact that a petition advertised in more than a column of the newspaper involves very unnecessary expense. I have accordingly prepared a section to be substituted for the present section.

Mr. AMYOT. Has the hon. Minister come to any conclusion as regards the time within which petitions may be presented ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That clause stands over. I may say, however, that the only provision I can suggest is the one contained in the Bill, and that is that 30 days after the return the petitions must be presented. It may be that we can meet the views expressed by making some provision as to the time after the election within which the return must be made, and I am quite willing, if a proposal of that kind can be suggested to the satisfaction of the House, to adopt that provision. The difficulty I have in framing it is simply to prevent its being absolutely fixed in such a way as to invalidate elections if returns are not made in that time. I am quite willing that the return should be left to one week after the polling and the petition say 30 days after that.

Mr. AMYOT. Putting the petition 37 days after polling day would reach that result.

Mr. OUIMET. Referring to section 8 of the amended Bill, I think the section is a very wise one. I think we ought to follow up the principle embodied in that amendment ; we ought to abolish the right of appeal in every judgment rendered by an election court, especially now that we have two judges who require to agree to form a judgment. My intention, when the Bill comes back before the Committee, is to move an amendment in order to repeal entirely that right of appeal embodied in section 50 of the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Is my hon. friend prepared to maintain the opinion that the system of appeal has not worked advantageously ?

Mr. OUIMET. I know that it has been the ruin of a good many members who have been unfortunate enough to reach this House, and it has worked very disadvantageously to some parties. I think we ought to have confidence enough in two judges, without feeling obliged to go to a court of appeal to reverse their judgment. I do not think that anyone can congratulate themselves very much about having that appeal, at least that is my experience.

Mr. LAURIER. On the contrary, I think the hon. gentleman admits the theory which has been used by all members of the profession. Courts of appeal are very useful, as a rule, not only as a rule, but the administration of justice would be impeded without courts of appeal.

Mr. OUIMET. Very useful to the profession.

Mr. AMYOT. Most decidedly, in politics especially, an appeal should be allowed. It is a bad principle to leave the fate of a man and his political future in the hands of two judges only, without the right of appeal. In our country, very often, political feelings are kept in a man's mind when he is on the bench. We have any amount of precedents for that. It is not very agreeable to quote them, but we know they do exist. When the judges know there is a court of appeal above them, then they will go more prudently to their work, and we have a chance of having less injustice or at all events having a judgment reversed if there is injustice.

Mr. OUIMET. If there were any grounds for my hon. friend's pretension he would have to contend that there is less prejudice among the higher court than the lower courts, and I am decidedly of opinion that the judges in the court of first instance are just as much above all prejudices as those who have had the good luck, very often, of getting into a higher court. I contend that two judges in a lower court are just as competent to decide in an election trial as five judges in the Supreme Court.

Mr. AMYOT. I am sorry to say that, as a matter of fact, I cannot agree with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). It is a disagreeable thing to do, but I might quote here, and I will do it privately to him, a certain judge in a certain district who has committed the gravest possible wrong.

Mr. OUIMET. Order.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not give the name, but I give the fact; and I have been very ready in a certain instance to bring the matter before the House. I say that there are certain judges; but, fortunately, they are not very numerous.

Mr. OUIMET. Order.

Mr. AMYOT. I believe that in the city of Montreal they do not complain of that: but there are certain judges who are politically biassed in cases, and we want, at all events in our section of the country, to keep the right of appeal. If the hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of moving such an amendment I will state the facts publicly.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I may say that I understand that the Minister of Public Works informed the Committee on Privileges and Elections this morning that he had tendered his resignation. I would like to enquire whether that resignation has been accepted or not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resignation of the Minister of Public Works has been tendered, but no action has been taken upon it as yet; but another Minister will take charge of the department in the meantime.

ENQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. An Order of the House was made on the 1st July for a return of all the employés in the Department of Public Works, designating whether they were male and female, and so on. The Minister promised to bring it down, but it is close to the end of the session and has not yet been brought down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will make an enquiry in reference to it.

SUPPLY—KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK.

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

Mr. AMYOT. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring before this House a matter which I judge to be very important. I want to refer to the contract which was given for the Kingston graving dock. The first point to which I will draw your attention is the lack of information or proper data which the Government seem to have had when they decided to build that dock. I think the first time that the matter came before the House was in 1888, when a sum of $75,000 was asked in order to begin the construction of a graving dock at Kingston as a Government work. It was then stated that the exact location had not been decided upon, so that the Government could not state what the total cost would be, but the then Minister of Public Works estimated that the cost would be from $250,000 to $400,000. It was then asked why the Government undertook that as a public work for the Dominion, and the answer given by the then Premier of Canada was that the maritime interests of the lakes were not able to undertake these works themselves, and, therefore, it was necessary for the Government to do it. The next year, on the 22nd March, 1889, Parliament was asked to vote $124,000. I find in the *Hansard* of that year that Mr. Jones, of Halifax, enquired what would be the total cost of that work. The reply of the then Minister of Public Works was that the total cost would be $350,000. He gave the exact measurement of the work. The length was to be 280 feet, the width at bottom 70 feet, the width at top 72 feet, width at the entrances 48 feet, and he said that would be sufficient for the largest vessels that ply on the lakes. The year following, that is, last session, the amount of $160,000 was voted for this work. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, again enquired, "What are the estimates for the completion of this work?" Sir Hector Langevin replied: "The total estimated cost of the dock, including everything, is $318,000, and this is required to complete the dock." Now, if we refer to the estimate which was given when an alteration in the work was decided upon, if we refer to the report of the engineer who was acting for the chief engineer, Mr. Louis Coste, we find that, on the 22nd July last, the total cost of the work was estimated, not at $318,000 as was declared on the floor of this House, but at $350,000. But, on the 16th of March last, when the Government asked for a special vote of $60,000, the chief engineer of the department stated that the total cost of the dock would be, not as previously stated from $250,000 to $400,000, nor $350,000, nor $318,000, but $450,744.62. It seems extraordinary that works of that character should have been gone into by a department having at its disposal so many experienced engineers, and that they should vary in their estimation of the total cost of that work to such an extent. Tenders were asked for that work in February, 1889, and I read in the notice published in the press, amongst other things:

"Intending contractors are requested to bear in mind that tenders will not be considered unless made on the printed forms supplied, and accompanied by a letter stating that the person or persons tendering have carefully examined the locality, have satisfied themselves as to the nature of the materials to be excavated, and the foundations for the coffer dam, and its probable cost. Tenders must be signed with the actual signature of the tenderers."

There was a widespread rumour that something was incorrect in that contract, and at the beginning of this session the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) applied for the papers in this case. He made a motion on the 5th of May, asking, amongst other things, for the reports of the engineers which were being made on the progress of the works, or the changes which may have been made in them. Later on the hon. member for Montmorency complained that the papers were

not forthcoming. Then the Minister of Public Works stated in the House :

"The papers the hon. gentleman has mentioned are being prepared in the department. I am writing now to the deputy of my department to ask if they will be ready to-morrow, or when they will be ready."

This was on the 2nd of June. When the papers were produced at last, we looked at them and found they were most incomplete. The plans, the calculations made by the engineer as to the probable cost, and the details of the extras, of which I will speak in a moment, were not brought down. We wanted to find out the handwriting of one of the tenderers, whose name was Andrew C. Bancroft; and the only clue we could find, or the only way of discovering anything, was by his post office address accompanying his tender. We then enquired from the Government who was the lessee of that box in the Kingston post office. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, the answer we received upon that question—we could not obtain the required information, and then we were seriously told that the boxes of the Kingston post office were held in the names of parties who could not be found nor remembered, though their names must have been registered in books, still the name of the lessee of that box could not be found. The Government could not obtain from their numerous employés at Kingston any information upon a point so recent as to the lessee of a box who necessarily must have gone or sent every day to receive his papers and letters. Every member of this honourable House must know how these things are done in post offices. Inside the post office the name of the proprietor of a box is written or printed, the employés of the post office see it daily, and nobody will believe for a moment that there was good faith on the part of the officers of that post office in the answer they gave—because I am bound to accept as truthful the answer of the hon. Postmaster General—nobody in this country will believe for a moment in the good faith of the officers of the Kingston post office. It was, therefore, the duty of the Government to enquire further, it was their duty to press upon their officers to find out the information so as to be able to tell this honourable House the name of the proprietor, so that we could have some means of tracing the identity of the party whom we were seeking for. I am sorry, therefore, to have to say that the Government were apparently trying to shield and cover up what had been going on. At all events, we moved again to have the missing papers; and on the 1st of July I moved for :

"Copy of the original plan and also alterations made in the Kingston Dry Dock, showing the additional excavation, crib work, extra masonry and additional iron works and caissons; together with the quantity of each class of extra work paid for or undertaken to be paid for, and the rates of payment for said extra work."

Well, we have not yet got these papers. We have seen the original, the copy of which has already been laid down before the House, but the plans of the work, the details of the prices given by the chief engineer, as to the contract itself, and the details as to the extras, were not given, and we have not been able to obtain them. Mr. Speaker, I now refer to that tender, notice of which was published in the press, but the record does not contain a letter accompanying the same from the person tendering. The tenderer, Andrew C. Bancroft, does not appear to have accompanied his tender with a letter; though it is one of the conditions stipulated by the notice. If I remember rightly, there were twenty tenders; Bancroft's tender, and the tender of Michael and Nicholas Connolly, were not accompanied with this letter, although all the others were. The Department of Public Works have passed over that, and have granted the contract in spite of that missing letter. That was requested, I presume, as the department thought fit to insert it in the conditions for granting a contract. Then it says that the tender must be signed with the actual signature of the tenderer. Why? In order that the department might know exactly with whom they had to deal. Well, the tenders were opened; Bancroft's was $260,000, in round figures; Macdonald & Aylmer's were $265,000; Nicholas & Michael Connolly's, $322,000. The tenders were accompanied by cheques of $20,000. I may say now that after having failed to obtain the necessary information as to the post office box, we went on in our enquiries to examine the parties who had witnessed the signing of the contract. We could not obtain any information further than that there were three contractors who signed the contract. Mr. Saucier was the witness who saw the signing of the contract, and he said that all he knew was that three contractors were introduced to him by Mr. Gobeil, who is now the Deputy Minister of Public Works. We examined Mr. Gobeil, who said: I know the two Connollys, but I do not know the third one who was introduced by them as Mr. Bancroft. Then we examined the officers of the Finance Department and we ascertained that the cheque went through the Union Bank, but it had been sent to the department through mistake as having been signed by Babcock instead of Bancroft. At all events we went on. We got an official from the bank. The answers we received from him were these : The Union Bank of Quebec had advised the Union Bank of Ottawa to place $20,000 at the disposal of Nicholas Connolly. Nicholas Connolly went to the bank with a cheque signed by Bancroft, asked the amount of $20,000 to be deposited in Bancroft's name, and deposited a cheque in Bancroft's name, which was payable to the Minister of Public Works. That cheque was sent with Bancroft's tender, but the Connolly's tender was also accompanied by a cheque for $20,000, and both were in the same handwriting, and so it was easy for the department to find out by comparing the handwriting the identity of the tenderer. After we had examined the officers of the bank——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman referring to an examination of witnesses before the committee?

Mr. AMYOT. I am speaking about papers which belong to the Committee on Public, Accounts and which are presumed to be before this House, because if I wait until all the papers are brought before this House I may have to wait till next year.

Mr. SPEAKER. Have they been reported to this House?

Mr. AMYOT. I think so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The evidence has not been reported.

Mr. AMYOT. It is never fully reported to the House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, it ought to be reported.

Mr. MULOCK. The Committee has discharged itself of the enquiry.

Mr. AMYOT. Not only so, but the Committee have moved that all the papers be referred back. There are many members of the Committee present, and I will be corrected if I am in error, as I proceed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have been refraining from taking the point of order against the hon. gentleman, as I did not want to do so. I understand his object is to call the attention of the House to something he regards as an irregularity in this matter; but, if he intends to follow his remarks with a motion on the investigation before the Committee, I shall have to take the point of order, because, until we get the evidence before us, it will be absolutely impossible to judge what it is and what the result of the investigation may be. I do not understand that the Committee has made a report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not understand that the Committee has made a report in this case. If it has reported, has it sent in the evidence?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They have reported the evidence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then the hon. gentleman may be right in referring to it, but he will surely give the House an opportunity to read the evidence on which he expects to make a case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The papers have all been reported to the House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. DAVIES. (P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The Committee have made no finding on the evidence, but the report of the evidence and the papers have been presented to the House and the House is in full possession of the necessary evidence. As to whether the debate should proceed after the hon. gentleman had made his statement, is another matter.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think the hon. gentleman is in error. What the Votes and Proceedings say is as follows:—

"On motion of Mr. Sproule, it was Ordered, That the evidence taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts in connection with the item "Kingston Dock" set out on page B—349 of the Auditor General's Report on Appropriation Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1890, be printed for the use of the members of the Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Fourteenth Report of the said Committee."

Mr. SPEAKER. I find the record is, according to the Votes and Proceedings, as the hon. gentleman for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has stated. The evidence has not been reported to the House, but an Order of the House has been passed giving authority for the printing of the evidence for the use of the Committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the evidence was brought down yesterday, and an order given for the printing of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I also call attention to the fact that the report of the Committee presented yesterday states that the evidence on this question is now being taken. The Committee recommended that the evidence, not which had been taken, but which is now being taken in connection with the item Kingston Dock, page B—349 of the Auditor General's Report on Appropriation Accounts for 1890, be printed for the use of members. So it would seem that the enquiry is not yet finished.

Mr. AMYOT. I may state what I know to be the facts, and if hon. gentlemen are going to contradict all the facts, I am ready to wait till the full evidence is laid before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. While the hon. gentleman was going on with his speech I supposed he was referring to something which had taken place before a Committee; but as he had not said so, I waited until he came to make the statement that certain officers had been examined, and then of course it was perfectly obvious that the hon. gentleman was stating something that had taken place before a Committee. As I find the matter referred to has not been reported to the House, the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. AMYOT. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The facts are so simple,—there is only one fact out of the record to which I desire to refer, I might go on, I think, without injuring anyone or committing any wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LAURIER. Two reports were made yesterday to the House. One was with respect to the Langevin Block, which embodies the evidence. The other report was in reference to Kingston Dock, and I confess that at the moment I thought the two reports were identical. I find they are not so, and I hold your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to be correct, and I, therefore, advise my hon. friend to wait for another opportunity to make his remarks.

Mr. MULOCK. It is only reasonable, of course, that the House should, if possible, have the evidence taken before Committees in its possession when the judgment of the House is invited on any such matter. In order that public business may not be delayed, I ask that whoever is responsible will see that this objection of the non-printing of the evidence does not meet me when I move a motion at an early date in regard to expenditure on the Langevin Block. I believe the evidence has been ordered to be printed for the convenience of members of the Committee. I do not know whether it is necessary to have it reprinted for members of the House. If so, it seems to be a rather unnecessary waste of money. If there have not been a sufficient number of copies printed I direct the attention of the Government to the matter, as I cannot wait until they in their leisurely manner get the evidence printed. I intend, at the earliest possible moment, to make a motion in regard to the Langevin Block expenditure. I presume the evidence will be printed and in the hands of the members almost at once.

Mr. FOSTER. When the evidence comes down, then it will be for the House to deal with it and send it direct to the House Committee on Printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand the evidence given has already been printed and distributed to the Committee. There is no delay in this matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not complaining; I am only calling attention to a certain point. It is quite reasonable that each member should, if possible,

have the evidence in his possession; but if the House delays, or if the department or whoever is responsible for the printing delays, members of Parliament cannot be expected to postpone making their motions. It would be perfectly in order to make a motion based on the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, in reference to the Langevin Block. I presume that evidence is technically before the House now.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. It is laid on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course it should be printed, to be available by members. The Government will, therefore, be to blame if, when I make my motion after a day or so, the printed evidence is not forthcoming. They cannot expect to hold back motions by not printing evidence. I do not want to be met with this point, when I make a motion which I will do at a very early date.

Mr. LAURIER. When the evidence is on the Table, whether printed or not, my hon. friend will be in order with his motion.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the leader of the Opposition might be correct literally, but the practice has always been that where evidence is reported from a Committee of the House, the order of the House is then to refer it to the Printing Committee to have it printed at once for the use of members. It is not particularly the duty of the Government, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) sees, and they cannot be held responsible for the non-printing immediately of every report, as he suggests it should be. I do not wish to be understood as taking objection to the arguments of the leader of the Opposition, but I state that the practice has always been different. With regard to the Langevin Block, the Minister of Finance intimated, as the hon. gentleman will remember, that the architects would be called before the Committee at the earliest possible moment, and the hon. gentleman, I hope, will at least delay his motion until the matter is fully investigated. It is only the other day that I had an interview with the two architects in which they pointed out what they considered some discrepancies in the printed evidence, and I told them I thought they should come and correct it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather think that Committee does not meet until Thursday, and if I am correctly informed there is another order of reference made. If this business is urgent, as the hon. Minister seems to indicate, arrangements should be made for having that Committee meet to-morrow for the express purpose of getting in this evidence which the Minister of Customs states it is so desirable to have. I refer to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think my hon. friend will say that any member of the Government has delayed any investigation, or attempted to delay any investigation before that Committee. If these architects have not been before the Committee at an earlier date, it is because the time of the Committee has been fully occupied for every moment from ten to one o'clock each day, by the members of the Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but the hon. Minister states that the investigation is not yet closed, when we had all supposed it was closed. I submit that, in the public interest, and for the public convenience, and for the convenience of Ministers themselves, it would be desirable that these witnesses which the Government wish to produce should be called for to-morrow when this Committee might meet. I suppose an hour would be ample to-morrow to dispose of the case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Witnesses have been summoned which would take not only an hour to examine, but to-morrow and the day after, if the summonses are in earnest.

Mr. BOWELL. If the members of the Committee, most of whom are here, would consent to have the matter taken up the first thing on Thursday morning, I will see that the architects are before the Committee. I am very much afraid that an hour will not do.

Mr. MULOCK. Take to-morrow. The hon. Minister will remember that last Friday we came to a sudden termination of our enquiry into the Langevin Block matter, owing to certain action of the Committee, and at that stage I moved that the proceedings be reported to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is getting into the same difficulty as the member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot). Perhaps I might be permitted to say, that although a discussion on going into Committee of Supply may take a wide range, yet if my hon. friend proposes to move, the proper time to discuss the question would be on a motion.

Mr. AMYOT. I would be entitled to move if I wanted to, but I understand it is better that the House should have the evidence printed. I do not want to blame any one for the delay. I do not think there is a considerable delay, but I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to the importance of getting that report, which is very short, printed at once and laid before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It is already printed and partly revised.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope a sufficient number of copies will be printed so that each member of the House will have one.

Mr. LAURIER. As soon as the evidence is put on the Table of the House my hon. friend has a right to move. For convenience sake, and if the hon. gentleman would facilitate the business, we will be happy to wait until the evidence is printed, which must be done of course within reasonable delay.

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

(In the Committee.)

Pensions payable on account of Fenian Raid..... $3,147 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that there is a new name introduced here, Mr. J. Franckum, at 30 cents per day, under Order in Council. Will the hon. Minister give us an explanation of the cause of that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The increase to which the hon. gentleman has referred is the result of a recommendation made by myself as Minister of Militia. The Order in Council states that Gunner

J. Franckum, of "A" Battery, of the Royal School of Artillery, while on duty as marksman at the butts, was injured by a rifle bullet striking him above the ear. The board sat at the time and reported on the case, stating how the accident had happened. Gunner Franckum has since continued to suffer from his wound, and his case has become aggravated, and he is now in a lunatic asylum. The papers in the case were referred to the Minister of Justice, who reported that the matter came under paragraph 906 of the Regulations and Orders of the Militia; and considering the above circumstances, I recommended that a pension of 30 cents per diem be granted to Gunner Franckum. He was compelled to leave the service, and he left his family perfectly helpless.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to object to the pension itself, but I would just call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that apparently it is classified under pensions payable on account of the Fenian Raid, which took place a considerable number of years ago, and it appears to me that it is an obvious error.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I made the same remark to my officers that my hon. friend makes to myself. I could not understand how this item came to be charged to the Fenian Raid, but I was told that it came under the statute which permitted pensions to be given on account of the Fenian Raid. But it is a misnomer, no doubt, and I mean to have it changed hereafter.

To meet probable amount required for Veterans of war of 1812.....$1,230

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of these old gentlemen remaining?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Forty-one patriots, at $30 each. The decrease this year is $1,080.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of some little interest, does the hon. gentleman happen to know the ages of these worthy veterans? None of us will grudge them their $30; but seeing that it is 80 years since this war took place, it is a curious matter how many centenarians our country has produced among these veterans. There seems to be a considerable number over 100 years of age.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It shows what excellent care the Department of Militia has taken of these veterans. It is a question which has been discussed every year, and I have been trying to ascertain their exact ages, but I have had to give it up; and as the decrease is so considerable, I thought it well not to go into the investigation again.

Pensions payable to militia men on account of Rebellion of 1885..... $23,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that there is a considerable reduction in the vote—nearly 10 per cent. Will the Minister explain how that has come about? Is it by deaths among the pensioners, or in what way?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, it is by death, and by the children who were entitled to pensions up to a certain age, passing that age.

Pensions payable to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers, and Police scouts, on account of the Rebellion of 1885..... $4,322 66

Mr. AMYOT. I would take this opportunity to bring before this honourable House the subject which has been referred to occasionally by the press of this country. I happened myself to be in command of a battalion when what is called the North-West Rebellion took place. When we came back there was not praise enough for my battalion and for the commanding officer of that corps. Later on I thought proper to give up my party allegiance, because I was of opinion that, politically speaking, I could not go along with my old chiefs any more. Then, in the session of 1886, I made a speech before this honourable House in support of my way of looking at the administration of the North-West. I made that speech honestly and with the least possible offence, and in answer to my speech the hon. Minister of Militia got up and read, without notice and without my expecting it, private telegrams which I had sent to him. I do not want to-day to go back to a discussion on that matter. I will only say that I had been requested by him to keep him posted as to everything I should observe or find out in the North-West, and I did so confidentially and in a friendly manner. Two of those telegrams were partly quoted by the hon. Minister, and if I remember rightly, they were about in these words:

"Men fighting in the same way as the rebels should be selected to fight them, and the volunteers here would be better adapted for the protection of forts and provisions."

Since that time, in spite of my explanations before this House, it has been distinctly said by the press that this was an evidence of personal cowardice on my part.

An hon. MEMBER. No doubt.

Mr. AMYOT. I hear "no doubt"; I do not know who said it. Mr. Speaker, I said then, and I repeat to-day—and after that the press can say what they like—that being in the North-West, on the open prairie, I was invited by one of the best officers of the British army to go with him over the prairie. And I found it great folly to have 3,000 or 4,000 men of infantry going about the country chasing mounted men. The officer seated near the door of this House was there in control of a battalion, and he himself saw me with the officer to whom I refer. I travelled all day, and when I arrived at night at the camp I was convinced that the war was being conducted on a wrong principle, and that we might be months running after an invisible foe without being able to catch up to the enemy. If the hon. Minister who laughs at me, instead of having been quietly seated in his office, had been in the North-West with us, he would have seen whether I was right or wrong. It was in this the war was conducted stupidly and foolishly. It was conducted for the glory of one man, the general in command, and for nothing else. Thousands of men were scattered over the prairie, hundred of carriages had to be sent hundreds of miles through the country, and at any moment ten or fifteen men at night could have attacked and captured all the provisions and prevented the main body of the army from having their necessary supplies. That happened in one circumstance, and if Riel had not

been a fool, most decidedly those would have been the tactics he would have adopted. If instead, four hundred or five hundred mounted men had been despatched, in eight days the whole war would have been over, without the expenditure of $6,000,000 and the loss of 200 lives. Do these brave men who attack me to-day know what is meant by supplies and provisions? Do they know that the efficiency of an army depends on the perfection of what is called the base of supplies, and on communication with it being open? Do they know that if an army be deprived of provisions it can do nothing. I am not well versed in English, but I am doing the best to present my views, and I knew what I meant when I sent that telegram. I am not a fool, and would not have signed a telegram saying that I am a coward. What I meant was that the volunteers should be used in order to protect the base of operations and keep up free and unimpeded communication between the troops in advance and the base of operations. This is very simple. Of course a portion of that press which costs very dear to the country will go insulting me from year to year; and to everything I say, they will answer me: You have wired in cipher to the Minister of Militia that the volunteers were only fit to take care of the provisions and the forts: and when, at the time, I was trying to prove that it was not right to hang Riel, what was the answer I received from the head of the Militia of this country, from the one to whom the country looked to reward the volunteers and acknowledge their devotion to the state? I received the answer: You are a personal coward.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear," would not dare to tell me that outside these precincts. He would not dare to thus insult me, eye to eye. I was not sent to this House as a man able to fight or to box, but if I am thus to be insulted I will try to make one or two examples. I may be beaten then, but they will see whether I will run away or not. Well, Sir, this was the meaning of my words: it was that the war was being badly conducted. As a friend of the Government I did not want to throw blame upon them, but I did what my duty compelled me to do; and I felt that hundreds of, nearly thousands of carriages, were scattered over the country, at the mercy of any enemy who might choose to attack them. At any given moment the two or three buildings composing the forts might be captured and burnt, and then the supplies cut off, and the main body of the army, distant hundred of miles from the base of supplies, might be deprived of their food. I know that it is impossible for me to get my honest intentions acknowledged in some quarters, but those who criticize me were never at the front; and I would ask those who attack me to point out any wrong act on my part during the whole campaign. I would ask them to point out when I refused to obey a single order. What harm have I done? I was occupying my seat in this House, and, had I chosen, I might have said, when I received the orders to go to the front, that I was a member of Parliament, and according to the usage in the British Empire, was not bound to vacate my seat. I did not do that; but I went to the front and obeyed every order given to me. I never was reported for a single thing to which I had to sign my name, and I had to sign it thousands of times, acting, not only as commander of the brigade, acting not only as commander of the whole militia force of the district of Alberta, but acting besides as replacing General Strange; and I never received any recompense. Hon. gentlemen are careful not to say in this House that I am a personal coward. I am happy to find in his seat the hon. member for Algoma, who, the other day, referring to a speech made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), said:

"Who appear on certain days in the uniform of Her Majesty, and are never heard except when they say they are willing to lay down their lives for their country, when there is no battle to be fought."

The hon. member for Algoma commenting on this said:

"I do not see the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); I am sorry he is not here."

I hope the hon. gentleman will explain what he meant. I hope he will explain his allusion and the inference to be drawn from his remarks. I never insulted or provoked him in any way; but I will give to him my explanations, and I mean in this House to put a stop to this personal abuse. These attacks on me are made specially by two papers in this country. They are made by the *Empire*, which is a very able paper, but I do not know who controls it——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a joint-stock concern.

Mr. AMYOT. There is another paper which has indulged in these attacks, and that is *Le Monde*, a newspaper controlled by the hon. Minister of Public Works, as he has admitted this morning in the committee of investigation. Well, the person who writes in *Le Monde* was a member of this House, and, either through cowardice or some other sentiment, received moneys from the corruption fund, and shelters himself behind the doors of his office where he writes to abuse and insult me. Is that fair or just? As I have said, I did not entrench myself behind my privilege, but went to the North-West and was everywhere I was ordered to go. It is not during the heat of battle that a soldier decides to sacrifice his life, but it is when he leaves his home. When the fight is on, there is something in the smoke of the powder that makes a man no more himself, and a man has to see actual fight to find out whether he is sufficiently master of his nerves not to be afraid to do his duty. But I defy any member of this House or any one in the country to quote one instance in regard to the North-West where I lacked in my duty and where I was not worthy of my position. Have you heard any complaint or any reproach made against me in public? What have I done that is wrong? If I have done nothing wrong, but if I have used an expression which was not correct but which meant something which was correct, is it honourable or is it just that a man should try to stab me in the back as the Conservative party press constantly does? This is not the way to encourage the volunteers who have risked their lives for their country. Why should they be subjected to attacks such as those to which I am subjected? I would not mind these attacks much if they affected me alone. I know that a public man is exposed to many things of that kind, but, commanding as I do a battalion, I feel that when they attack me they are not only attack-

ing me but also the battalion which I have the honour to command, but they have the pleasure in their hearts of attacking the whole of my race.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. AMYOT. No? Well, look at what Mr. Goldwin Smith said in his last book, "Canada and the Canadian Constitution." He not only attacked me but he also attacked the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). He said there were two French-Canadian commanders in the North-West, and he insinuates that both of them were dishonoured. I left this House during the session, I organized my battalion, I went to the North-West, I was crowded with all sorts of praise when I came back, but, when the political question arose, I was met with various accusations, and parts of my telegrams were read in such a way that they appeared to be contrary to the views which I entertained. When I wrote to the Minister of Militia, I thought I was writing to a friend. I did not think I was writing official correspondence, which as a military man I could not send in such a way, but I thought I was writing to a friend, and to-day the organ of the Minister of Public Works—another Frenchman—the paper representing him in the Province of Quebec is constantly accusing me and insinuating that French Canadians are cowards. I will not say that the Minister encourages that, but certainly he could stop it if he chose. I suppose it is a good thing to belittle a political adversary, no matter what is done for the honour of one's race. There was no wrong done by myself or by any members of my battalion. We were scattered over the prairie and I had a living witness here when this case was brought up before, and I am not ashamed of what I did there. When, because of the false use of a word, I am open to the attacks of the press, I say to the English press: You are not doing the best to bring about what you say you want, a great nation which will be united, but you are sowing hatred in the hearts of the different races in Canada; you show that in your hearts you do not love us. As to the French press, I say to the hon. Minister: If you do not care for the honour of your race, what do you care for? The press will go on and sneer at me, but I think I was right in stating that the war was badly conducted, that mounted men should have been selected to run after mounted men, and that, as the volunteer militia were there, they should have been used to protect the forts and to see to the safety of the provisions between the forts and the main body. If those at the head of the Government of this country believe that it is a fair way to encourage and reward the efforts and the devotion of the volunteers, to act as they did, let them take the responsibility. I have never, for my own part, been kept back by these accusations and insults. These have never prevented me from deciding upon political questions as my conscience dictated. The press to which I have referred will go on attacking me. Let them do so. I will not lower my forehead on that account, because I have done no harm. I have simply done my duty. The volunteers in my battalion love me, and, instead of leaving my command in consequence of these attacks, I remain at the head of my battalion, and anyone who has seen it will say that it is one of the finest military bodies in the Province of Quebec and may compare advantageously with any other battalion. I hope this explanation is clear enough. If the press choose to go on with it, let them go on, but the disgust which will be felt by the country will be such that some way will be found of recompensing the efforts which we have made in its defence.

Mr. DENISON. I am not aware what the explanations of the hon. gentleman has given have to do with the question before the House, nor do I intend to deal with them; but the hon. gentleman cast a reflection on the management of the campaign in the North-West by the Minister of Militia. I was not in the North-West during that expedition, but the corps to which I have the honour to belong formed part of the force, and all my brother officers and all the members of the corps have taken every opportunity to put in a good word for the Minister of Militia and for the way in which he managed that expedition, for the manner in which he looked after the corps on the north shore of Lake Superior and further up, so that they never suffered from lack of a meal but were always well fed; and every one knows the difficulty of provisioning is one of the greatest difficulties to be encountered in war times, but they never experienced any serious want in that way. While I am on my feet, I may take advantage of the opportunity to draw the Minister's attention to a point which I took two years ago, and that is in regard to a change which I would like to see made in the management of our military schools. I would now suggest again, as I did then, the desirability of allowing young fellows to enter the schools as they did some years ago. At the present moment, the only classes who enter the schools are those who are officers of the militia, or privates, or non-commissioned officers. The result is, only a few go in to get their certificates. I know in one battalion, that out of 17 officers, 14 are not qualified; and if you turn over the pages of the militia list you will find a great many in the same position in every battalion. I think that would be remedied considerably if the old system was adopted by which anybody might enter the schools and qualify to be captains and receive a gratuity, as they did at that time. The other class who enter the schools are the non-commissioned officers and men. They learn only the duties of non-commissioned officers, they learn duties that would be suitable for men holding that rank, and if they are afterwards promoted to be officers, they have acquired certificates that are of very little advantage to them. On the other hand, if the general public were allowed in, if young men of 17 or 18 or 20 were admitted at an age when they can generally afford the time, they could be supplied with a cadet's uniform, such as was supplied before, and they would not be called upon to live in barracks as soldiers, which is objectionable to a great many. The class that we have in this country in our permanent militia are far superior to the class they have in the army of the United States; yet the respectable young men I refer to do not care to be obliged to enter into barrack-life with old soldiers. It has been urged that they would not get the proper knowledge of their duties unless they were in barracks. I think that there is very little in that objection; it would naturally rest with the commandant of the school as to the nature of the instructions they received, whether they got in-

struction in interior economy or not. I am sure that these men obtaining certificates in that way, as was the case 20 years ago, would be an element from which the officers of the force could be drawn afterwards, and would be very useful members of the force. At the present time it is impossible for any person to go in, unless an officer of the force having a certificate, and be qualified as lieutenant-colonel or as captain; and the result is that a great many, even of the present officers, cannot afford to go to the expense of buying further uniforms to go to these schools, and are obliged to stay at home. That, I think, is one of the serious faults of the system, and I would like to see the Minister of Militia consider this question again. I think there is an opportunity here where great good could be done to the militia, if it was only allowed that cadets could go to the school, at the same time allowing officers, non-commissioned officers and men, to enter as under present system.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). As the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has brought my name into the discussion, perhaps the present opportunity would be a good one for me to reply to him. In the remarks that I made on the 28th of July last, in using the language I did with regard to some remarks that were made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) during a previous debate, referring to the different classes of people that were loyal, the last class I referred to were those dapper little gentlemen who parade with the Queen's uniform upon certain occasions. Now, Sir, the words as quoted by the hon. member for Bellechasse are perfectly correct; but let me do the hon. member the justice to say that, in making the remarks I did, I did not wish for one moment to imply any doubt as to his personal bravery. As to that, I know nothing whatever: whether he is as brave as a lion or as brave as a jackal, I do not know the first thing about it. I merely wished to ask if the remarks dropped by the member for Guysborough applied to the gallant colonel from Bellechasse. The first time I had the pleasure of knowing who that hon. gentleman was, was during a very fiery speech he delivered in this House during one of the debates that took place since I had the honour of occupying a seat in the House, and it struck me at the time that the fiery sentiments enunciated by the gallant colonel were not those that would commend themselves to an officer commanding a battalion in the militia; but so far as his personal bravery is concerned, I know nothing about it. I did not mean to attribute to the hon. gentleman anything like cowardice, and upon two or three occasions when he mentioned it to me privately, had I been of as irascible a disposition as himself, the chances are that we would have come to fisticuffs. But, Sir, I fight with no man on account of either politics or religion; consequently I endeavoured to keep as cool as I could, assuring the hon. gentleman that I did not wish to insinuate anything as to his want of personal bravery, and that when I had an opportunity in the House, I would explain my previous remarks.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will say one word in answer to the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken this evening on the vote for pensions. I cannot trace the reason for this ebullition of temper and the extraordinary display of eloquence of the hon. gentleman for Bellechasse to-night. Three years ago this matter was discussed, and we went into all the details, and I, for one, decline now to be drawn into the discussion of the events which then occurred, and which ought to be left, so far as possible, where history has placed them. Now, Sir, it is impossible for me, speaking from memory, to state exactly all that the hon. gentleman has done for his country, and all that other hon. gentlemen have done for their country; but I remember very well when the hon. gentleman used to be good enough to state that he recognized the kindly hand of the Minister of Militia all over the North-West, extending every possible comfort to the troops who were under his command, and under the command of his brother officers. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared for one to stand by the record of that day, whether I was right or whether I was wrong, for I am satisfied that, in so far as I was personally concerned, I did my duty in the position I was occupying, and I shall allow the events of those by-gone days to rest. Now, my hon. friend from Toronto West (Mr. Denison) has taken the opportunity, as he had a perfect right to do on the vote for pensions, to speak about the system which he considers to be the best system that could be introduced concerning the training of our Militia force. I thought that, perhaps, this question might have better come up upon the item which referred more particularly to our training schools; however, I can tell the hon. gentleman that, although men who have given a great deal of their time, as I know he has, to our Militia force, and view the matter as he does, and believe the system which he is advocating would be more to the advantage of the force than the one which now prevails in Canada, I think that the consensus of the opinions of military critics, and men like the Major General in command, is that it would be impossible to resort to the old system, and I shall give my hon. friend the reason why I think that it would be impossible to go back to the old training schools of the past. I can very well understand that when we had the advantage of possessing Imperial forces in Canada those forces were the nucleus which we were permitted to use for the purpose of training our volunteers. When those troops were withdrawn from Canada it became imperative, as the law is that we give a commission only to a man who has taken out a certificate to organize some such training school as we now possess, and so far as my experience as head of the department goes, which now extends over several years, and the reports which I received from the officers who are the military advisers of my department, I consider it would be impossible under the present system to do away with our training schools or change the system which is now the system of training in Canada without great detriment to the efficiency of our military force. However, I may tell the hon. gentleman, as he knows well, that every opinion expressed by him and by those who have given as much time as he has devoted to military matters, I am always quite prepared to consider, and as we have a new Major General, perhaps his views may be different from those who preceded him; but I tell the hon. gentleman with all candour that the consensus of opinion, so far as military men are concerned, is that we cannot possibly do away with the present

training schools without affecting very materially the efficiency of the force. I can tell the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that ever since he and I discussed these matters on the floor of Parliament, so far as I am concerned, I have never referred to the hon. gentleman in any shape or form, and I am unable to understand why he took advantage of a vote which had nothing to do with the matter to bring up a dead issue.

Mr. MULOCK. A live issue! The widows of dead militiamen.

Mr. AMYOT. I took the opportunity afforded me on this item, because we are not quite sure when the proper time arrives to discuss these matters, for we may find ourselves detained in committees of enquiry. I think I was right in doing so, because the item referred to the volunteers in 1885, and I happened to be one. The Minister cannot complain——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not complaining.

Mr. AMYOT. I will not cross swords with the hon. gentleman on the point, nor recall what he has done. I recollect perfectly well all I wrote and said during that time. I remember I complimented him and treated him as a most trusty friend; but I was met with the reading of private telegrams, and parts only of them, read in such a way as to put in my mouth or from my pen an admission of personal cowardice. I complained, moreover, that the Ministerial press, the *Empire*, in Toronto, and *Le Monde*, in Montreal, are constantly endeavouring to injure my personal reputation and also the reputation of the race to which I belong. I am very glad the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) has given that explanatino, and I will not deal with what he has said. As to the training of the officers of the force, I understand very well that it is not easy to undo the present system or change it materially; but I call the attention of the Minister to a point on which hon. members of this House and myself have interviewed him. We have asked that those who went through the campaign of 1885, who saw active service and who acquired experience, should, on the recommendation of their respective commanding officers, receive certificates. Surely there is no one more responsible for the efficiency of the corps than the commanding officer; no one who knows more correctly its wants? Those who went to the North-West and who are known to the commanding officers worthy of being recommended for a certificate should receive it. No harm could be done to any one. It would be good for the whole corps that these certificates should be granted, and they would afford a fair recompense for services. In my own battalion I have eight or nine officers who are perfectly qualified on every point, but who cannot spare time to go to the St. John School in order to obtain certificates. This is not in the interest of the Militia force. We should give these officers certificates if they are recommended as efficient by their commanding officers. I hope the Minister will see that is done. We will not object to these applicants undergoing an examination, provided that the board is not composed of men who will take opportunity of this occasion that it is only at the military schools that we may qualify efficient officers. Give us a good and fair board and we will not object. We want to get some good officers, and we have great trouble in securing them; the best men are those who cannot spare the time to attend the military schools. I ask the department to grant this request, and I hope it will be acceded to.

Mr. DENISON. The Minister seems to have run away with the idea that I am opposed to the schools. If I said so, I did not intend to say so. I think the schools are most essential. What I wanted to say was that we should engraft the present schools on the old schools. In the *Canadian Military Gazette* of 27th December, 1888—I do not know whether this journal voices the views of the militia of Canada, but it is supposed to do so in a certain measure—I find the following remarks:—

"We are convinced of the desirability of opening our military schools to candidates for officers' appointments as well as to those who have already had appointments conferred upon them. There is at present a course of instruction in non-commissioned officers' duties, but that does not fill the bill. The non-com.'s life at the school is congenial to very few aspirants for commissions. There are constantly being added to the ranks of the Militia officers who know nothing of military duties, and who are allowed to hang on from month to month and year to year without qualifying. Once allowed in, it is hard to get rid of them. Were the school system changed, all intending officers could be taught a great part of the knowledge essential to the desired position before being allowed to wear the uniform in public."

Those words about express my ideas.

Superannuation—Extra allowance to W. Wallace, ex-postmaster at Victoria, B.C. $240

Mr. PERRY. I should like to be assured that every man stands in the same position in Canada as does this gentleman, to whom it is proposed to grant an additional $240 as superannuation. I now desire to allude to the late postmaster at Summerside, P.E.I., Mr. Green. That gentleman has been acting postmaster for a quarter of a century. He was dismissed a short time ago. I am not aware, although living near Summerside, which is in the county I represent, that he ever neglected his duties as postmaster, that he had stolen any money from the Post Office Department or interfered with the head of the department, or that any complaint was ever made that he neglected his duty. We know there have been times when the whole of the post office correspondence from Canada to Prince Edward Island passed through Summerside, and Mr. Green acted during those years as postmaster and no fault was found with him. Is this gentleman to be superannuated? I do not know what has become of the Postmaster General. I suppose he will be able to explain; but I would like him to explain a litttle more than whether Mr. Green is going to have superannuation or not. I would like to know why Mr. Green has been so abruptly dismissed; I would like to know if he has been dismissed to gratify the self-will and wishes of a defeated candidate; I would like to know why he has been dismissed as abruptly as Mr. Saunders and Mr. Muttart, the section foremen, have been dismissed from the Prince Edward Island Railway. I have a notice on the paper asking for this information in respect to Mr. Green, and I suppose the information I am going to get will be a *fac simile* of the information which the acting Minister of Railways, I was going to say, had the impudence to lay on the Table last night in relation to Mr. Saunders and Mr. Muttart. In this document, Mr. Schrieber said: I want Mr.

Unsworth, Manager of the Prince Edward Island Railway to dismiss promptly Mr. Saunders and Mr. Muttart. Is that an answer to my motion? Will that show me the reason why these men were dismissed? Will it satisfy the House, will it satisfy the people of Canada, and the people that I represent here? Are the Government ashamed to give us the information? If these men have been neglectful of their duties—and although they are in my county, but I do not know whether they voted for me or not—I would say dismiss them; but I take it for granted that they are not guilty of neglect of duty when the Government are ashamed or afraid to bring down these returns. My motion was complete and it asked for the orders relative to the dismissal of these gentlemen, but this order was not brought down. The order emanated from Mr. Schrieber, Superintendent in Chief of the Government Railways, to Mr. Unsworth, Manager of the Prince Edward Island Railway in Charlottetown, and what did it say?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he is speaking to a subject which is not at all included in the item before the Committee. A little while later the Intercolonial Railway items will be up, and then his remarks will be in order.

Mr. PERRY. The Minister of Finance is getting very captious, and I am glad to find that he is not always in a moment of weakness. I contend that I am only showing the smallness in which the Government is acting in respect to officers in Prince Edward Island, and especially in Prince County.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not now discussing the item of Railways and Canals, or anything connected with it.

Mr. PERRY. I will submit to your decision. I know you are very impartial, and I like always to see you in the Chair. I want to know if Mr. Green is to be superannuated, and I have a right to know that from the Postmaster General. This gentleman has been a civil servant——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is commencing again the very same thing. I think this would better come up in discussion when we come to the items for the Post Office Department.

Mr. PERRY. The item we are now discussing is additional superannuation to a postmaster in British Columbia, and if I am not in order the House will be taking a new departure. I am quite willing to go on the lines of the new departure, but I would like to follow the old mode, if there is no objection. I would like to know if the postmaster at Summerside, P.E.I., who was dismissed without any reason, or because of some spite that a certain individual had and who made some false representations to the Government, is going to be superannuated. I contend that a public servant who has served his country for a quarter of a century has a right to be superannuated. I do not know how long Mr. Wallace served as postmaster in British Columbia; I do not know what great service he has rendered his country to entitle him to this $240 increase of superannuation; but I suppose the Government in their wisdom have examined the case and I presume he is worthy of this amount; and if he is worthy let him get it. I contend that the postmaster in Summerside, P.E.I., who served his country honestly, and without anyone being able to point the finger of scorn at him, and who was dismissed without any reason; I say that the Government has a right to tell this House and the country, that his faithful services would be appreciated by superannuation. I suppose the Government will bring down another small supplementary estimate, and I hope and trust that in that supplementary estimate they will come down to the scratch; come down to what is fair and just, and give Mr. Green suitable superannuation for the services he has rendered the country for a quarter of a century. I do not expect that the Postmaster General will now give the reasons which induced him, in some particular moment or other, to dismiss this gentleman; but I will take another opportunity of learning that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who is this Mr. Wallace; when was he superannuated? What was the amount of his superannuation allowance: who succeeded him; what age is he now, and why are you granting this extra superannuation allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must know, although probably he has forgotten it for the moment, that this item has been in the Estimates now for two years, and has been explained each year; and it will remain in the Estimates so long as Mr. Wallace lives. The facts are I believe that some two or three years ago Mr. Wallace was superannuated. He was superannuated on certain time, and once the superannuation was fixed and had passed the Treasury Board and Council, it is impossible to review it again, except for the purpose of correcting a clerical error, if there be one. Previous to that there had been an agreement between the Prime Minister and Mr. Wallace that he should have five years added to his time. It was impossible to review the superannuation as it had passed the Treasury Board and Council, and this sum of $240 was put in, and will be put in the Estimates each year so long as Mr. Wallace lives, to make up to him for what would have been his full superannuation allowance each year, provided the agreement had been carried out at the time of the original order. This has already been explained two or three times, and I suppose the fact of having it appear in the Estimates will call up the same discussion each year, although it might be well if the discussion were dispensed with to save time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the amount of the superannuation allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the amount here.

Mr. HAGGART. I brought it down last year and the year before, and I did not think it was at all necessary this year. You will find it in last year's *Hansard*.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not want to take the trouble of looking up *Hansard*, nor do I remember what was said last year. If the Ministers made false calculations, and have put themselves in a position to be obliged to take this step, they should be competent to answer questions and necessary information.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the Ministers are rather captious in this matter. My hon. friend asks a question, and it is a very easy matter to answer that question and to answer it civilly. But he was told that the item was in the Estimates last year and the year before, and because he does not happen

to remember and know all about it the Ministers are taking him to task. If they knew it they might have easily informed him of the fact. They had better consult the amenities of debate, and the rules of propriety a little more in this matter, when members rise to ask a question.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. There was not the least intention on my part, and I do not think any inference could be taken from my words, that I intended to cast any reflection on the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I simply called his attention to the fact that it had been in the Estimates for two years previous and had been explained, and I presumed that he had forgotten it for the moment.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman thinks I should remember all about it. He will, no doubt, remember all about it; and I now ask him, what was said last year about the total amount of superannuation Mr. Wallace gets, what was said about the man's age, and what was said why he was superannuated? What was said about why he was superannuated? What was said about who succeeded him? And what did he say last year would be his age this year?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that the hon. gentleman ought to remember these points. I said that he should have remembered that the subject was discussed and the explanations made in previous sessions. I certainly do not ask him to keep a travelling record of these things in his head; I simply called his attention to the fact that the subject had already been discussed. Mr. Wallace was superannuated for the exact time he had served; it was intended to add five years to his time of service; and this $240 is simply the extra amount which would have been added to his superannuation if the time had been added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was his age?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what his age was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It looks very much like a bargain for the purpose of putting in some other gentleman.

Mr. TROW. I had the pleasure of seeing this officer a few months before he was superannuated, and I think he was a much more efficient officer than the present incumbent. He understood his duties thoroughly, he was a practical man, and he was most anxious to retain the position. I should like to know what was his age at the time he was superannuated, and for what purpose he was relieved of his duties which he understood so thoroughly, and an ex-member of Parliament put in his place.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the gentleman was of a fairly ripe age, and that he was anxious to go home to England where his friends were, and pass the remainder of his life there; and Mr. Shakespeare was appointed in his place.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is quite clear that there is something very irregular in connection with this superannuation. I have taken occasion, on the several opportunities that have been presented to me, to discuss this whole question of superannuation, and I think this case of Mr. Wallace is one which shows that the Act has been continually abused, in order to provide places for those who have been pressing on the Government their claims. This gentleman, who was postmaster of Victoria, it is quite clear, was removed from that position in order to make room for a gentleman who once had a seat in this House, Mr. Shakespeare. The hon. Minister of Customs, when the question of superannuation comes up, usually delights to present a statement to the House to show that under the operation of the superannuation system the country is making money. In this case that claim cannot be made, for the simple reason that Mr. Wallace was drawing a salary of $2,400 a year; he was removed and granted not only the superannuation allowance to which he would be entitled under the statute, but an increase of $240 a year, and Mr. Shakespeare was appointed in his place at $2,400 a year. This is another evidence of how this system is abused. I see that last year thirty-five names have been added to the list, of whom thirty-one are granted an annual allowance, so that the entire sum which was added last year, and which will continue as long as these men live, was $15,486.75. I find that there are some men on the list who are not by any means aged. In the Customs Department there was added to the list last year $6,074.64; next comes the Post Office Department, with an addition of $3,850.84; the Department of Railways and Canals comes next with $2,482.55; the Marine Department added $496, a moderate sum; the Inland Revenue Department $721, and the Finance Department $1,860. The gratuities amounted to $15,051.95. I find that we had on the superannuation list on the 30th of June, 1891, 532 persons. Of these, I find that there are no less than 114 men who are under the age of 54 years drawing annuities out of the treasury of this Dominion. That is an evidence that the Act has been abused, ridiculously abused, for the purpose of making room for other men who are pressing their claims on the Government for positions. And now we are asked quietly to pass an item of $240 extra to a man who was compelled to leave his position. Now, I contend that this whole system should be changed. Last year we paid $241,000 in superannuations, which shows on the face of it that the system is grossly abused, and it is time that some change should take place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the hon. member for Victoria if he has seen Mr. Wallace lately, and how he is in health?

Mr. PRIOR. I have not. I do not believe he is living in British Columbia at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where is he living?

Mr. PRIOR. That I cannot tell you. If you look up *Hansard* you might find out.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman wants full information, I have not got it here, as I did not expect this matter to come up. It belongs to the Post Office Department, and I will bring down the information when the Estimates for the post office are being considered.

Mr. FOSTER. I can give the hon. gentleman some information, which I find in the Public Accounts, which are accessible to him as well as to me. Mr. Robert Wallace was superannuated in the year of our Lord 1888, and his annual allowance was $912. His age at the time of retirement was 67.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this the same Wallace?

Mr. FOSTER. The same Wallace—the postmaster of Victoria; there is a mistake simply of a letter in the name. The number of years of his service was fourteen. The cause of his retirement was age. His salary, at the time he retired, was $2,400. The average salary for the three years previous was $2,400. It has been paid twelve months. I think that is full information.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister has given us information which was not furnished the House, when the House voted this amount in 1889. On looking to *Hansard* of 1889, I find it stated there that:

"Mr. Wallace was for such a long time in the service of the country that he was superannuated, and in consequence of his long term of service, ten years were added to his superannuation."

Now, we are told that fourteen years is such a very long term of public service that when a man who has been that number of years in the service is superannuated for any reason, he is to have ten years added. Is it quite true that that long service was only fourteen years?

Mr. FOSTER. It seems by this to have been fourteen years.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it is quite in order to refer to what has taken place. If the grant of this extra amount was in consequence of long service, it is quite clear that, had we known that long service was only fourteen years, we would not have consented to the extra ten years. The matter is fairly open for our consideration; and in view of the contradictory statements in the *Hansard* of 1889, we should have the papers brought down. It is stated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that Mr. Wallace was induced to send in his resignation for certain reasons, and that this increase was given him as hush money to prevent his making known the reasons for sending in his resignation. That statement was contradicted, but the Committee was not furnished with the evidence, which is no doubt in the possession of the department, showing exactly the circumstances under which the resignation took place. There must be some correspondence. If Mr. Wallace asked to be retired, his application will be in the department; if there is any correspondence, that will be in the department; and we should have now before the Committee all the papers before proceeding further with the vote. The hon. Minister of Finance must be in error in saying that explanations were given last year. I do not find any allusion to this matter in the *Hansard* of 1890, though possibly I may have missed it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is there.

Mr. MULOCK. But I do find the statement to which I refer, on page 1597 of the *Hansard* of 1889, and if the House was not then in full possession of the facts, we should be put in full possession of them now before we vote this money. I would suggest, therefore, that the item should stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the item should stand. Any information we have in the department will be brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It ought to be down now. My hon. friend will see that when the Government take the responsibility, on a service of fourteen years, of nearly doubling the pension, by adding ten years to it, a reason should be given. From what my hon. friend has said, the late First Minister must have supposed the service had been very much longer. It is a gross abuse of our system of superannuation to add ten years to a man's service, who only served fourteen years, without very grave reasons. The explanation given is not satisfactory. This whole superannuation matter excites a great deal more attention in the country than perhaps the hon. gentleman is aware of. There is no doubt whatever that this $250,000 which we pay as pensions is looked upon with a very evil eye by very many of our constituents; and although I do not myself see my way, within due bounds and moderation, to adopt the very radical remedy proposed of abolishing the superannuation system, yet I must warn the Government and the civil servants too that the way in which it is being conducted tends to imperil the chances of the system being prolonged much longer.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hardly agree with my hon. friend, and believe the whole thing should be swept away. It has been and will be productive of abuse, and I believe we had better adopt the system of paying the civil servants for their services, letting them serve while they are able and take care of themselves afterwards. I do not believe the superannuation system is a good one. I believe of the five hundred or six hundred people on the list nearly half might be performing their functions, and that the course taken by the Government is such as to have provoked the animosity of the country with regard to the whole system, and we will be obliged to repeal it not many years hence. For that course my hon. friends will be largely responsible. This case we are considering now is one the country will consider as furnishing good reason for a repeal of the system entirely. I think the item had better stand until we get the papers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not very often that I have the good or the bad fortune to agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not rise for the purpose of awarding to them any credit for the manner in which they conducted the superannuation system when they were in power, because it is within my own knowledge that a very large number of men were superannuated. No such credit, Sir, is due; when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, men who should not have been superannuated were superannuated, these cases being a clear abuse of the very system we are discussing. I may differ very materially with the Government and with many members on this side, but I confess I do not see any reason why we should keep up this system.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not talking for cheers from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We can cheer if we like.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Certainly, you are at perfect liberty to do so. At the same time, you must remember you are doing it in the light of your record in this matter when in power. If the officers of the Government are not well enough paid to provide for the future, they should be better paid, and this system of superannuation entirely abolished. Surely this House, free entirely from partizan considerations, should take

upon itself some opportunity to discuss the matter and come to a logical and fair conclusion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What do you think of this particular item?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know nothing of this particular item, as I was unfortunately absent when the explanations were made.

Mr. CURRAN. As this subject has taken so wide a range, I may be permitted to say a word.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CURRAN. As this debate has taken so wide a range, I may be permitted to say a word or two on the subject. My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat has spoken in favour of abolishing the superannuation system altogether. I hope that abolition will not take place at all events until justice has been done to one gentleman who was employed in Montreal for some years. I refer to Mr. George Craven, who was employed as a warehouseman at a salary of $550 a year. He was only 55 years of age when he was superannuated, but he had been continuously employed from the 1st June, 1853. Although he was a political opponent of mine, he was permanently appointed, on my recommendation, on the 1st March, 1884. The inspectors having reported that the poor fellow is nearly blind and is physically unfit to discharge his duties and should be replaced, I think it is only fair to a man who has been in the service for 37 years to give him a superannuation allowance. It is true that, under the Civil Service Act, a person requires to be ten years in the service in a permanent appointment in order to come under the Superannuation Act; but, because this poor fellow was not permanently appointed until eight years ago, it is hardly fair that he should be turned adrift when he is nearly blind, according to the official report; and I hope some means will be taken by which this case will be dealt with in an equitable spirit, so that after the 37 years of service which this man Craven has given to the country, he will have some allowance for the few remaining years he has to live, and that, if he is physically unfit to discharge his duties and is nearly blind, he should have some commiseration shown to him. As I have said, he never supported me politically and was always on the other side; but I believe we should do justice to a poor man who is in such an unfortunate predicament.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), I am very glad to find that he endorses the movement for the abolition of the superannuation system. He pointed out that some similar cases took place during the term of office of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). That is true. Some of those were cases in which, if the Government had dismissed the parties without a retiring allowance, the Government would have been accused of harsh dealing. The brother-in-law of the late First Minister was superannuated and drew the largest superannuation on the list. If the new First Minister had dismissed that gentleman instead of superannuating him, he would have been blackguarded from one end of the country to the other for such an inhuman act. I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) say he was not in favour of doing away with superannuations; but perhaps the hon. gentleman himself is looking forward to taking shelter under the superannuation system. Of course, we know that Montreal is a very important port of Customs, and it is not impossible that the man who is now there might have to be superannuated, and then my hon. friend might desire to take his place. We will have to keep our eyes open in regard to this matter, and, perhaps, after all, we may find that what my hon. friend is looking for is getting a position for himself, and that after he obtains that position, he would consent to the abolition of this particular system. The Minister of Customs was not in his place when I made my first remarks, but I notice that he has taken the lead in this superannuation business. I see that he superannuated a large number of officers in the city of Montreal last year. Either a number of these were not required or else he has superannuated them for a purpose. He says that the offices have not been filled and that he has no intention of filling them. Well, if the affairs of this country under the management of the Minister of Customs are so conducted that three or four men can be superannuated and their services dispensed with without any inconvenience to the service, there must be a great deal of looseness somewhere in the management of that department. If that is the way in which the hon. gentleman manages an important port like the port of Montreal, so that he can dispense with the services of these men without any inconvenience, it would be well to find out if there are unnecessary men at other points. There might have been a time when the superannuation system might have been considered a necessity. In England, I think, when it was first introduced, the system of life insurance was scarcely known, but here in a country like ours, where a man can pay an insurance premium upon his life and can draw the amount when he arrives at a certain age, it is very much better, and it would be better for the Civil Service that the superannuation system should be abolished, and this should be done. In that case, the civil servants would control the whole of their salaries, and they could insure their own lives and could be certain, either of receiving money at a certain time, or that, at the time of their death, it would be paid to their families. How is it now? A man may pay into the superannuation fund for twenty years, and he may die in the service, and his family never gets a single dollar from that. Those who are superannuated draw a certain annuity for their lives. I think it would be better for the Civil Service to allow them to control their own means, to insure their lives and to provide something for their family, if they were taken off in early years, or for themselves, if they live up to an old age. You have now on the superannuation list 114 men under the average age of fifty-four, and that proves that the system has been steadily abused by people being placed on the superannuation list in order to make room for those whom the Government desired to appoint. I agree with my hon. friend, that this system ought to be abolished. I would have no objection to the system which was proposed by Mr. Blake in this House, when he moved that we should deduct 2 per cent. from the salary of the civil servants, and that it should be placed to their credit at interest, and that it should be paid to their families, in case

of their death, or to themselves, when they retired from the service.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we must insist upon having information before we can give our consent to the passage of this item. If, after this discussion, the item is passed, next session the Minister of Finance will say that it was thoroughly discussed in 1891, and, after the most mature deliberation, the House came to the conclusion that the item ought to be passed. Now, he is asking us to pass it in the dark, just as we did in 1889 and 1890, without any information, and he asks us to pass it without any information to-day. This is a new Parliament, and, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) suggests, one-third of the members of this House have never heard anything about this item, and are in no way committed to this item at all. But whether that one-third is seeking information or not, I, as an individual member of this House, demand information before being called upon to vote yea or nay on this matter. It is time to discuss whether the best mode is adopted in appointing civil servants, and we suggest that the time has arrived when the salaries of civil servants, instead of being secured to them after they have ceased to work, should cease at that time; and, further, that they should not be considered different from the earnings of other citizens, but should be attachable at the instance of the creditors. I do not believe in placing civil servants beyond the control of their creditors; it is a most dishonest principle. And this system of superannuation promotes dishonesty on the part of the Government at times, because it is used as a bribe to induce people to make way for politicians who are inconvenient, or whose places are desired for other parties. However, apart from the general merits or demerits of this question, we are now dealing with a particular item, and we must have information before we pass this item. The Minister of Finance himself understands that it is his duty to lay this information before the Committee. He thinks probably, that by obstinately withholding information, he will make progress. Now, his experience in this House ought to have taught him that this is the poorest way for him to make progress in public business. There is no desire on our part needlessly to delay business, but considering the extravagance of the Administration, considering the enormous increase in the public expenditure, it is time for each and all of us to do our duty now, to supervise carefully every item of public expenditure. We must be careful of the small items as well as the large ones. Although this is a small item, it is one of a class embracing nearly a quarter of a million dollars per annum of tax upon the people of Canada. We will not be doing our duty if we do not insist upon having this information, and the Minister of Finance will not be doing his duty unless he gives it to us. Let us have the whole of the correspondence and the papers, and probably a perusal of these may satisfy the members, so that no further discussion will be needed; but until that information is laid upon the Table of the House, he must expect that there will be a very proper desire on the part of hon. members to know all the facts concerning this item.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman should be satisfied with the statement I gave, because this is an item that has been two or three years before the House. The gentleman was superannuated in 1888, and it could not be expected that the Minister would come here with full details of that superannuation, nor could the Minister have expected to be asked to explain what has already been before the House two or three times. I told the hon. gentleman that if the item was allowed to pass to-night, I would, on the first item that was introduced on the post office estimates, give all the information I had in my department. I doubt very much if there is any fuller information; I think no more information can be given than the statement that the hon. Minister of Finance has read from the Public Accounts. I do not know of any arrangement when Mr. Wallace was superannuated. I do not know what arrangement, if any, was made with him for the appointment of his successor. The hon. gentleman must know that none of the departments contain any information as to an arrangement, such as he insinuates, having been made. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that 114 employés of the Government had been superannuated whose age did not average fifty-four years, I can state to the hon. gentleman that a great proportion of those who were superannuated in the Post Office Department, were superannuated for grave and serious reasons, which are all set forth in the Orders in Council for their superannuation; and the insinuation that they have been superannuated for some reason or another which the Government dare not make patent, is altogether a fabrication of the hon. gentleman. I may state that there has not been a single superannuation for which the best of reasons were not submitted to the Council, and the superannuation was passed by the Treasury Board. The reasons are given in the Orders in Council. A person may be sick for six or nine months and incapable of duty; he may have a medical certificate ordering him on leave of absence for 12 or 13 months, showing that it was impossible for him to perform the duties of his position. Every reasons were given by the chief of the department to show why the gentleman was superannuated.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be very true, as the Postmaster General informs us, that there has been no superannuation without the very best reason, but we would like to have the evidence laid before us showing that such is the case. We have a particular matter before us now, and when we are disposed to question whether that was a proper superannuation, the Government require us to take their assurance that it was. The Postmaster General tells us that he could not be expected to have the information brought down. Well, we say if he has not brought the information down, let this item stand until he does bring it down. We require the information, and we do not suppose the Ministry expect to force all these items through without according to us sufficient reasons therefor. The hon. gentleman says this item has been passed twice already, and that is a reason why it should be passed again. Sir, if this House, or this Committee, has been remiss in its duty upon two former occasions, that is no reason why we should be remiss upon the third occasion. It is a good reason why we should be more careful upon this occasion, and why we should now demand that which we ought to have demanded upon the two previous occasions.

Then, this is a new House, and there is a large number of members in this House who were not here on the two previous occasions, and they may want to know the reasons that actuated the Government in making this superannuation. Is it possible that the Government, when we demand the papers in regard to a matter, when we demand all the information that we are entitled to possess with regard to this matter—is it possible that the Government dare to tell us that they will not give it?

Mr. FOSTER. We have never said so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Postmaster General tells us that if we will let this pass, he will bring down the information. That is equivalent to saying that we will hang the man and try him afterwards, to see if there was any reason for hanging him. We do not intend to let this matter pass till we have the information, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that it will probably save time if he will allow this item to stand, and bring down the information we ask for, and that we are entitled to receive at his hands. If we find that the matter is all right, and that there is no reason for refusing the item, it will pass as a matter of course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is no force in the argument of the Minister, that because this item has appeared in two previous years, it should pass now. We know very well that this item is subject to a change every year. The mere fact that having been passed on two previous occasions does not at all justify us in passing it now, without sufficient reasons having been given. This is entirely a new House, and the Minister himself will see the reasonableness of his showing the new House the reasons why he asks this vote to pass. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), says that he does not know anything about this item at all, and he may desire to know something about it, and if the hon. member for Haldimand is in that position, a great many other new members of the House are in the same position, and may be averse to letting an item pass about which they know nothing. The Minister doubts very much whether he can give us any more information. Well, let the matter rest until he is sure. It seems to me there ought to be some information as to whether this man desired to be superannuated or not. That would weigh upon the question. If I remember rightly, I think when I was in Victoria a few years ago along with my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow), he stated that he saw Mr. Wallace, and he was quite well. I do not know that he met him personally himself, but I understood him to say that he was quite capable of discharging his duties. I know that the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) in a speech at the opera house alluded to coming events, and the reference was enjoyed very much. Here is the point. The Government superannuated this officer and then endeavour to add 10 years to his service. For what reason is this addition to be made? Is it for long length of service? The hon. Postmaster General said it was so; but the Minister of Finance said it was not for long service, for 14 years is not long service. Thus there is a direct contradiction between one Minister and another. This man who was practically capable of discharging the duties of that office, was superannuated after 14 years' service, and now the Government come down and ask the House to grant a superannuation allowance based on 10 years' additional service. That is equivalent to giving him superannuation for every year except 4 years during which he was in the public service. And yet this gentleman is in perfect health and able to discharge the duties to-day. Does the Minister of Finance say there is nothing worthy of explanation in this matter? Does he mean to say that he can shelter himself behind the fact that because such votes have been made on representations, which even according to the Minister of Finance himself were not correct, we are to-day to take similar action? It is only reasonable that a full explanation of the facts should be given to the Committee, as there are so many new members of the House who are not acquainted with the merits of the case.

Mr. DEVLIN. As a new member I should like to know why we are called upon to vote this amount. The only explanation given to the Committee is that there is—

"Item 92. Extra allowance to W. Wallace, ex-postmaster at Victoria, B. C."

You might put down 216 other citizens for a similar amount, and we would not be much wiser. I agree with what has been said, that because this House has in past years voted this amount, that is no reason why it should be voted again. At all events, we should have some explanation regarding the matter. Apart from that, I agree with what was said by the hon. member for Haldimand regarding the system of superannuation. I do not think it is the most commendable system to adopt. It is said that it existed in the time of the Mackenzie Administration, and that is set forth as an argument by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I always thought that hon. gentlemen opposite condemned what was done by the Mackenzie Administration, and yet here to-day we find their action brought forward and endorsed. When gentlemen obtain good positions in the Civil Service at high salaries, I do not think that after they have served their country for a few years they should be entitled to a large retiring amount. The business man is obliged to provide for the future. The farmer, although he obtains a much smaller remuneration than an ordinary civil servant, is obliged to provide out of it for the future. The labouring classes have to assist in providing for the maintenance of the Civil Service, and are they to be asked to allow themselves to be taxed still more in order to provide a fat thing for a civil servant who does not want to work any longer, and yet the labourer has also to provide for his future. If a civil servant wishes to retire from the service, let him, while in it, provide for the future from savings from his salary. We were told by the Postmaster General that superannuation is never allowed except for grave and serious reasons. Perhaps some so retired would have been worthy of dismissal instead of superannuation. The whole matter is one deserving of the most serious consideration; and respecting this special item, I think as a new member I am entitled, as are many others who are here for their first session, to more information before we vote this amount.

Mr. BOWELL. The argument addressed by the hon. gentleman would be applicable if the question of the repeal, extension or amendment of the Superannuation Act were before the House. At present it is simply a question whether $240

should be given to Mr. Wallace in addition to the amount he is receiving as superannuation.

Mr. DEVLIN. We could not get the reason why it should be voted.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know why this needless and lengthy argument on the principle of superannuation should have been addressed to the Commiteee. I do not hold myself responsible, I speak now individually, for the Superannuation Act. I took very much the same ground as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken when it was passed in 1870. I opposed the Act then for the reasons advanced by many of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken; but we are dealing with an Act on the Statute-book, and they who have its administration in charge should endeavour to administer it as nearly as possible in compliance with its provisions. Unless it is shown that this is not done, the violent remarks addressed by some hon. members are certainly not in place. I regret as much as the hon. member for Montreal Centre can possibly regret the position in which he finds an officer whom I considered it my duty to remove from the service for reasons which he himself has given. If it had come to the knowledge of some hon. gentlemen opposite that I had an officer drawing $700 for doing nothing for twelve months, who was really incapacitated on account of loss of sight and ill-health, I would have been attacked just as violently as the whole system has been attacked for keeping people in the service who really did nothing and drew full pay. Now, because in the interest of economy, and in the interest of the service, I took the only means left to me under the Superannuation Act to remove him from the service, that was to give him a gratuity of one month's salary for each year in which he had been upon the staff, I am assailed. It is true, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre said, this man had been in the service for a number of years.

Mr. CURRAN. Thirty-seven years.

Mr. BOWELL. I was not aware of it. He was one of the temporary clerks who received $1, $1.25 or $1.50 a day. Some are recommended by collectors to be placed on the permanent list, they having proved good servants in the past, and I have no doubt that these recommendations in many cases are made in order that in their old age these men, not receiving very large salaries, may retire on allowances and become really pensioners on the country. In regard to the case before the Committee, I understand that when Mr. Wallace was superannuated, he was promised by, I think, the late Premier, although I will not speak positively on that point, an addition to his years of service. When the question came before the Treasury Board they knew no particular reason why any additional years should be added, and, consequently, recommended to Council the superannuation of Mr. Wallace with an allowance based on the time he had been postmaster at Victoria. Subsequently, it was urged that this promise having been made to him, the additional amount should be voted annually. We were advised by the Minister of Justice at the time, that the Treasury Board and Council having once acted on the question of superannuation of any officer, and the recommendation having passed Council and received the sanction of the Governor, our functions then ceased, and the superannuation could not be amended unless it could be shown that there was an error either as to the number of years served or some other cause. Under the circumstances the board was not able to reconsider this question and recommend an additional number of years to be added to this man's service, and, consequently, it has been placed ever since in the Estimates. This is the only information that can possibly be given to the House, and it becomes a question whether, under these circumstances, and in view of the explanations which, I believe, were given by my colleagues before I entered the chamber, if the House thinks that this is an improper expenditure of money to pass, the best way is that either the Minister of Finance should drop it, or that the House reject it. I do not think, and I am speaking with all sincerity, that any other information can be given on this question. I was not a little amazed at the arguments used by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, which would tend to show that all the iniquities—if they are iniquities—and all these wrongs—if they are wrongs—which have been perpetrated under the Superannuation Act, have been perpetrated by the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. However, it is just as well that I should call attention to a few facts which I find in the superannuation list now before me, as there are a large number of new members in the House who may like to know how the Superannuation Act was administered under the Administration of my hon. friend who sits before me (Mr. Mackenzie). I find on looking at this list—and there are a number who died off since and consequently do not appear in the list for the present year—that Mr. Brennan, bailiff of Trinity House, Montreal, was superannuated, and had served only six years——

Mr. LANDERKIN. What date in the year was that?

Mr. BOWELL. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What date in the year 1873 was that?

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman be quiet for a few moments; will he kindly permit me to finish what I am stating? I find that ten years is added to Mr. Brennan's service.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was done by your own Government.

Mr. BOWELL. You are now making a statement that you have not proved.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am making a statement that is nearer the truth than your statement, because your Government was in power for eleven months during that year.

Mr. BOWELL. That is only a repetition of that insolence that always characterizes that hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. You had better take that back.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not take it back.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh, yes, you will. I will leave it to the Chairman whether you should withdraw that expression or not.

Mr. BOWELL. If I were speaking about you probably I would.

Mr. MULOCK. That will not do. If you would be kind enough to wake up, Mr. Chairman, and restore order, I have a point of order to make.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If that were for the fiscal year of 1873, it would not be under the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie).

Mr. LANDERKIN. Allow me to speak to the point of order. I do not wish the Minister of Customs to take anything back which he says about me. I consider always the source from which it comes. Do not be uneasy at all; I am not uneasy about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You know hon. gentlemen in Committee like to say a great many things that they do not want to take back, and it does not amount to much anyway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But we would like to have your ruling. The hon. Minister of Customs accuses my hon. friend of insolence, and I submit that it is not strictly parliamentary. If you rule that it is, of course that is a different matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will not rule that it is or it is not. I am not familiar enough with the English language for that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then I will translate it for you.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order also. I wish to draw your attention to a personal insult to yourself. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) asked you to wake up, and that is an insult to the chair, and a reflection on the way you discharge your duties in this House.

Mr. MULOCK. I will withdraw the observation and the Chairman can be at liberty to remain asleep if he likes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a discussion like that which has been going on for the last two hours is enough to make anybody sleep.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that according to your ruling——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not know that I have ruled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is just as well that we should know that according to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, the word "insolence," is strictly parliamentary. That is a very interesting point to have decided.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not say it is parliamentary, but I can say that I have been sitting here for an hour and a half and I have heard a great many things that were not parliamentary and nobody drew my attention to them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, never mind; that language is quite customary in the Customs Department.

Mr. BOWELL. If I said anything in this Committee unparliamentary, I am quite willing to withdraw it.

Mr. MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Very well, I accept your apology.

Mr. BOWELL. This little digression has taken place because I was not able to give the day of the month on which this superannuation took place after six years of service and to which ten years are added. Look a little further down the list and you will find that in 1877—and I do not think there is any doubt as to who was in power then—that the Rev. John Cameron, a clerk in the statistical office in Halifax, who had served only three years, had ten years added to his service, and is now drawing a salary on thirteen years' service instead of three.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are not opposed to the clergy, are you?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I must appeal to you for protection in this House. The Chairman as Speaker must protect gentlemen who are speaking in the House from these unseemly interruptions. Go a little further down on the list and you will find that, in 1874—I do not think there will be any doubt about the Liberal party being in power then—that John Costley who had served ten years had ten years added to his term of service, and he was superannuated upon a twenty years' allowance. If you look down a little further you will find that in 1877, Mr. T. B. French was superannuated after thirteen years' service, and had ten years added, so that he is drawing a superannuation allowance for twenty-three years. A little further down and you will find that in 1875 George Futvoye, then Deputy Minister of Militia, was superannuated after twenty-seven years' service, and had eight years added making thirty-five years, which ha enabled him to draw the largest possible amount that could be drawn under the Superannuation Act, namely, 70 per cent. of his salary. The names on the list which I am reading from are given in alphabetical order and not arranged according to the dates, but if you look again in 1875 you will find that J. W. King, director of penitentiaries, served only six years, was superannuated on account of abolition of office, and had ten years added to his service. In 1878—the same discussion might arise on this as did arise a few moments ago as to whether the present Government, or the previous one were in power—but if you refer to the name which is that of John Langton, you will all know that he was superannuated by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and he had ten years added to twenty-three years' service.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In order to give a member of Parliament his place.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not give any reason for it, but I have no doubt that it was for the reason the hon. gentleman states. I find that in 1876, Mr. Lindsay had ten years added to twenty-four years' service. In 1877 the Rev. H. McMillan, secretary of the statistical office at Halifax, had served eleven years and had ten years added to his length of service; and in 1877, Mr. C. M. Nutting, a clerk in the statistical office in Halifax, had ten years added to five years' service; and I might go on giving a number of similar cases. Here, in 1877, is another very good sample: A Mr. Ryan, who was a messenger in Halifax, had served only three years and he had ten years added to it, making thirteen years, and is still drawing the amount of that superannuation. It is true it is only $75.72 per annum, but being a messenger the amount would not be very large; the principle, however, is the the same. In 1875 there was a Mr. Wilson, who served

nineteen years, and had six years added to his term of office. Now, I do not pretend to say that cases have not occurred during the time of the present Administration, in which two, three, five or ten years have not been added to an officer's length of service; but in every instance there has been good reason for the addition. I find that in most of these cases in which the ten years were added, it was done because of the abolition of the office.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear;" but that is simply in accordance with the superannuation law as it exists on the Statute-book. When the Government abolish a man's office, they have the right, if they think proper, to add from one to ten years to his term of service, but they cannot exceed ten years. I am not finding fault with our predecessors for what they did in this matter, but I am pointing out that in administering the law, they found it necessary, presumably in the interest of the service, to superannuate these men on account of their unfitness or illness, or because of the abolition of their offices. I shall not refer to the remarks made by one hon. gentleman with regard to the Montreal Custom house. I made a plain and distinct statement the other night, in answer to a question as to why those gentlemen were superannuated. I also stated distinctly and positively that I did not intend to fill their places, because I did not think the service required it. That statement ought to have been sufficient; and when a statement of that kind is made, if it is shown that the Minister who makes it has told an untruth, or has not carried out the promise he made to the House, then it will be time enough to insinuate that he told a falsehood, and did not intend to carry out the promise he made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some of the cases the hon. gentleman has alluded to hardly bear out the case which he has undertaken to defend. Take the first case, that of Mr. Brennan, of Montreal, who he said secured an addition of ten years. Well, I find that Mr. Brennan was superannuated on the 1st day of September, 1873. I will try to fix the incident a little more clearly in the hon. gentleman's mind by reminding him that that was fifteen days after a certain prorogation of Parliament, which took place under remarkable circumstances in 1873, and it was, I think, about two and a-half months before the Canadian Pacific scandal cabinet, of which the hon. gentleman it is true was not a member, was driven ignominiously from power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, deservedly driven from power, under circumstances about as disgraceful as some of those now transpiring in this House.

Mr. BOWELL. We will treat that upon its merits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will treat that upon its merits, of course. As to Mr. J. W. King, I think his office was abolished, and I remember very distinctly the late First Minister making a very vehement appeal to our side of the House, that if it was necessary to abolish the office, Mr. King, and I think another gentleman whose office was likewise abolished at the same time, should have all possible consideration that could be granted to them in conformity with the statute, which I think was done. As an hon. gentleman remarked before me, I will take the responsibility of having, in common with my colleagues, dealt perhaps too generously with Mr. Bernard, who was the Deputy Minister of Justice, and a brother-in-law of the late Premier. I believe we allowed him several years additional; and I think that most of those whom the hon. gentleman has alluded to, and who were perhaps too generously dealt with, were gentlemen who were very great friends of hon. gentlemen opposite and very strong political opponents of ours, and who, if they were so dealt with, were certainly dealt with not because of any particular partiality we had for them but on broad principles of equity.

Mr. COCHRANE. In order to put some of your own friends in the same positions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir; to improve the efficiency of the public service. That was the ground on which we acted, and on no other ground. I recollect well, during the election of 1878, a great number of hon. gentlemen opposite, and notably my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) whom we miss so much, and whom we have so long missed in this House at a critical period, used to indulge in the most envenomed periods against the Mackenzie Administration, because we increased in four or five years the superannuation allowance from about $60,000 a year to $104,000 or $105,000. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen and their successors have not a word to say now—except the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who is perhaps anticipating the time he must appear before his constituents, and wishes to pose as a purist—about an expenditure of $241,000 a year. Now, with respect to the particular instance before us, the allegation made by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock)—and he gave proof of it—was that this particular gratuity had been arranged under misrepresentations — erroneous, though I do not say intentional—made to this House by no less a person than the late Premier. He read from *Hansard* in proof thereof, and he elicited from the Minister of Finance the statement that that was sufficient ground for asking why the ten years were added.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before you left the Chair, Sir, the hon. Postmaster General challenged the statement I presented to this House, in which I showed that there were on the superannuated list 114 civil servants, who were of an average age of 52 years. The hon. gentleman challenged that statement, and I think pronounced it "bosh," or made some remark of that kind.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not challenge his statement, but the inferences he drew from it.

Mr. MULOCK. You used the word "fabrication."

Mr. HAGGART. I did it unintentionally.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to prove that my statement was true. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the list of superannuations on page B—220

of the Auditor General's Report, and take the ages as there set down, he will find the following results. He will find that ten gave their birth as in 1830, that eight stated they were born in 1831; that eight gave 1832 as their date of birth; that seven were born in 1833, four in 1834, ten in 1835, seven in 1836, eight in 1837, five in 1838, three in 1839, four in 1840, seven in 1841, one in 1842, three in 1843, four in 1844, three in 1845, one in 1846, three in 1847, two in 1849, three in 1850, one in 1851, two in 1852, three in 1853, two in 1854, three in 1855, one in 1858, one in 1860 and one in 1864. These 115 names show an average of 52 years on the 1st of July last. Now, the hon. Minister of Customs attempted to defend the superannuation system, so far as the port of Montreal is concerned. I notice we have no less than 45 superannuated officers, who were living in Montreal up to the 1st July, 1890, and since that the hon. gentleman has added four to the list, which makes forty-nine superannuated officers living in the city of Montreal. The people, the labourers, mechanics and artizans of that city as well as the surrounding country, have got to provide an annuity for forty-nine men in that city, who do nothing but live on the allowance granted them under this system. The hon. gentleman also attempted to point out that considerable abuses had taken place under the Mackenzie Government. But of the 115 shown in this list only 31 were put on it by the Mackenzie Government. All of them with the exception of three, have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Again had the superannuation system been adhered to as it was first inaugurated, had the percentage first imposed on the salaries of civil servants, when the Act was introduced by Sir Francis Hincks, and which was 4 per cent. on the salaries of those drawing from $600 to $1,000, and 5 per cent. on the salaries over $1,000, we would be paying much less than we do to-day. But hon. gentlemen opposite, in their magnanimity and liberality, reduced that just one-half. They struck off, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, 50 per cent. from the fees, and deducted from the wages of the civil servants only half the percentage formerly deducted. Had they allowed the Act to remain as it was, even with all the abuses which have been perpetrated, the system would have been almost self-sustaining, but they have abused it in two ways. First, they have reduced the amount taken from the wages of the civil servants 50 per cent. We are now collecting about $50,000 of dues per year from the entire list, whereas had the Act been allowed to remain as it was, we would have been collecting $102,000 and would only have been losing $150,000 a year, instead of $250,000 as at present. Last year we paid $240,000. This shows that hon. gentlemen opposite have abused the Act in two ways: first, by reducing the amount taken from the civil servant's salary; and second, by largely and unnecessarily increasing the superannuations. The hon. Minister of Customs quoted a great many superannuations which had been made by the Mackenzie Government; but I defy him to show any case in which any man was superannuated who had never contributed a cent to the fund. The Mackenzie Government may have added years to their term, and, if they did, I do not endorse their action, but they never allowed a man a superannuation allowance who had not contributed to the fund. The time has arrived when we should abolish the system. There is no necessity for it, and I believe that the civil servants themselves, if it were left to their vote, would vote that the system should not be kept in force any longer. If, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has said, their wages are not sufficient, pay them what is sufficient and give them control of their own means. But I say there is no class in this country at present receiving a better annual allowance than our civil servants. There is no class half as well paid for the work they do. Bank clerks, wholesale clerks, school teachers, ministers of the Gospel, the best educated class we have, taking all their salaries together and dividing the total by the number employed, are worse paid than our Civil Service clerks. That being the case, why not allow these people to provide for themselves. It is not their fault if the Act is in the statute; it is not there at their request or with their consent; and it was not put there for their benefit but for the sole purpose of giving the Government power to remove from office clerks who are efficient and faithful but whose positions are wanted for others. It is for that purpose the Act is in our statutes, and the Government take every opportunity of using it. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Customs used the Act to get a comfortable position for his own son in Victoria, B.C., as I understand he has a son there as collector of Customs. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us whether he utilized the superannuation system in order to make room for his son or not. He does not appear to take any notice. I suppose it is convenient for him not to take any notice. No doubt it would not be convenient for him to answer the question, and he prefers to take no notice. Therefore I must come to the conclusion that the superannuation was used for two purposes in British Columbia. It was used in the first place to remove Mr. Wallace, the postmaster, in order to make room for Mr. Shakespeare, who was once a member of this House. In the second place, I presume, as the Minister of Customs has not contradicted it, it was used to remove the Customs officer at Victoria in order to make room for the son of the hon. gentleman himself. We do not know how often this has been used for similar purposes, and it may be used, as I suggested before, to make a vacancy in the important port of Montreal for the benefit of an hon. member of this House. If it were not convenient for the Government to use this system in this way, it would have been abolished long ago. The Civil Service would be glad to have it abolished. They do not desire to have a portion of their salary taken out of their own hands. Some of them complain very loudly of the discount which is taken off their salaries every month in order to pay to the superannuation system, because the only way in which they could derive any benefit from it would be if they were put on the superannuation list, whereas, if they should die in the service, neither they nor their family would get a farthing. It would be better that they should be paid the full amount of their salary, with perhaps the exception of a small percentage to secure the proper performance of service on their part, and then let them insure their lives on their own account. I want the Postmaster General to understand that the statement which I presented to the House is a correct statement, and I advise him not again to

declare that statement bosh or to ridicule it without being further informed on the subject. I am prepared to submit this statement to the Clerk of the House, and let the Postmaster General submit his statement in the same way and I will leave it to the Clerk to decide.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I desire to say something in regard to this iniquitous system. I cannot understand why a certain class of people in this country should be selected and pensioned off at the expense of the people generally, when the rest have to look out for themselves. Everyone is aware that the civil servants are better paid than any other class of the same standing and the same education, and I cannot understand for the life of me why they should be allowed to retire into the world with a compensation or a pension. I do not know whether the Liberal party objected to the introduction of this system by Sir Francis Hincks in 1870, but, if they did not object, they did not do their duty, and I think that the Liberal party did not do their duty when they were in power from 1873 to 1878 when they allowed this measure to remain on the Statute-book. I do not care for any party in this matter, but I think the country should be saved this money. When we consider that more than $200,000 is annually paid in pensions without any claim for compensation except that the recipients have served the country for a few years, I think it is not a fair system at all. Take the teachers of this country, whose education is certainly as high as that of the civil servants, and they do not expect the Government to come to their aid. It is true that they contributed largely to a superannuation fund in the past, but during the last few years, the Government has refused to contribute, and they are now thrown on their own resources. The Government saw the error of its own way. In 1882 the Liberals in this House took a decided stand in reference to this question. The Superannuation Bill was before the House, and, when it came from the Committee, Mr. G. W. Ross moved :

"That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole to amend the same so as to provide, with due regards to the rights of those who have been already admitted to the superannuation list, for the abolition of the present and the substitution of a plan whereby a percentage of the salary of each civil servant shall be retained and placed to his credit and shall be payable to him with interest on quitting the service or to his family in case of his death in the service."

That was a fair plan submitted by the Liberal party in 1882, but every Conservative voted against it. The Liberal party is therefore not responsible for the continuance of this iniquitous system. Two years ago I was told by a member of Parliament that he knew thirty Conservative members of this House who would willingly vote for the abolition of this system if they dared to oppose the Government. That proves that even the supporters of the Government do not believe in the principle involved in this system. Take the amount of money which has been paid to those who have been superannuated because they have been supposed to have been unable to earn any more money during their lives. Let me give you a list of a few of these. A gentleman by the name of C. J. Birch was superannuated, the amount he had paid in was $112, and the amount which he had drawn out up to the 1st January, 1886, which is the last date at which I have been able to get the figures, amounted to $10,207. In fact, he made a fortune after he had left the service larger than many men have the opportunity to make by their hard work. Then there was H. Bernard, who had paid $505 in, and up to that date he had drawn out $18,704. Another case was that of C. Bristow, who paid in $69, and drew out $10,973. Mr. W. G. Fyfe paid in $212 and drew out $10,773. Mr. G. Futvoye paid in $420, he was superannuated because he was of no more service to the Government, and he drew out $24,580 ; Mr. Thomas Hewitt paid in $112, and drew out $10,873 ; R. Kimber paid in $275, and drew out $11,187 ; John Langton paid in $847, and drew out $20,147 ; Joseph Lesslie, formerly postmaster of Toronto, paid in $584, and drew out $16,858 ; E. A. Meredith paid in $639, and drew out $18,060 ; Gilbert McMicken paid in $261, and drew out to the date I have mentioned $12,507, or up to the time of his death, over $16,000. Alfred Patrick, the late Clerk of the House, paid in not a solitary cent ; during that period he received $12,090, and up to the present time he has received about $20,000, and the sum will keep on growing. Now, let me give you some details with reference to those superannuations, to show how the system is abused ; and it will be abused, no matter in whose hands it is placed. If it is placed in the hands of the Liberals, outside influences will be brought to bear to make a place for some Liberal who wants a position ; and if the Government themselves want to open a position for a friend it is quite likely—because we are all human—that some position will be opened and some person superannuated. And what is true with us, is true with any other Government. Influences are brought to bear every day upon the Government for a position in the Civil Service, and these influences are so strong that some person must be superannuated in order to make room for the party that is pressed upon them. Or if the Government is anxious to put in some strong supporter of theirs they will make room for him. Now, I say that the system should be abolished, and some other system established whereby those influences by outside parties on the Governments should be overruled. Let me give you a few instances to show this. Take the clerkship of this House. Mr. J. G. Bourinot, a gentleman who is as capable of filling that position as any man in the Dominion, and who fills it with honour to himself and dignity to the House—he receives a very fair salary, $3,400 ; and my friend who sits at his right and acts as his assistant, receives $2,800. Now, if that were all I would have no objection ; or, if $3,400 is not a sufficient salary for that gentleman to discharge the duties of clerk, I say the Government ought to increase it ; and if $2,800 is not sufficient for the assistant clerk, let it be increased. But we have three superannuated clerks. We have Alfred Patrick, who has been drawing a salary of $2,400 a year for the last 10 years out of the exchequer of this country because he is not able to discharge the duties of Clerk of this House. We have another, Mr. Leprohon, who receives $1,500 a year as superannuation allowance, and we have another gentleman, Mr. U. Piché, who receives $400 a year. Now, the position of clerkship of this House costs the country $10,500 a year on account of this iniquitous system which is in vogue, whereas it should only cost us $6,200. Let me give you another instance : Mr.

Gilbert McMicken, of Winnipeg. I know I shall be told that he was superannuated under the late Liberal Administration. I do not care under what Administration it was, it only shows that the system is bad. He was superannuated because he was sick, and received an allowance of $1,579 per annum. After he received that some years, he got quite well, and ran and was elected for a constituency in Manitoba for the Local Legislature. He was appointed Speaker of that Legislature. Now, what has he been drawing from the two Governments, his salary as Speaker, his indemnity as member, and $1,579 superannuation allowance, because it was said that he was so sick that he could not do anything at all. Is that a proper system for this country to follow? Take another case. You will all remember a few years ago, when the Liberal party was in power, there was a certain gentleman in the city of Toronto then writing for the *Mail*. He was a vigorous and trenchant writer. He abused the Liberals right and left during the time they were in power. He was the Opposition's right hand man at that time. In 1878, when the Liberal party was defeated, this gentleman, who was then a writer for the *Mail*, came to Sir John A. Macdonald, or his Government, and said: "Now, I want my reward. I have written many strong editorials in favour of your party during the last four years and I take to myself the credit, to a large extent, of having defeated the Liberal party." "What do you want," says Sir John A. Macdonald. He answered: "I want the position of postmaster of the city of Toronto." "But Joseph Lesslie has that position, and he is comparatively a young man, only 62 years of age." "Well," says the editor: "You can superannuate Joseph Lesslie and give the position to me." Joseph Lesslie was an active man, and had held that position for 30 years, giving the utmost satisfaction to the people of Toronto in the discharge of his duty. But strong influences were brought to bear, and he was superannuated, and has been drawing $2,400 a year ever since 1880. And, Sir, Thomas Charles Patterson was placed in that position with a salary of $3,000. But $3,000 and $2,400 make $5,400 that that office has cost this country each year, during the last ten years, on account of this system of superannuation which has been adopted and continued by the present Government. But that is not all. There was a gentleman in the post office in the city of London a few years ago—no doubt the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) remembers him—named John Gordon. He had occupied a position in that post office for 35 years. But the Minister of Agriculture wanted that position for a friend of his; influences were brought to bear upon Mr. Gordon who refused to be superannuated, but he was shoved out, and received $600 as superannuation fee, and another gentleman was put in his stead, and John Gordon since then has drawn $4,000 from the funds of this country on account of that superannuation. John Gordon to-day is under sixty years of age, and is as smart as any man in this House of that age. But that is not all. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a few years ago they superannuated a man by the name of Alexander McNab, an engineer of the Prince Edward Island Railway. It was supposed that he did not discharge his duty properly, or the Government was at fault; however, he was superannuated on the ground of ill-health. Now, Mr. McNab was at that time only forty-five years of age, and he has received a superannuation allowance for nearly ten years, and is as robust and as healthy a man as there is in the country, and has taken charge of another railway as engineer. I might go on from one case to another; I might go through one hundred and one names, if it were necessary, but these are sufficient to show the iniquity of the principle which is pursued. Why, the people in the country, when I tell them that a large number of able young men and of older men, have been superannuated at their expense, they stare at the iniquity that has been perpetrated upon them. Take the farmer who goes early to his work and returns late at night, year in and year out, for twenty or thirty years; when he has cleared his farm and made improvements, he has served his country, and if he fails during those years to make a sufficiency for himself and his family in his old age, he has not the Government to fall back upon, he is not able to ask them for assistance. Take the mechanics of our country, or the workmen in our manufactories; take the school teachers who teach our children; take the clerks who labour in our banks and our various other institutions—they have nothing to fall back upon, and consequently they are more economical during the first period of their lives, they save something every year, and that habit of economy builds up their character and they become better men and women than those who depend upon superannuation to support them after they have become unable to work. Now, after looking at all these facts, I would ask that this system be abolished just as rapidly as it can be. This particular item, I understand, is called for by the Government to pay a Mr. Wallace of British Columbia, and I understand that the Government refuse to give information to this House as to what that amount is asked for. I will put it to the common sense of the Ministers, have we not a right to know the reason why this $240 has been asked for? If this Mr. Wallace is entitled to it, if he has done work which deserves compensation to the extent of $240, are not the members of this House entitled to know what that service was? Will not the country demand from the members of the Government, from the party on that side of the House, a minute explanation of all the moneys that are paid out? If this money has been paid fairly and legitimately for work done, why should the members of the Government refuse to give the information to the people which they are naturally entitled to receive? The refusal of the Government to give the information has caused a delay in the passage of this item for the last three or four hours. Now, in view of these facts, I would ask the Government and the supporters of the Government, I would ask our own friends on this side of the House, to put their heads together and devise some means by which this iniquitous system may be wiped off the Statute-books of this country, and be replaced by some other system that will be more truly in the interest of the Civil Service. And whatever statute is passed I am not in favour of compromising the vested rights of those men who entered the Civil Service on present conditions. The Act would be passed, and it would take effect gradually, so that those men would receive the compensation they expected to receive when they entered the service.

Mr. FOSTER. My only desire is to facilitate the business of the House, and I think I am in strong contrast with some hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. I do not rise for the sake of replying to the long speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He has undertaken to discuss the whole merits and demerits of the system which has been adopted by Parliament and kept on by both parties for a number of years. The accuracy of the hon. gentleman's information, if it may be tested by a particular point, will be known to the House when I state, that although the hon. gentleman rounded up one of his periods in a very eloquent manner by declaring that Mr. McNab, who has been superannuated, was walking round as robust as ever in his life, I am credibly informed that Mr. McNab has been dead for a certain length of time, and consequently I suppose is not very robust.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He was not dead this time last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say that this iniquitous Act which has been on the Statute-book for a length of time, and which has been so roundly denounced by some hon. gentlemen opposite, is an Act, I understand, placed on the Statute-book in 1869 or thereabouts. The amendment which was referred to, making the percentage smaller, was, I think, passed in 1873; that, I think, was before the Mackenzie Government came into power. This fact remains that the Liberal Government were in power in 1874; but instead of sweeping this iniquitous Act from the Statute-book they took advantage of every provision in it, and I am quite willing to make a comparison between their administration of that Act and the administration of it since by the Liberal-Conservative Government. Reference has been made to a great many different persons There is one comes to my mind now. In 1875, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, there was a certain robust, healthy, active and competent postmaster in the city of St. John, N.B. He had been in the service for a number of years. He was at that time 62 years of age. He was superannuated, and has from that time up to the present day been receiving $1,400 yearly out of the public treasury, and he is, as the hon. gentleman said of Mr. McNab, but in a truer sense, walking about the city of St. John to-day robust, hearty and well. "And tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon," if that is the correct scripture quotation, this very same Mr. Howe, in the bloom and pride of his manhood, was superannuated for no other purpose than to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to put in a partisan of their own, John V. Ellis as postmaster at St. John. If such a thing had happened as an act of this Administration we would have had two and a-half hours speeches on it. I simply call attention to the fact, and leave it there. I am not going into a discussion of the principle of a Superannuation Act or an insurance scheme to provide for the civil servants. I have my own views on that score. I do not think this is the best time to discuss this policy and to define what we should do when we are on an item of the Estimates, and consequently I leave that part of the discussion. What I will do is this, to come to the simple point at issue and ask hon. gentlemen if they really have anything to complain of in the attitude of the Government in connection with this item. Please remember that every bit of information that is available, unless hon. gentlemen want brought down the written orders containing the statements that have been made here by Ministers, has been laid before hon. gentlemen. What is the information they want? The information as to the condition of Mr. Wallace at the time of the superannuation? Very well. He was 67 years of age. No hon. gentleman will contend that was not *primâ facie* a fair age to entitle him to superannuation. By the Act civil servants can be superannuated after 60 years of age; he had passed 7 years beyond that. His term of service was 14 years, a very respectable service for that one office. An addition is made to his time provided for in the item now before the House. I have explained that fully. I have given more information to the House than hon. members could get from the papers. I am informed by the Postmaster General that after the House rose he went to his office, saw his deputy, and found there is no correspondence in his office on this matter. What more can be got by hon. gentlemen opposite when the papers are brought down is the Order in Council, and the minute of the Treasury Board embodied in the Order in Council with respect to this superannuation. The facts are as I have stated them: That this gentleman of 67 years of age was recommended for superannuation; that he was of an age sufficient to entitle him to it; that after the Treasury Board Order had passed and superannuation named, and the Order in Council passed, the case could not be opened except for a clerical error; that an addition of five years was made to his time, and that additional allowance for the five years, as it was not included in the first Order in Council, is here as an item in the Estimates, was placed there first in 1889, and has been voted for two years. I do not see that any fuller information can be got or is required than that. I do not suppose the House proposes to go back on the action of the Government and on its own endorsation of it during two years. Any desire for reasonable information ought to be met, and any demand for reasonable information respecting this item has, I contend, been met to-night. With this explanation and with the statement that the Order in Council and the Minute of the Treasury will be brought down and laid on the Table of the House for the information of hon. gentlemen, I think this item ought to pass, and I do not think the business of the House on this 108th or 110th day ought to be obstructed for any lack of information, alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite, on this one item. I think the House ought to pass it, and if not passed the responsibility for the delay will not rest on the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is something more than the mere item itself or the merits of the item involved in the discussion which has taken place since 8 o'clock, and before that hour I did not hear it. We are considering now not the item in the Estimates, but we are considering the question of superannuation altogether, and it is just as well for the House to discuss it on an item of this sort as by a Bill submitted by an hon. gentleman which perhaps he would not succeed in having carried. The hon. member for South Huron has read a resolution proposed to this House by a member sitting on this side in 1882, enunciating the sentiments of the Liberal party, and if that resolution had received the support of a majority of the House there is no

doubt whatever it would have been immediately followed by the submission of a measure carrying out the principles stated in that resolution. But every member who was elected as a follower of the Conservative party, voted against that resolution and for the maintenance of the principle of superannuation. I remember very distinctly the discussion which took place in this House when Sir Francis Hincks, as Minister of Finance, proposed the adoption of the principle of the superannuation allowance The hon. Minister at that date, in submitting his measure to the House, proposed to reserve 4 per cent. of the salaries of public officials, out of which this retiring allowance to which the members of the public service were to be entitled was to be paid. It was not supposed that after the measure was well established and came into operation, that there would be any charge upon the public treasury whatever. Of course it was then stated and it was supposed, that there would be a larger amount charged for a few years than the contributions would have afforded, because in the beginning those who would first be retired, would be men who had been contributors to the fund but for a few years. It was also stated at that time by Sir Francis Hincks, that the members of the Civil Service had, up to that time, been paid very moderate salaries, and the small salaries which they had received might be considered as if a sufficient sum were reserved to entitle them to draw from the superannuation fund whenever their retirement took place. The reason assigned was that the members of the Civil Service were very much like the sailors; they were a class that were not very well fitted to provide for themselves; they were an improvident class, who paid very little regard to the principles of economy; and that unless some portion of their salary was retained for the purpose of establishing a fund of this sort, they would be kept in the public service long after their usefulness had departed. The original Bill provided that the Government should have the right to retire any man after he arrived at sixty years of age, and they might retire him at an earlier period if there was any indication of his mental or physical unfitness for being retained in the public service. It was then said by the Minister of Finance: If you make no provision and a man in the public service tells you: I am depending on the salary which I earn for the maintinance of myself and family. I have succeeded in saving nothing, I have been kept here in a town where the cost of living is very considerable, and the amount which I have received has been very moderate. It was said that it would be very difficult to dismiss him under these circumstances, but that if there was provision made by the retention of a portion of his salary for the creation of a superannuation fund, then it was said: You will be at liberty to discharge him whenever you feel that he has less fitness for the public service than what he had in the prime of life. These were the arguments used by the hon. Minister of Finance when he submitted the original Bill for the consideration of the House. It had not been on the Statute-book very long until there was a very strong pressure on the part of the civil servants for the payment to them of a larger amount than they were entitled to receive under the original Bill; and in the year 1871, or thereabouts, the amount was reduced from 4 per cent. to 2 per cent., and so the funds, by this reduction, were made altogether inadequate to carry out the original plan without imposing some charge upon the public treasury. If the original plan had been strictly adhered to, it is not improbable that the public treasury would not have suffered, and it is highly probable that the fund thus created would, after a period of ten or fifteen years, have proved adequate to provide the retiring allowances. It was not adhered to, and a very large number of persons have been retired who no doubt did not fall within the policy of the law. I know myself of many persons who were retired, and who are still fit, after many years' withdrawal from the public service, for the discharge of those official duties which were imposed upon them at the time this retiring allowance was provided. Now, it does seem to me that the plan suggested by the resolution of 1882, proposed from this side of the House, would, if embodied into a statute, carry out the policy of the law as it was originally intended. If you were to retain from each person a certain percentage of his salary, and as you do now retain also the right of dismissing him from the public services when you felt he was no longer qualified to efficiently discharge his duties in that service; he could have had handed over to him the amount reserved with the interest that had accrued upon it up to the time of his retiring. There is this further advantage in such a system: If a person dies in the public service under the present law his family receives nothing. He may have been a contributor to the superannuation fund for a quarter of a century, and yet, if he dies in the service his widow or his children receive nothing; whereas if a percentage, with the interest which had accumulated upon it, were paid out upon his ceasing to be a member of the public service, or upon his death was paid to his family, then some one in whom he has an interest would receive back that portion of his salary which has been deducted with the interest which had accumulated thereon. For these reasons, the representatives on this side of the House came to the conclusion that a law based upon the resolution of 1882 would prove more satisfactory, and would leave the Administration equally free to carry out the legitimate intention of the law of 1869. It is, I say, pretty clear that that law has been abused. I take the case of the retirement of the postmaster of Toronto. That officer at the time he was superannuated declared himself still fit for the public service. He did not wish to retire; he wished to retain his office, and he was threatened, if I remember rightly the facts, with some investigation into his conduct, which, if the charges which had been made against him could have been established, would have disentitled him to any retiring allowance whatever; and thus he was subjected to moral coercion which compelled him to comply with the wishes of the Postmaster General of that day, and to ask to be put upon the superannuation list; and another gentleman not any more competent to discharge the duties of his office was put into his place. And so the public treasury has been burdened with a superannuation allowance to a retired postmaster that ought never to have been imposed upon that fund. One hon. gentleman on that side, I think the hon. Minister of Finance, has stated that the law was not more abused by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches than it was by their prede-

cessors in office. Well, Sir, I do not admit that; but I contend that however forcible an argument of that sort might be addressed to those who were Ministers of the Crown at that date, it certainly can have no force when addressed to the people at large, or to those who represent the people who were not members of the House at that time. But I do not admit that to be the case. If you look at the annual increases in the charges which were imposed upon the superannuation fund each year, you will see that they were very much less under the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) than they have been under the Administration of those who have succeeded him in office. But I do not care, Sir, to argue that question. I do not care seriously to consider an argument which says that an Administration which held office some thirteen years ago, and from which the people at that time withdrew their confidence, is to serve as a perpetual barrier against progress and improvement, when the progress and improvement are pressed upon the attention of hon. gentlemen to-day. I am ready to adopt the proverb of the Turks, and say I would rather change every day than remain always in the wrong; and when hon. gentlemen tell us that an Administration thirteen years ago has superannuated year by year, during the period of its existence in office, as many as they have done, I say that is no answer whatever to the charge that the Act has been abused, and that whether abused or not experience shows that there is a more excellent way of providing for the Civil Service than the one indicated by that measure now on the Statute-book. I think, Sir, that it is not wasting the time of Parliament or impeding the public business to consider this question. I trust that the discussion here this afternoon and this evening will better prepare the House for the consideration of the defects of this measure and of the remedies which would be appropriate to produce more satisfactory results, not only to the Civil Service, but to the country at large.

Mr. McMULLEN. On page B—236 of the Auditor General's Report I see that Mr. Wallace drew last year $1,271.85. I would like to know how that is made up?

Mr. FOSTER. There were $316 of arrears due to him which were paid last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the regular allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. $912.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has intimated to the House that there were ten years added to his time of service.

Mr. FOSTER. Five years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then he is allowed under the Act nineteen-fiftieths of his salary, and this vote is for five years more, which makes his allowance twenty-four-fiftieths of his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. His full allowance is $912, which includes the $240, so as to make it nineteen-fiftieths of the whole.

Brigade Majors, salaries, transport expenses, etc..... $13,900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that some officer has been dropped. What particular brigade major has been dispensed with, and for what reason?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The decrease is caused by the dropping of two brigade majors. One died, Colonel Lewis, and we did not consider that it was necessary to replace him, as I believe we ought to make use of all the money voted by Parliament, as far as possible, to increase the efficiency of the force, and to decrease the expense of what I consider to be an expensive staff.

Clothing and great coats..... $90,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is this clothing purchased?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is given under contract. There is no clothing purchased except under contract given under the Order in Council passed two years ago on the recommendation of the officers of the department, that a three-years' contract would be preferable to entering into one every year, because the contractors had gone to great expense for the purpose of fitting up machinery to make the clothing more perfect than we ever had it before.

Mr. MULOCK. Were the contracts given after the tenders were publicly invited?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; in one way. The contracts were given to certain firms under the Order in Council; and I believe the hon. gentleman knows almost as much as I do about it, for I had the pleasure of being subjected to his cross-examination for a couple of months before the Public Accounts Committee, and I believe I gave him all the information his acute cross-examination could get out of me. I told the hon. gentleman then that the contract system had been limited to the extent of giving the contract for three years, and the officers of my department have assured me that under that system the clothing has been much more satisfactory than previously.

Mr. MULOCK. I do remember having endeavoured to get information from the hon. gentleman, and I found there were some abuses then in consequence of that regulation, and I wish to know now whether these abuses continue to exist. For example, at the time to which I refer, there was no system of asking competition by public tender, and that I considered wrong. The hon. gentleman had a system of awarding contracts to those he wished to favour with his patronage. That was about the extent of his competition. It was not open and above board. The Minister offered as an apology to that course that he desired to continue his patronage to those who had familiarized themselves with the work required; but I contended that was not a proper way for letting contracts of these proportions. It is one thing to get good material and cut, but is also very important that we should not pay too much, and my recollection is that the prices paid for the scarlet uniforms, at all events, were very excessive. Another feature in that connection was that the contract for a portion of the clothing was let practically to a member of Parliament. It was let to the firm of Sanford & Co., an incorporated company, it is true, but practically owned by Mr. Sanford, who had been raised to the Senate, and who previously had the contract in his individual capacity. I believe the Government endeavoured to prevent all information on that point coming to light, but none the less it was ascertained that the contract was let to the same old contractor, trading under the name of an incorporation. I do not think it is

proper that the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act should be violated by giving contracts to companies substantially controlled by members of Parliament. I am aware that the law permits such a thing to be done, but it is time the law should be amended, and that Parliament was shown the extent to which incorporated companies are really controlled by men occupying public positions. I can see no difference in principle between a member of Parliament contracting directly in his own name and contracting through the medium of a corporation. It may be necessary, in the affairs of life, to make exceptions in the cases of corporations, otherwise it would be difficult or dangerous for members of Parliament to have any dealings at all. But a small interest on the part of a member of Parliament in a company which may have a contract with the Government is a very different thing from the case of a member of Parliament who is practically the company himself. If that be the case with regard to the Sanford Manufacturing Company of Hamilton, the objection stands as sound to-day as when I raised it three years ago. Coming now to the question which concerns the public treasury itself, and that is the question of tendering for the work, if the Government is still simply working out the old contracts that were before the House at the time I mentioned, I will make no further comment; but if new contracts have since been entered into, I have the right to complain that the old system has been maintained. I know that at concurrence there is no opportunity practically for discussion, but if the hon. Minister will be good enough to furnish a statement of the case, I will not press the matter at this stage, but will endeavour to do so on concurrence. I would like that statement to be full, frank and candid, and to set forth the dates of the contracts entered into, under which these supplies are furnished, and also what steps were taken by the department to obtain the best results at the lowest prices. I do not think it is right to simply renew a contract with the existing contractor without giving other parties an opportunity to compete. There is a feeling in the country now that the department is playing into the hands of certain favoured contractors, that there is a ring, and I am not in favour of any set of contractors being in possession of even my hon. friend the Minister of Militia; and I want to strengthen his hands in order that he may be enabled to apply business principles in carrying out the work of his department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend is so frank in his criticism that I could not help being absolutely frank in giving him all the information he requires from me. The hon. gentleman remembers, when the question was enquired into by the Public Accounts Committee, and I told him then, when he was taking a particular interest in the debate, as he is to-night, that, whether I was wrong or whether I was correct in my judgment, I was acting as I supposed to be right in the interest of my department. I shall lay every paper on the Table. Every contract I have given has been given on the authority of an Order in Council. I have never relied strictly on my own judgment as head of that department without obtaining the sanction of my colleagues, and I am prepared to leave the whole matter to the judgment of the hon. gentleman, who, for once, if he finds I am right, may possibly say that the Minister of Militia was not wrong in giving out these contracts. My hon. friend remembers that this matter was referred to upon a motion when we were going into the Estimates, and my hon. friend may remember that the largest majority which the late Government of Sir John Macdonald ever had, was given on this very question.

Mr. MULOCK. It spoke very little for the judgment of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not bringing up dead issues, but I am simply warning the hon. gentleman that, when the case comes up again, he may find himself in the same position as he did when the attack which was made upon the department before in relation to this matter culminated in that large vote sanctioning what had been done.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman plumes himself on the result of that vote. I happen to know something as to how that majority was obtained. I understand that quite a large number of the hon. gentlemen who support the Government in this House up to six o'clock in the evening told the hon. gentleman that, unless he mended his ways, they would vote against him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) say what his attitude was on that occasion?

Mr. DENISON. It is not so.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman know what attitude every military man in this House took upon that occasion?

Mr. DENISON. What is that?

Mr. MULOCK. I thought you knew what you were talking about. Although I do not wish to detract from the credit of the majority the hon. gentleman obtained on that occasion, I understand that unusual efforts were made and very substantial pledges were given at that time. I remember that my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) had a very serious grievance then. I do not say that he went so far as to say he was going to condemn the Government unless his grievance was redressed, but his attitude was not very far from that. Then my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) had a grievance and he was a kicker too, but he came into line.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Allow me to contradict the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. Then his loyalty to his party was greater than his loyalty to the service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not take it back, because the hon. gentleman told me himself that he had these grievances, and I found that the freedom of these militiamen was so curtailed that I had to look after their interests myself, because of the neglect of those people who should have been their defenders or advocates. However, because I do not desire to refer to the past so much as I am anxious to look to the future, I will remind the Minister of Militia that what I am specially anxious about is not in reference to Orders in Council. I do not know under what authority he has acted, but Orders in Council are not going to shelter

people unless there is a proper authority for these Orders in Council. I do not say that the Minister of Militia is to blame for anything. I do not know at present under what authority these contracts were let; but these contracts are made, I presume, after public competition of some form, after a substantial invitation for tenders from the public. It may be through departmental officers making a recommendation to Council, and Council may in its wisdom approve of the recommendation and let the contract privately. I say that system is vicious, is dangerous, is objectionable, and is contrary to the sound principle of getting value for the public money which is expended. I want to know if the discussion which took place before has borne fruit in bringing about a change in that respect. I know that at that time you continued a contract for a certain part of the militia uniform with the same contractor at the former prices for a period of five years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; for three years.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, call it three. I think there was a large fall in the price of wool during that time, but the same prices were paid by the country, though the price of the staple had fallen. Perhaps this was necessary, but the Government had not the necessary evidence at hand to satisfy a body like this. They could not say they invited public tenders. They took the responsibility themselves, and, whenever the Government take the responsibility of departing from the sound, wholesome custom of public competition, they take all the onus of proving that they made a good bargain. More than that, they invade a sound system in taking any such action. I hope, in the statement the hon. gentleman brings down, he will make it perfectly clear what steps have been taken, and will not try to hide them under Orders in Council. I have had occasion before to find fault with Orders in Council.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We ought not to wait for this return in order to get an account of the expenditure of money which has taken place. I think this is the time for us to have such information in our possession, and the Minister is supposed to know all about his department and how these contracts are made, whether they are let by public competition, when they are let, and who obtained the contracts. I have a distinct recollection of the investigation which took place in the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the militia clothing, and I know we had some officers there from some of the crack regiments in Toronto who swore that the clothing handed out by the department was unfit to be worn by the men in their regiments, and that, rather than allow the men to wear it, they imported the clothing themselves from Great Britain. I think the House is entitled to know if the contractors who were then violating the contracts are still contractors, and if that contract has been renewed since that investigation took place. The expenditure for militia clothing amounts to a very large sum of money, and we should be placed in possession of all the information in the possession of the Minister before this vote is passed. I also concur in the statement of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that there is something unseemly and something which ought to be improved upon in allowing contractors to make private contracts with the Government. Now, I live in the section of country where the Sanford Manufacturing Company is located, and the information I have with regard to that company is that the Hon. W. E. Sanford and the Sanford Manufacturing Company are, to all intents and purposes, the same parties, they are members of the same family, and that the company was formed for the purpose of evading the law after he was elevated to the Senate in order that he might obtain these contracts for militia clothing. This company was organized for the purpose of evading the law, as other companies have been organized in other branches of business in connection with the public service, for the purpose of evading the law. It is well known that a large number of newspaper concerns in this country have been formed into joint stock companies since the passage of the Independence of Parliament Act, in order that the proprietors might get round the law. In years gone by I have had opportunities of showing to this House where large sums of public money have been paid to the proprietors of newspapers who had formed companies for this purpose, and to this day such infringements, as I may call them, of that Act, are still carried out by obtaining money from the Government for printing. Now, my opinion is that the Act ought to be amended, in order that these practices may be stopped; because it is all the same thing whether Mr. Sanford receives this money as W. E. Sanford, manufacturer of clothing, in Hamilton, or as the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, for he is the head and front and tail of the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, and the money goes into W. E. Sanford's pocket. I have been informed on very good authority that W. E. Sanford, of Hamilton, is a very liberal contributor to the election funds of the Conservative party whenever they require any large sums of money for carrying on elections in the Province of Ontario. There is some reason why Mr. Sanford should be a liberal contributor. He obtains liberal grants from this Government for clothing, has done so in the past, and, I suppose, he is still manufacturing the militia clothing that is required by the department. I rose to ask for that information. I want to know now who has the contract for the manufacture of the militia clothing which is required by the department here, when these contracts were let, how they were let, and whether there was proper public competition offered when the contracts were let? I would like the Minister to give me that information.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can give the hon. gentleman all the information he requires.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to hear it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I generally give the hon. gentleman whatever information he asks for in so far as my department is concerned. My hon. friend for North York (Mr. Mulock) probably knows very well that I have continued the system I now follow, because after the severe criticism which he inflicted upon my department and upon myself, Parliament declared that I was right and that he was wrong, by the largest vote that had ever been given in that Parliament. I continue to follow the system which the country, through its representatives in Parliament, has declared to be a far better system than the one the hon. gentleman wanted to introduce. Now, the hon. gentleman asks me if the contracts have been continued with the same contractors. I tell the hon. gentleman that I have continued the contracts, and I did

so, because I would have been oblivious to the interest of the department over which I preside, if I had not taken advantage of the opportunities afforded by people who have imported from England, at a large expense, machinery for the purpose of filling contracts for the militia clothing, as some firms had done. Now, I can tell the hon. gentleman there was nothing hidden about the tender I gave out. I sent it to different firms who were prepared to take contracts for the clothing for the militia of Canada. The hon. gentleman may not have gone into these matters as closely as I have had occasion to do, from the fact that I had to know exactly how the department could best be conducted. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are very few firms, even in England, who manufacture militia clothing, only four or five, I think, who manufacture the clothing for the Imperial army. I can further tell the hon. gentleman that continental nations come to the same English clothiers for the purpose of getting their militia clothing. Now, I thought I was doing right, in so far as my judgment goes, by going to the men who had invested capital and imported machinery for the purpose of manufacturing the clothing that we require for Canadian army. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that when I became head of this Department, $200,000 of Canadian money was sent out of Canada every year to firms outside of this country, who did not belong to Canada, to purchase the clothing for our militia force. In that respect I may, perhaps, be in antagonism with the views of the hon. gentleman sitting on the left of the Speaker. I thought it would be a benefit to Canada to keep that money in this country, and let Canadians get the benefit of the $200,000, or the $250,000, which we were spending annually for the militia clothing.

Mr. MULOCK. What benefit would it be to give to the Canadian contractors more than the service was worth?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say to my hon. friend what he has investigated and what he knows to have been proved, that when the clothing was imported from England we were getting an inferior article; I say that we ought to expend our Canadian money in the interest of our Canadian people, and in doing so we were getting a more substantial article, and that instead of purchasing clothing from abroad, which only lasted for four years, we are now giving them clothing which lasts six or seven years. That is my policy so far as Canadian interests are concerned. I know very well that I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman on that point, but I am still prepared to stand by the old policy; I am still prepared to say that that policy has done more good to Canada than the policy the hon. gentleman was in favour of pursuing when he was getting up investigations to prove that Canadian goods were inferior to goods imported from the old country, and when we were sending to the old country $250,000 a year, which it was to the interest of Canada to expend among our own people.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister has not at all answered the questions I asked. He rose with a great flourish of trumpets stating that he intended to give me all the information I asked for, and now he has sat down without giving me a particle of the information I asked for. I asked for information on these points: Who are the present contractors: When did they obtain the contract? Were opportunities offered to the manufacturers of clothing in this country to compete when that contract was let? I would like the Minister to answer those three questions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can give the hon. gentleman the names of the contractors, if that is what he wants. What does the hon. gentleman want?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will repeat my question for the third time. I want to know when the contracts at present running for militia clothing were let, to whom they were let, whether there was a proper opportunity given to clothing manufacturers to enable them to compete, by sending in tenders for the work required?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have answered that already.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to answer his question, I will give him the names of the contractors. For tunics, the Rosamond Woollen Company; for trouser cloth, the Rosamond Woollen Company; Shorey & Co. for trousers. Other contractors are O'Brien & Co.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman has yet failed to state when the contract was given, and whether a proper opportunity was given the manufacturers of clothing to compete.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contracts were given out as we have given them out before.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How was that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Upon the recommendation and reports of the officers of the department that it was better to give the contracts to firms who had been in the habit of contracting with the department, and we let out contracts, giving information to the different firms for the purpose of their contracting with us.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You did not advertise for tenders?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; and have not done so for several years past.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You wanted to favour certain manufacturers?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not say so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman wanted to favour the men who had imported machinery to manufacture the cloth. He does not imagine there are any other men as enterprising as some of the firms he refers to. I understand that the Rosamond Company are not tailors at all. They do not make up clothing, but only manufacture the goods. I should like to ask the Minister if he has not a contract with the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, of Hamilton.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; I gave the hon. gentleman every contract.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the Rosamond Manufacturing Company manufacture the clothing?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know what they manufacture.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Where is their place of business?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell him, but he knows it, and he need not apply to me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the information given by the Minister of Militia is very unsatisfactory to this Committee. It cannot be considered satisfactory, because he shields himself behind the idea that as he was supported at the investigation which took place in the Public Accounts Committee with respect to the militia clothing, because a majority in this House declared that the system which he adopted was right, it must be right and must be followed for all time to come. It is well known that majorities are not always right, that in most cases the minorities are right. I am of the opinion that the minority in this House is nearly always right, and the majority sitting behind the Minister is generally wrong. The investigation which took place before the Public Accounts Committee showed conclusively not only to the Liberal members of the Committee, but to many of the Conservative members that the clothing furnished by those companies which obtained the contracts in years gone by was not equal to the clothing that it was proved could be obtained from other manufacturers. It was shown conclusively that the prices paid to the clothing manufacturers, the W. E. Sanford Company, were in excess very largely of the prices for which clothing could be obtained from other manufacturers. I do not think that because a majority declared that the Minister was right in selecting that company as the manufacturers of the clothing that ought to create in him the opinion that he is acting rightly in continuing the system. I believe that the militia should be clothed as cheaply and as well as possible for the money expended, and I do not believe the Government should expend public money for the purpose of supporting any manufacturing establishment, even if the firm does import special machinery from the old country to manufacture the clothing. It is the duty of the Government to purchase the clothing required for the militia in the cheapest market. It is a wrong principle that has been enunciated by the Minister that because a certain cloth manufacturing firm imports machinery suitable for the manufacture of this class of goods, no other person should be at liberty to compete when tenders are asked for. According to his statement when he wants a new batch of clothing for the militia, and is ready to make a contract, he sends a letter to Messrs. Rosamond, of Almonte, or Sanford & Co., of Hamilton, who no doubt share in the plunder, for no doubt, although the contract is let to the Rosamond Company, yet Mr. Sanford, who sits as a Senator, has a share in the contract with Rosamond or some other contractor who furnishes the clothing for the militia. It is altogether a wrong principle to adopt, that these wealthy manufacturers who have certain facilities for the production of the goods should alone be selected to compete in contracts for those goods. The only proper system for the Government to pursue in purchasing militia clothing, as for all other articles required for the public service, is to ask above board for tenders, and advertise for tenders, so that everybody may be placed on the same footing. This system seems to be ignored every year. Some years ago it was the custom of the Government to advertise for all the paper required for printing the blue-books and other parliamentary documents. During the last two or three years another system has been adopted. When the Government want to make a contract for paper they do not advertise for tenders in the newspapers and allow every manufacturer to stand on the same footing, but they send a letter to Mr. Buntin and some others and ask them to send in tenders. This is not the proper system to follow in transacting public business, and I contend that the Minister of Militia is not doing his duty to the people when he expends large sums amounting to $100,000 a year for militia clothing, and does not afford the manufacturers of this country outside of the particular pet ring he has established, an opportunity of competing for the privilege of manufacturing the goods required. The hon. gentleman admits that that is the principle on which he has acted. Does he not know fully as well as any other intelligent man in the House or the country, that certain rings have been established in this country amongst the manufacturers for some years past, and that if these clothing manufacturers understand that there are only three or four or half a dozen men who are to be asked to tender for this militia clothing, they will form a ring, and one will say: You can have the trousers, you can take the tunics, Snd you can have the overcoats. That is the way the matter is fixed amongst these manufacturers, and by this system the treasury of the country is robbed every year, for the reason that the manufacturers of this country are not afforded a fair and honest opportunity to compete for this supply of clothing. I would say that the information given by the Minister is not such information as ought to be given when this question is brought up in the House, and we ought to be given fuller information than we have yet received before this vote is passed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have given really the information which can be obtained from the department. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the whole matter came up and was discussed in the House. We have asked for tenders not only in one province or in two provinces, but over all the provinces of the Dominion where we knew that we could find contractors to do the work for the Department of Militia and Defence, and our contracts after a long discussion in this House, as to the manner in which they were carried out, were sanctioned by the vote of Parliament. I have no interest whatever in preventing any contractor in the Dominion from supplying this clothing; but I remember well under the old regime when we were appealing through the newspapers to every contractor in the Dominion to send in tenders, the department lost two or three thousand dollars in some contracts which were undertaken by men who had not the capital or the means of supplying the clothing. Looking after the interests of the department, as it was my duty to do, I thought that it was far better to go to the firms who had the capital and who had imported from England the implements which were required to carry out the contracts, as they had seen them carried out in Pimlico. I thought that was far better, because we were getting value from that money from the contractors with whom we had entered into contracts. I have given the hon. gentleman every name that appears in the department as being a contractor with us. I have given him the record as it appears in the department, and the

hon. gentleman may make use of the brilliant eloquence which distinguishes him to speak against Sanford & Co., or any other company, but I have given the hon. gentleman every name which is entered upon the books of my department as being contractors with that department. I can tell the hon. gentleman that when this system was inaugurated we had complaints, but for the last three years, from the east or from the west, from the north or from the south, or wherever this clothing is forwarded through the channels of the Militia Department to the militia forces we have had no complaints. I can further tell the hon. gentleman that it is a system which to my mind is a good system, and one which we should stand by.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. According to the statement of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, he has departed from the rule that he laid down for his own guidance, because he stated to this Committee that because the former manufacturers who had the contract had given such satisfaction, and had acquired such machinery as enabled them to manufacture goods so much superior to other people, he had continued the contract with these men. Now he tells us that the men who had the contract before do not hold the contract now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I beg your pardon.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I beg your pardon, Mr. Minister of Militia. You stated your practice was to give your contracts to the men who had formerly held the contract, because they had fulfilled the terms so well that they were entitled to consideration at your hands; and the former contractors, I want to inform you, were the Sanford Manufacturing Company. Now the information you give to this Committee is that the Sanford Manufacturing Company do not hold the contract at all, but that it is Rosamond & Co., of Almonte, who hold the contract. Therefore, you did not act up to what you believed to be the best interests of the country, when you refrained from giving the contract to Sanford & Co. and gave it to Rosamond & Co. Further, I want to call the attention of the Committee to the last statement made by the Minister of Militia, that he had solicited tenders from the manufacturers of clothing in all the provinces of the Dominion. If that is a fact, the Minister must know the names of those prominent clothing manufacturers to whom he sent letters asking them to tender for this clothing. I want to know, who, in the Province of Quebec, was asked to tender for this clothing? Who in the Province of Nova Scotia, who in the Province of New Brunswick, and who in the Province of Ontario, were asked to tender, because the Minister must have a list of all the parties who were asked to tender for the clothing, and I would like to know who they were? Furthermore, if the Minister were going to carry out the policy which he announced here as to giving the contract for this clothing to the men who had imported, at large expense, the machinery necessary to do this work, did he ascertain before he asked tenders from the manufacturers of these outlying provinces, whether they had the necessary machinery to do the work? Now, I want to know from the Minister the names of the firms to whom he sent circulars asking them to tender for this clothing, and as to whether he ascertained if they had the necessary machinery to make it, or not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I gave the hon. gentleman the names in Quebec. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know the geography of the country very well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps not as well as you.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I told the hon. gentleman that Shorey & Co. and James O'Brien & Co. were asked to tender for great coats, riding breeches and trousers. They happen to be manufacturers in the Province of Quebec; and I may tell the hon. gentleman that we sent circulars to Doull & Gibson, in Nova Scotia.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Had they the necessary machinery?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman might investigate that when he becomes Minister of Militia.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is your duty to investigate that, not mine.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want the hon. gentleman to know that it is not my practice to screen myself under any Order in Council, because every Order in Council sent from my department is made on my recommendation and on my responsibility. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly satisfied that everything I have told him, in so far as these contracts are concerned, is exactly what has taken place; and of the contractors of the different provinces who have been appealed to, some have been accepted and others have not been accepted, because they could not properly carry out the contract.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to tell us when the last contract was entered into, or when tenders were last called for?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend is now taxing me to a very great extent. I think it was last year that the renewal of these contracts was made by Order in Council. I think it was in January, 1891; but if the hon. gentleman wishes to know the exact date I shall get that information for him.

Mr. McMILLAN. Was the old list of prices continued?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, from his practical experience, will see that the contracts were given at very low prices. The prices were as follows:—Tunic cloth, for artillery, $6.04; for infantry, $5; and for rifles, $5.50½. Tunic serge coats, $3; trousers, $4.18; trousers, serge, $2.82½. Riding breeches for cavalry, $6.06; for artillery, $5.56; for infantry, $5.56. Great coats, for cavalry, $7.47; for artillery, $7.69; for infantry, $5.73; and for rifles, $5.73.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these the old contract prices continued?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No. The prices vary. We took advantage of the market. The woollen market was going up or going down, and we took advantage of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You took advantage of it when it was going up. If I mistake not, these are the prices under the old contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman should not interrogate me if he is giving the answers. I think he should have the civility at least to permit me to explain what is done so far as my department is concerned. I know the hon. gentleman cannot be expected to be civil——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As a military man.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not as a military man, but as a gentleman. I was going to tell the hon. gentleman that in making these new contracts we invariably consider the state of the market, and in some instances the market going down we took advantage of that and had the prices reduced by 10 or 15 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was simply the information I wished to obtain, whether the contract prices are reduced; and if the hon. Minister is able to give us definite information on that point we shall be glad to receive it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As I told the hon. gentleman, we took advantage of the market. The contractors came to us and said the woollen market was up or down, whatever it might be at that particular time. The hon. gentlman laughs, but it is really exactly what did take place, and we made our contracts according to the rising or the falling of the market, and we succeeded in getting lower prices than we had been paying upon the previous contract.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Minister ought to give us information as to the prices paid under the former contract, so that we can compare them and ascertain what reduction he has made.

Mr. FRASER. In the exceedingly lucid explanation given by the Minister I did not understand him—I am perhaps somewhat obtuse—to give us information as to whether the market was rising or falling at the time the last contract was made. Did he say that the prices at which the last contract was made were lower than the prices previously given? I would like to know whether he took advantage of a falling market in January last or of a rising market.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is so very lucid in what he requires in the shape of explanation that I think what I have already explained might satisfy him. I told the hon. gentleman that when these new contracts were entered into, we took advantage of the state of the market. I have not got at this moment the state of the market at that particular time, but if the hon. gentleman wishes to avoid some trouble in ascertaining himself exactly how they stood, I might possibly succeed in getting the information for him from the papers of the period or from the contracts which were entered into. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I am at all discourteous, but he would not imagine that I could have, in the explanations to be given to the House at present, the exact state of the market at that period of time. I have been asked to explain what the system was which had been adopted by the department in so far as contracts were concerned. I have told the hon. gentleman exactly what the system was. An hon. gentleman asked me whether we had followed the old prices. I told the hon. gentleman exactly what we had done—that we had in some instances followed what had been the varying prices in the market, and I can tell the hon. gentleman, moreover, that he will not find a single contract which was renewed which was not lower than the previous contract.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman I understand now says—and I am perfectly satisfied with the information he gives—that the contracts given last January were lower than the contracts given in the previous year; but I submit that it is not a very difficult matter for the hon. gentleman to give that information; and I submit further that as a Minister he ought to have that information here now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, I ought not to have it; but I am prepared to give it.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to give it he ought to give it. Preparation means he has the ability to give it, but he should consult his deputy who is present, and who could give that information. One thing strikes me as somewhat remarkable, and that is that the hon. gentleman should consult the manufacturers to know whether the market was rising or falling. It seems to me that he could do better than consult those men who are interested in the matter. The hon. gentleman seems to treat that as a matter of profound indifference. In fact he seems to look upon any matters of trade as beneath him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. Notwithstanding the protest of hon. gentlemen opposite, I should rather gather that from the character of the remarks he has made this evening. Another thing which has been shown this evening is that our militia organization is rather an expensive luxury, and I submit if the method of giving contracts is as described by the hon. Minister, there should be some change made. I agree with the hon. member for North Brant that no particular state of matters in the past should be a criterion for the Minister, and that because the party stood by him in a given emergency he should not rely on that for all time, and refuse to improve his system of carrying on the business of the department. If the hon. gentleman is falling back on that as an excuse, if that is his authority for going on in the old way, I submit he is standing before Parliament in a very unenviable light. He does not pretend to say it is the best method, but falls back on the vote. Another thing has come out in the debate, and that is that the goods got in Canada are better than those obtained in England. I rejoice to learn that we can make better goods in Canada than they can in England; but I submit that the evidence given before the Committee was quite the contrary, and unless the hon. Minister is able to show that since that date the manufacturers with whom he is dealing have made better goods he has not proved his case. I am glad the goods are got in Canada, provided they are as good as those that can be bought in England or anywhere else; but I submit that every man in Canada should have an opportunity of seeing whether or not he can supply those goods. I can understand well that the hon. Minister, depending always on a vote being given to sustain him, no matter what he does, should make his arrangements with the least possible trouble to himself, and con-

tinue to deal with the men with whom he has dealt on previous occasions, and who have satisfied him; but that is not the way business is conducted outside the House. Outside the House it is conducted on commercial principles, and men are asked if they can supply the quantity and quality of goods required. This discussion has also shown the effective condition of our militia force, which is very satisfactory. If the militia were called out to manœuvre and fight, and do all that is necessary as effectively as the hon. Minister has done his duty here to-night, then there is no fear for the future of Canada. I am satisfied we are ready for an invasion at any time, but I am glad to know that the men are better than the department, better organized, better controlled, more ready for their work; but these men will be all the better fitted for their work if they are clothed with the best clothing that can be got at given prices, and I am sure that best can be got in Canada only through the fullest opportunity being given to our manufacturers and importers to compete on equal terms. For some time past I am beginning to think that we are spending too much on our militia. We are spending more than the return which is made. I may be mistaken, but I am satisfied now, when the hon. gentleman says that he himself is conscious of this.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear" to the fact that we are spending too much. I am happy to see that his returning consciousness is giving him now the idea that perhaps he is in a wrong position; but be that as it may, there is a feeling in the country that the militia, while doing good service, are costing more than they ought, and that the amount expended is out of all proportion to that which finds its way to the men. If that is the case, the sooner we know it the better, and I am sure the good and true men who are in the militia force will, when they read the discussion here to-night, feel that they are perhaps not receiving all the advantage they should from the outlay we make from year to year. I would suggest that common sense principles should apply in that department as well as in others, and that, although it may be very pleasant for the Minister to carry on the same contracts from year to year, and watch the sliding scale as given by the manufacturers themselves, he himself, or his deputy, or somebody on his behalf, should mark the rise and fall of the market when he makes his contracts.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We have, perhaps, had enough discussion on this subject, but there is one point of view which has been overlooked by hon. gentlemen opposite, to which I will briefly refer. I do not feel at all concerned to defend the action of the Government with reference to the issuing of the contracts for the clothing of the force. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has stated that the Minister of Militia has not acted on sound commercial principles. I think he has, if he has pursued the course I understand he has taken. I think any man in business who wants a special article will go to those whom he knows, from previous experience, are capable of producing it and will produce it up to the standard he requires. That is the course which would be pursued by commercial men in almost every branch of business. If there is an article which a man in business finds by experience only can be produced under certain conditions by certain people he naturally goes to those in whose enterprise he has every confidence, and who have the best facilities for supplying his wants. We have a good deal of experience in the matter of clothing for our volunteers, and have had clothing furnished which we found most unsuited for the purposes for which it was required. In the first place, the manufacture of scarlet cloth is a specialty, and the process of manufacturing it is very expensive. In England it is only carried on by two or three firms, and in this country only one firm has succeeded in making that cloth at all satisfactorily. Naturally, therefore, that firm will have the preference in supplying us with that material.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What firm?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am not sure; but I know there is only one firm in this country which has succeeded in producing that cloth. With reference to the cut, I think the same observation will apply; as it requires great experience and skilled men to cut the clothing in such a way that it will be satisfactory to the men of the force. Speaking from my own knowledge, I believe that, irrespective of the methods employed in entering into contracts, the department have succeeded in purchasing a quality of cloth thoroughly satisfactory and well appreciated by the force; and I know that in previous years the clothing which was furnished some companies of the militia was not proper, either as regards quality, or cut, or make up, or material. I must say, however, that the clothing now issued is infinitely superior, both as regards material and cut, to that formerly obtained, and the officers and men are perfectly satisfied. I speak, of course, with a general knowledge of what took place in the Committee last year, when a great deal of evidence was given condemnatory of the last issue of clothing, and many statements made in which, as far as my knowledge of the subject went, I could not agree at all. With reference to the clothing now issued, I believe it is as good as can be desired, and the prices quoted are reasonable, considering the quality supplied. Last year I know some members of the House, including the hon. member for Wellington, examined the clothing manufactured last year. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) looked carefully into the material and the process of construction, and I think he was satisfied the country was getting good value for its money. I would add that when a special article is required, which can only be produced by special means, the manufacture will naturally fall into the hands of those who give security, through their experience and the quality of the previous work they have produced, that they are capable of carrying out the contract satisfactorily. The hon. Minister might apply for militia clothing all over the country, and get applications from many persons who would consider themselves competent, and the result would be that we would get a cheaper article but not satisfactory, and we would have over again the complaints of other years of the unsatisfactory quality of the clothing. My own opinion is strongly in favour of the course pursued by the hon. Minister, which course, I understand to be, the obtaining of tenders from those firms he knows from previous experience are capable of doing the work satisfactorily. Of course, if it was anything of common material or of common

cut, which required no special preparation or workmanship, then the theory of general tender would apply; but in this case I am perfectly satisfied that the course which has been pursued—assuming that a fair opportunity is given to every firm, and assuming that there is no combination amongst these firms to raise the price to the Government, which is, of course, a matter upon which we cannot have any precise information—but assuming that all these tenders are honestly asked for and honestly awarded, I believe the system adopted by the department is best calculated to give the best return for the money expended. I think experience and common sense will show us that. The hon. gentleman who spoke last said something about the great cost of the militia. I would call to his attention the fact that our militia force, constituted as it is, is, I believe, the best calculated to bring out most fully and economically the best feeling of the military spirit of the country, and I say that our force is the cheapest of any force in the world. It costs us about a quarter of a dollar a head of our population. The American army, exclusive of the State militia and the navy, costs about $1 a head, and the military force of Great Britain costs about $2 per head. So, comparing ourselves with other countries that mostly resemble ours, we find that our military force is the cheapest in the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you say the American army costs?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think about $1 a head of the population. That was the case some three or four years ago when I made the calculation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The American army costs only $32,000,000, or about half a dollar a head.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The lengthy argument the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has entered into in order to prove that the Minister of Militia has been pursuing the proper course in this matter would not, I think, have been delivered if the hon. member had been here in time to listen to the statements of the Minister of Militia, because the statements of the Minister of Militia and the statements of the member for Muskoka are in direct contradiction. The member for Muskoka argues that, because certain firms have proved successful in producing good clothing for the militia, therefore the Minister of Militia should continue to give the contract to those firms. If the hon. gentleman had been here when the Minister of Militia made the statement in reference to the parties who got the contract last January he would have learned that the Minister of Militia had departed entirely from the course which he commends. Instead of awarding the contract again to those parties who, he says, had given so much satisfaction in the past, the Minister of Militia did not give that contract to them at all, so that the elaborate argument of the member for Muskoka falls entirely to the ground. The Minister of Militia has not let the contract to W. E. Sanford & Co., but he has let the contract to a man named Rosamond, out in Almonte. The hon. member for Muskoka must now see that he is doing wrong in supporting the Minister of Militia, because that gentleman has done the very opposite of what the member for Muskoka says he ought to have done. He has given the contract to a man who has not the experience to which the hon. gentleman refers, who may not have the machinery from the old country which is necessary in order to fill this contract properly. After receiving this information, I expect the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) will get up and say that the Minister of Militia has done wrong in giving this contract to Rosamond, and he ought to have given it to W. E. Sanford & Co. I appeal to the member for Muskoka to get up and say he was wrong, because the Minister of Militia has not done what he thought he had done. The Minister of Militia says he obtained better prices last January than he had under the previous contract. He is the head of an important department, which costs the country a very large sum of money every year. In this item he is asking for a vote of $90,000, and I think we should have all the information he can give us. I ask him now to put us in possession at least of this information. What were the prices under the former contract, and what are the prices under the contract entered into last January? I think this is information we should be in possession of, and I ask the Minister to give us that information before we vote this money.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall give all the information the hon. gentleman requires, but I have been Minister of Militia for the last eleven years, and the hon. gentleman cannot expect me to have all the contracts I have entered into in regard to clothing or materials for the militia force in the book which is supposed to be required from the Minister when the Estimates come up. I have nothing to hide, and I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman all the information. The whole thing was investigated time and again, and I am prepared to give him all the information, but I hope he will not insist upon this item not being passed. I will give him all the information on concurrence, and the discussion may take place just as it is taking place to-night, but I hope not at such great length.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is a large amount of money, $90,000, and the Minister refuses to give us the information in regard to it. When will he give it to us? He has his deputy here, and I think there need be no difficulty in his telling us what were the figures under the old contract, and what the figures are under the new contract, and then we can tell whether he has made a good bargain. He says he is going to give us the information, but he does not give it to us.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will be surprised at the good bargain I have made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, if the hon Minister has made such a good bargain, I think we ought to get that information.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot give it to-night.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When will you say when you can give it? Can you lay it on the Table to-morrow?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; there is no trouble in getting it.

Mr. MULOCK. Then that statement will show the previous price, the separate articles, and also the prices under the present contract?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. It will also show what steps the department took to invite competitive prices, and what tenders were invited?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give you a list of every tender.

Mr. MULOCK. Every person that was invited to tender?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Militia and military stores..... $45,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For general service in connection with military stores, such as transport of freights, pay of labourers, rent of stores, fuel and light, &c., $18,000; military stores, equipments required for the service, $7,000; field guns, gun carriages, artillery harness, equipment, &c., $20,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are not purchasing any new guns now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not just at present; but I think if hon. gentlemen continue to attack me as they are doing, I will have to purchase a few extra guns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In respect to these military stores, I notice last year one item of some $7,000 was for salaries at the head office. I am aware that the practice has prevailed for a good while of charging a considerable portion of the headquarters' expenses to these stores. It appears to me rather a questionable mode of book-keeping; $7,000 for salaries in Ottawa to be under the heading of military stores is, I know, an old fashion; but it is a fashion which I think would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I think this ought to be put along with the salaries of the department, and what is expended for stores ought to be by itself.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can give the hon. gentleman every item of that expenditure. When the camps take place we require extra hands, and we keep them employed for six weeks or two months, and we could not, according to the hon. gentleman's advice, make them permanent members of the staff, because that would require more money than the efficiency of the service requires. For instance, there are men employed in the different stores only for a certain time, after which we do not need them any longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my hon. friend will look at page B—29 of the Auditor General's Report he will see that these identical outside votes, where $7,173 are charged for stores, appear to be for the most part regular annual charges.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some are, no doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand well enough the principle of charging a few days' work which occur at each particular camp; but if he will look at that page in the Auditor General's Report he will see that, practically speaking, a vast majority of these persons are charged all the year round; they are charged for 365 days, for the most part. Now and again you will find a short charge; but the great proportion of them are yearly charges.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Most of them are, I admit; but the hon. gentleman will see they are day labourers, and we cannot dispense with their services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They all appear to be in Ottawa.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You have got Military District No. 1, London, $600; Toronto, $600; Kingston, $600; Montreal, $900; Quebec, $600; St. John, N.B., $800; Halifax, $900; Winnipeg, $500; Victoria, B.C., $500; Charlottetown, P.E.I., $500. That makes up the $7,100 the hon. gentleman mentions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think not. I think that is an extra charge, so far as I understand, under the heading of militia and defence here at Ottawa, and the reference is made specially to salaries at Ottawa. The item I am criticizing is "Salaries at Ottawa, see page B—29, $7,173." If the hon. gentleman turns to that reference he will find that none of these particular items are included in the sum of $20,187, which are charged as follows: Military stores, so much; militia clothing, so much; contingencies, so much; batteries, so much, &c. These are different items from those my hon. friend has been repeating. We require details of B—29 of the Auditor General's Report. The item we are discussing now is military stores, and I understand in the Auditor General's Report of the expenditure for last year $7,173 are charged as salaries at Ottawa. Those salaries may or may not be right. I dare say they may have to be incurred. All that I would say to the hon. gentleman is that I think these things should go into the charge at headquarters at once, and not be put under the head of military stores.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am giving the hon. gentleman the information which the officers of my department have given me. It is under the head of public armouries, care of arms, district paymasters, superintendence of stores.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is another item. It is on the item for military stores for which you are asking $50,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For general service in connection with military stores, such as transport—that was the information I had given to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will understand that in Ottawa we have the headquarters and the centre from which the stores are distributed all over the Dominion. At our Ottawa building we have to employ a large number of packers and storekeepers; but if hon. gentlemen visited the building when the clothing was being distributed, and when the camps are assembled, they would find that not only was the staff employed, but it was necessary to hire extra men. It is a large staff I admit, but not too large for the requirements of the service. Previous to Confederation and even after Confederation the provinces had their respective militia forces, while now the stores have to be distributed from headquarters all over the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I do not see any way of reducing this staff. The number may be reduced by a few at one time; but at another time the necessities of the service will compel a corresponding increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, $7,000 looks a very heavy percentage for the distribution of $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I had occasion to enquire earlier in the session in regard to some saddlery which the Minister said had been ordered and been stored in the department for the troop of No. 1 Regiment. I learn from the regiment that it has not

received it. As they are going into camp soon, and as they are using saddles belonging to the time of the Crimean war, I should like to know whether an issue had been made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman exactly what I told him when he put the question before. The saddlery in stores are not such as I should like to see. We have, however, been gradually endeavouring to improve the stores in this respect, as far as the parliamentary vote will permit, and if we obtain a little more money we will get more saddles to serve out to the different troops all over the Dominion. I have been giving out new saddlery as far as possible to different troops, irrespective of provinces, and I hope before long we will be able to accommodate the troop to which the hon. gentleman refers. We have not got them in store, and it will not be until we get a new supply that we will be able to comply with the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Mr. HYMAN. The saddlery may be in store, but we cannot use it if it is in store. I asked this question early in the session, and I was told by the Minister that saddles were in store.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. HYMAN. I am almost certain I was told that the saddles were in store. Surely no saddles are being used of an earlier time than the Crimean war. I desire to bring this matter again to the notice of the Minister.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who has the contract for making the saddles? How is the contract let, who holds the contract, when was the contract let; and in fact, I want to know all about it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have acted on the hon. gentleman's advice in so far as saddlery was concerned, because there was no necessity for any special appliances to manufacture the saddlery which was required for the force, and contracts were made after public competition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were tenders advertised for?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who hold the contracts?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Borbridge, of Ottawa, and, I believe, a firm in Hamilton. In any case, I can give the hon. gentleman the names.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When was the contract let?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or for how long?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For the time they will take to manufacture the saddles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want to know what the hon. gentleman has been doing in regard to this item. He does not, I suppose, insert an advertisement for saddles for every single troop in the Dominion, but he issues an advertisement for a quantity for a term of one year—or is it for a term of years?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If we have a vote of Parliament for a certain amount we call for the quantity of saddles we can afford to call for, and we call for it upon tender.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister give some information as to the quality of the saddles. There is a great difference in saddles, some being very cheap and some being very expensive. Are the saddles manufactured of genuine pig-skin or of sheep-skin, because there is a great difference in saddles?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows all about saddles.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I know some things about them, and I would like to know the material from which these are made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will produce one here.

Mr. SOMMERVILLE. Better let the item stand until you produce it.

Mr. HYMAN. I would like to have a little more definite information with regard to these saddles. I would like to know if I am mistaken in the belief that the hon. gentleman told me that he had new saddles.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never said we had them in the stores.

Mr. HYMAN. Then they are under contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Armouries, care of arms, etc.....$60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt in the cities I suppose the armouries are fairly well attended to, and I presume the arms are all kept in the armouries; but what are the reports to the hon. gentleman about the arms which are in the hands of the country corps? Does he find that a considerable number of these arms are allowed to remain in the hands of the men, and are not in a good condition of repair?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have not the same facilities in the country districts as in the cities to keep the arms in armouries, which are under the supervision of a caretaker. If there be no armoury or drill shed, or military store, in a country district, it generally happens that a sum of money is given to a man to look after the arms. If the arms are out of repair they are sent to the armourers in the military district, whom we keep under pay, and these arms are repaired and sent back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman's officers report to him as to the condition of the arms in the hands of the rural corps generally? Are they well taken care of?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As far as our reports are concerned, and under the difficulties I have explained, the arms belonging to country corps are not in just as good a condition as they might be. As a rule, good value is obtained for the money expended in keeping the arms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no regiment armed with either Martini or repeating rifles?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; except the permanent schools. We have given them Martini's, and we have also given Martini's for use at rifle practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although the question is not absolutely germane to this, and I meant to ask it under the head of ammunition: Supposing by any evil accident my hon. friend

should be called upon to defend this country against a foe, could he tell me, as a matter of information, what the extent of our small-arm fixed ammunition might be? How many rounds do we possess in Canada to-day?

Mr. FOSTER. This information should not go out of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that we have been limiting the manufacture of ammunition just to the amount required for the purposes for which it is needed at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know just about how much.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think we always have between a million and a million and a-half rounds as reserve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that if you had unfortunately to engage in war, after about two hours' active engagement, your commander-in-chief would have to report that he was short of ammunition.

Mr. FOSTER. We would have killed all the enemy.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. During the troubles in the North-West we manufactured night and day, and during a fortnight we had more than was required during the whole trouble.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That might be, as our opponents were about three or four hundred in number.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the quality of the ammunition been improved? As I understand, during the North-West Rebellion, a great deal of the ammunition sent up there was not very efficient. I would like to know if they have improved in the manufacture of this ammunition. I have heard that a great many members of the volunteer force throughout the country complain that the ammunition furnished to them is not of that superior quality which I have heard the hon. Minister describe in this House.

Mr. FRASER. I think the hon. Minister ought not to be called upon to give an answer to a question like that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why not?

Mr. FRASER. For this reason: that we shall expose our weakness to surrounding nations. The matter of the quantity and the strength of our ammunition should not be a matter of discussion in this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the information on this subject is very valuable. If the volunteers are called upon to perform active service it is important that their ammunition should be reliable, so that if they shoot to kill they will be sure to kill. I would like to know if this factory at Quebec produces reliable ammunition now?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I have a great deal of pleasure, as one connected with the militia of Canada, in stating that the riflemen have found a great deal of improvement in the quality of the ammunition manufactured at Quebec during the last two or three years. It has really improved wonderfully, and at the last two or three meetings no fault whatever has been found with it—nothing but unqualified praise; and I am sure that our riflemen would not require men of the size of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to be marks for them to shoot at. In proof of the high quality of this ammunition, I can not only say that our riflemen in Canada are attaining great efficiency in shooting, but I can point to the fact, and a proud fact it is, that one of our Canadian riflemen—I think from the city of Quebec, though not belonging to the corps of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), but from his next neighbour, the 8th Battalion—Capt. Davidson, came near winning the Queen's Prize at Bisley the other day, and would have won it had he not made two misses in the last stage. As it was, he was fourth on the list, and only five points behind the winner out of several hundreds.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did he use Canadian ammunition?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; he did not use it there; but he practised with Canadian ammunition before he went there. The rifle he used there was the Martini.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very happy to be able to corroborate what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken says about the quality of the cartridges now manufactured at Quebec. But it is a well known fact that the rifles now in the hands of the volunteers are not the kind that should be used, and the more quickly they are changed the better for the force. His Excellency the Governor General himself stated at our last meeting of the Rifle Association his earnest desire that the rifles should be changed, and that we should have modern rifles. But I take this opportunity to draw the attention, not only of the Minister, but especially his colleagues, to the fact that we at Quebec are now enduring a great wrong to the militia force, not only the 9th Battalion, but the 8th Battalion and the 87th. We have at Beauport a rifle range which has been there for thirty years; it is one of the finest in the Dominion; but I beg to call the attention of the colleagues of the hon. Minister of Militia to the subject, because he has not listened to my representations or those of the whole force at Quebec. There has never been an accident at the Beauport range; but about three months ago, if I mistake not, a gentleman who had laid a fishery on the next grounds wrote a letter to the department, stating that he had been wounded by a shot fired by one of the soldiers practising on the range. The Minister ordered an investigation to be made at Quebec, and the report was made that the man in question had not been wounded in that way, but had wounded himself in laying down his fishery. His letter asking for damages was not sworn to by affidavit or solemn declaration, and was not accompanied by a doctor's certificate, and his statement was contradicted by many officers and soldiers of the force. But the hon. Minister has thought fit to issue an order immediately to prevent any more firing at the Beauport flat, and the consequence is that our officers and soldiers at Quebec cannot use that range. Whenever now they want to practise they have to cross to Lévis, at considerable expense and great loss of time. Every time I speak of the matter I am answered that it is a question of property. In vain do I assert that it is not a question of property. I know that four or five years ago Mr. Sewell claimed that the soldiers were using part of

a swamp which was his property. Two years ago it was given up, and Mr. Sewell has died since, and there is now no question of property. The stopping of rifle shooting there is a great inconvenience to our militia. Our young men want to practise, but they have not the means nor the time to go to Lévis. I hope the hon. Minister will see that this order is reversed. For thirty years this range, which is perhaps the best in the Dominion, has been used constantly, and there has never been an accident there, and nobody claims the property. A railway passes through it, but the proprietor of the railway has given all the necessary consent; in fact, I think the railway was only allowed to pass there on condition that it should not interfere with the shooting. I have no personal interest in this matter, except that I like to go there occasionally to practise; but I speak in the interest of the force, and of those soldiers who like to join in the general competition in the Dominion and to go to Wimbledon occasionally. I hope the Minister will see that a stop is put to that sort of thing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There can be no question about my being as anxious as the hon. gentleman that he should have a field close to Quebec, where he can practise rifle shooting; but, as the Minister, I got a report stating that a man had been shot, and I thought it was only ordinary prudence to tell the militiamen there not to shoot until I could ascertain exactly whether they were going to kill those people or not. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I submitted all the papers to the Department of Justice. The soldiers stated that this man wounded himself in putting down his fishery in that portion of the flats to which the hon. gentleman refers; but I had a duty to perform to the public, and the hon. gentleman knows very well that we have a range at Lévis, and there is a ferry which crosses every five or ten minutes, which costs only 5 cents. It was my duty to see, when these reports came to me, that the whole thing should be investigated.

Mr. AMYOT. That is the same answer I have been receiving since the last three months. How long am I still to be receiving it? A man wrote to the department three months ago that he was wounded and claimed damages. The officers of the department at Quebec reported there was no truth in what he said, the doctor who attended the man said his story was false, the volunteers on the beach said it was false; and yet the hon. Minister has had these flats closed to the force ever since, although an investigation was made three months ago and the man's claim proved to have been unfounded. Is that investigation going to stop the use of the flats for another three months, or three years, or three centuries?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It will not hurt you after three centuries.

Mr. AMYOT. It hurts me now, because I like the militia; and when the officers and soldiers complained I told them that I expected I would obtain redress on laying the matter before the Minister in a friendly manner. I am forced to-night, however, to bring it before Parliament and to the attention of the hon. Minister's colleagues. The hon. gentleman may continue in his stubbornness, but he will have to take the whole responsibility. Let him look to the report of his own officers, Colonels Forrest and Duchesnay, and very good officers they are, and he will see that he is not justified in refusing to accede to the request of the militia. He says that we can use the ferry and cross to Lévis, which only costs 5 cents. But does he not know that the ranges are at St. Joseph de Lévis, and that the volunteers have to drive in order to get there; whereas the Beauport flats are quite close to the city of Quebec, and much more convenient than the range at Lévis. Does the hon. Minister call that encouraging the militia? He must know that mere drill does not make a good soldier, but that the great object is to have men who can shoot straight. That is what our esteemed general now insists upon, much more than proficiency in drill, and the hon. gentleman, by his course, is injuring the militia; and now that I have laid the facts before the House I throw on him the full responsibility. I have done my duty.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Great difficulties have been experienced at the rifle range in Hamilton, and the officers of the 13th Battalion have been taken before the police magistrate for allowing shooting at that range. The range is situated on a flat immediately under the mountain, but a farmer who has a market garden on the mountain, about a hundred and fifty or a hundred and seventy feet above the ranges, complained that the volunteers, in shooting at a mark a hundred and seventy feet below his garden, sent their bullets over the mountain. I would like to know if that matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister. The 13th Battalion is one of the best battalions of Ontario, and ought to have every opportunity for rifle practice. The hon. gentleman no doubt looks as well after the people of Ontario as in Quebec, and that is the reason I ask what is the quality of the ammunition furnished by his department, because it is an extraordinary stretch of imagination to believe that a man in the militia force, armed with a good rifle and cartridges, would shoot at a target under the mountain and send his balls over the mountain, to the great danger of those working in the fields. Now, that was the reason I asked about the ammunition, and I will ask the Minister whether he knows anything about the difficulty in Hamilton, and whether it has been arranged?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think we have any report from Hamilton on that subject. What the hon. gentleman says is contrary to all the reports I have ever had as to shooting in Hamilton. If anyone who was shooting at the range got over the mountain it must have been very poor shooting indeed. One of his political friends, Lieut.-Colonel Gibson, who is a personal friend of mine, and occasionally writes me about militia matters, has never complained of this, and I think that possibly, if there had been any reason for complaint, he would have told me so.

Mr. WATSON. The farmers should complain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You allow them great latitude there.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Great altitude, you mean.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend's battalion shoot better in Quebec than the force there, and we have received no complaints about the range in Hamilton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I very rarely interfere in military debates, not being a military authority;

but I want to call the Minister's attention publicly, as I have already done privately, to the matter of the rifle range in Charlottetown. There was an immense amount of correspondence on this subject. Some time ago that range was owned by an English gentleman, who did not look after it very well, and he allowed the Militia Department to have it at a very small rental. About two years ago that property came into the hands of a private owner, who demanded an increased rent, which the hon. gentleman did not see his way to give. I spoke to him privately on the subject, and I understood that he was willing to give the increased rent, so that the volunteers would have some place to practise in, because, if they have not that place they have no other place in or near Charlottetown in which to practise. I think the hon. gentleman decided not to rent this range for more than one year. Upon that I wrote to the authorities in Charlottetown and have had no reply; but it appears that the owner will not rent the range for one year, but that he requires to lease it for four or five years. I press upon the hon. gentleman here in the House, as I have already privately, that he should take the range for five or six years. If the owner declines to accept that proposition the volunteers will be without any place to practise in. I do not think the demand was an exorbitant one. I think it is only $50 a year more than was paid before.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend is completely wrong. The hon. gentleman will remember that I stated to him what my proposition was. There is no necessity to bring this before the House. I went to the hon. gentleman, because I thought he took an interest in the volunteer force in his province, but there was no necessity for me to go out of my way to go to him. I said the offer the proprietor was making was $150 per annum, and I was prepared to enter into a contract with him for ten years at his own price. I have the hon. gentleman's own letter, which may refresh his memory, in which he tells me that this gentleman will not accept the proposal, but that he is prepared to enter into a contract at $150 per annum, renewable, if the department and he consent to a renewal. I told the hon. gentleman, acting upon his advice—and I see now that I may have been wrong in accepting his advice—we cannot possibly prevent the volunteers from practising rifle shooting, and I will take the range for one year, upon the very conditions submitted to me by the hon. gentlemen's friend.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am glad to hear that. I did not understand it in that way.

Sir ALOLPHE CARON. Three or four days ago I asked the hon. gentleman to write to this man and ask if he would accept this contract for one year, because the rifle shooting was going on and we could not put it off; and because I have done exactly what the hon. gentleman told me to do he brings up the matter before Parliament, and says I was risking the possibility of the force in his province being prevented from practising. I accepted every condition submitted to me by the hon. gentleman's client or friend.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is neither.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend asked me to look into the matter and I did so, and I did absolutely what the hon. gentleman asked me to do, and because I did that the hon. gentleman questions my action.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am exceedingly glad I brought this matter up, because, though it may have been my own fault, I now understand for the first time that the hon. gentleman is willing to accept the offer the proprietor made of $150 a year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Apart from the hon. gentleman altogether, I sent a reply from the department to the person who made the offer to us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand now that the hon. gentleman is willing to accept the offer of $150, renewable from year to year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If those are facts, I shall be glad to communicate them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I asked the hon. gentleman this very day if he had received an answer from this man, and the hon. gentleman told me he had not, and this was upon the very basis I have explained to-night.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman asked me if I received an answer to the letter I had written, and I told him I had not. The letter I wrote was not in exactly the same terms as those he has expressed now. I am very glad to hear what he now states. It must have been my obtuseness that I did not understand that before.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That there may be no mistake now, I understand that the hon. gentleman is willing to make a contract for a year at $150, renewable from year to year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If it is thought desirable to renew.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask if any contract has been entered into for the erection of a drill shed and armoury in Toronto? I understand that work has been commenced on the ground; but I received an enquiry the other day as to whether a contract has been entered into for the erection of the building.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. So far as my department is concerned, I took action in regard to the Toronto drill shed, and the money was voted, and it has been turned over to the Public Works Department, but I have been closely following the matter up. Several deputations have seen me, and the hon. gentleman has occasionally spoken to me about it; and, recognizing as I do the importance of having a drill shed built in Toronto as soon as possible, I communicated with the Department of Public Works, and I think my hon. friends from Toronto will bear me out in the statement that I tried to hurry up the notice of tenders as much as possible. The hon. gentleman knows that the money is voted, and we will be prepared to go on as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I wish to know whether there was a contract for the erection of the building?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given all the information I have got.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, will you tell me again whether the contract has been given out for the erection of the building?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have told the hon. gentleman that is out of my control altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman know whether a contract has been entered into?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not believe there is a contract, but I will not be sure of that.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there no person to take charge of the Public Works Department. We are entitled to have a complete Government to answer all questions. I understand the Government have been representing to the city of Toronto that a contract had been entered into for this drill shed, and I have received a communication saying that there is very grave doubts on that point; in fact, specifications and plans have not yet been prepared.

Mr. DENISON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, perhaps I can satisfy him. I spoke to the Minister of Public Works a few days ago to know if the contract had been entered into. The reason of the delay was this: It is proposed to strengthen the walls of the shed, and also to lower the roof, and it took a little time to make these alterations. These have all been done, and I have no doubt the advertisements have been given out.

Mr. MULOCK. I want to know if the Minister of Militia can confirm the information which the member for West Toronto has given. Of course, it is accurate, so far as he believes, but he is not in the responsible position of a Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Public Works is not here, as my hon. friend knows, and this is an item which pertains to the Public Works entirely. The Minister of Militia has nothing whatever to do with it. It is a vote given to the Minister of Public Works for the erection of a drill shed in Toronto. So far as an answer to the question is concerned, I have made a note of it, and will see that an answer is given as soon as possible.

Mr. COCKBURN. Perhaps I may be allowed to state, having taken a good deal of interest in this subject, that I have seen the Minister of Public Works again and again with reference to this matter, and I know that months ago it ceased to be in the hands of the Minister of Militia, who did all that he could in the short time after the city had selected the site. I may say that only two days ago I had a conversation with the Minister of Public Works with reference to the erection of a drill shed, and I stated to him that the excavation for the drill shed was being rapidly proceeded with, and asked him if we could rely on the work being put out as soon as possible, so that the artizans in Toronto might be employed during the winter months to get it under cover; and he assured me that, owing to these few changes that the member for West Toronto has mentioned, a delay had taken place, but he expected that this week the contract would be advertised. I have no doubt that such will be the case, and that the drill shed will be rapidly proceeded with. I think the total cost will be about $150,000. The city itself has given, I think, $120,000.

Mr. DENISON. Nearly $140,000

Mr. COCKBURN. The claims which have arisen with reference to it will be fully $140,000. The city will pay its gift in hard money. The city of Toronto generally provides very well for any matter of that kind. The money was provided in the ordinary course, by being submitted to the ratepayers for their approval in the form of a by-law. These drill sheds are being erected on property that has been transferred to the Government. The citizens of Toronto wished to have a central site, and the Minister of Militia said to them, if they would provide a site that would meet the requirements, and if at the same time it was a site that he, in his military capacity, could approve of, he would be delighted to accept it. There was considerable delay in getting that site; but as soon as it was obtained the Minister of Militia lost no time in fulfilling his part of the bargain, and as soon as he had approved of that site the matter was handed over to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MULOCK. My correspondent calls my attention to this statement of the Minister of Public Works. He says:

"It is within your recollection that in the House——"

Mr. FOSTER. I submit that this is irregular. The hon. gentleman has asked a question and it has been answered. I think this discussion ought to drop until we get to that item.

Mr. MULOCK. Why is it irregular?

Mr. FOSTER. Because it refers to the building of a drill shed which is under the Public Works Department entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The item the hon. gentleman is speaking of is 105, and we are on 99.

Mr. MULOCK. I only wanted to know whether the excavation is being done by contract, or how?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; so far as I know.

Mr. MULOCK. But you do not know anything about it.

Mr. COCKBURN. The excavation is being done by Davis & Co., under contract; they made the lowest tender. It is being done by a firm outside of Toronto, for only 25 cents a cubic yard.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. During this session quite a number of persons have complained to me with regard to the regulations that have been made recently concerning Cartier Square. Some years ago we know the young people of the city were at liberty to use it for all sorts of games, such as cricket, base ball and lacrosse—in fact, it was a playground for a large proportion of the youth of the city. Lately I have been informed—I suppose correctly—that it is now devoted to a pet club, under the patronage of the Minister, called the Ottawa Riding Club, and that the public are excluded from that property, that the boys and girls of the city are not allowed to go upon it and pursue their usual youthful games. Now, I do not think this ought to be reserved especially for a few of the *élite* of Ottawa to use as a riding park. I think the Minister should allow the use of the property by the youth of the city, as formerly, and not keep it for this special purpose.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not kept for any special purpose, except with a view to obtain for the young men, whose champion the hon. gentleman seems to be at this particular moment, a better field. Last spring the officers of the department who were looking after Cartier Square told

me the square would have to be ploughed up, and it would take a couple of years before the young men could again use it. I told our officers that, from some information I obtained, if they merely seeded it over and kept it until the end of September the grass would have grown sufficiently strong to permit the games to be resumed. Several gentlemen have come to me on behalf of the various clubs, and have thanked me for what I had done, and said they were not aware that I took so much interest in having such good games in the field. I have not only taken this action, but the presidents of the various clubs are aware of it, and have declared I was perfectly right in the policy I was following. For the purpose of the cavalry in Ottawa we built a track at small cost, so as to permit the cavalry evolutions, without the cavalry being obliged to go into riding school. Several gentlemen interested in horseback exercise applied to me for the use of the track, saying it would not only do no injury, but would keep the track in good order. I permitted them to use it, the only obligation being to withdraw when the department considered it necessary. That is the history of the Cartier Square matter. The hon. gentleman will find that the policy pursued by the department has been one in accord with the interests of the people, and after the department had spent $3,000 or $4,000 in improving the field we would, by permitting the various clubs to use it this spring, have simply thrown the money away. I am at the same time ready to offer every possible facility to the young men and various clubs who join in athletic sports, and I was doing what I thought proper to make this square as perfect as possible hereafter, in order that it might be of more use to them.

Drill instruction..... $32,300

Mr. MULOCK. The statute in question provides that the Governor in Council may fix by Order in Council a rate of remuneration for drill instructors. I should like to know, whether, under any Order, the amount of remuneration paid must go to the instructors, or may it be farmed out by the instructors?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It strikes me that the practice is that which has been followed for many years. The amount required is set out by the Estimates every year. The drill instruction allows payment to officers commanding corps of active militia—under Militia Regulations 390 and 395 passed during 1887—for 18 field batteries, $200 each; 600 batteries of garrison artillery, troops of cavalry, troops of engineers, infantry and rifles, $40 each, or a total of $26,000; allowances for officers commanding rural battalions to provide battalion drill instruction, 416 companies, at $25 each, or $10,400.

Mr. MULOCK. You have not touched the question. I want to know whether the Government or the department allow those to whom money for drill instruction is paid to make any cheaper bargain than the regulation provides.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not in a position to answer the question. I do not know whether it is farmed out or not. Under the regulations, we pay the commanding officers of a company so much. If the hon. gentleman who has taken an interest in militia matters believes so little in the honour of the militia officers that they will go and farm out the work for which the country pays them, then it is for the hon. gentleman to decide whether he is right or wrong. I know nothing about it; I never heard it mentioned before; I do not believe it possible. The money is voted by Parliament for a certain purpose; it is given to the commanding officers of the various companies, battalions, batteries and troops of cavalry, and I have never heard of any such thing. If the hon. gentleman believes that, I have never heard of it.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say whether I believed it or did not believe it. I asked the hon. gentleman whether such a practice would be sanctioned by the department if it were brought to his knowledge.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It certainly would not.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be considered a breach of trust.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It certainly would.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman would examine the pigeon-holes in his office he would find a memorial to that effect.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman seems to know more about the pigeon-holes of my department than I do myself.

Mr. MULOCK. I have a copy of a petition that was forwarded to this House. The petition states that it was first submitted to the hon. gentleman, and he neglected to attend to it, and at last it had to be submitted to Parliament. That is my information.

Mr. DENISON. I think I might throw a little light on this. The drill instruction money is generally paid to officers commanding corps, and as a rule the officers commanding are the instructors, and generally do take the whole of the drill instruction money. But if they choose to employ any one they have a right to do it, and they can please themselves about it.

Drill pay and incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the Militia.....$250,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you pass this vote of a quarter of a million dollars, I think in all conscience a little explanation ought to be given to the House as in what particulars they propose to use it, and especially at what times they intend to call the militia out for drill instruction. Are they going to call them out this autumn?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given the details of the distribution of the money which Parliament is called upon to vote. From the peculiar circumstance of this late session, and not wishing to anticipate the action of Parliament, so far as the voting of the money was concerned, we had to postpone our camps; it is the intention of the Government to have camps, but I can tell the hon. gentleman, as possibly he may know from his own section of the country, that it is a question that has disturbing elements amongst the volunteers. Some find that it is too late, and others consider that it is not. The department has tried to ascertain, in the different military centres, when it would be most convenient and least objectionable to call out the volunteers to drill. As the hon. gentleman knows, the camps are generally much earlier in the year than now. I had no authority to anticipate the action of Par-

liament on this vote, and I thought until that was done we would have to do the best we could in arranging the camps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to call out the battalions in the rural districts of Ontario and Quebec this autumn?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is our intention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of practice and fact, will not that be extremely inconvenient, in view of the circumstance that a great many of these rural battalions will be very busy at their harvest work, and it will be a very inconvenient thing to call them out after the harvest is over? I rather think that in the Maritime Provinces the people do prefer the autumn season, but it is not the case with the rural battalions in my own province, and, I think, in the Province of Quebec also. If that be so, would it not be wiser to throw over the encampment, in these provinces, at any rate, until next summer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would feel very reluctant not to hold camps, because under the system of drilling the rural corps only once every two years they might lose their chance of being drilled; and I have tried to consult the convenience of the commanding officers, who know very well how their men feel. I am very anxious to have the camps held as usual, and although I feel that in some portions of the Dominion it may be an inconvenience, yet in other portions of the Dominion it will not be so. The Major General and myself have received letters from several of the commanding officers of battalions who will go to Niagara camp, stating that the last week in September or the first week in October would be quite convenient. I know that the fact of the harvest coming on may render the matter inconvenient in some sections of the country; but I have tried to ascertain how that difficulty can be overcome, and I believe that we can have our camps. They may not be as numerously attended as usual, but I think it is very important not to drop the practice of drilling the men.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman says it is the rule of the department to drill the rural battalions once every two years. I would like to ask him why the 95th Battalion in Manitoba has never been in camp at all. They were organized at the time of the North-West Rebellion, and have been in existence for six years. They have tried to keep up their organization, and I know that they have petitioned year after year to go into camp. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why this corps, which has been in existence six years, has not yet been in camp?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that we have no permanent camps in his province, and that the militia drill at headquarters, just like the city corps.

Mr. WATSON. They have not been drilled at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They have a right to do so. He knows that we cannot get up a camp for one battalion.

Mr. WATSON. I know that they have asked to go into camp, and have not been furnished with the necessary means. I have called the attention of the Minister to this matter year after year, and promises have been made, but no action has been taken; and unless the Minister takes an interest in these companies, and allows them to go into camp, he will lose some of the best volunteers he has in the force. It is unfair not to allow the volunteers of Manitoba to go into camp once in six years, when those of the other provinces go into camp once in two years.

Mr. HYMAN. I would like to ask on what principle the department decides where these camps shall be held? I would like to know whether the deputy adjutants-general are asked to report to the department as to their location, and whether the department acts on these reports?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We believe it is an advantage to have the camps in different localities. There are certain advantages, from a military point of view, of having a camp in a particular locality. It trains the people, to the extent to which a camp of twelve days can do so, in military art and science; and besides, these advantages should be distributed all over the country as far as possible. We get our adjutants-general in the different localities to advise us on the subject. The department acts on its own discretion, always considering, however, the advice which is given to it, because the different places are recommended in different ways and for different reasons. There may be, for instance, advantage attached to a certain place, but it may be more expensive for the department to send a camp to that locality.

Mr. HYMAN. The explanation of the hon. Minister is very lucid, certainly; but I understand him to say that the department asks the deputy adjutant-general to report, and yet does not always act on that report. I would like, then, to know, in case the deputy adjutant-general reports against a camp being held at a particular place, whether the Minister would act contrary to that report. He says there are other reasons. I know there are other reasons; but I question whether any should be considered, apart from the interest of the militia force. Now, I understand that it is proposed to hold camps in a short time at different places, and that the department has reports from the deputy adjutants-general with regard to them. Before the item passes I would like the Minister to bring down the report of the deputy adjutant-general with regard to military district No. 1. I think it only right that this House should know how the department are acting with reference to that report. If it is found that the report is favourable to a particular locality for the camp there can be no difference; but if the report is found to be against a certain locality it does not seem to me that the department should decide directly contrary to the report. I think the Minister should promise to bring the report down before this item passes, as I would like to see it.

Mr. McGREGOR. The Minister has said that he moves the camp from place to place. We know that London has had it several times, Stratford two or three times, and that other towns and cities have bid for it. The town which I have the honour to represent, Windsor, Ontario, has offered to the department certain terms for the camp this year. We offered the gounds, the light, the water, and other advantages; it is a good place; and the Minister decided, on being called upon, that he would let us know before a regular decision was made,

and get any further offers which we might make. But I hear that the camp this year is going to St. Thomas. One of the reasons for taking the camp from place to place is that the young men like to have a change. In coming to Essex they will have the advantage of seeing one of the finest sections of the country; we have three trunk lines of railways, which could bring them there; we have the finest river in America; the place is healthful; we could show them as much as any place in Canada, and they would have the advantage of our American neighbours coming over in very large numbers to see them, which would have the effect of making our young men put on their most soldierlike appearance. We hope that the Minister will next year allow us to bid for the camp, and give it to those who bid the most.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to tell my hon. friend from London that these reports are sent into the department for the purpose of giving us information, but, after they come in, the department have to exercise their discretion; and the hon. gentleman will understand that until the report is acted upon, it is confidential, and if it is confidential it cannot be brought down.

Mr. HYMAN. It is rather late to object after the act happens. I prefer to object before. It is true the report may be confidential until the decision is made, but certainly the information should be given to the House,

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; it is never given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has got three-quarters of a million out of us to-night, and has discomfited all his foes, and has put two of his most important colleagues to sleep, and I think we ought now to adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been the whole day on three or four items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; you have not been the whole day on three or four items. There are one or two of these items which I think ought to be reserved, with the understanding that we ought to have a particular discussion over them. This particular vote of $250,000 for drill pay and contingencies brings up a question which ought, I think, to have some attention at the hands of this House, and that is, whether we are really getting any respectable value for our money under this whole system of camps for ten or twelve days. I have grave doubts whether the public money is being at all usefully expended in the way in which our camps are conducted, and I think before the Estimates are finally disposed of some serious consideration should be given that question. To a very great extent, the time put in at those camps is almost absolutely thrown away, and it would be a great deal better—and I am giving, not only my individual opinion, but that of a good many officers of experience—that a far smaller number of men should be drilled, and much more efficiently drilled than they are. In many cases you do not get many of the same men twice over, even for their bi-annual drill, and it is impossible any proper discipline or instruction can be acquired under our present system.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have been asked by captains of the several rural companies of Prince Edward Island to urge upon the Minister the necessity of allowing these companies to drill at headquarters, instead of compelling them to go into camp. That could be done with great efficiency to the service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We try as often as possible, from the departmental standpoint, to comply with the views of the officers, and in the case which the hon. gentleman has brought under my notice of course we will do so.

Military properties—care and maintenance, and construction, &c.....$ 97,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I recognize the courtesy of the hon. Minister in answering questions; but it seems to me that, in passing militia estimates, his explanations are fuller than is absolutely necessary at times. I would like to know whether he intends making any repairs to the Brantford drill shed, as it is in a dilapidated condition, the armoury not being fit to preserve the arms and the building having been partially destroyed by a storm, and made partly unfit for use.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that, owing to the protracted discussions that have taken place this session, we have been kept here much longer than possibly we might have been, and the Estimates have not been voted. I am trying to get through them to-night, and the hon. gentleman seems to object to the very vote which would permit me to help him, in so far as repairing that drill shed is concerned, which is in a very bad condition, I must admit, judging by the reports I have received. We endeavour just merely to repair it in the most temporary manner possible, because the new drill shed, which is to be built under the conditions submitted by the town of Brantford, and accepted by the Government, should be built in a very short time, and then we will transfer the arms to that building. From the reports I have, it will cost a great deal to repair the old drill shed, and it would then be a very poor job after the money has been expended.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the hon. gentleman cannot allow things to continue in the shape in which they are. I see no hope of the drill shed being completed soon, and have about given up trying to get the hon. gentleman interested in the maintenance of the Brantford battalion. When I find that the department will not advertise even for tenders, there is very little hope of the new shed being built this year; and from the reports I get from the Minister it is absolutely impossible, with the amount of money at his disposal, to build it. They do that in the face of what they have done for other battalions. I am not pleading for charity; but I reiterate that it is one of the most unfair kinds of treatment to give to one of the best regiments we have. There is a battalion there with arms, and part of this shed has been blown down by the winds, so that the arms are not properly sheltered, and yet the hon. gentleman says they have to remain there until a new shed is built, and even refuses to advertise for tenders. I thought I had got the department to that length. I do not want to reveal private conversations; but I say that the patience which the officers and men are showing under the treatment they have received speaks largely for their love of the service. That shed was put up on ground which the city of Brantford gave without rent 23 years ago for 21 years. The Government

then gave $1,000, the county gave $1,000, and the city, in addition to land, gave $500, and there is the old shed still, and the battalion left there under all these difficulties. Now, when the city of Brantford has voted $10,000, and $10,000 have been put in the Estimates, and plans have been prepared, the Government find out that $20,000 is not enough, and they will not even advertise for tenders, and in the meantime the old shed is wrecked by a storm, and the arms are exposed. The regiment has remained on, in hopes that something would be done; but at the last moment, when I thought tenders would be asked for—and I believe the hall could be built cheaper than the Minister says—we are told that the architect says it cannot be done, and the Minister lays the blame upon his colleagues. However, this belongs more to the Department of Public Works. What I am discussing now is what the Minister proposes to do with the arms? Can he afford to leave the arms out in the rain?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Like the hon. gentleman, I am not going to discuss the question of the new drill shed. But I may say that the city of Brantford got exactly what it asked the Government to grant, and the city of Belleville received the same amount.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What has that got to do with it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As to the old drill hall, I believe the officers do not expect or wish that it should be repaired, except so far as to prevent the arms from being injured, and that is what I desire to do under the vote I am now trying to get. But the hon. gentleman mixes that up with the building of a new drill hall.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; you did.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; the hon. gentleman gave the whole history of the old drill hall, and referred to the proposed building of the new one. I can add my testimony to that of the hon. gentleman as to the efficiency of the battalion there, and as to its being one of the best in the Dominion, but the building of the drill hall is a matter for Parliament. The amount of money which was asked for was granted, but it was found insufficient. If the city of Brantford will grant enough to build that drill hall, that is another matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was led into this discussion by the statement made by the Minister that the old drill hall would not be repaired. Surely the hon. gentleman is not waiting for this vote to make the necessary repairs to preserve these arms from the weather?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I do not get this grant I will have to pay it out of my own pocket to suit my friend.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You have had 10 per cent. voted. Is the 38th Battalion enrolled to preserve peace in the city of Brantford, or is it enrolled for service anywhere in this country? I take it that municipalities are not bound to give anything in matters of this kind. It is the duty of the Government to protect the country, but the municipalities show their desire to aid the Government, and the city of Brantford has voted $10,000 for this purpose. It is constantly thrown up that, because Belleville got $10,000, Brantford must not have any more. Belleville did not grant $10,000.

Mr. BOWELL. We will discuss that when we come to the item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand the Minister to say that there would be no economy in repairing the old drill shed.

Mr. BOWELL. I supposed you were going to do what Belleville did—take your $10,000 and build your drill shed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the way the Militia Department is run?

Mr. DENISON. That is the custom.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that what is going to be done in Toronto?

Mr. DENISON. That has always been the custom, as far as I know; and I think it is laid down in the law that the municipality must pay a portion of the cost of the drill shed. I suppose the object of that is to prevent applications being made from places all over the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that Toronto is going to take the $34,000 in the Estimates for its drill shed, and itself expend it on the building?

Mr. DENISON. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And yet the hon. gentleman says that is what is always done.

Mr. DENISON. The city of Toronto have already voted $140,000, which goes to the Government to supply the grounds, and the Government builds the shed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who calls for the contract, and who builds the shed?

Mr. DENISON. The Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, does not the hon. gentleman see how extremely wrong he was when he interrupted me, and said it was done all over? Where is there another place that ever did it, or was asked to do it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Belleville.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Belleville drill shed was built before the ground was given. I know no other case where the Government ever did it, or asked for it.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to draw the attention of the Minister to the need of waterworks for the drill shed at Quebec. There are six corps drilling in that shed, and I do not see why the Government should not come to an understanding with the corporation of Quebec to supply the men with pure water. There is not even water for the closets, and when there is such a large number of men drilling, this want is injurious to their health. When we spend thousands of dollars for big bonnets and big hats, I think we could afford to spend a few hundreds to supply the soldiers with water. I suppose the Minister does not expect that they will lose their time and also pay out of their own pockets to bring waterworks into the drill shed. I do not complain about the state of the grounds in front of the drill shed. We have to cross through the mud like dogs, as there is no sidewalk nor anything of the kind. We endure that; but when men drill for three hours every night, surely they should be entitled to pure water to drink.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The trouble did not come at all from the Government, but from the corporation, who exacted much more than they were entitled to for the water which we were trying to provide for the drill hall, and, naturally, we had a discussion which extended over a considerable period of time. But I understand that the whole matter has been settled, and I think there will be no more complaint concerning the water. As to the grounds, I think the hon. gentleman should not complain, because we have one of the best drill halls in the Dominion, and I do not think there can be any great inconvenience to these corps by walking to their drill hall, even when there is a little mud in the fields. The field is like other fields in Montreal and other places where the soldiers drill. There are no sidewalks, because it is the business of the corporation to supply them.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very glad if the question is settled with the corporation. There is another point which I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister. The drill shed is not very large, and in the winter they pile up wood, two cords deep, all around it, which diminishes the space inside the building on each side. There is no use building a drill shed and occupying a fourth part of it as a woodshed. The Government should find some other way of housing their wood. When there has been a great deal of snow, I do not think the volunteers should be compelld to go into the drill shed by passing through an immense amount of snow, and having to wear wet pants all the evening. We should at least treat them as ordinary servants, if not as soldiers.

Permanent forces—Pay and maintenance of "A," "B" and "C" Batteries, and Schools of Artillery at Quebec, Kingston and Victoria, B.C.....	$ 175,000

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the Minister kindly to make a note of a claim which I wish to present on behalf of the poor widow of the victim of an accident that occurred about two years ago in the town of Yarmouth, when the battalion of artillery were drilling. I would like the Minister to let us know what petitions or applications have been made to the department for some compensation to the widow of that unfortunate man. To show the strength of her claim for some slight compensation, I may say it was, perhaps, the most extraordinary accident that could be imagined. An investigation was made by the department, the result of which was published in the papers at the time, but it has escaped my attention. A labouring man was at work in a stable grooming a horse within a short distance of the end of the drill hall. The company were endeavouring to get a ball out of a gun where it had stuck, and through some extraordinary accident the gun was discharged, although the men stoutly maintained there was scarcely any powder in it. The ball passed through the rear of the drill shed and struck that unfortunate man, a few rods away, killing him instantly. He was a very poor man, and his widow and two or three children were left absolutely destitute, and apart from some slight voluntary assistance from charitable friends, I am not aware whether she has had any assistance from the department. I do not know what view the Minister of Militia may take of any claim which the widow may have against the Government; but even if she had a claim, she and her friends are utterly unable to prosecute it. Therefore, I will ask the Government to see if they could not possibly place in the Estimates, in some shape, a small sum for compensation for that poor woman. I believe it will not be establishing any precedent which will at all interfere with the management of the Militia Department. I appeal to the Minister to give us the information which he has in his possession, and if the rules of his department will allow it, if it would not be creating an improper precedent, I would ask him to give some slight compensation to this poor widow, suffering from an accident occurring through the operations of a volunteer battalion, although I believe the accident was beyond the control of the officials at that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The case has been brought to my notice, and I shall be glad to reopen it and consider it, and I will give all the documents and information which have been laid before me.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS.

Mr. GIROUARD presented the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, reporting that the Hon. Thomas McGreevy had refused to answer certain questions put to him in the investigation being conducted by the Committee concerning certain contracts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report of this Committee requires some action on the part of the House, and I would merely intimate just now that I propose to move to-morrow in the matter.

PRIVATE BILLS—REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until Friday, the 21st instant.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TAY CANAL.

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

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House to a public work constructed at the public expense, but not generally known to the members of this House—I refer to the Tay Canal. The first time, so far as I can learn, that Parliament granted aid to the Tay Canal, was in the session of 1882, when Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals, asked Parliament for a grant of $50,000 for the purpose of entering upon the construction of

this canal. He then represented to Parliament that, outside the cost of the land through which a portion of the canal would pass, the canal would cost $132,660. Parliament voted the sum of $50,000. In the session of 1883 Sir Charles Tupper, then still Minister of Railways and Canals, asked Parliament for a grant of $75,000 to continue the construction of the Tay Canal; and on that occasion, after speaking of the plans, specifications and estimates, all of which, I gather from the discussion, which was very short, indeed, had been carefully prepared at the expense of the department, Sir Charles represented to the House of Commons that the cost of the canal would be $240,000. Mr. Blake, then leader of the Opposition in Parliament, questioned the propriety of this expenditure, and asked the Minister, when moving for that vote, as to the propriety of this public work, as to the necessity for it. Sir Charles Tupper did not pretend that he himself understood anything about the necessity of the public work, but he referred to his hon. friend the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as being tolerably conversant with the subject. The member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), in justification of the vote, made use of the following language :—

"There is the traffic of the town of Perth, and smelting works will be erected there which require this canal. In the back section of the country, as we all know, there are the largest deposits of iron ore in Canada, as well as of phosphates of lime. It will also enable freights to be cheapened in the bringing in of coal for the purpose of smelting iron and for other works intended in that section."

Upon that representation of the Minister of Public Works, which has never been realized, and from the nature of things never will be realized, the Parliament of Canada was induced to vote the $75,000 asked for the continuation of this public work. In the session of 1884, Sir Charles Tupper asked Parliament for an additional grant of $100,000 to continue the construction of this canal, and then also represented to Parliament that the cost of the canal would not exceed $240,000. But little was heard in Parliament of this work until the session of 1887, and then Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways and Canals, asked for an additional vote of $55,000. It will be observed that, including the session of 1887, there was voted by Parliament for the construction of this canal $280,000, or $40,000 more than Sir Charles Tupper represented in 1883 the canal would cost. Some hon. members of the House by this time became a little doubtful as to the propriety of this expenditure out of the public funds of the Dominion, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), ever vigilant in the public interest, put the following question to Sir Charles Tupper, as will be found in the *Hansard* of 1887, page 838 :—

"How long has this canal been under construction; how much has it cost and how much is it likely to cost? There have been some sums in the Estimates for the last fifteen years."

In reply to this pertinent question, Sir Charles Tupper made the following reply :—

"The hon. gentleman will feel very much relieved when I tell him that the expenditure commenced in 1883. From that date to 1st March, 1887, the expenditure has been $256,360. This sum of $55,000 will complete the work, including the new basin at Perth, which is not under contract. We shall thus obtain a canal six miles in length at a cost of a little more than $250,000."

Sir Charles Tupper represented to Parliament in 1885 that the cost of the work would be $240,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

In 1887 he stated in Parliament that already $256,360 had been expended, and he asked for $55,000 more, in all, including the year 1887, $311,360, or $71,360 more than Sir Charles Tupper represented to Parliament in 1885 the work would cost, and $178,700 more than he said the work would cost in 1882. I think that if it were a valuable public work, constructed in the interests of the public, even although it exceeded the estimates by several thousand dollars, one would not have so much of which to complain, especially if that were the end of the matter, as Sir Charles Tupper stated in his place in Parliament that it was the end of the matter. But in the session of 1888, the Tay Canal, through the responsible Minister, was again knocking at the doors of Parliament for an additional grant, and Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Finance, acting for the Minister of Railways, asked Parliament for an additional sum of $78,000. On that occasion the suspicions of the hon. member for South Oxford were more than aroused and he drew the attention of the Minister to the enormous expenditure. Sir Charles Tupper said: "This amount is required to settle matters in connection with the construction of the canal. The work has been done." That was a clear and distinct representation made by the Minister of Finance in his place in Parliament in the session of 1888, that the work of the Tay Canal was then done, and that the $78,000 then asked from Parliament was for the purpose of paying the balance due to the contractors, the work having been finished. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion : "What will the total cost be?" and Sir Charles Tupper replied : "$358,364." In other words, the expense, including 1888, had increased to $118,864 over the amount which Sir Charles Tupper assured Parliament in 1883 would be the total cost of the completion of the work. One would naturally suppose that after the declaration made by Sir Charles Tupper in the session of 1888, that the work was completed and the sum he sought for not only paid for the completion of the work, but for the new basin, necessary to excavate in the town of Perth, no further expenditure would have been necessary. But, unfortunately for the tax-payers of the country, that was not the end of the Tay Canal, and in the session of 1889, the present Minister of Finance asked Parliament for an additional sum of $25,000 for this ever-wanting Tay Canal. Upon that occasion, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said : "I thought those works were finished last year." The hon. gentleman had reason to think that the work was finished, because Sir Charles Tupper made the statement in the House of Commons, that the works were completed. The Minister of Finance on that occasion replied : "$25,000 is required to complete the basin and carry out the other works." Sir Charles, as I have pointed out, declared in 1883 that the total cost would be $240,000 ; he declared in 1887, when he had obtained an additional grant from Parliament, that the sum then obtained would complete the work, including the basin in the town of Perth ; he declared in 1888 that the works were complete, and the sum he then asked Parliament would pay up the balance due on the work. The Minister of Finance in 1889 asked an additional sum of money, and the hon. member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked him the following question: "What is the total cost of these works, and is this really the last amount required?" The Minister of Finance replied: "The total cost up to date is $364,951." In other words, $124,951 more than Sir Charles Tupper asserted to Parliament in 1883 that the work would cost. But the Minister would not pledge himself that it would cost no more than $25,000, then asked. He was too cunning for that, he did not know exactly himself what it would cost, and he was bound to leave room for leaks and the filling up of leaks, and he did not answer the hon. member for South Oxford as to whether the amount asked for would complete the work or not. Well, one would naturally imagine, after these various grants of Parliament from 1882 down to 1889, that surely Parliament had voted enough for the completion of this work. Not so, Mr. Speaker; because I find that in the session of 1890, Sir John A. Macdonald, the late Premier, asked of Parliament the sum of $11,000 for the Tay Canal. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked Sir John Macdonald the following question, and made the following statement:—

"This I understand is really a useful work, it drains the County of Perth."

Sir John Macdonald's eyes appear to have been opened to the utter folly of the work from the beginning of it, and he replied in the following language characteristic of the late First Minister:

"Implying if it does not drain the County of Perth, [Lanark it should be] it drains the public treasury pretty well."

It was quite manifest that up to that time this little canal had drained the public treasury pretty well, and Sir John further said:

"The amount is to settle with the contractors and finish the work."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the third time, as I have shown you, that a Minister of the Crown, when asking Parliament for an additional sum of money for this canal, declared upon his responsibility as a Minister, that the sum then sought for was the last sum that would be required to finish this work. In 1888 the then Minister of Finance declared that the works had been completed and that the $78,000 he then sought from Parliament was simply to pay up balances that I suppose were due to contractors and others. One would naturally suppose that after the statement made by Sir John Macdonald when he asked for those $11,000, that that would end the matter, and that the Tay Canal would make no further demand upon Parliament. One would suppose that Parliament had already been generous and liberal enough to this little work, and that at all events, that should be the last time of calling on Parliament for money. Not so, Mr. Speaker. The Tay Canal was just as rapacious as the Esquimalt Graving Dock. It was just as hungry as the Kingston Graving Dock; it was just as anxious for public money as the Lévis Graving Dock, and it was as keen to get its hand in the public exchequer as the contractors for the dredging of the Quebec Harbour. That was not the end of it, and the end of it is not yet. We find that in that very same session of Parliament, after Sir John Macdonald had got the $11,000 I have spoken of, another sum of $20,000 was sought for and was stated to be a revote, a portion of which had been expended and a portion of which had not been expended. He got the additional $20,000. Up to that time the expenses of this little canal amounted to $395,957; a canal that the people of this country and the Parliament of this country were induced to undertake upon the assurance of a Minister of the Crown that the cost would be $240,000. Up to that time we had expended on that canal $155,957 more than the Minister assured Parliament, in the session of 1885, the whole thing would cost. Now, Sir, does that end the matter; is the Tay Canal finished, and are there demands still made upon Parliament to build the Tay Canal? One would naturally imagine that, at all events, would be the last time of calling on Parliament for a vote, but it was not. There were other leaks to be filled; there were Micks and Nicks to be gratified and satisfied, and Micks and Nicks were gratified and satisfied; and we were told by the present acting Minister of Railways and Canals on the third day of this present month of August that the cost so far amounted to the sum of $440,613.21, or, in other words, we had expended up to that time, according to the statement of the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, $200,613.21 more than Sir Charles Tupper assured the people of Canada and the Parliament of Canada in 1883, that this work would cost. Is that the end of it? No, Sir, the thing is not yet ended, and I fear the end of the Tay Canal will never come. We find, Sir, in the Estimates for 1891-92 an additional sum, as I understand it, of $30,000 to complete the Tay Canal. Add that $30,000 to the $440,613.21 which we were told had been already expended upon it, and you have a sum of $470,613.21 so far expended upon the Tay Canal, or, in other words, $230,613.21 more than Sir Charles Tupper assured us this canal would cost, in 1883. Is that the end of it? Surely, there will be no further drain on the public treasury. But the Tay Canal must be satisfied, and everybody connected with the Tay Canal must be satisfied, and that is not the end of it. There is now under construction, as we were informed by the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, in reply to a question I placed upon the Order paper, an extension of the Tay Canal from the basin in the centre of the town of Perth to a place called Haggart's Mill. There is under contract an extension of this canal, the dredging of the canal from the basin up to Haggart's Mill, the excavation of clay and rock, the removal of the permanent stone bridge there, the replacing of it by a new iron swing-bridge, and the purchase of some property in order to enable the swing-bridge to work properly. I am told that all these things will cost well on to $50,000 more. So that, for the work which Sir Charles Tupper assured the Parliament of Canada would cost $240,000, we will expend at least half a million of money. But that is not all. In addition to the capital invested in that undertaking we have got annual burdens upon the tax-payers of this country. We have got the interest on the $500,000 to pay. We have the repairs, and the wear and tear of the canal, which I am told will be a very considerable sum, to pay, and the expenditure for lock-keepers, and keepers of the swing-bridges, and so on, that cannot amount to less than from $5,000 to $10,000 a year. All that will be saddled upon the people of this country. We know perfectly well that perhaps for a year or two the wear and tear will not be very much, but well we know from our experience in connection with other canals, that the wear and

tear will increase year after year; and as a return for this expenditure of nearly half a million of money, and the annual cost of keeping up this canal, we have by way of tolls from that canal, from the 1st October to the 30th June of this year, the sum of $58.81. That is the return on this investment; that is what the tax-payer of Canada gets for expending nearly half a million of money. Now, I would appeal to sensible men in Parliament and out of Parliament, if these statements are correct, and I challenge them to say they are incorrect, if the whole thing is not a gross outrage. They have been taken from the records of Parliament, so far as I have been able to get them from these records. Was there ever such a piece of supreme folly as investing half a million of money in a work that has realized $58.81 in eight months? We were told in 1883 that plans, specifications and estimates were made by the department. I assume that these plans, estimates and specifications were carefully prepared. We were told that the cost would be $240,000. I have shown that the cost has now risen to about half a million. What are the pitiful results of all this? We were told by the acting Minister of Railways the other evening that this great canal is navigated by one tug, properly called the *John Haggart*, of 117 tons, which I am told makes one trip a week to Kingston; by another tug called the *Harry Bate*, of 144 tons, which I am told makes one trip a week to Montreal; by a pleasure boat called the *Geraldine*, of 15 tons, belonging to Senator McLaren; by another little boat of 8 tons called the *Firefly*, about the size of an ordinary rowboat; by another little boat called the *Ranger*, of 8 tons, about the size of an ordinary rowboat; and by an old scow, which I am told made one trip in the season, in carrying coal, I believe, from the Rideau Canal to the dredge working on the Tay Canal. The whole result is that we have two little tugs, one little pleasure boat, two little rowboats, and one old scow navigating the Tay Canal. What a screaming farce that must be to the frisky Minister of Finance; how the staid and sober Minister of Justice must enjoy the joke; how the grave and solemn Postmaster General must chuckle in his sleeve; how the member for L'Islet must brace himself up, and rejoice at this profound stroke of Canadian statesmanship—an expenditure of half a million resulting in a revenue of $58.81. But, Sir, it is not a farce to the Canadian people; it is no joke to the Canadian tax-payer. If it is either a farce or a joke, they must foot the bill. No, it is no joke to them; it is something else, and something a great deal worse. That canal, Mr. Speaker, will stand there for all time to come as it is now, a living monument of departmental imbecility if not of something worse. That is not the end of the Tay Canal. There is something more yet. The people are not relieved of the burden of the Tay Canal yet. The canal proper extended, or was intended to extend from a place called Beveridge's Bay on the Rideau Canal to the basin in the town of Perth. That was the original undertaking, and the only undertaking that Sir Charles Tupper asked the assent of Parliament to. That was what Parliament was asked to sanction, and what Parliament did sanction under false pretenses, under the pretence that a trade would spring up there to feed this canal, under the pretense that $240,000 would complete the work. It was as gross a fraud perpetrated on the tax-payers of this country as was ever perpetrated by any Government on any people. I have said that that is not all. Last spring, without the assent of Parliament, so far as I have been able to gather—for I had not the honour of being in Parliament at that time—without the assent of the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, without any appropriation by Parliament for the purpose, this Government took upon themselves to enter into a contract to extend that canal from the basin in the town of Perth up to Haggart's mill, at a cost, we are told by the acting Minister of Railways, of $18,466. I do not know whether that includes the cost of a swing-bridge or not, or the cost of purchasing land for the purposes of the swing-bridge; but I venture to say that what the Government have now undertaken to do without the assent of Parliament and without an appropriation by Parliament, will reach from $25,000 to $30,000, if not more. Now, what induced this Government, without consulting the representatives of the people, to enter upon this mad folly of extending this canal from the basin in the town of Perth up to Haggart's mill? It was bad enough to enter upon the construction of the old Tay Canal. I believe it is of no public utility, and never will be. I believe it serves no public interest now, and never will serve any public interest. I believe the canal was not constructed in the public interest. But to extend that canal from the basin in the town of Perth up to Haggart's mill, was an act of the maddest folly that any Government ever perpetrated, and I venture to say that no Government in the wide world except this Government would perpetrate such an act. Now, I challenge the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, with six of the most stalwart supporters he has got behind him, to visit the Tay Canal; I challenge every man on that side of the House to travel over the Tay Canal from the Rideau Canal right up to Haggart's mill; and if they do not come to the conclusion which I have come to, that this work is not in the public interest, I will candidly admit on the floor of Parliament that I have been misinformed on the subject. Hon. gentleman need not be afraid to visit it; they need not be alarmed at the warning notes uttered by the acting Minister of Railways, the other evening, when he told us that the high winds blowing over this great canal often drifted the vessels ashore. They need not be afraid if the storms do rise and the winds do blow, and the vessel springs a leak and becomes a wreck, because every one of them can easily wade from the deepest part to the shore without the slightest danger to their lives. Do visit the Tay Canal, by all means, and visit the extension of it up to Haggart's mill, and if you do not come to the conclusion that this extension is not in the public interest, I will confess at once that I have been misinformed. Ask yourself when you visit it, for whose benefit was this canal extended from the old basin to Haggart's Mill, what public purpose does it serve, and in whose interest does it exist? I venture to say that of the 215 members sitting in Parliament today, if they all visited this canal, everyone would say that it is of no public utility, that it serves no purpose except the purpose of Senator McLaren and the hon. member for South Lanark. Believing, Mr. Speaker, that this is a wilful waste of public money, believing that this extension was not constructed in the public interest, believing

that it benefits nobody except the owners of that mill, believing that it is a squandering of the people's resources, believing that the Government were wholly unjustified in extending the canal from the basin to Haggart's mill, without the sanction of Parliament, without the approval of the representatives of the people, and without an appropriation by Parliament, I beg to submit to you the following amendment :—

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "In the session of 1882 Parliament was induced to enter on the construction of the Tay Canal, on the assurance of the Government that the cost would be $132,660.

1. That, in the session of 1883, Parliament was induced to continue the construction of the Tay Canal, extending from the Rideau Canal to the basin in the town of Perth, on the assurance of the Government that the cost would be $240,000.

2. That, in the session of 1887, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals, declared that, up to that time, $256,360 had been expended on said canal, and that $55,000 would complete the work, including the new basin at Perth. Parliament then voted said sum.

3. That, in the session of 1888, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Finance, stated that the whole cost of the canal would be $358,364. He then asked for and obtained an additional sum of $78,000, and stated that "this amount is required to settle matters connected with the canal. The work has been done."

4. That, in the session of 1889, the Finance Minister asked for and obtained an additional sum of $25,000, and then stated that "$25,000 is required to complete the basin and carry out other works," and that the cost up to that time was $364,951.

5. That, in the session of 1890, the late First Minister asked for and obtained two additional sums of $11,000 and $20,000, the latter a revote, respectively, and on that occasion declared "that this amount is to settle with the contractors and finish the work," and then also stated that this work "drained the public treasury pretty well."

6. That, according to the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, the amount expended on the Tay Canal, up to 3rd of August, 1891, was $440,-613,21.

7. That, in the Estimates for the years 1891-92, an additional sum is asked for of $30,000, or in all $230,613.21, more than Parliament was assured by the Government the works would cost.

8. That, without the assent of Parliament, the Government has contracted for an extension of said canal from the said basin—the former terminus thereof—to Haggart's mill, at a cost of $18,406.

9. That the vessels using said canal so far consist of two tugs of 117 and 144 tons respectively, one pleasure boat of 15 tons, two small boats of 8 tons each, one scow of 30 tons and one skiff of 1 ton.

10. That the gross receipts from said canal, from the 1st October, 1890, to the 30th June, 1891, amount to $58.81.

11. That this House is of opinion that the said expenditures on the said canal are in violation of the pledges and assurances of the Government to Parliament, and this House is further of opinion that the said extension of the said canal to Haggart's mill is not a work that ought to have been undertaken at the public expense, and is unwarranted by any public necessity."

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that I have any fault to find with the manner in which the hon. gentleman has treated this subject. I regret that I am not sufficiently acquainted with the history of the canal to enable me to speak of it in the way I should like under the circumstances in which it has been brought before Parliament. I have this, however, to say, that if the records of the past are to be exhumed, and if the utterances of Ministers of Public Works are to be taken as positive pledges as to the cost of all such works, I very much fear that the same charge of impropriety might be made in many other cases. I have no knowledge myself, but perhaps the hon. gentleman who has had some acquaintance with dredging and with works of that kind in the west can speak with more authority upon this subject than I have. I know of no work which has been commenced by this Government or by any other Government, where the expenditures have been confined within the first estimates and the reports of the engineers, except perhaps in the matter of the Goderich harbour. My hon. friend knows that that was not an exception to all rules, and that in no case has the report of the engineers in regard to any work, stating that certain sums would be sufficient to complete it, been found to be so erroneous, within my recollection of about a quarter of a century, as in regard to the work to which I refer. Constant application has been made to Parliament to complete that work and make it useful for the purpose for which it was designed. I do not say there was anything improper in that, but I draw attention to it because my hon. friend is more acquainted with the works on Lake Huron than probably any other member of this House. When he makes these charges against the Government, and particularly against Sir Charles Tupper, I instance the Goderich harbour to show that the same would apply to every public work which has been undertaken since Confederation. I have watched pretty closely the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman, and they seem to be confined more especially to the last extension of the Tay Canal, to that unfortunate mill which bears the name of my hon. friend, the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). If my hon. friend from South Lanark did not own the mill, I think we would not have heard anything about the extension of the Tay Canal to that place.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Hear, hear. The canal would not have been extended there.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the *gravamen* of the whole charge, and before hon. gentlemen give expression to their opinions on that subject, they should understand exactly what the facts are—and I refer particularly to my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville). They should ascertain before making charges whether this extension is for the benefit of that mill, either in raising the water in the mill-dam or in what is called the bulk-head. If they can show that any personal advantages were to be obtained by a member of this House or by a senator, then a charge might lie, but until that is done, I do not think any hon. gentleman has a right to charge the Government with having expended public money for the particular and personal advantage of any hon. member. Looking into the history of this canal, I find that this is not a new matter. The Tay Canal was first constructed by a private company, with the object of connecting the town of Perth with the Rideau navigation. On this canal were five wooden locks. The first contract for the construction of a new canal was entered into by Messrs. A. F. Manning & Co., on 15th June, 1883. This contract extended from Beveridge's Bay, on Lower Rideau Lake, to Craig Street, in the town of Perth, a distance of about six miles. It consisted of an artificial cut 1¼ miles long, with two stone locks of 13 feet lift each, of the same dimensions as those in the Rideau Canal, the lock gates and also the wooden swing-bridge, where the public road crosses the road between the locks, being built by day labour by the Government employees. From the junction of this cut and the river to Craig Street, the work consisted

of deepening the channel of the river, cutting across bends, &c., these cuttings being chiefly in rock. The next contract, from Craig to Gore Streets, was entered into by Wm. Davis & Sons, on 12th July, 1888. This contract consisted of deepening the river by dredge work, the building of stone piers for three swing-bridges to replace the wooden ones across the river at Craig, Beckwith and Drummond Streets (the superstructures of which were built by contract by Weddell & Co., of Trenton), and the excavation for and the crib wharfing around the basin. The next contract for the further extension of the canal from Gore Street to 1,000 feet west was entered into by Mr. O'Toole, on 26th January, 1891, and consists of building the stone piers for the new swing-bridge which replaces the old stone arch at Gore Street (the contract for the superstructure being entered into by the Canadian Bridge and Iron Co.), and deepening the channel of the river for the above-mentioned distance. Now, in reference to the extension, I heard, when this question was first brought up, that certain gentlemen, eminent engineers, in this House, accompanied by the most eminent of all, the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), went up to examine that work, and that they went there with the object of attacking the Government and blowing them sky high. I at once sent for Mr. Wise and asked him what reasons he had for recommending this extension, and who would derive advantages from this, and whether this mill, of which we have heard so much, was to be benefited by it. He gave me a verbal statement, and I told him to put it in writing, which I shall read to the House what he reported to me. I am not an engineer, nor should I be able to give an intelligent opinion on a matter of this kind. Mr. Wise handed me the following letter:—

"RIDEAU CANAL OFFICE,
"OTTAWA, 10th August, 1891.

"The Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL,
"Acting Minister Dept. Railways and Canals,
"Ottawa.

"SIR,—Referring to the conversation I had with you on Saturday last, with regard to the extension of the Tay Canal up the river to the mill-dam, I beg to report for your information:

"That the first extension from Craig Street to the old basin, in the town of Perth (a distance of about 2,100 feet) was made for the purpose of having the terminus and wharves in the centre of the town; the corporation expending some $4,000 in buying out a tannery which occupied part of the land required.

"That the basin is now within stone's throw of the town hall, and that its construction has been of the greatest benefit to all classes both in the town and also in the surrounding country, freight having been reduced fully 50 per cent. since the freight boats commenced running regularly.

"That the second extension up the river is for a distance of about 1,000 feet.

"That it was petitioned for in order to extend the navigation through a portion of the town above Gore Street, so that, if necessary, the wharves could be extended in that direction at any future time; the corporation contributing $4,000 towards erecting the new swing-bridge required at Gore Street.

"That this portion of the river had hitherto been used as a dumping ground for all sorts of refuse, which, during the spring freshets, would all be carried into the basin below.

"That it is not a fact, as is generally supposed, that these improvements in the river will be the means of increasing either the head or supply of water to the mill, which has been no more benefited than any other property in the town.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"FRED. A. WISE,
"*Supt. Engineer.*"

I believe those who know Mr. Wise know that he is a man whose word can be taken implicitly upon any question of that kind affecting the profession of which I understand him to be a clever member. Now, these are the reasons given for the extension of this canal. The question is really whether the Government is to be condemned by that resolution for having commenced a work and carried it out to completion which has cost more than it was originally supposed it would cost. I find no charge made by the hon. gentleman that there has been any money improperly spent except in the construction of the canal itself. The hon. gentleman declares that this work ought never to have been commenced; if that is so, then Parliament is equally responsible with those who proposed it. My hon. friend ridicules, in the facetious way that generally characterizes him, the statement made by myself, the other night, in reply to a question put by him as to the number of boats navigating this canal, and their tonnage. It must be remembered that it is only since the 1st of July, last year, that the canal has been opened; it has only been opened for a very short time, it is not yet in a complete state, and we could not expect much traffic over it yet. Reverting again to the cost of public works, I have a distinct recollection of hearing the late hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler) some years ago making a statement in this House that if the Government would vote him $75,000 he would construct a connection between Presqu'Isle Harbour on Lake Ontario and the Bay of Quinté. Well, after a good deal of trouble those who were interested in the construction and completion of that work induced the Government to place an appropriation before Parliament, and it was voted; but instead of $75,000, the connection between these two waters has cost nearly $1,250,000. True, it is not a canal of the character of the one we are discussing to-day; it is one which enables the lake boats to travel from the west down to Montreal. The canal is from 11 to 13 feet deep, in fact it is as deep as the Bay of Quinté in many places, so that by increasing the depth and by making it a more permanent work, we have expended upon it a great deal more than was ever contemplated. I am glad to know that the traffic through it is rapidly increasing, and it is becoming the great waterway from the west to the east; and I have no doubt, as the people begin to appreciate its value in the way of safety and for other reasons, it will be used still more largely in the future. And so in all probability it will be in the case of the Tay Canal, although it is a very much smaller one. I merely instance this to show that in the commencement of a work, and as it develops, and as construction proceeds and continues, in most cases the expenditure increases, for various reasons which it is not necessary for me at present to refer to. I like the wide range the hon. gentleman took when he spoke of the cost of management of this canal. "Why, Mr. Speaker," he says, "it will range from $500 to $10,000." He might just as well have commenced at a cent and gone up to a million.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not say that, I said the wear and tear.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say the management; probably I misunderstood him. Well, Sir, the cost for one year, or

since it was opened, of maintaining the canal, has been about $750 ; I think that is about the sum I stated to the House the other day. What the wear and tear may be in the future, I cannot say. As to the winds that were to blow and the waves that were to roll, of which my hon. friend spoke so eloquently when he ridiculed the danger to loss of life that might occur in navigating the canal, if the waters of that canal are of the character of a calm mill pond, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, the expenditure of maintaining the canal will not be as high as my hon. friend anticipates. In regard to the bridges, the number of which I gave the House the other night, the hon. gentleman has misinformed the House in stating that they were new bridges. They were for the purpose of replacing old bridges that already existed, so that the fact of there being so many is not due to the action of the Government in giving to the town more bridges than they formerly had. The bridges have existed for years, and in the reconstruction of these four bridges the town of Perth made a certain appropriation, and the Government provided the balance. There is one bridge, however, that is new, and cannot be classed among the other four to which I refer. Now, I have shown, in the first place, that the expenditure of money was authorized by Parliament. It is true the first forecast of the estimates has been exceeded, as it has been in the case of almost every work that has been undertaken by this or by former Governments. It would be well if engineers had arrived at that state of perfection in their profession which would enable them to lay before a Government the exact cost of any work which is to be undertaken ; but there are so many circumstances which intervene between the commencement of any work and its completion, that it is almost impossible to give an exact estimate beforehand. I have shown from the report of the engineer the reasons why this extension was made, and upon his authority I make the statement that the advantages which the hon. gentleman said were to accrue to the hon. senator and to the member for South Lanark, will not be shared by those gentlemen any more than by other property holders in the vicinity of the canal. Their interests are no more subserved by the extension of this canal to the town of Perth, than are the interests of any other resident or property holder in the town. In fact it does not give to either of those gentlemen any particular advantage over their neighbours, as has been inferred by the hon. gentleman. The hon. member insinuated that the opening up of this basin and the extension of the canal was made for the special benefit of the member for South Lanark, on account of his owning a mill. This statement is not the case. Now, with these facts before the House, and with others which will, no doubt, be laid before us before this debate closes, I scarcely think that the deductions drawn from the quotations which were made by the member for Huron are justified in fact. While I have no doubt as to the manner in which the House will vote upon this question, neither have I any doubt as to how the hon. members opposite would vote for any motion which might be moved by that hon. gentleman, no matter how unreasonable the proposition might be or however incorrect it might be. However, you have the facts before you so far as I am able to give them in connection with this work. And until, I repeat, it can be shown that there has been any improper act on the part of the Government in the spending of this money, in the giving out of the contracts, or that it was done for the special benefit of any member of the House and more particularly a member of the Government, I hesitate not to say that the hon. gentleman's motion should not have been put to the House.

Mr. GIBSON. Considering the subject, I congratulate the acting Minister of Railways on the defence he has put forward. I was one of those who went up to look at the work, making the visit more from feelings of curiosity that anything else. I did not make estimates or surveys, but I would be a very stupid man if I failed to see on the face of the work the reason for the extension of the Tay Canal. The acting Minister of Railways has said the expenditure on the canal was for a public work. I must say for the people of Perth that they are very blind to their own interests if they imagine the expenditure for the extension of the canal is to benefit the town by carrying the business further on, because the canal as it now stands is in the very centre of their town, within 100 feet of the public buildings. I must say as regards the canal itself that it is a work well done. I am not afraid of the "raging waters" as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) suggests, because I find in the official records that the canal is only 5½ feet deep. Very few people would drown in that depth, and I fail to understand how, as the hon. acting Minister of Railways pointed out, vessels drawing 13 feet of water could pass through it on their way to Montreal.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think I said that. I was referring to the Murray Canal when I made the reference.

Mr. GIBSON. At all events, I trust that the hopes of the Minister will be realized in the future, if they are in this direction. When a work of this kind has cost $4,500,000——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GIBSON. $450,000 I mean, and if the receipts have only amounted to $58.81, it is high time the traffic on the canal was increased. The acting Minister of Railways spoke as if an improper charge was to be made against the Government. Does the Minister think that because the Ministry, or some member of it, is not charged with stealing out of the public chest, we have no right to question the propriety of any expenditure? He said that this work was encouraged by the town of Perth to the extent of giving $6,000 for the highway bridge through the centre of the town. As a public contractor, and one employing labour, I say that a sum of $6,000 given by a town as a bonus is money well spent in a case of this kind, where I find 80 men employed in town at $1.40 per day, and who will probably be there for some time to come. The Minister also stated at another time that there were 1,000 cubic yards of rock excavation. According to Mr. Wise, whose report he read, the extension is 2,000 feet long. And if we take 2,000 feet of rock cutting, 40 feet wide and a foot deep, we will find it will give nearly 3,000 cubic yards of rock excavation under this contract, which, when the contract comes to be paid up, will come in as a claim on the Government not contained in the estimates. The matter of the canal has been so well and fully dis-

cussed by the hon. member for Huron that he has left me little to say, further than to say that I have not the least objection to the canal itself, but I do object to the scandalous use of public money for the extension of this work from the town of Perth carrying the business outside the town limit to Haggart's mill. It is done for no other purpose than to give the mill a greater head of water. It would have paid the Government well to have increased the depth of the tail-race instead of carrying out this work, and the result might have been accomplished without building a canal, which is of no particular benefit to the country, or it would have paid to have moved the old mill further down.

Mr. LISTER. What is its capacity?

Mr. GIBSON. About 75 barrels in the 24 hours. I have nothing to say against Mr. Wise's report, because he, being a Government employé, might be doing a very unwise thing if he had reported otherwise. Let an independent engineer visit the place and give an unbiassed report, and if he says this extension of the Tay Canal from Perth to Haggart's mill is a work of general utility, I will give him my head for a foot ball.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Too soft.

Mr. GIBSON. It is not too soft. It would be better for some hon. gentlemen opposite if they had both softer heads and softer hearts. The capital invested in this canal when finished will be, roughly speaking, $500,000. The interest on this may be placed at $20,000 per annum; maintenance of canal banks, &c., at $1,000 per mile, $6,000 per annum; cost of lock-tenders, wages 8 men at $1.25 per day, 200 days, $2,000. These items show that the annual cost of maintenance will be $28,000. I find that on the Welland Canal the cost is as follows: Maintenance, 27½ miles, staff, $97,035, or $3,528 per mile; repairs, $50,402, or $1,829 per mile. Carillon and Grenville Canal, 6½ miles, wages, &c., $7,582, or $1,166 per mile. Under these circumstances, I hold that it would have been much better to have deepened the river above the town of Perth so as to have increased the head of water for the hon. Postmaster General's mill, for this would have saved all this extra expenditure incurred to make it appear that the Government were building a canal for the purpose of increasing the trade of Perth, which canal, in my humble judgment, does not require any extension, as the canal basin is now situated in the centre of the town. For these reasons, I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron.

Mr. WATSON. As my name has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman opposite as one of the inspectors,——

Mr. BOWELL. Engineer.

Mr. WATSON. I am not an engineer. I was given to understand that I was supposed to be an engineer by the remarks of the acting Minister of Railways, but that is not my business. My business is that of a millwright, and I have some knowledge of that on which I am about to speak. Having some knowledge of the subject I felt it to be my duty to visit Perth for the purpose of seeing these public works. I believe it is the duty of every hon. member as far as possible to visit and view for himself, if he has any idea of forming an estimate of the work going on, as to how the public moneys are being expended. I have on former occasions asked this House to vote public money for the purpose of opening up and developing large trade. I have asked repeatedly for a vote for improving what are known as St. Andrew's rapids on the Red River. Not one dollar has been spent there. Talk of water power, thousands of horse power could be obtained there for the expenditure made on the Tay Canal. I visited Perth and took in the sights. I must say that I never was more surprised in my life to hear that any Government, or that any engineer would report to the Government, that they should expend the public moneys for the work that is now going on in Perth. I had heard of Haggart's mill, and I thought it was a large mill, that it might be one of these infant industries that the Government wished to protect and encourage, and that they wanted to construct the canal for the accommodation of the trade to and from that mill. But, Mr. Speaker, what did we find when we arrived at Perth? We found a small mill, with a capacity of turning out 75 barrels of flour in twenty-four hours; a two and a-half storey building, forty by sixty feet, and any gentleman in this House knows what a building of that description is worth. It is true it has a water power, and I suppose that the acting Minister of Railways will see fit to condemn the action of the Government, or at least to say that the Opposition are justified in bringing forward this matter, if it can be shown that the present Postmaster General has benefited by the construction of this canal. The hon. Minister of Railways stated that if it could be shown that the canal raised the head of water, then there would be good grounds for complaint. Now, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say, without being a surveyor, that the construction of this canal will give to Haggart's mill three and a-half or four feet greater head of water than it has. It does not raise the dam, but it lowers the tail-race, which has exactly the same effect. Who is to be benefited by that? There is no person in Perth that I can find out, who will be benefited by the construction of that work, except the Postmaster General who owns the mill, and Senator McLaren who happens to own three acres of land on the opposite side to Mr. Haggart's mill. If that is the case, it is easily seen by whom the benefits are to be derived. The acting Minister of Railways has stated that the engineer sends in a report in respect to this work; but I say that that is not a very wise report. He says the object of the engineer was to bring the Tay Canal into the centre of the town of Perth. We might not complain of that expenditure, if the town of Perth demanded it, but I find that in the town of Perth, with a population of scarcely 4,000 inhabitants, there is no trade of any extent carried over the canal. It is not a distributing point now, as the trade is cut off by the railways from the town of Perth. In other words, there is a canal built from the Rideau into Perth apparently for the accommodation of pleasure boats running from Perth, because we find that all the receipts we got last year from tolls from these two locks was $58.81, which clearly goes to show that there is no freight, and very little traffic over that canal. Now, the acting Minister of Railways states that the extension of the canal to the mill was to increase the wharfage. Well, Mr. Speaker, I should say that it would be well for a great number of members of this House to visit Perth, and

see what an immense amount of freight is lying on the present wharf around the canal basin. When we went there, there was not a single craft visible to us except a small rowboat lying in that canal basin, and there was no freight lying on the wharves except the stone that was brought there for the purpose of building the abutments to the new bridge. The Government in order to make this extension pulled down a first-class stone bridge that had stood there for years, and would probably have stood for the next hundred years, if it was left alone. They pulled that down for the purpose of putting up a draw-bridge, in order to extend this canal. As was stated by the last gentleman who spoke (Mr. Gibson), we found, on arriving there, that there were certain reasons why the people of Perth should vote $4,000 for the purpose of having this work done, even if it were only to benefit the Postmaster General; because we found that there was a very large amount being expended on that work, and the pay-roll must be large, as, I think, the contractor told us that he had eighty-five men working at $1.40 per day. It was clearly a matter of speculation for the people of Perth to give this $4,000 in order to encourage this work. Outside the benefit which will be derived by the gentlemen owning the property where the water power is at present in existence, namely, Senator McLaren and the Postmaster General, there is not a single individual who will be benefited by this extension and this large expenditure, except the people of the town who will get the benefit of the money while the work is in progress. Now, the acting Minister of Railways and Canals told us that we should not take for granted that a speech made by the Minister of Public Works should be the final estimate of the cost of building any public work. I could understand that this might be the case in a work where there were engineering difficulties to contend with, but an estimate for simply digging a ditch over a level piece of country, ought to be calculated nearer than 50 per cent. of the cost. I certainly think that reflects very badly upon the Public Works Department.

Mr. LISTER. The cost is more than 100 per cent. beyond the estimate.

Mr. WATSON. Yes. The estimated cost of this canal was $240,000, and now it is costing in the neighbourhood of $500,000; and when it is stated that there is only one lock at the mouth of this canal where it connects with the Rideau, it can be easily understood that there is nothing but a ditch to dig through a piece of level ground. I do say that it is the business of every member of this House, be he an engineer or not, to go and see that canal. I believe that any intelligent man in this House—and no man should be elected to this House unless he had some fair understanding of knowing when he sees a work whether that work is in the interest of the country or not—I believe that if any man visits Perth and says that that work is done in the general interest of the country, or even in the interests of the people of the town of Perth, then I would be willing to do what my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) says he is willing to do, that is, to give my head for any purpose. With the exception of benefiting the Postmaster General and his little mill the canal will do no good. I contend that an infant industry of that kind, if it is no use without such a work, should have been bought out by the Government at once, for it would be very much cheaper to do that than to build such a canal as this. I venture to say that there is not a practical man in this House or in Canada who would pay $8,000 for that mill to-day. It has six set of double rollers, 9 by 18 inches, and 75 barrels per day is the capacity of the mill. It would have paid the Government far better to buy out the mill at once, or bring it down to the canal basin, if they wanted to give the Postmaster General his head of water. The Minister has told us that the people of Perth used this for a dumping ground; but I do not think that any sane man will say that the Government should have expended half a million dollars of public money on a canal in order to prevent the people of a town from using the land as a dumping ground. The present canal basin is within 75 yards of the post office and the Customs house of the town of Perth. It is right where the people want it. We might justify the expenditure of cutting out that canal basin if there were any idea of extending the canal so that it would facilitate the business of a town, but the Government, after all their expense in taking away a good stone bridge, and erecting a new draw-bridge, and extending the canal up to Haggart's mill, are, in my opinion, doing an injury to the people of Perth, because they are carrying the freight past the business portion of the town. Not only have we this expenditure on the canal, but we have a lot of other incidental expenses connected with it. We have six draw-bridges to take care of, three of them within the town of Perth, and a fourth one to be erected. We find that the Government has two persons attending to those three bridges that are now erected there, but I suppose that these bridges will not have to be opened very often, because when we were in Perth we saw no sign of navigation on the canal. If there were any object in extending the canal beyond Haggart's mill, it might be justifiable, but we could hear of no person who would even suggest that that canal might be extended further than the present extension. I do say, as one of those interested in the expenditure of public money, and one who believes that money should be spent in opening up and developing public highways or waterways in Canada, when necessary; that it is an unjustifiable expenditure to throw this money away as it has been thrown away for the purpose of benefiting any one particular individual. If individuals wish to have the Government keep them and sustain their business, and improve their property, the best thing the Ministers could do is to visit these districts, and buy out the industries at once, to benefit their friends. I say that it would pay us ten times over to buy out the property at present in existence at Haggart's mill, than to extend this canal to the mill for the purpose of giving the owner of the mill this water power. For these reasons, I shall have great pleasure in supporting the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Huron, which I consider in the public interest. I am only sorry that there was not further time to enable some hon. gentleman from the other side of the House to visit that district and see how the public moneys are expended—to see those 85 men working there at the public expense; and not a man in the town of Perth will

tell you that it will benefit any person except Mr. Haggart and Senator McLaren.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I have heard a hundred say differently myself.

Mr. WATSON. I have not heard anybody say so, and when I visited the place I do not think anybody knew that I was a member of Parliament.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). It was the class of people you visited.

Mr. WATSON. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman, if he visited that place——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I was there before you were born.

Mr. WATSON. You may have been; but I venture to say that the hon. gentleman himself will not get up and justify the expenditure which was made in extending that canal, and I defy him or any other person to visit that locality and then say that the people of Perth will be benefited by that extension. If he has found out in what way it will benefit them, I venture to say that no other man has. The statement made here to-day by the acting Minister of Railways, who gave Mr. Wise as his authority, is a very lame excuse. It cannot be shown that this work has benefited anybody but those two gentlemen, and there is no justification for spending the money of the people of Canada in this way, for the purpose of benefiting two of the Government's friends.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Speaker, some time last week it was whispered in the corridors of the House that a deputation made up of members from the other side of the House had visited the Tay Canal. It was also whispered, after these hon. gentlemen returned, that during their hilarious excursion they got so full of benzine and tangleleg that they did not know whether it was the Tay Canal or the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I contend that no hon. gentleman has a right to throw any such insinuations across the floor of the House. The hon. gentleman makes a charge that the members from this side of the House who visited Perth were under the influence of liquor. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that the deputation who visited that place are not built that way. If the hon. gentleman had been along, perhaps there would have been good grounds for the charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume that the hon. gentleman wants a ruling on the point he has raised. Then I rule that the hon. gentleman is not out of order: he is not referring to anything that has occurred in this House.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I merely mentioned what I have heard, and if I have been incorrectly informed that is my misfortune. I would be sorry to say anything against the morals of hon. gentlemen opposite when they go on little junketing tours of that kind. But with regard to the Tay Canal, it strikes me that money expended for developing the country, such as the money expended on that work, is money spent in the best interest of the Dominion of Canada. I believe that every dollar of public money expended in the Dominion is for the benefit of the people of this Dominion, and it is a base insinuation to suggest that money is expended there for the benefit of an hon. member of this House. I would scorn to use language of that kind, and say that the Postmaster General is being benefited by this scheme. I was glad to hear an hon. member from one of the Hurons state that certain boats pass through the canal. His remark brought to my remembrance an expenditure of public money which took place a few years ago in the district which I have the honour to represent. It was an expenditure on a work which was supposed to be a canal or a lock, and it is there yet, Sir, as a monument to the imbecility and inability of the Reform Government that existed from 1873 to 1878, and through that canal no boat has ever passed and no boat can pass. In fact it is not a canal at all; it is but a hole dug out of the rock, through which the water trickles, but through which a boat does not pass. Call it a canal if you choose; it is but a canal in appearance, in so far as it is a hole in the ground, and nothing else; and when this Government is charged with having built a canal that is of some use, a canal that will float boats and through which merchandise can be carried, it should not for one moment be compared with the expense of half a million dollars which was incurred in the district of Algoma to make a hole in the ground. Sir, I am prepared to vote against that resolution, as I think that public money expended for the benefit of that particular part of the Dominion is for the benefit of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FRASER. I have some interest in this discussion, coming as I do from a province that has been attempting to get some improvements of such a character as would be in the interest of the people. I congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just sat down upon the admirable way in which he seems to confuse in his own mind right and wrong. He is in favour of spending money anywhere and everywhere, he does not care where it is, and then he turns around and says that money was expended wrongly somewhere in his constituency. No wonder the hon. gentleman should confuse these matters, when he rises in holy indignation and scorn, and has the meanness to speak about gentlemen who are not only his peers but his superiors, and to impute to them things which never happened. He is a fine man to speak of scorn in this House—is he not?—and to lecture people upon a matter of public interest, when he has so far forgotten himself as to drag in an untruth about gentlemen who went in the public interest to look after an expenditure of public money. I trust that when the hon. gentleman gets up again, the proprieties of life and the common decencies that should prevail among gentlemen will prevent him saying things about men which he would not dare to say outside of this House where these gentlemen could have an opportunity to answer him. So much for the scorn and noble indignation of the hon. member for Algoma, who seems to have learnt from the boundless acres that he represents, the habit of making boundless statements in this House without data and without respecting the proprieties of life. Permit me to say, so far as the matter under discussion is concerned, though I did not visit the place myself, that as the hon. member for Marquette says, it is the business of every public man, by visiting the *locus* of any public work in this Dominion, to make himself

acquainted with it. I am very much surprised—perhaps I am wrong, but I understood that the acting Minister of Railways himself has not visited that canal, although it is very near his place. I asked a question a few days ago about the deepening of the East River, betwen New Glasgow and the town of Pictou, a river about six or seven miles long; and New Glasgow is a town of more than twice the population of Perth, while Pictou is a town of nearly the same population. The deepening of this river would be of great advantage, not only to the people of the county but to trade generally, because, as everybody knows, Pictou is one of the best harbours in Nova Scotia. And what was I told by the present comatose Minister of Public Works! I was told that investigation had been made and surveys had been made. And here let me say that when a deputation from the town of New Glasgow came first to Ottawa and presented the question to the Government, they were told that nothing could be done until the spring when the ice would be gone, and that an investigation would be then made. But I noticed last winter, just as soon as the election was on, men were down there at work cutting holes through the ice, which was two or three feet thick at the time. I was told that the work would cost over $200,000, and, therefore, it could not be done; but here we have an expenditure of $500,000 to enable two or three pleasure boats to navigate four or five feet of water to the town of Perth. That may be all right for the town of Perth. The difficulty with us is that the river is very crooked, but we have built some of the largest ships ever built in Nova Scotia, and taken them down that river, only it is rather difficult, and for $200,000 we would have one of the finest rivers—something like the great rivers of Scotland, which have been deepened for navigation purposes. But in the case of the Tay Canal, the result we obtained from this expenditure of $500,000 is a depth of four or five feet of water, and a revenue, in round numbers, of $59 per year. That is the value of the investment. Are not our people being taught what it is to be economical? I admit that the revenue need not, and in fact cannot, always be in proportion to the amount invested. I admit that the Government must expend money, and that the people need not always expect they will receive a return for the money invested; but I submit that the amount of traffic on that canal is something ridiculous; and if the amount of revenue we now receive is any indication of what that canal will do in the future, I am bound to say that money has been thrown away. There is one sound principle upon which every Government should act in their expenditure, and that is, that the expenditure should be made always where it is most required. Is it required up there? When I heard the acting Minister of Railways speak about the raging waves, I pictured to myself something similar to what we have down by the sea. I heard the lashing and the roar of the Tay, but when I came to understand that all this lashing and roaring was in a turgid canal of four or five feet of inland fresh water, I began to think that it takes very little to frighten some people.

Mr. BOWELL. Give the hon. member for Huron credit for that.

Mr. FRASER. My hon. friend the acting Minister of Railways gave the clue to that, as I understood him to say some vessels were cast ashore up there. If I am wrong, I beg to be corrected.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say anything about that.

Mr. FRASER. But this I wish to say, that in all the lower provinces, and I do not want to be sectional, but bring this up as showing how unwise the Government is acting—in the lower provinces we have small harbours where the fishermen live, and the expenditure of $500,000 would give us fifty harbours for our fishermen—fifty good substantial harbours. Would not that be a benefit to these people who have to risk their lives by being out in boats during such storms as I would not like the hon. gentleman to see. There we have storms, but here on the Tay Canal, in five feet of water, something like a little creek running through a farm, only a little wider, to talk of storms is absurd. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to think that it is wrong in the Opposition, as it ought not to be wrong on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, to visit our public works and see whether our money is properly expended or not. There is no particular privilege hedging in a Minister of the Crown, and if the public money is devoted to serving his private interests, the Government is more culpable than if it were expended to serve a private member. I am not going to say that expenditure was made on behalf of the Minister. I have not been there, but I do say it looks very much like it, and if we are to believe the evidence, and you will notice, Sir, that even the report of the Minister, very carefully worded, got up for the very purpose, only says that the Postmaster General is not benefited more than anybody else. That may mean a very great deal. The hon. gentleman may own a lot of property there and consequently may be benefited with other property holders; or it may mean that nobody at all is going to be benefited, and that money is to be thrown away after all, and he will be as badly off as the others. But it seems to me, if the only result of this expenditure is to help a mill which only grinds seventy-five barrels a day, it is an expenditure which should not be made. I will not say that is the reason it was made, but the evidence looks like that. The point is this: Are the Government to go on spending money just to suit their own friends, or should they take into account the places that need the expenditure most? I contend that the closest investigation should be made, and any Minister in Ottawa, who lives so near the Tay Canal, and who knew that $500,000 was being expended there and did not visit it, did not do his duty. Half a million dollars is a large amount of money, of course, not to hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is a large amount of money, when we consider how little is spent all over the Dominion. The evidence before me satisfies me that the last expenditure at least, an expenditure made outside of Parliament, looks very suspicious. I think the acting Minister of Railways himself will admit that when an appropriation of this kind is made outside of Parliament——

Mr. HAGGART. If it is so.

Mr. FRASER. I mean this last expenditure. If it is made by the Government without having submitted to the Parliament first——

Mr. HAGGART. If it is so.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, it may be suspicious. That itself may furnish a ground for suspicion. I do not say that that of itself is sufficient, but this I will say, that I believe that there is no town in this country with a population of only 4,000 whose trade will warrant us, when we have so many railways, in expending $500,000 for a canal only 4 or 5 feet deep. This country cannot afford to spend $500,000 to provide a 5-foot canal for a town of 4,000 people. The resources of this country are not sufficient. The country is not getting settled quickly enough for that. We will not have the means of paying that, because when we make that expenditure there, there are a hundred other places where such expenditure not only is necessary, but the trade is larger, and which will have the right to demand that this be taken as a precedent. The report says that the trade has been doubled, and I understood the Minister to say that the trade has been doubled. Doubled, when the whole amount collected is $58! That is a very big trade to be doubled. If it were not for the canal, the amount of carriage would only pay $29. To men coming from the Maritime Provinces, when they think of the hundreds of schooners that are never heard of and do more trade than the whole trade brought down that canal, I cannot tell you how ridiculous this whole matter appears. I would ask the Government to take into consideration those cases I have named, where the people and the country would be largely benefited, and where they would have the assurance that they were acting in the best interests of the best citizens in the country. And they were doing this for people who could not help themselves. I mean the fishermen of the second largest county in Nova Scotia. I heard here that this Parliament would not give the money to these men because it costs about half the money to distribute it, and I fear that my native county is not getting what it should. Some other influences must be at work. I would not like to impeach any Minister for having given any benefit to any person other than he should give, but, when a man was strong enough to use his influence with the Ministers, I think the Minister yielded to the aggressive methods which were used by his supporters.

Mr. BOWELL. When did the conversation which the hon. gentleman referred to take place?

Mr. FRASER. I did not say that you were the Minister I referred to.

Mr. BOWELL. You referred to the comatose Minister of Railways.

Mr. FRASER. My reference was to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HAGGART. As this is a matter which particularly interests me, and which I was the means of inducing the Government to enter into an expenditure for in 1883, perhaps it is necessary that I should make some explanation in regard to it. The first charge against me is that made by the hon. member for Huron that I induced the then Minister of Railways to construct a canal in order to benefit myself and the people of my locality on representations which were, perhaps, unfounded. The statement that I made at that time was that it was the intention of some parties in the vicinity to induce the construction of smelting works for iron and other ores, and that, if the canal was brought up to the town of Perth, it would facilitate the smelting of these ores in that town. At that time there was a large traffic going to the town of Perth, and I then believed that it was the intention of several parties to erect smelting works and to bring the ore into the town of Perth to be smelted there. As to the construction of the canal, you would imagine from what has been stated that I was interested in the matter. The first idea as to the construction of the canal was brought up in 1883. It was then proposed to construct that canal by the enterprise of the merchants of the town of Perth, who proposed to put their own money into it. Afterwards a grant was given by the Government of Canada to assist in the building of this canal. The island in the centre of the town of Perth was given in order to assist in the building of this canal, and the merchants there were anxious to see the canal constructed from the mouth of the river to the place where it is now. A canal was constructed by private enterprise, but of course that canal had not the depth of water that members from Nova Scotia require for their canals in order to accommodate the large schooners which come in there; but it was sufficient for private enterprise to build a canal of a certain depth in order to encourage the local trade. They did that and they put their hands in their pockets in order to do it. Afterwards, when money was being distributed through the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and other places for public works of public utility, I thought that one of the oldest counties in Canada had a claim to some assistance, a county which has contributed as much to the public revenue as any other part of the Dominion and had never received any return. Then I asked the Government to assist in the construction of that work, showing the expenditure that had been made by private enterprise and telling them what benefit would accrue from the completion of this work. These gentlemen say that there is no benefit derived by the town of Perth from this canal. The fact is that the benefit derived by the town of Perth in regard to the importation and the exportation of goods amounts to over $30,000 a year. The freight exported and imported has been 400 tons a week, or 24,000 tons a year since the construction of that canal. The reduction on the cost of that freight because of the construction of the canal is $1.50 a ton, or $30,000 a year. Is that no benefit to the people of that locality? Is that no benefit to the people of the Dominion generally? I need not show the absurdity and folly of this resolution which is introduced in 1891 and professes to find fault with the legislation of 1883, and with the statement made by the Minister of Railways in 1887, 1888 and 1889. If they had any fault to find at that time, why did they not vote against the legislation then, and move against it? Why did they not raise their voice against it, instead of waiting till 1891, when they find new life and go back to review legislation which took place seven or eight years ago? As to the statement made by the hon. gentleman that this expenditure was made solely for the purpose of the extension in my interest, I do not mean to say anything. The canal from Perth to Oliver's Ferry was built before that with 3 feet of water and five wooden locks, and the water was 3½ feet at the time that the water in the Rideau Canal was 5½ feet. The

present canal is a great benefit to. the country. I say the expenditure was perfectly justified. It is a benefit to that section of the country. Look at the vote that was given by the town of Perth for the purpose of contributing towards the construction of the basin and for erecting a bridge over the Tay Canal. The ratepayers of Perth, by ten to one, voted $8,000 for that purpose; and will you tell me that no man in the town of Perth has received any benefit from that expenditure except the owner of one small mill and the Hon. Senator McLaren? The hon. gentleman says that the extension was made for the purpose of increasing the head of water for the mill I own there. I say that his statement is incorrect, it does not increase the head or fall of my property six inches. I risk my reputation as a Minister standing in this House, by challenging the hon. gentleman to get any engineer in this country who will go up and make a survey and confirm the statement the hon. gentleman has made. The engineer who recommended the extension says himself that it is not a fact, and that it does not add one single inch to the head or fall of the property which I possess there.

Mr. WATSON. The engineer's report does not say so.

Mr. HAGGART. The engineer's report does say so.

Mr. WATSON. Not the one that has been read.

Mr. HAGGART. The engineer's report says so. The extension was not made for my benefit. I did not care one bit about the extension. It was urged upon me by the ratepayers of the town of Perth, and I think I spoke to the Minister of Railways, stating that there was an unexpended balance for completing the Tay Canal, and that it was in the interest of the canal that the extension should be made. I stated, and the engineers stated, that there was an old saw-mill at the head of it, a couple of hundred yards above, and all the refuse was dumped into the water every spring and had accumulated in a large pile; the ice brought it down in large quantities into the canal, and they thought it would be much cheaper to extend it up there than to remove that mill. When he was doing it I said: Perhaps it would be more in the interest of those residing along the extension that there should be a strong bridge erected. I believe the people in the town of Perth wished it, I had no particular interest in it at all. The answer to me was that if it was extended the people of Perth would have to construct the bridge. An estimate was made for the cost of the bridge which was placed at $4,000, and this sum the people of Perth voted and paid in cash for the purpose of building the bridge.

Mr. LISTER. That was the superstructure.

Mr. HAGGART. That was the superstructure. The piers of the bridge cost, I suppose, $5,000 or $6,000, and the total extension, as I understood it, cost in the neighbourhood of $19,000 or $20,000, of which sum the town of Perth contributed $4,000 towards a steel bridge. Those are the simple facts in regard to the building of the canal and its extension. I say that in that section of the country it is a work which everyone is proud of; the people consider it not only in the interest of the place, but it saves them a large amount in freight The amount saved upon freight runs up to $30,000 a year, which sum is saved to that section of the country, and represents more than 6 per cent. interest on the whole amount expended. When a statement was made in the House concerning the advantages of building that canal, I well remember the then leader of the House asking: Would it develop more water power? And he asked me what was the principal reason of the extension from the Rideau up to Perth. The answer was that it would enable the public to effect a great saving on the amount of freight carried over that canal, and it would enable us to say to the railways around us: If you do not give us freights at fair rates, we have a competing line which we will use, and in that way the canal would be a public benefit. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Gibson) has made an absurd calculation as to the probable annual expenditure on that canal in paying parties for taking care of the canal, the locks and the bridges, including the wear and tear, and he comes to the conclusion that it will cost about $28,000 a year.

Mr. GIBSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I made a calculation of 8 men's wages, at $1.25 each, making $10 a day, which, for 200 days in a year, would be $2,000. I added to that the wear and tear of the canal, but I limited my deductions according to the experience of other canals, and taking the Tay Canal as a basis, I estimated the wear and tear at $6,000, which, with the wages added, would amount to $8,000, and adding $20,000 for interest, I made $28,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. But even $8,000 a year for management would be largely in excess of the requirement; one-quarter of that amount would be quite sufficient. Let him look at the estimates of the Government engineers of the sums required as yearly expenditures upon both the Tay and the Rideau Canals. The Tay Canal is only six miles in length, while the Rideau Canal extends from Kingston down to Ottawa, and the whole amount of the annual expenditure upon the latter canal is in the neighbourhood, I think, of $32,000. If you will look at the old accounts from year to year you will find that Mr. Wise's estimate fully reached the amount that is expended each year; so you can see the absurdity of the figures given by the hon. gentleman when he says that the Tay Canal will require an expenditure of $8,000 a year. The hon. gentleman takes the breadth of the bottom of the prism, which is to be built from the extension up to the mill, and you will find $32,000 in the Estimates this year for both it and the other, including the excavation of rock from the bridge up to the end of the extension. If the hon. gentleman will only wait until the result is known, he will find out that there is not nearly the quantity of rock, nor nearly the expenditure, which he anticipates. I do not know what the amount will be, but I say his estimate is far in excess of the probable requirements. There is another point. The canal was open for traffic only last summer; the lock-tender was put on last summer, and the bridge-tenders were only put on the first of the present month. There has been very little traffic, because the canal was not really open until the 1st of July of this year. I have nothing more to say upon the subject, except that I think this expenditure was perfectly justified,

and the people in that section of the country have found it to be greatly in their interest. Certainly, they considered it to be so, when they put into the enterprise a large sum of money. No expenditure can produce more beneficial results to the people of any portion of the province than this expenditure on the Tay Canal. The action of the people of the town of Perth proves that they consider that it has been a boon to that section of the country, and I have shown that they save in freights alone the sum of $30,000 a year. So I think that the Government, in making this expenditure, has been perfectly justified by the results.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have listened with some pleasure to my hon. friend the Postmaster General. The first thing I think that would strike forcibly on the minds of his colleagues, and on the minds of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, is that he must be astonished at his own moderation in only asking for a paltry $500,000 for so desirable an end. And knowing the weight, and knowing the deserved influence which my hon. friend, as a member of the old guard, and in various other relations, has always exercised over the heads, shall I say, of some of his colleagues, I, for my part, am rather surprised that my hon. friend did not go it one better, and demand at least a round million for the benefit of the town of Perth. After hearing the statements on both sides, after hearing the enthusiastic defence of this expenditure by the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, and the much more temperate address from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, a doubt does remain in my mind, and the doubt, Mr. Speaker, is this: Whether, all things considered, a much more wilful and wanton waste of public money was ever incurred in this country. We have seen a good many schemes in which the public money was wasted by both hands. We have voted $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 for a Chignecto Ship Railway, which I believe to be as useless an enterprise as was ever formed on the face of the earth. We have known what it is to have to consent to an expenditure of millions on millions made on the faith of another Minister of Railways, who formally declared that by spending a couple of millions we would reduce the distance by the Intercolonial Railway to important points by 45 miles, and which afterwards turned out to have the effect, if it did have the effect, of causing a reduction of four miles. But I think, taking all things into consideration, bearing in mind all the facts of the case, bearing in mind what was known to the Government and the country when this work was entered into, the Postmaster General may be congratulated on having extracted a larger sum out of the public treasury on shallower pretenses than any other hon. member has done. The hon. member tells us there was an ancient canal built there some 50 years ago. If the condition of things was as it existed 50 years ago, there would have been some considerable justification for the hon. gentleman's defence, because in those days railways were not. The only navigation open to the citizens of Perth and the people in the neighbourhood of the Rideau Canal was by the Rideau Canal, and consequently it was natural that the citizens of Perth should wish to spend some of their own money in obtaining a connection. But what was the case in 1883? The case in 1883 was that a railway was running through the town of Perth, giving the people full access to their markets and making them, to all intents and purposes, absolutely and completely independent of this canal. What was the fact in the town of Perth as to this same Rideau Canal, of which the Tay Canal is a branch? Why, the fact is this, and it has been pointed out by me, it has been pointed out on the floor of this House times without number, that the Rideau Canal has all but become an abandoned work, that the Rideau Canal is ceasing to do the traffic and business of the country, that the Rideau Canal is at this moment in such a state that, while we had to pay for the maintenance of the canal an amount of $55,000 per annum, independent of extra sums occasionally required for repairs, the total income of the canal is just $7,000, or one-eighth of the amount of the annual expenses, without taking into account the cost of maintenance, or a farthing on the cost of construction, which I believe was done by the British Government. We will now consider another point which the hon. gentleman made. He admits that $500,000 of the public money has been spent for the town of Perth. He admits that there will be a considerable charge, which, however, he places at a less sum than did the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), whose authority on this subject as an eminently practical man is, I think, as good as that of the Minister; there will be, at all events, a considerable annual charge to keep this work in repair, and judging from our past experience I should say that the annual charge would be much more likely to approximate to the sum named by the hon. member for Lincoln than that by the Postmaster General. He tells us that by an expenditure which he places at $22,000 or $23,000, but which the hon. member for Lincoln places at $28,000, an expenditure of $30,000 may be saved in freight in the town of Perth. His statement in that respect will hardly stand washing. First, he declared that there is an annual export of 400 tons a week. Very well. It will be well, however, to remember that for a long period of the year, unless the climatic conditions alter considerably, the Tay Canal will be sealed up firmly against all freight whatever, and that, even if there were 400 tons a week, it could not benefit Perth during half the time assumed. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman means to tell the House that, having a railway at their doors, running straight through from Perth to Montreal, there is any reasonable ground for believing that the bulk of that traffic or the great proportion of it, even if the railway companies were to put up rates would go by the very uncertain and tedious navigation of the Rideau Canal to Kingston and then go down to whatever point it might be consigned. The more the matter is looked into the more it will be found that no such benefit as the hon. gentleman suggests can be obtained by the town of Perth. He says there has been a reduction on 20,000 tons of freight of $1.50 per ton. I think that reduction would have come in any case, and, if the facts are investigated, it will be found the reduction did come to them wholly and entirely irrespective of the construction of this little six-mile canal. That, however, is a point which will repay some investigation. And it is well we should consider it, in the case of a town represented by a Minister, it is worth while to spend dollar for dollar of the public money forever to benefit it to the extent of

securing a possible reduction such as the hon. gentleman alleges has been obtained, because that is what his contention amounts to. The hon. gentleman used another very extraordinary argument. Says the hon. gentleman—and I call the attention of the House to this—there were large outlays going on under the present Government, large outlays were going on all over Canada, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, and he claimed for the good county town of Perth and for the county he represented a share and a right liberal share of the plunder. That is about the length and breadth of the hon. gentleman's argument. Where are we going to come to if it is laid down by a Minister of State that if outlays are made in other provinces, presumably for objects of general utility, thereupon every other sub-division of Canada is entitled to claim an expenditure to the tune of $500,000 or thereabouts? The hon. gentleman in criticizing my hon. friend's argument used a remarkable illustration. My hon. friend was speaking of the cost of maintaining an actual canal mile by mile. He put that cost at $1,000 per mile. That is a thing I am not in a position to judge from my own personal knowledge; but the answer made by the Postmaster General is this: Why, he says, there is the Rideau Canal extending from Kingston to Ottawa, over 100 miles, and the cost of that is only $33,000 annually.

Mr. HAGGART. $32,000, including the Tay Canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Tay Canal being just built, it at present requires no very great outlay. My hon. friend spoke of the future. I know the Rideau Canal almost as well as does the Postmaster General, and it may interest the House to know that the greater part is not a canal at all, but a series of lakes, for the proper keeping up of the water in which no repairs on the banks, most assuredly, are likely to be called for.

Mr. HAGGART. The Tay Canal is mostly river.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Tay Canal, as constructed, will require banks to be kept up. That is the information I have in regard to the matter. I do not think if it be a river, it is at all likely to be so free from requiring repairs as is a canal which, like the Rideau Canal, consists mainly of a series of lakes. There is no parallel whatever between the cost of keeping up a "canalled" river, if you choose to use such a word, and between the cost of keeping up a so-called canal, which really consists of a series of very short canals connecting one lake with another. The Minister also laid a great deal of stress on another point. He declared that it was proof of the wisdom of this expenditure of half a million dollars that the town of Perth was willing to put up eight thousand dollars for the sake of having five hundred thousand dollars spent for its benefit, a large part of which went for wages, and all of which wages were spent in the town of Perth. Which of my hon. friends here would not enter into bonds with the Government that he will cause his county or the chief town of his county to furnish them, not with $8,000, but I venture to say with $80,000, if the Government on their part will consent to spend $500,000? But, Sir, the hon. gentleman alluded to another point, on which I think he was altogether ill-advised. The hon. gentleman declared that we were not justified on this side of the House in bringing up the question of the wisdom of this large expenditure, because, forsooth, against our protests and remonstrances, the Government had in former times succeeded in passing votes through the House on this subject. I say that now is the proper time for my hon. friend to bring this up, when he is in a position to show to this House and to the people of this country with what wasteful lavishness the public money has been expended to gratify a powerful and influential supporter. How are we to know; how are we to tell beforehand, that this same Tay Canal which we were told originally would cost $130,000, which we were told afterwards would cost $240,000; how were we to tell that this was going to cost $500,000? Why, Sir, had we based our opposition to it on the ground that it was sure to cost half a million dollars, what would have been the answer of the hon. gentleman? How the late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, would have declaimed, would have made this House ring with his denunciations of the ignorance and presumption of members on this side of the House who disputed the careful calculations which he himself had verified at every point, and to which he would pledge his reputation that this work would not exceed $240,000. Now, what does the engineer's report say? Well, Sir, it is a cautiously drawn report; it is such a report as I would expect would be drawn by an officer of the Department who was sent down specially to report in defence of an anticipated parliamentary attack. In that report which was quoted just now, does the engineer say that this is a valuable work? Does he say that he approves of it; does he enter into any calculation or give any reason why a work so easy as this, a work the cost of which should have been estimated for within a mere fraction, cost nearly $270,000 more than was originally estimated should be spent? All that he says is this: That this work and particularly this extension which the hon. gentleman speaks of, would be a useful drain for the town of Perth; and would be a useful outlet for certain impurities and certain matters which they appear to have been in the habit of precipitating into the canal. The report is not that it does not advantage my hon. friend the Postmaster General, but that it does not advantage him in particular. I am not going to enter into that particular question. I have not been at Perth; I do not know for my part how this would affect his mill; but, I think, it will be obvious to most hon. gentlemen, that if the effect of this is to extend a navigable canal a thousand feet from the Perth basin up to the hon. gentleman's mill, that it must be of some considerable value to that property. I am not going to say—we have not any evidence on that point—that this extension was undertaken for the purpose of benefiting the hon. gentleman's mill; but I should think, as a matter of fact, that whether it did or did not enable him to obtain an additional head of water power, that the probabilities were all and strongly in favour of it benefiting the mill itself. I think that it is reasonably clear on the face of it; that if you extend the navigation up to his mill door, some considerable sum may be fairly added to the value of his mill. But the truth is this: I think that this must be regarded as a small testimonial to show the extreme respect which the Government entertained, even at that early date, for the

member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The hon. gentleman says truly that his county had not received anything for any considerable time, although it had benefited largely, no doubt, in the early days by the construction of the Rideau Canal, as all that part of the country did benefit. I think, Sir, that the real object of the matter was to show, and to convince the citizens of South Lanark, that my hon. friend was a power in the state and a power behind the throne, and as I say: What was half a million of the money of the people of Canada, compared with establishing my hon. friend firmly in his constituency? This is a very fair specimen—and that is what makes it of importance—of the way in which we have been spending public money during these past years. There was no reason on earth, there was no sufficient or adequate excuse, for adding half a million dollars to the public debt and for adding a considerable charge to the public expenditure from year to year, other than this: that, no doubt, it was a very convenient thing for a prominent supporter of the Government that this expenditure should be gone into. They had the flimsy excuse, as I must call it, that, half a century ago, when the whole condition of the country was entirely different from what it is now, certain citizens of Perth for their own benefit had constructed a shallow canal in that quarter. But, knowing that Perth was adequately supplied with railway accommodation, they had no excuse for voting half a million dollars under these circumstances. Now, there are a few points here which the House may very well have its attention called to. The hon. the Minister of Customs takes refuge in the statement that, always and under all circumstances, engineers' estimates are apt to be incorrect. That is a very poor excuse under the circumstances which now exist. If there was one thing on the face of the earth which it should have been easy for competent engineers to estimate to a nicety, it would be the work of constructing a 4 or 5-foot deep canal in such a locality as that is, from the town of Perth to the Rideau Canal. There could have been no difficulty there about boring the ground to the requisite depth, there could have been no difficulty there in ascertaining almost to a pennyweight what was the extent of rock cutting, or earth cutting, or all the other expense that would be necessary. There ought to have been no difficulty whatever, and if the department was worth its salt it ought to have known within 5 per cent., or 10 per cent. at the outside, all that this work could possibly cost. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), in bringing forward this motion, showed that not once, but twice and three times, very misleading statements, to say the least of them, were made to this House. He showed that time and again the House was told that everything had been expended that required to be expended, that time and again they were told that this work could be off our hands for a certain sum, and that, notwithstanding the former statements made both in the estimates submitted, and the declaration of the hon. Minister, the practical result is that we have a dead loss of at least $20,000 a year in the shape of interest. You may depend upon it that we shall have in all probability an annual loss of from $5,000 to $10,000 inflicted upon us for the purpose of keeping this work in a proper state of repair; and when it is all done, Sir, with all deference to the Postmaster General, I doubt exceedingly if a committee of practical men were appointed to investigate the subject, and to have conferences with the railway company, and examine into all the savings that could possibly be effected by giving the citizens of Perth the Rideau Canal extension to Kingston, from which point they would have to ship to other points—I doubt exceedingly if they would not report that instead of a saving of $1.50 a ton being effected on the 400 tons a week that he speaks of, there would not be a saving of 15 cents a ton. With regard to the personal advantage, I do not refer to it, although, be it more or less, this work must redound to his advantage. The hon. gentleman did not touch, nor did the hon. Minister of Customs touch, the fact that apparently this extension was made without acquainting Parliament with the intention of the Government to make it. In the original statements made to us it was said that this canal would extend from the town of Perth to a certain point on the Rideau Canal. Now, it turns out that an extension of a considerable distance and at a considerable cost has been made, with which the House was never acquainted until the motion of my hon. friend was laid before us. I think, that is not dealing fairly with the House. And more than that, I think a very bad precedent has been established. I think, that other members of this House, supporters of the Government, relying on the example of the hon. Postmaster General and the doctrine he has preached, that, because his county had not received any considerable public expenditure, he has done a meritorious thing in using his influence and position as a supporter of the Government to extract half a million out of the public funds for the purpose of benefiting his own county, will be only too ready to go and do likewise. Now, Sir, we have no half millions to throw away. I will venture to say that throughout the length and breath of this Dominion there are to-day, not one, but five hundred, or it may be a thousand, public works of infinitely more utility than this canal at Tay, all of which are naturally enough clamouring at the doors of the public treasury for assistance; and the Government having granted this request, have made it doubly difficult for themselves to refuse the requests of others; because such an example as this under the circumstances will most assuredly be quoted only too readily by all the hon. gentleman's followers; and I am very much afraid that when you come to consider the incidental results that will flow from this expenditure, we shall be well off if we escape from this Tay Canal without finding that it has involved us in an expenditure of as many millions as it has cost us in hundreds of thousands. But, Sir, the gist of the position of the hon. Minister of Customs is to be found in one or two remarks he made. The hon. gentleman appeared to me not to enter with very great zeal or zest into the task of defending this expenditure. He did it in a rather perfunctory manner. He appeared to feel very much like a certain eminent politician who remarked: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very bad case; we must apply our majority to it." That is almost precisely in terms what the hon. Minister of Customs has suggested to his colleagues and supporters.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that is what you would do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not like the task of defending it, and he wound up his speech by encouraging his friends to use their majority to put down this motion, on the ground that apparently they could not afford to quarrel with so powerful and influential a person as the Postmaster General.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the whole question of the Tay Canal and extension. I think that this question can be fairly divided into two distinct parts—that which has to do with the authorized portion of the work, and that which has to do with the unauthorized portion. I understand that it is admitted on all sides that there was no parliamentary authority for the entering into a contract for the construction of the canal from the basin in the town of Perth to the northerly terminus at Haggart's mill. Therefore, the Government have taken upon themselves the responsibility of establishing the necessity for that work under that legislation which alone authorizes the Government to expend money without the consent of Parliament. Is this, then, one of the works unforeseen and so urgent that the Government are warranted in applying to it the Audit Act, and in pledging the country's credit for it without the previous sanction of Parliament? I do not understand that the Government have seriously defended the work on any ground whatever. The acting Minister of Railways did not venture to compromise his reputation as a public man by saying that the work was a necessary one, a useful one or a wise one. The only extent to which he committed himself was in reading the report of Mr. Wise, the engineer of the Rideau Canal. Now, first of all, I would question the propriety of the Government in seeking to shoulder upon an officer of the Government responsibility for administrative policy. It is the duty of an engineer to decide upon such questions as location, mode of construction, and for that matter mode of operation; but it is no part of the duty of an engineer, in the employment of the Government, to be a witness in support of the policy of the Government in erecting public works. There is an attempt made by the Government of the day to get a defence from a subordinate of the department, when they are unable to find one themselves; and what sort of a defence do they get? They send out an officer after the work is under contract, to try and find an excuse for their previous act; and we may assume that however honourable the engineer is—and I believe that he is a thoroughly honourable and reliable public servant—we can understand that, nevertheless, in his desire to accomplish the object of his mission, he will certainly give the Government the benefit of the doubt. He was, then, sent out on the mission of trying to find an excuse for this work. Ordinarily one would suppose that the justification would have preceded the fact, but in this case the excuse comes after the fact; and what is the excuse offered by the engineer? In his report, in endeavouring to establish the utility of this work, he says what? Not that it is a necessary work at the present time; not that there is any certainty that it will ever be a necessary work; but simply this, that if the navigation of the canal is extended from the basin to Haggart's mill, it will in the future afford facilities for the construction of wharfage along that extent, should wharfage ever be necessary. Was there ever a more flimsy excuse offered for an unjustifiable job than the defence offered under this report? The engineer says in so many words, I commend this report to the attention of the Postmaster General, for, after all, he must take the individual responsibility of this work, as there is no doubt he set the idea afloat, or, at all events, encouraged it until it matured, and I, therefore, commend his attention to the report of his own officer condemning the work as absolutely useless. Mr. Wise says: If you ask me to find out an excuse for this work, if you ask me to say what possible public service it can render, all I can say is that it does not render any public service at present, and, so far as I can see, it is not likely to; but should it ever be necessary, in the dim and distant future, to erect additional wharfage, then as you have the tail race made navigable, that will afford facilities to utilize wharfage. If we required any evidence on that point, which we do not, we could easily show there is no present necessity for any additional wharfage, and, therefore, there was no necessity, on the ground of wharfage, to extend the navigability of the canal. The hon. Postmaster General has not dared to commit himself to the suggested excuse that wharfage is necessary. He will not, at this moment, rise in his place, and say that the condition of trade in the town of Perth to-day required the extension of the canal to his mill for the purpose of supplying additional wharfage accommodation. I ask him now if he will say that, as that will have some effect on my argument. He is silent.

Mr. HAGGART. The extension of the canal does not go to my mill.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the point. I ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. BOWELL. That is the point you asked.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not ask where it went to or where it did not go to, but I understand it goes to Haggart's mill.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a mistake.

Mr. MULOCK. No matter where it goes, I ask whether additional wharfage is necessary? That is the question I put, and that is the question the hon. Minister cannot answer. The Minister will not dare to say that the trade of Perth requires additional wharfage, and the only excuse the engineer can find for the construction of this work is that, at some future period, additional wharfage may be required. The Government engineer having said, in effect, that at present no additional wharfage is required, and the Postmaster General having admitted that by his silence—for he is always ready to make statements when they will serve his purpose—he having now endorsed the statement of the engineer that additional wharfage is not required, and that being the only excuse, with the exception of one other to which I will refer in a moment, the construction of this work, so far as utility is concerned, was not at all required. The other ground which the engineer takes to say that possibly the work might be justifiable is that the tail race——

Mr. HAGGART. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that the extension was made on the recommendation of Mr. Page, the engineer.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you got the report?

Mr. HAGGART. No; but I have seen it.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman desires to take any advantage out of the reports of the engineers, let those reports be laid upon the Table. Where is the report of the engineer of July, 1890, on which the late Minister of Railways passed some judgment? Where is the rest of the papers? Why have the papers moved for in the Public Accounts Committee not been brought down in order to enable us to properly investigate all the circumstanees? The hon. Postmaster General was in the Public Accounts Committee when they were ordered, and now he says that he has some reports.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not in the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, he was.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware that the Public Accounts Committee ordered the papers.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman was present and consented to the passage of the order. I moved it, and the hon. gentleman bowed his head in assent.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman's memory is defective. I remember it well. I come back to the point that, so far as the Government are concerned, they advocated the extension on the ground to which I have referred, and on another ground, namely, that the tail-race, which has been or is being converted into a navigable portion of the canal, has heretofore been used by the good people of Perth as a receptacle for refuse, and that, at a certain period of the year, this refuse was swept down to the canal. Was that a reason for extending the canal? It would have been a good reason for preventing the dumping of garbage into the tail race, but it is by no means a reason for extending the canal to prevent that nuisance. The town of Perth had its own remedy. It is entitled to the benefit of the municipal laws of the land, and if the people of Perth are above the municipal laws and could dump into the tail-race they could also dump into the completed canal. That excuse will not do, so that there is no possible defence to the transaction on the ground of public utility. What is the object? The Postmaster General has stated it is a very minor offence at best. He acknowledges the wrong, but he says after all I only misapplied money voted for a different purpose; Parliament voted money for the construction of a canal from the Rideau to the basin in the town of Perth, and there was a small balance over, which I was entitled, by some forced construction, to misapply to a work Parliament never ordered or intended should be done. No more dangerous doctrine could be advanced on the floor of Parliament. Parliament, in the exercise of its wisdom, looks into proposed expenditure, plans and specifications ought to be laid before the House, and when money is voted for a particular work and not used, it belongs to the people generally; and I am surprised that to-day, in a Parliament like this, a Minister of the Crown should assert the doctrine that he has the right to seize upon lapsed balances and expend them as he or the Government, without further consent of Parliament, may determine. There is another circumstance in connection with the transaction. We find a contract given for the construction of a work which was not previously sanctioned by Parliament, and given on the eve of an election. We find that, in the month of February last, the Government entered into a contract for the construction of this work. Why did the Government happen to select that particular time, when the whole country was locked up in the embrace of winter, for the construction of a canal? Why did they choose that most inopportune season of the year in every respect, except a political one, namely, that it was a month before the day of voting. Sir, the whole thing smacks of fraud. It is fraud. In my judgment it was a gross misapplication of the public money. Whether the purpose was to put money into the hands of private individuals or to promote the political advancement of an individual, the money was not expended in the public interest. It is as illegal a transaction as if it had been made through the medium of a contract with Larkin, Connolly & Co. for dredging or other works; but it is in harmony with the practice which has obtained for many years in a certain branch of the public service. It becomes all members of this House, no matter where they may sit, to endeavour to restore a more correct idea of the duties of public men. If there is one thing more than another which we should sacredly guard, it is that we should be true to the public who entrust us with representing them, and should not misapply the taxes we are taking out of their pockets. If we once concede that the Government can, before Parliament assembles, pledge the credit of this country by entering into a contract which is not sanctioned by Parliament, though to-day it may be a small matter of $30,000 or $40,000, if that is once allowed to go unnoticed, I say we are on the eve of wiping out the control of the people over the expenditure of their money, we are abolishing the rights which the people have over the control of that money, we are abolishing the rights of Parliament in that regard and we are abolishing the only safeguard which the people have, which is that Parliament should come together and should deal with their financial affairs in a constitutional way. This, however, is in keeping with the transactions of the past year. I believe that never has there been so much disregard of the rights of the people of Canada shown by any Government as has been shown during the last year. Look at the violation of the spirit of the Audit Act, when between two and three million dollars have been used without the sanction of the people's representatives, and, during the same time that that illegal expenditure was taking place, we find that a member of the Government promoted his own ends by a course equally unjustifiable and of the same class as that to which I have referred. I say, therefore, it is time for this new Parliament to establish, if it be possible, a position for itself in this matter, and to lay out wholesome rules for its future guidance. Without dwelling upon the other portions of the works which may or may not have been of a useful character, the one question in regard to this which I desire to consider is that this extension was unauthorized by the representatives of the people, and I think that those who desire to secure the respect of the people for Par-

liament should feel it their duty as trustees of the people to condemn such an act as this, even if it had the sanction, illegally obtained, of a Minister of the Crown and of the whole Government. Any member of Parliament has a right, if the Postmaster General had any right, to do the same thing. If any member of Parliament is a supporter of the Government, he may induce the Government and has the same right to induce the Government to do such a thing as this as the Postmaster General had, though perhaps he may not have the same influence to aid a particular individual or a particular locality which is friendly or which may be made friendly to the Administration. If this action is to be ratified by Parliament, there is no end to the abuses which may arise. No matter on what side I might be, I would condemn such a measure as a subversion of the principles of parliamentary representation. If people are free to vote as they like on such a subject they should condemn this action, and it was not complimentary on the part of the Minister of Railways to say that on this side we were not free to vote as we choose.

Mr. BOWELL. The same thing has been said a dozen times.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has violated the decorum of this House a dozen times, and will do so again ; but I say that partyism ought not to be strong enough to induce members of this House to endorse measures which are not worthy of endorsement, and this action is one which, in my judgment, deserves the condemnation of the people's representatives here ; and I am sure that in a free Parliament, as I hope this is, it would receive such a condemnation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not intend, after the very thorough discussion which this subject has received at the hands of hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, to take up very much time ; but there are one or two features of this matter which I desire to call attention to. First, I think there is no question that the House ought to hold the Government to a strict account in regard to the proposed expenditure on any new works, and I think the House should demand from the Government, especially when they inaugurate any new works, that the statements they submit to the House should be accurate and reliable. If that is not insisted upon, we can never know, when any work is started, where the end is to be or what it is going to cost. For instance, in this matter of the Tay Canal, the first estimate, submitted in 1882, was $132,000. I need only say that, if the House had known in 1882 that that canal would have cost half a million dollars it is very unlikely that the vote of $50,000 would have been passed at all. Then, in 1883, after another year's investigation, they told the House that, after a careful examination, they estimated the cost at $240,000, and asked for another appropriation of $75,000 for the construction of this canal. In 1884 they again said they had made careful estimates of the cost, which would be only $240,000, and to-day we find that, notwithstanding all these statements submitted by the Ministry to the House, the cost of this canal has run up to half a million dollars. I say the Government ought to have known and to have been able to give a careful estimate and a more reliable statement of the cost of this canal to the people and to the House, and that, in neglecting to submit an accurate statement of the cost, they were deceiving and misleading the people and the members of the House of Commons, and in this respect I think they deserve the censure of the House. This seems to have been in accordance with their course in regard to all the contracts that have been entered into. Within the last ten years we have not had a single contract entered into by the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways, the amount of which has not been largely exceeded. We always find that the final estimate is two or three times the amount of the estimate first submitted to the House, and I think that in that respect the Government deserve censure for not being more accurate and careful in submitting their plans to the House. So far as the Tay Canal is concerned as a whole, I do not intend to say very much. It has already been shown, I think, that the canal was of very little use to the country, and that it cost more than it was worth, but I wish to refer more particularly to the recent extension which was begun last winter without the sanction of Parliament, and for which the House is now asked to vote this large sum. I had the pleasure a short time ago of visiting the beautiful little town of Perth, and of examining closely the location of the proposed extension now being constructed, and I may say that I believe there never was a work undertaken by this Government, or any other Government, that was of so little value to the people of this country. I cannot for the life of me see what in the world ever induced the Government to go on with that work except that it is going to increase the value of the property known as Haggart's mill. Now, the hon. Postmaster General stated that it would not increase the head of water at all. Well, I differ very much with him ; I believe it will increase the head of water at the mill from three to four feet ; it will give him at least three or four feet more head, and in that respect, of course, his property will be increased in value.

Mr. HAGGART. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course, I have not made an accurate survey of the exact height of the water, but it was the opinion of all those who went there, and I believe we can form a pretty correct estimate, that at least it will give an increased head at the mill of three or four feet. This is, of course, a great advantage to the mill. But outside all that, I believe that if the canal is extended up to where it is proposed to extend it, it will increase the value of that mill at least eight or ten thousand dollars. I know a good deal about flour milling, I have been in that business all my life, and I have no hesitation in saying that if I owned that mill, and if I could get that canal extended up to where it is proposed to extend it, I would not take $10,000 for the mill more than it is worth to-day. It is easy to see that it will be worth that, because at present the mill is situated at least half a mile from the railway, without any means of getting in grain by rail. The canal in its present location is a considerable distance from the mill, and all the grain coming in has got to be carted from the railway or from the canal ; but the very moment the canal is extended up to the mill, any man can see that immediately a great deal of trouble and expense is saved in carting this wheat from the basin to the mill, as is done now. Why,

with that extension, he can immediately put a small elevator in the scow or whatever brings the wheat to the mill, and elevate it right into the mill without any handling at all. In my opinion I believe it is worth $1,000 a year to that mill to have the canal extended up to it. The House will see that when the canal is extended up to the mill you have got 60 miles of navigable stream from the door of the mill to Kingston or to Ottawa; you can buy grain all along the banks of the canal, put it in barges or scows, and bring it to the mill, put in a small elevator and lift the grain into the mill without a cent of expense. Now, you have got to unload all the barges at the canal basin where the canal stops, and then you have got to cart it to the mill a considerable distance. So, again, in shipping flour and feed from the mill, it is certainly a great advantage to have the canal come up to the door of the mill, because then you can put all your flour and feed into the canal boat and take it down to Kingston or this way to Ottawa, without any expense at all. I think there is no question that it is a great advantage to the mill to have the canal brought right up to its door, and I cannot see where it is an advantage to anybody else. As has been stated here to-day, the canal basin comes to within, I think, 100 feet of the main street of the town of Perth; it goes up to the main street within 100 feet I believe, or within a few hundred feet, of the post office and court house, so that it reaches now very nearly the centre of the town. There is a wide basin and good docks, and a splendid place to unload, where vessels can tie up to these docks, and everything complete. Now, they are extending that canal, and tearing down the old permanent bridge across the main street, and carrying it away out of the town into the suburbs to Haggart's mills. There is ample accommodation now, there is plenty of wharfage and plenty of accommodation for all the traffic that comes to that basin. You have all the facilities that you want, and there is no possible benefit to the people of the town in carrying the canal on any further. But the Postmaster General stated that the people desired it and had, ten to one, voted a sum of money in order to extend it. Well, I do not wonder at it. They would be very foolish, indeed, if they refused to vote a few thousand dollars to extend a work that would scatter so much money in their town. When we were there a few days ago, there were no less than 80 or 90 men working there at $1.25 or $1.50 a day. All this money is being spent in the town, the expenditure will be continued for months, and the people would be very foolish indeed if they did not vote the paltry sum asked for in order to have this work completed. But I certainly cannot see where there is any possible benefit to be derived to the town of Perth from the extension of the canal. If the basin was not there, if they had not ample accommodation in the present basin for wharfage and so forth, then I could understand the necessity for continuing it on and having a basin on the other side of the street. But as it is now, they have all this accommodation, and no possible benefit can be derived to the people of the town by the extension, as is proposed, to the mill property. As I said before, it is to that property alone that I think any benefit can be derived. I have no doubt that so far as the mill is concerned, if I owned it I would consider it worth at least $1,000 per year more to me if I had that canal built right up to my door. The Postmaster General said there were 400 tons of freight a week shipped from the town of Perth. I would like to know what that freight is. He said there were $30,000 a year saved in freight alone. Now, 400 tons a week means about 5½ cars of freight that is loaded every day in the town of Perth, and I think the hon. gentlemen was far astray in his estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. It is an actual fact.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway works, I do not know I am sure how it could be. I know that the flour-mill does not ship a great deal, and there are no saw-mills there that I know of, and I do not see where the 400 tons of freight a week come in. Then as to the statement about the $30,000 saved in freight I would like to know how that occurs. That is a pretty wild statement also, and I think it requires a good deal of proof. When there are so many works required of so much importance all over this Dominion, it seems to me a most scandalous thing that this large amount of money should be expended upon this extension that is so little needed. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has estimated, and I think his estimate was a very fair one, that it will cost the people of this country about $28,000 a year to keep up this work, and when we find that the total receipts for the last seven months were only $58, it seems to me that it was a most foolish and unwise thing for the Government to go into. The interest on that investment of half a million dollars at 4 per cent. will be no less than $20,000 a year. We have therefore this large expenditure, the interest on the money, the cost of these bridges, the swing bridges, repairs to the canal, &c., which will amount to at least $28,000 a year, which I think is a very low estimate; and last year the receipts from the canal amounted to only $58.81. Now, it seems to me that in itself is enough to show that the work was a huge job, and should be condemned by this House without a moment's hesitation. When we find that the only man going to be benefited by the extension of this work is the hon. Postmaster General, I think this House should vote its censure and express its condemnation for any such expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think we should permit this matter to pass without giving it that criticism it deserves. It appears to me that from the commencement of the work up to the present time every dollar expended has been expended on this work in the interests of the Postmaster General. I felt surprised when I heard the statement made to-night that in 7 months the receipts from this particular work had only reached $58. That of itself is sufficient to prove that it is an unnecessary work, that it is a foolish work, that its inception was a mistake, and the carrying of it on and the extension of it is a still greater mistake. I say to my friends around me that they are not discharging their duty to their constituents if they permit matters of this kind to pass through the House without giving them that measure of criticism and searching investigation which they deserve. It appears to me that the Postmaster General has a peculiar, personal infatuation for the development of water privileges. It seems as if the hon. gentleman was determined that he would not only spend his own resources on a matter of that kind, but when

they had gone he drew on the resources of this Dominion. I hold it is wrong, and the people will hold it to be wrong to permit this state of things to go on from year to year, and allow the hon. gentleman to occupy the position he fills and to draw on the country's resources for matters of this kind. I was surprised that the Minister of Customs should have tried to defend that piece of abomination. I thought he would have allowed the Postmaster General to have shouldered his own responsibility in these matters, and was surprised that the Minister of Customs was prepared to lend his countenance and assistance to defending an undertaking for which his hon. friend was responsible. I believe the work is called Haggart's ditch. Hon. gentlemen have been out of one ditch into another ever since we met this session. They have been out of one ditch and into another from the commencement of the Tarte investigation to the present time, and to-night they are in Haggart's ditch. The ditch is well named, and it was never intended for anything except to drain that particular section of the country which the hon. gentleman represents. The Minister of Customs would be quite willing to consent to-night to grant the necessary sum to begin at his friend's mill and fill in the ditch all the way to the Rideau Canal if he could bury in it all the scandals hon. gentlemen have had to face since we met in this Parliament. He would be willing to do it, but it would not hold half of them, and there would not be enough material found on the banks to cover them. It is not strange, when we review the expenditure of money throughout the Dominion, that we should find a great deal has been expended in the same line. The Postmaster General said this afternoon, and he did it to shield himself, that money for similar purposes was spent in other portions of the country. In all probability he had reference to the Chignecto Ship Railway, which is just about as foolish a scheme as is the hon. gentleman's ditch. By that railway the company undertook to lift ships out of the water, run them across the peninsula and put them into the water again. It is another wild goose enterprise, undertaken by the Government when it thought it might give advantage to them. Another scheme is the Cape Breton Railway, which my hon. friend opposite represents. He stated, when we were finding fault with the enormous cost of that undertaking, that it would pay for the grease on the wheels, and he even said it would pay running expenses. Suppose it does pay running expenses, we will have to pay $400,000 of interest at 4 per cent. for the supreme satisfaction of allowing this road to be built, for the inception of which that hon. gentleman is responsible. If we look around we find monuments of folly from one end of the Dominion to the other, inaugurated since 1881. There is the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, duplicating the line of the Intercolonial Railway, built for the purpose of securing certain seats, no doubt, in that section, and to fulfil a promise made by Sir Charles Tupper that a road would be run through that section absolutely and entirely at the cost of the people. The people have to pay interest on the money expended, and the money that goes to swell the amount we have sunk on the Intercolonial Railway to about $52,000,000, for which the people are paying at the rate of 4 per cent. $2,000,000, from which they do not get one brass farthing. All this was done for the purpose of fulfilling promises made by such men as the High Commissioner when he comes out here on the dancing tour as the chief champion of the Tory party of this country. So we have from time to time railways, and ditches, and canals, and public buildings, sometimes constructed in places where they are not wanted, while other places that should have them do not secure them; these works are entered upon on the basis solely as to whether they tend to perpetuate the political existence of hon. gentlemen opposite. That is the whole movement and scheme. I suppose the Postmaster General found that in order to satisfy the people of Perth some particular drain or ditch should be constructed for the advantage of the town. The town has been run into that particular ditch and the Government are now proposing to extend it. After the efforts of the Postmaster General on behalf of the town, he no doubt expects and hopes that when he returns, notwithstanding all the incidents of his official life and the official lives of his associates, the people of that section will forgive and condone everything laid to his charge and return him to discharge his duties. I repeat that the Opposition are not doing their duty if they do not thoroughly investigate abominations such as this brought before Parliament. Here we are 5,000,000 of people with $240,000,000 of debt, on which we are paying $10,000,000 interest annually, and yet the Government are proceeding quietly and secretly, and without authority of Parliament, and are setting men to work to quarry out a basin close to the Postmaster General's mill to improve his property and give him advantages which he otherwise would not enjoy, and then come to Parliament and ask its sanction for the work. I say that it is time that we should put an end to these things. I earnestly hope that the statement which has been made by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the use of Governor General's warrants will have some little effect upon hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that these Governor General's warrants have been very seriously abused, both last year and during years before. I have heard the matter brought before this House on several occasions, and it is time now that this abuse should be stopped once for all. I am surprised that gentlemen in the Government, who have earned for themselves a reputation of being honourable, would allow their names to be used in connection with a system of this kind, that is a discredit to them, and particularly so in the matter we are investigating to-night. I am sorry that we are called upon to-night to offer our criticism on this question, but if the Government discharged their duty as they should, and refused to expend this money before Parliament voted it, the possibilities are that the criticism offered to-night would not have been offered to the same extent. I say that the Government deserve condemnation on the two-fold ground: first, for undertaking this work at all, which is a monument to their folly; and, in the second place, for their having proceeded to complete a work without the sanction of Parliament, and thus adding such a large burden on the people of the country.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Cameron (Huron):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Allison,	Hyman,
Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	King,
Bain,	*Landerkin*,
Beausoleil,	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowers,	*Lister*,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown (Monck),	McGregor,
Cameron (Huron),	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	*Mignault*,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Monet,
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	*Paterson (Brant)*,
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Préfontaine,
Delisle,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	*Rowand*,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Savard,
Fraser,	Scriver,
Frémont,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Simard,
Geoffrion,	*Somerville*,
Gibson,	Spohn,
Gillmor,	Sutherland,
Godbout,	Trow,
Grieve,	Truax,
Guay,	Vaillancourt,
Hargraft,	*Watson*.—82.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	*LaRivière*,
Bergeron,	Léger,
Bergin,	Lippé,
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Burnham,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Carignan,	Macdowall,
Carpenter,	Mackintosh,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Chapleau,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cleveland,	McKay,
Coatsworth,	McLennan,
Cochrane,	McLeod,
Cockburn,	McNeill,
Corbould,	Madill,
Corby,	Mara,
Costigan,	Marshall,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Miller,
Daoust,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davin,	Moncrieff,
Denison,	Montague,
Desaulniers,	O'Brien,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Ouimet,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Pelletier,
Dickey,	Pope,
Dugas,	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Roome,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Sproule,
Gillies,	Stairs,
Girouard,	Stevenson,
Gordon,	Taylor,
Grandbois,	Temple,
Haggart,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hazen,	Tisdale,
Henderson,	Tupper,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	Weldon,
Jamieson,	White (Cardwell),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—100.

Mr. McMULLEN.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Walsh,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Lépine,	Mr. Forbes,
Sir D. Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Skinner,	Mr. Brodeur,
Mr. McAllister.	Mr. Barron.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) is entered as being paired with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). The hon. member for Russell has voted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) to last Saturday night at midnight, and I have his letter to that effect. If any other entry is made it must be a fraudulent entry.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will look on the——

Mr. SPEAKER. There cannot be any discussion upon this. I wish now to refer to a matter that occurred in the House this evening. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell), in the course of a speech that he delivered, accused certain members of this House with having been "filled with benzine and tangle-leg." I confess that I did not quite understand those terms myself, but I have been informed that they implied that these hon. gentlemen had over-indulged in intoxicating liquors, and had therefore been guilty of conduct that was disreputable in members of this House. I ruled then, that as this matter had occurred outside of the House, the allusion of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) was not unparliamentary. My ruling was not then called in question, but having some doubt about it myself I looked into the authorities more closely during the recess between six and eight o'clock, and I have come to the conclusion that statements of that kind made by hon. members of this House respecting the conduct of other members of the House, even although outside of the House, is unparliamentary. I must therefore ask the hon. gentleman, if I am correct in assuming that the expression "filled with benzine and tangle-leg" means that they were intoxicated, to withdraw the expression.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Speaker, what I said during the course of my remarks was: That I had heard that some hon. gentlemen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). However, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement *in toto*.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

On the motion of Mr. Foster that the House do resolve itself into Committee of Supply,

Mr. WELDON. Before the motion is adopted, I wish to take occasion to bring before the House a matter which I would have brought before the attention of the House and the Government at an

earlier date, were it not that it has been found to be extremely difficult for those of us who are engaged in the Committee on Privileges and Elections to avail ourselves of a suitable opportunity in the House. The matter to which I refer is the present position and the future of the Intercolonial Railway. Some weeks ago I took occasion to express my regret that the present position of that railway was so unfavourable, and from the appearances that are open to an observer of the workings of that road during the year 1890 there is reason to apprehend that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway is quite as great, if not greater, than during the year 1889, for which the record is published. I shall briefly refer to the matter, giving myself much less time than I should like to have, having regard to the great impatience of both sides of the House at this time of the session. I shall very briefly state what seem to me in some degree the causes of the present very unsatisfactory condition on that railway, and to suggest briefly what seems to me as well to be a remedy of some hope and of some promise. It is well known to every member of this House that the Intercolonial Railway was one of the terms of the union of the provinces. The Intercolonial Railway article of the British North America Act was one of the articles, and perhaps the one article, which most largely commended that scheme to the people of the lower provinces. At that time we had in New Brunswick a railway running from the city of St. John to the Northumberland Straits, and in Nova Scotia they had a railway running from Halifax by way of Truro up to the coal-pits in Pictou, and the contract the confederated provinces undertook was to supply a link between Moncton and Truro, and also a link from Moncton up to River du Loup; so that the railways of the lower provinces might have complete connection with the Grand Trunk Railway. Filling up these two links referred to meant the building of 500 miles of railway. To very many of us in New Brunswick it was a matter of profound regret that the Intercolonial railway came to be located as it was located—by what was then known as the northern route. It is written in the history of the Intercolonial Railway by the chief engineer of that road during its construction, Mr. Sandford Fleming, that the route chosen, chosen largely in deference to military considerations, largely in deference to English feeling, and largely in the hope of getting by an Imperial guarantee the money necessary to build the railway, was a very long and circuitous route, as is well known. It is estimated by Mr. Fleming that the cost of the railway by the route chosen exceeded what it would have cost had it been carried by the most desirable commercial route by $10,000,000; and he has estimated further that the annual cost of operating the railway by the present route, as compared with the cost of operating it by the shortest available route to connect the Atlantic seaboard with Montreal, is an annual charge much greater than the interest on $10,000,000. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that the Intercolonial Railway, having been located where it is, is run at an annual loss of something like a million dollars as compared with what would have been the cost of running it had the short and commercial route been chosen. But whatever the facts were twenty or twenty-five years ago, the recent facts are very discouraging indeed. Those two links which connected the Grand Trunk Railway running to River du Loup with the railways existing in the Maritime Provinces were filled in so far that an unbroken system was completed in 1876. In that year the road was operated at a loss of $28,000, in 1877 at a loss of $507,000, in 1878 at a loss of $432,000, in 1879 at the stupendous loss of $756,000, and in 1880 at a loss of $97,000. By the year 1881 the tide had turned, and the annual reports show a profit in that year of $542, in 1882 a profit of about $9,000, in 1883 a profit of $11,000, and in 1884 a profit of $9,000. Then the tide again unhappily ebbed, and we had in 1885 a deficit of $73,000, in 1886 a deficit of $106,000, in 1887 a deficit of $232,000, in 1888 a deficit of $363,000, in 1889 a deficit of $258,000, and in 1890, the last year of which we have the public records, a deficit of $553,000 on the Intercolonial Railway proper, a line something less than 900 miles long, and a second deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway and on the other branches of the Intercolonial Railway. The total deficits in those years were, in round numbers, three millions and a third. In the light of these facts I cannot apologize for taking up the time of Parliament at this late stage of the session—eager as both sides of the House are to go into the estimates—in making some comments on these facts; and I tell you frankly that in my judgment it is possible in part or in whole to remove these deficits by a radically new method of administering the railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. I hear cheers across the House, and I am glad that my hon. friends opposite are giving me a sympathetic hearing. Any one who has given attention to the systems of railways in Canada, not only the state railways, but the other systems, and who look at the comparative statements written by the railway experts, will admit that railroading in Canada is more unprofitable than in almost any other great country on the earth; and the Intercolonial Railway managers, in common with the managers of the other railways, thoroughly comprehend these difficulties. They are partly climatic; they are partly due to the fact that our territory is vast and our population scattered; and I frankly admit that the losses on the Intercolonial Railway are partly due to the fact of its management being political. I have read the deficits for fifteen years. Some of these occurred in the time when Mr. Mackenzie was Premier and Minister of Railways, and some of them occurred in the years when Sir John Macdonald was Premier of Canada, and when Sir Charles Tupper and the late Mr. Pope and the late Sir John Macdonald occupied the position of Ministers of Railways; and I think in all candour it will be admitted by both sides of the House that the two parties who have divided the Government of this country during the last twenty-three or twenty-four years have placed the railway in the very best possible hands. I think that our hon. friends opposite will admit that they had not a man of greater or more practical knowledge than Mr. Mackenzie; nor will the Conservatives claim that they had more powerful or more able men to manage the railways than Sir Charles Tupper or Mr. Pope—and I would like to say a word as to the very high esteem I have always had for the late Mr. Pope as one of the ablest men in public life in Canada during the last

thirty years ; I need not speak of Sir John Macdonald. We have tried to manage these roads by placing at their head a political Minister and adopting a political system of management ; we have always allowed the members of Parliament to have a hand more or less in the management of the railway ; and we know that the results have not been satisfactory. We are not the only people on the earth who have had state railways, or the only people who have had to complain of deficits. A great number of political communities, not only in Europe but in Australasia, have been trying the experiment which we have been trying, and they have had the same experience, namely, that the direct political management of railways, whether under one party or another, has been wasteful and inefficient. I have in my hand a report written by a commissioner whom the United States' Government sent to Europe five or six years ago to study the railway problem, and he reports that in countries having had arbitrary rulers, as in countries where there was popular government and a wide suffrage, state railways, with direct state management, were managed wastefully and extravagantly. Indeed, he gives a picture of the evils under which Italy groaned when the Italian railways were, as they are not now, owned by the state and controlled and managed by a member of the Cabinet, and the statement of abuses which he makes reminds me of the statements which I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite as to abuses in Canada. Here is a paragraph from Mr. Simon Sterne's report, which bears date 1887 :

" Italy suffers almost as much as the United States does from a pressure upon the local deputies to the Italian Parliament for positions in the public service——"

I would not say that this is a picture of the evils that exist in Canada, but it shows the state of things that existed in Italy.—

"—and the railway was used as a sort of general hospital to take care of the friends, relatives and the political hangers-on of deputies."

Italy, in part because of these difficulties, and for other reasons not pertinent to the discussion, was induced to deal with the railways in a different fashion, and to put them out of the control of the state. And for other reasons, not now necessary to discuss, a measure was introduced to take the Government railways out of the control of the state. The Australian colonies have had to deal with the very difficulties from which we suffer, and they felt them to be much more serious than the most pessimistic members of this House would declare ours to be. Abuses arose through the inefficiency of a management influenced largely by politics, and I will give the House briefly a statement of the evils existing in the colony of Victoria as they were depicted some nine years ago by a leading member of the lower House. I will not trouble this House with reading his statement in full, but will merely paraphrase it, so as to give the substance. He described how things were going on. He said there was waste and loss everywhere ; that members were overloaded with applications for positions ; that the bulk of the correspondence of some hon. members consisted of applications for employment on the railway service. Taking one day with another, during his attendance in Parliament at Victoria, this gentleman said that seventy-five per cent. of his letters related, in one way or another, to railway matters, with which he had neither the right nor the competency to deal. He complained also that there was political favouritism shown, and great waste, especially at election times, through the crowding up of the service with unnecessary employés ; that the promotions in the service were not according to ability, but depended largely on the political influence the applicant could bring to bear on the Government ; that discipline could with difficulty be maintained ; that if conductors were found to have been passing people freely, so long as they passed the right people, those supporting members on the Government side, they would not be punished, or disciplined or suspended, because political pressure would be brought to bear in their behalf. Conductors by the wholesale were well known, not only to pass people freely, but to steal, to put money in their own pockets, and it was impossible, in many cases, to get them expelled, because of political pressure ; and when found guilty of drunkenness, they could not be got rid of, for the same reason. If detectives were put on the line to spot them the cry of police espionage, which a free people would not tolerate, was raised, and the result was that discipline had largely broken down. Another complaint was made in Parliament, and not received very kindly, that, in the nature of things, a political Minister was not the most desirable man to make the head of a railway department, as he had not the necessary knowledge or the opportunity or the time to make himself acquainted properly with the nature of the duties he has to perform ; and therefore it was urged for years, in the press and Parliament of that colony, that these railways should be taken out of the hands of the Administration, that the waste should be saved, and the road be no longer lumbered by useless and superfluous employés, that members of Parliament should keep their hands off the railway management and that they should approach as nearly as possible in this matter the economy and the efficiency displayed by a private corporation in similar management. I would be sorry to say that that is a fair picture of things in Canada, because I live in a railway country, and know how matters stand. But I do say that we will plunge into these abuses if we go on managing our railway and leaving it in the hands of a Minister, I care not whether he be of the Liberal or the Conservative party.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How do the rates and charges on the Government railways compare with those on railways controlled by private parties?

Mr. WELDON. I will deal with the question of rates in a few minutes, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to follow my order of argument. Another point made in those discussions to which I am referring is, that railways, under political management, are not as vigorously managed as they should be. The Minister of Railways is a busy man, who has other things to attend to, and there is such a dividing up of power among the Minister and his chief engineer, and those immediately concerned in the management of the railway, that the business is often unduly delayed. No man will say that such a picture does not describe the state of things in Canada. There is here in Canada, in the management of our railways, too great division of powers. There are some powers with the Mi-

nister, others with the chief engineer, and others with Mr. Pottinger, the manager at Moncton; and the result is that no one of them has sufficiently large discretion to act promptly, and business is consequently lost. I have no hope that any change of management will remove the evil; I believe the Moncton management is as vigorous as possible, under existing conditions, but I do hope, and that is my reason for rising to-night, that it is possible to profit by the experience of communities situated somewhat similarly to ourselves, with a political system very much like our own, and put our railway in a different position, and try and wipe out or reduce this deficit of a half million dollars a year. In the year 1883 the colony of Victoria undertook to deal vigorously with this matter, and they introduced an Act, which appears on the statutes of that colony, as the 47th Victoria, No. 757. I will not describe that statute minutely, but in a general way. It established a railway commission consisting of three commissioners, who were strictly non-political men, and they were given, as that colony gives its public servants, very high salaries. Their position was guaranteed and secured from any undue influence by very excellent provisions, very much the same as those which protect the position of our Auditor General. They were made independent of Governments and members of Parliament: and it is indeed a tribute to the thoroughness with which our Australian friends thought their way through this question before they formulated their theories in an Act, that in the seven intervening years between then and now—and I have gone through the subsequent acts as carefully as I could—I have discovered no amendment, material or immaterial, to that railway statute. And reading, as fully as I have been able to do the *Hansards* from year to year, I have gone through all the Victoria parliamentary debates from 1883 down, following their railway discussions to see how the commission was accepted by Parliament and could only discover that it has a growing popularity. The project was fiercely attacked in Parliament. All sorts of objections were trumped up and all sorts of difficulties were pointed out. It was pointed out that it would be useless; that you could not take political influence from the management of the railways; that the members would still control the commissioners; that the Administration would continue to control the commissioners; but I leave it to any candid man who will go through these debates to say whether those predictions have not been completely falsified. The commission was not popular at first, but as the years went on, so far as one can judge from reading the debates, it has been growing in popularity. There is one striking instance of that. Six years after the Act was passed an item was put in the estimates by the Minister of Finance to increase the salary of the chief commissioner by the large sum of £1,000, his previous salary having been £3,000, and an item was also introduced to increase the salaries of the assistant commissioners. Naturally, that proposal was attacked; but the objection against it was mainly on this point: that many said it should have been brought in as an amendment to the Act and not as an item in Supply; but there was very little substantial opposition to the vote. It seemed to be agreed on both sides that the commission had been a great success. Abundant figures were reported to show that for the seven or eight years antecedent to the Victorian railways being put in commission, while there had been a rapid increase in the business done, there was a very slight increase in profit: but in the six years succeeding 1883, when the road was put in commission, the net profits increased enormously, and, in the absence of any alleged cause, and I have not been able to find any in the records, I think it must be concluded that the road was more vigorously and more economically managed. I have a mass of figures here, but I will content myself with a reference to the figures of one year. It is often said that figures cannot lie, but we know that nothing in this world can be made to lie like figures if they are used dishonestly or without competent knowledge. The railway was put in commission in 1883. The mileage of the Victorian system of railways is 2,200 miles, or nearly twice as much as the Intercolonial, and in 1889 the earnings amounted to $5,847,643 more than in 1883, while the net profits had increased in 1889 as compared with 1883 by $3,269,986. Unless there are some causes which we do not know for this remarkable increase in the net profits of the railway under the commission, we must draw the conclusion that it is due to greater economy and greater vigour. In New South Wales the railways were put in commission much later.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was there any increase in rates during that time in Victoria?

Mr. WELDON. No; on the contrary, there was a great decrease, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has asked me that question. There was a decrease in the freight on wheat, on wool, on mutton, on ores. All these were lowered, and they claim that they made a reduction in rates of £200,000 sterling, or $1,000,000, a year; so you would have to add another million to the net profits. That is the statement of the commissioners themselves. In regard to New South Wales, that colony put its railways in commission five years later, and the result of their experiment was even more striking. Quoting from the report of the last commission, we find that in seven years before the railways in New South Wales were put in commission, while there had been an increase in the gross earnings of nearly three million dollars the increase in the profits had been almost nothing, amounting to only $4,440. There had been an enormous increase in the earnings, but there had been practically no increase whatever in the net profits. But during the two years succeeding the appointment of the commission there has been an enormous growth in the earning power of the road, an increase in two years of $1,640,000. The striking fact is that, step by step with that enormous and unusually large increase in the gross earnings of that system of railways, there has been an increase in the net profits of nearly two-thirds of the increased earnings. If these figures are correct, if there is no undiscovered force to account for this result, I think that should be convincing to every hon. member of this House. A responsible public man who had come from New Zealand and had been connected with the railway system there stated that the result of putting the railway there in commission was a decrease of over 20 per cent. in the expenses within three years after the appointment of the commission. I ask the attention of the House to these facts, and I ask

the Government to give their attention to it, and I ask all hon. gentlemen who are interested in railway matters on both sides of the House to look at this matter in a spirit of fairness. I think it will be a misfortune if we cannot have for an hour or two a temperate and dignified discussion of the position of this railway on its merits. We are all familiar with this business of throwing party missiles across the House, with the result that we do very much to confuse the people and we do not do very much to influence the country. I have striven to say not a single word that would rouse the political feelings of any member of the House. I submit these brief facts without much note or comment to the House, and I hope the Administration will give this matter their patient consideration, and see whether it may not be worth while, in our interest, with a view to finding, if not a certain solution, a possible or a probable solution of this question of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, to send some railway experts down to those colonies where the system has been in some instances eight years at work, in others six, in others three, and find out by actual observation on the spot how far that experiment is likely to work successfully in Canada. I promised the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to answer a question for him. Will he repeat it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I asked a question with regard to the comparison between the charges on freight and passengers, between those Australian railways and the Intercolonial Railway and other railways in Canada.

Mr. WELDON. I will give the hon. gentleman my information on that point. My information is that the rates for local freight on the Intercolonial railway are reasonable; my information is that the rates on through freight are low as compared with other railways in Canada. But as compared with these foreign systems, their rates are enormous; we cannot compare them, as they are four or five times, even six or seven times, higher than ours.

Mr. OUIMET. It strikes me the hon. gentleman, in making his comparison between our own railways and the state railways in those colonies, would interest us very much by informing us if those state railways are subjected to the same competition that our state railway is here, and as regards other railways owned by private companies.

Mr. WELDON. There are no railways in those colonies owned by companies or corporations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That does not affect the comparison of the two systems.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say at this stage, as I come from a province intimately connected with the Intercolonial Railway, that the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) are very interesting, and the statistics he has presented are very striking. They indicate, certainly, that the subject which he has suggested to the House, and the proposal which I know he has entertained for some time past, are very well worth study. Although, perhaps, he did not call the attention of the House last session to the subject, I know he spoke to members of the Government on the question, and urged very much the same views that he has presented to-night, and the result of attention being called to that subject was that the late Minister of Railways and Canals took steps to make careful enquiries as to the working of the system of Government railway commissions in the Australian Colonies, making a fuller enquiry than could be made merely from the documents and blue-books which are accessible to us here in Canada. There can be no doubt whatever, I think, that considerable allowance must be made, in judging of the force of the illustrations which he has drawn from the Australian Colonies, for the widely different circumstances in the two countries: there can be no doubt whatever that the mere nomination of three gentlemen to control a railway, as compared with the appointment of a member of the Government, does not by any means account for the difference in the volume of trade, in the reduction of working expenses, and in the increase of the net earnings, which he has mentioned to the House to-night. The appointment of two or three commissioners certainly would not swell the volume of trade, nor induce a greater number of people to travel on the road, and if the appointment of commissioners made all the difference he has mentioned, by checking extravagance and fraud on the roads, then under the system which prevailed before the frauds and extravagance must have been enormous. Allowance must be made for the circumstance which is mentioned by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), that in those colonies the Government has a monopoly of all the roads in the country, and has absolutely no competition, even from water carriage, in comparison with what we have in Canada. If you take the line of the Intercolonial Railway, nearly through its whole extent there is a magnificent waterway lying in view of it, and when you come to Nova Scotia a waterway lying within 30 or 40 miles on either side of it, keeping down rates and establishing competing points at almost every station on the road. Now, one practical step to be taken before we can come to a conclusion that the management of the road would be improved by the appointment of a commission, would be to ascertain with some kind of precision where the cause of the present deficit lies. Does it lie in the reduction of rates? I deny that emphatically, from the little experience I have had. We have had that point discussed frequently in this House, and members from points in old Canada not connected with the Intercolonial Railway have been accustomed to believe that for the benefit of the people of the lower provinces charges for carriage have been made on through freight which are exceedingly low, and which are for the purpose of fostering certain industries in that country, and such as would not compare with the rates charged on other railways in other parts of Canada. I am convinced that that is another fallacy. We will take the rate on coal, which has been mentioned so frequently in this House. Some members, even from Nova Scotia, have stated to the House that the cause of the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is that we are carrying coal for the benefit of the coal miners of the lower provinces, and far below the cost of carriage. We have been told, and occasionally by an officer of the railways, that the charge on the through carriage of coal does not cover the actual cost; by others it is said that it simply covers the cost, and no more. I venture to say that on investigation it will be found that any railway company left to follow the interest of its business and its shareholders would carry that coal

under the same circumstances at a like rate. If you investigate you will find that no higher charge is made for freight under the like circumstances than is charged for the carriage of coal from Nova Scotia; and you will find that even lower rates are charged on through freight for articles like coal for the sake of the encouragement of business. For instance, if from Spring Hill coal is moved a long distance at $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent a ton per mile, and you ask any practical railway man in Canada for his opinion on that rate, if I am not entirely mistaken he will tell you that for the sake of building up the business of that coal mine, for the sake of building up in Spring Hill a population, not of a few dozen people, but of thousands of people, he would continue to carry coal at that low rate. Take the article of flour: the rate is very low upon that. In the lower provinces the people are told that the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway arises to a very great extent, not from the low rate on coal, but from the low rates on flour carried to the seaboard for the benefit of Ontario millers. Well, Sir, comparatively speaking, the rate is quite as low on flour as it is on coal, and the low rate on flour is quite as beneficial to the western parts of old Canada as the carriage of coal at a low rate is beneficial to certain districts of Nova Scotia. But you will find, I think, if you consult the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway managers, that we make the same rates as they would make on the same freight, and I saw a telegram to-day urging the Minister of Railways to reduce the flour rate lower still, on account of the low rate the Canadian Pacific Railway has made in carrying flour to St. John by the short line, showing that the present rate on the Intercolonial Railway is really higher than the Canadian Pacific Railway is charging in the interest of its line to St. John. On any consideration as to the management of the Intercolonial Railway, whether we shall improve it by cutting down working expenses, or by a change in classification, whether we shall improve it by increasing the rate of charges, we have certain cardinal principles to consider in the operation of that road which it is absolute folly to put out of sight for a single moment. We cannot possibly consider that railway as the railways in Australian colonies can be considered. We are not to consider it purely as a business institution, although I admit that it ought to be conducted on safe business principles; but we must remember that that road was built under a stipulation between the different provinces, that it was built as a condition of the union of the provinces, and that if that road had not been built the union of the provinces would have been absolutely impossible. It was not stipulated that it was to be conducted according to any particular principles, or at any particular rate for transacting its business, but it was clearly understood that it should be built as a means of practically uniting the provinces and enabling the provinces to do business together. If we were to place it under the management of a company, or place it in the hands of railway commissioners to manage it as a company would, I doubt that the result would be a considerable increase of rates, because the through rates are not higher in my opinion than would be charged by any company under like circumstances; but if it is attempted to produce the results that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) declares have been arrived at in Australia, the happy result of increasing the revenues of the country by high rates on the Intercolonial Railway, I, for one, would say that that was a proposition not capable of being taken into consideration for a single moment. I do not contend that any article should be carried on the Intercolonial Railway at less than cost, unless under the same circumstances as a company, well conducted, would do the same thing, and carry at less than cost, with a view to the indirect advantages arising from that trade. So far, I am perfectly satisfied, as a member coming from a province lying on the Intercolonial Railway, that we cannot secure a revenue or even save a deficit in connection with the Intercolonial Railway by simply raising rates, regardless of the interests of the provinces concerned. I do not require to illustrate this at any great length. Anyone who knows the history of the union of the provinces, anyone who knows the history of the Intercolonial Railway, will not forget the cardinal principles that enter into the management of that road, and must enter into it for all time to come. And so in relation to the railway in Prince Edward Island. It was part of the stipulations that that railway should be constructed. It was perfectly well understood by the people of the Island that the railway was to be managed by the Government. How would the appointment of a commission improve the business of the Island railway? Possibly it might reduce its working expenses by sharper and closer economy and management, but it certainly would not increase the volume of business which passes over it. Would it be expected that the people should be charged higher rates, and that a commission in charge of the Government railways would, by screwing up the rates, save a deficit, no matter what it might cost? Will the same principle be applied to the railway in Cape Breton which has only been a summer in operation, and the result of the business and trade of which has been far more encouraging than one had reason to expect. I need not refer at length to the reasons of its construction. It was constructed under a vote, which was practically unanimous in this House, and leading members on both sides generously expressed in regard to Cape Breton a recognition of their right under the circumstances of the past to have a railway constructed, and even at the Government expense. They even expressed regret that the obligation had not been undertaken sooner by the Government. Enough of that; I do not intend to enter into a justification of that work, although it has been challenged at a recent date. Eighty miles having been constructed; it is not to be expected that within a year or two it will pay working expenses, but it will eventually, I have no doubt, pay its working expenses, and even do better than that, besides furnishing a very important link connected with other parts of the Intercolonial Railway. The same thing occurred in connection with the acquisiton of the railway known as the Eastern Extension, 80 miles to the Strait of Canso, of which the Cape Breton Railway is a further extension. When the railway was acquired, its acquisition was defended on the ground that when the Government owned it and controlled it we should keep in hand what was recognized as a well-paying railway—the Pictou Branch—and that was the principal attraction for buying it recognized by the Government of the day. But the fact is, that those 80 miles of railway now, if I am not misinformed, are paying working expenses, are doing as well as

any other portion of the Intercolonial Railway, and in the near future will do a good deal better, besides the direct advantages which it gives to the country through which it passes. We have to consider all these circumstances, and when we say, if we do make up our minds, that the Intercolonial Railway and the other Government railways are not to be considered as political roads any longer—and I agree to that in the sense that politics should not enter into their management—they will never cease, if I can have any voice in preventing it, they must continue to be political in so far as to respect the principles laid down and understood when the compact was made which united the provinces and resulted in the railway being constructed. Short of that, I say as one member of the Administration to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon): let us see where the difficulty lies. Let us not be led away by any charm arising from a comparison of figures from foreign countries in which the circumstances are as widely different as things can possibly be. Let us ascertain where the difficulty lies. If it lies in the fact that the Intercolonial Railway carries a great amount of traffic over a long route, built under the circumstances which the hon. gentleman has detailed to the House, built partly under pressure from the Imperial Government in consideration of the guarantee which it gave, and partly out of local interests in New Brunswick—if it arises from that, then to that extent the difficulty is one that cannot be helped. If it arises from the fact that improvident rates of freight are charged, if freight is carried under cost, and without the advantages which a company management would keep in view, namely, the advantages in the way of other lines of business—raise the rates. I go so far as to admit that. If there is loss by undue working expenses, or expenses under the name of working expenses, by mismanagement, by duplicating offices or increasing the number of officers on duty, let us ascertain that, and I think surely that can be put down by the Government, without its being considered absolutely necessary that Parliament should actually give it up as an impossible thing to attempt to stop mismanagement of that kind. I shall cheerfully join my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) in ascertaining where the difficulty and the waste lie, and if it lie in that direction shall assist in putting it down and I think we can put it down as well without a commission as with it. As regards prompt action in making rates for special cases, he must remember that the Intercolonial Railway is peculiarly situated as to co-operation with other roads. In nine out of ten of the cases to which my hon. friend refers, and in which he says prompter action is necessary, are cases in which application is made to know the rates of freight which can be made from points lying away off the Intercolonial Railway to points on it. Under such circumstances, no rate can be fixed and no rate can be made by the Intercolonial Railway alone, because the Grand Trank Railway intervenes, or the Canadian Pacific Railway intervenes; and until the intervening railway, whichever it may be, make a special rate, the Intercolonial cannot do so. Sometimes when persons have made serious complaints to me of want of prompt action, and want of promptness in giving an immediate answer as to what rate of freight will be made from some point in Ontario to the seaboard, I have complained to the department of the want of promptitude, and I have found that the answer of the intervening railway was that they declined to make a special rate for that class of goods at that time of the year. That may be for reasons which it is not worth while going into now; it may be because the carriage in some other direction would be more advantageous, or because some other rate had been given to some other customer; and the Intercolonial Railway, of course, has to bear the blame of all this. I have only to say in addition, as in fact I think I have said before, that the subject which the hon. member (Mr. Weldon) has brought to our notice deserves very careful consideration, and that we are, in pursuance of the promise that I think was made before, at all events in pursuance of the resolution that was arrived at some time ago, now ascertaining the practical working of the commission system in the Australian colonies, and endeavouring to ascertain, as far as we can, what other forces, beyond the mere change of management, have produced the results which have been arrived at there. But we have something more to do. Before we adopt any remedy our first duty is to ascertain whether there is any abuse connected with the working of the Intercolonial Railway itself which can be cured, and whether the domestic cure is not quite as good and as effectual as the foreign one. We have to ascertain whether there is that duplication of officers which has been alleged; we have to ascertain whether there is a want of firmness in dealing with fraud when it is discovered, and we have to apply a suitable remedy if so. But I do not think it will be found, on the most careful and strict examination, that the cause of the deficit is by any means the lowness of the rates of freight, to which the deficit has been popularly attributed by members residing in other parts of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The subject that is brought under the attention of the House by the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is one of considerable interest, and it is of all the greater interest to every section of the Dominion, because the failure of the Intercolonial Railway to pay the running expenses has imposed a very considerable burden upon the public treasury. I do not know how far the Minister of Justice would be disposed to argue that because this road was a political undertaking, and its construction was a part of the terms and conditions of union, that therefore the cost for freight and for passengers should be fixed at a very low rate, and at a uniform rate in every part of the Maritime Provinces, in order to place all the people who reside in these provinces, in this respect, upon a footing of equality. The Intercolonial Railway forms a part of the terms of the Union, precisely in the same way that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway does, or the extension of railway communication to the North-West Territories. They were all embraced in the articles agreed upon by the Quebec Conference prior to the passage of the British North America Act. I do not understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway imposes uniform rates for freight and passengers in every portion of its line, and I have never heard that those who are paying higher rates than others that were more favourably circumstanced claimed that the terms or conditions of the Union were in that respect interfered with. I see no reason that would put the Intercolonial Railway in a different

condition from every mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have found a company to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway upon terms and conditions agreed upon between Parliament and the executive Government on one side, and the parties who became that corporation upon the other. I apprehend that the terms of Union would be strictly adhered to if the Intercolonial Railway were transferred to a private corporation, by any agreement between the Government and the persons who might be found disposed to form such a corporation. It is the fact that the railway has been constructed, and that it has been available for the people who were intended to use it, that constitutes the essential portion of the compact; and whether that road is worked by a commission, whether it is under the direct charge of the Government, or whether it passes into the hands of a private corporation, the terms and conditions of Union will have been equally complied with. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has pointed out, in the case of the railways in some of the Australian colonies, that they have been more profitably worked under a commission than they had been under the direct management of the Executive; and he also states that the charges upon passengers and upon freight is less, under the commission, than it was under the Government management. I think that Mr. Galt, in his book on railways, in which he advocates the ownership of railways by the Government of the country or by the public, points out that high railway rates do not mean large revenues, and he gives instances of several railway corporations in the United Kingdom that entered into active competition with each other and greatly reduced their charges for freight and passengers; and the result of that reduction was, during its continuance, a much larger revenue than under higher charges. I have no reason to doubt, looking at the monopoly that was enjoyed by the Government in the various Australian colonies, that the same result would follow a reduction there as elsewhere. If the prices are reduced, there are no doubt many persons who will travel upon railways who would otherwise remain at home. They would visit their friends, travel for pleasure, and travel for business, which they would undertake to manage in some other way than by personal superintendence if the rates were continued high. I do not know how far the improved condition of the Australian railways is due to the reduction of excessive charges, and how far due to superior management. There are no doubt great differences between the position of railways in Canada and the position of railways in the Australian colonies. There all the roads belong to the Government; they are public works and undertakings; they may charge what rates they please; and those charges, so far as I understand, are uniformly applied in the various sections of the country, whether they are thickly populated or sparsely populated, whether the particular portion of the road is profitable or not. You only ascertain the general results, not the particular results as to particular sections of the road. Mr. Galt, in his work on the Government ownership of railways, points out as one of the advantages that a country would enjoy from public ownership that the rates may be made uniform, and that persons living in sparsely settled districts are put on an equal footing with those living in districts more thickly populated; and that, no doubt, is true. He also points out that there are very few points where there is competition; that where there is not competition there is monopoly, and there the road may increase its charges; there are few competing points, and those points enjoy particular advantages. He also observes that as long as the private ownership of railways is permitted, when you confer upon railway corporations some of the powers of sovereignty you ought also to impose upon them some of the obligations of sovereignty; and Parliament ought to interfere and see that excessive charges are not made where there is no possibility of competition—that, in fact the rates ought to be regulated where competition will not regulate them. Now, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway the impression generally exists, and I think it is not altogether unfounded, that it has been largely run as a political institution; it has been run in the interest of a party; it has been officered by a party and managed by a party; and so the responsibility being to party, the leaders of which are under certain obligations to the officers who have earned by political service their positions and the distinctions which they occupy, it is not easy to exercise over them that supervision or that control that would be exercised by a private corporation or by a commission. Now, it seems to me that Parliament has scarcely discharged its duty in this particular instance. I think we do not so much need a commission as a committee. We ought to have had long ago a parliamentary enquiry into the management of the Intercolonial Railway. It is not paying expenses. Large deficits exist; charges are made upon the public treasury; burdens are imposed upon a population which already contribute to the maintenance of railways in their own portion of the country. These, indeed, may be private corporations, yet for the carriage of freight and for travelling they are contributors to the maintenance of these private corporations. For the same purpose, without living along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, they are contributors to that public corporation, and it is an important question to consider whether, on account of these roads being public property, you are conferring upon those who are using them advantages over those who are using private railways in their own localities. I think that is a fair subject for parliamentary enquiry. It is a fair subject to ascertain whether the burdens imposed upon these people in the way of freights and charges are less than are imposed on those who are obliged to use private railways, and whether the competition of private railways is such as to make it possible to bring the freights and charges in these districts up to an equality with those that exist elsewhere. In my opinion, that is an enquiry that ought to be made by this House. I think the actual condition of the road, the efficiency of its management, the charges that are made for freights and passengers upon it, as compared with the charges made in other sections of the country similarly situated, ought to be known to this House. After all, when we look at what has been done we see that the road, in the first place, was located in a section of the country in which we were told it was necessary to locate it, so that it would be as far as possible from the American boundary. It was located on a long and circuitous route; it was not a route that a private corporation would have chosen on commercial grounds for the promotion of trade and commerce; and we have had contributions made

by this Parliament for the construction of a road in a foreign country for the purpose of entering into competition with this road, which has been contructed out of public money, and which is owned and managed by the Government of the country. I could never understand myself why money should be taken from the treasury of Canada to construct a railway through the State of Maine. That has been done, and that road is a rival to the Intercolonial Railway. While the Intercolonial Railway was not paying expenses, a road which the hon. Minister of Justice says we are under obligations to maintain and to keep in operation in fulfilment of the terms of Union, we made large contributions to the construction of another railway that was to draw away trade and commerce from it, and the construction of which did not add to the value of property or confer special advantages on the citizens of this country, but added to the value of property and conferred special advantages on the people living in a foreign state. That has been a part of the policy of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. They have constructed a railway, the Short Line, which has diminished the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, and has increased the loss sustained by the public treasury of this country. It seems to me, Sir, that while it may be proper, in order to get rid of the political influences which interfere with the efficient management of this road, ultimately to appoint a commission, or to put it in charge of some one outside of the Government and independent of its meddlesome oversight, it is first necessary that Parliament should institute an enquiry to ascertain what the management actually is, what opportunities the road may have of adding to its revenue under a more efficient management, and what are the opportunities furnished by the country through which it runs to increase its traffic, and to add to its usefulness as a public undertaking. I am sorry to find that the first thing required to secure a reform in the management of this work is an enquiry by a committee of this House. That enquiry should be full and exhaustive, and the reason why the management of the road has cost so much should be clearly ascertained, and that cannot be ascertained until such an enquiry is had. It will be then possible, with all the facts before us, when we know the actual condition of things, we can determine whether it is wise that this road should continue under the control of a Minister, or whether it might not be better managed by being handed over to a commission which will be free from those political influences that have so long seriously affected the management and the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAZEN. I would like, as this is the first opportunity I have had of doing so, to enter my protest against the idea advocated in some sections of the country, and put forth by a gentleman holding a prominent position in the public life of this country, that unless the Intercolonial Railway can be made to meet the expenses of running it should be closed up. It has been pointed out during this debate that the Intercolonial Railway is part of the compact under which the four original provinces of the Dominion formed Confederation, and I may say that the closing of that road would, under the circumstances, be regarded by the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and I may also say by a large portion of the people of Quebec as well, irrespective of party or politics, as a violation of that compact. I may also say, with regard to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, as to its being perfectly right and proper, under the terms of Confederation, that the road should be given to the management of a private corporation, that I, for one, and I believe my views will be shared to a great extent by all the people of the province I have the honour to represent, would solemnly protest against the Intercolonial Railway passing from the control of the Government and being placed in the hands of a private corporation, because under the management of that road by the Government the people would feel that their rights would be better secured and protected than they would be, perhaps, if placed in the hands of a private corporation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Such as the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAZEN. The Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway; and it is my impression that the views I put before the House will be shared by all the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, whether Liberals or Conservatives. I think the House is indebted to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) for bringing this matter before us. It is a question which may be fairly discussed; and it is of the utmost importance, if such a thing is possible, that some scheme should be devised and adopted for the management of the Intercolonial Railway, which would enable that road to be conducted in a manner that would prevent this yearly drain on the general revenues of the country. The road during the past sixteen years, I find, has been run at a gross deficit of $3,834,956.67.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Far more than that.

Mr. HAZEN. I think my figures are perfectly right. If the hon. gentleman, of course, takes into account the interest on what that road originally cost, then the deficit is very much greater; but I am simply giving the figures of what the gross deficit has been on the running of the road during the past sixteen years. I can make my position good by the figures I will give the hon. gentleman, and the accuracy of which will defy contradiction. The results were as follows:—

Year.	Deficit.	Surplus.
	$	$
1874-75	281,563 99	
1875-76	243,912 87	
1876-77	507,228 20	
1877-78	432,327 78	
1878-79	716,083 53	
1879-80	97,131 23	
1880-81		542 15
1881-82		9,605 18
1882-83		10,547 83
1883-84		9,068 17
1884-85	73,324 26	
1885-86	106,042 84	
1886-87	232,105 75	
1887-88	363,043 16	
1888-89	258,564 34	
1889-90	553,392 05	
Total	3,864,720 00	29,763 33
Less, surplus	29,763 33	
	3,834,956 67	

Adding up these figures of deficits and deducting from the total the sum of $29,763.33, which is the amount of surpluses during the four years I have named, the hon. gentleman will find that the gross deficit was $3,834,956.67——

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman give the difference in mileage?

Mr. HAZEN. I will deal with that shortly. I find that in the five years during which hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, from 1874 to 1878, the deficit was $2,181,116.37, and that the deficit during the eleven years when the Conservatives had the management of the road amounted to $1,653,840.30, or an average yearly deficit under Liberal management of $436,223.27 and under Conservative management of $150,349.11. So that the average deficit when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power was $285,874.16 more than it has been under the present Administration. I do not quote these figures for the purpose of making any invidious comparisons, as there might possibly have been special reasons why, during the four years from 1874 to 1878, the difference between expenditure and revenue was larger than during the past eleven years. That may have been the case; but at any rate, during the five years the Liberal party were in power the road did not give the results it has given since. In 1874 the mileage of the road was 339; in 1875-76 it was 462; in 1876-77 it was 714. In 1879-80 that increased to 829 miles, and now in 1889-90 the mileage is 890. There may be some reasons which I am not aware of why, before that system was completed and while a smaller number of miles were operated than are operated to-day, the profits might be smaller. But, without any partizan motives, I lay these figures before the House, and I say that, under both Governments, there has been a deficit in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. That being the case, I think both sides of the House should consider whether some scheme could not be adopted, whether some change in management could not be effected, by which these deficits which crop up year after year might be reduced. So far as that part of the road is concerned which lies in the Province of New Brunswick, between St. John and Amherst, and between St. John and the Nova Scotia boundary, and also in regard to that part of the road in Nova Scotia, almost everyone will acknowledge that it must be run at a profit. There is no road that I know of in Canada where there is more freight carried and more passenger travel than there is on the road from St. John to Halifax. I believe that the loss is in a large measure on the division of the road between Campbellton and Rimouski, where the country is not very thickly settled, where there is not much local freight, and where in the winter season there is a great deal of snow and heavy storms, and great expense is incurred in keeping the road clear. The people of the Maritime Provinces do not wish to be charged with the fact that this road is entailing an annual loss upon the people of the Dominion. I do not believe this loss is due to the operation of the road in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I believe it is largely outside of those provinces that the road is run at a loss. In the recent election campaign in St. John this was one of the subjects discussed, and one in which a very deep interest was felt, as it is in all parts of our province through which the Intercolonial Railway runs, and I stated on the public platform there during the campaign that I would bring the question of the management of the road before Parliament when elected. While I trust that the Government will carefully consider the views expressed this evening by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) as to the advisability of placing this road in the charge of an independent commission, the members of which should be as independent of the Government of the day as the judges are, and having authority to appoint a qualified manager to conduct the railway. I may say that it is the opinion in the province from which I come that the road would be better managed, and would be managed in every respect more satisfactorily to the people, if the management were not so far removed from the road itself. My contention is that it is almost impossible to satisfactorily manage a road when the management is so far removed as the City of Ottawa is from the centre of the Intercolonial Railway system. It would be much better in the interests of the country, in the interests of the road, and in the interests of those who use the road, if the management were placed in the hands of an efficient manager in Moncton, which I think is about the most central place, than to have a general superintendent there—against whose ability I have nothing to say—whose authority comes from Ottawa. The responsibility for the management of the road is now very much divided. We have the general superintendent at Moncton, and then we have the general manager of Government railways at Ottawa, and over him we have the Minister of Railways. It is well known that, where merchants desire to get special rates or special terms on a railway it is a matter of great importance that they should be able to act quickly, and that a quick decision should be given. At present, if a merchant in St. John wants to get a rate over the Intercolonial Railway, if he is in doubt whether he will take his goods by the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, he writes to Mr. Pottinger at Moncton, and if Mr. Pottinger cannot arrange it, then he has to write to Ottawa; and thus there is a delay which would not occur if some one—either Mr. Pottinger or some one else—had more control over the railway system at Moncton. As to the rates on the Intercolonial Railway, I do not believe that the loss is due to the carrying of goods from the Maritime Provinces at a less price than they should be carried, but I know of cases where goods are brought from Toronto to Halifax and other ports in Nova Scotia, five times the distance from St. John, at a less average rate than is charged from St. John to those same places. I have papers here which will bear out what I state. I know that in certain lines of hardware the same goods are carried from Toronto to Halifax, and other places in Nova Scotia at a less rate than they are carried from St. John to the same points. I believe that, if the management were more centralized, say in Moncton, and if the superintendent was a thorough railway man—and I do not say that the present superintendent is not—and if he had more power than the superintendent now possesses, he would be able to popularize that road and could give fair rates and would obtain a larger revenue than is now obtained. There are other matters concerning the internal management of the road to which it may be better that I should refer when the Estimates are under discussion, but

I hope the Government will give due consideration to the views expressed by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) to-night, and will consider the advisability of giving more power, as to management, to the superintendent of the road in the City of Moncton, than they now do; because, no matter how desirous a manager may be to please the people, it is impossible for him to do so effectively when he is so far removed from the centre of the road as the manager is now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the importance of this subject was a sufficient justification for the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) to introduce it to the attention of the House this evening, and I listened with great attention to his speech. The references made by him to railway management in Australia were, no doubt, interesting in themselves; but I agree with the criticism which has been passed upon them, that they are hardly applicable to the circumstances which exist in Canada, because in Australia they have no competing lines such as we have here, and, therefore, the arguments arising from increased receipts, which would be almost conclusive in support of the appointment of a commission in Australia, would not have the same force in this Dominion. It is evident that the Intercolonial Railway is handicapped in two ways. There was a radical and grave mistake made when this road was built. I agree with the junior member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), who has just taken his seat, that as far as the Intercolonial Railway which runs through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is concerned, it pays well, and I believe that the loss takes place on that portion of the road which runs north from Campbellton to Rivière du Loup. The mistake was made when the road was constructed. Business considerations were put on one side, and the road was constructed from military considerations. We danced to a military tune and now have got to pay the piper. That road has been built some hundreds of miles longer than it should have been built, and there is no man to-day in Canada who will not admit that a grave mistake, a mistake which cannot be remedied, has been made by the gentlemen who constructed that road where it has been placed. Sir, that road should have been run down through the valley of the St. John, and if that road 20 years ago had been run down the valley of the St. John it would have cost many millions less money than it has cost, and the advantages which would have accrued to that great City of St. John, N.B., and to all the cities of the Maritime Provinces, would have been incalculable. I never could conceive how the Parliament of that day, or those who controlled it, could come to the conclusion that it could be in any sense in the interest of this country that that road should be built in a location which lengthened it some hundreds of miles, and where for all time to come the cost of carriage must be, and must continue to be, more than it ought. The result has been what my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Mills) has said, that as commerce developed a second road had to be built, not by a private corporation, but subsidized by this very Government. We had to build a commercial line running down to St. John through the Maritime Provinces, competing with the military line which we built so many years ago, which we have had on our hands ever since, and will have on our hands for all time to come. That was a mistake which could not be remedied; it was a cardinal mistake in the first instance, the fruits of which the present generation and future generations will have to bear. Now, Sir, how else is the road handicapped? The road is handicapped from the fact that it is a political road, there is no doubt about that, and that, I think, was the weakest point in the speech of my hon. friend. If he had shown wherein he thought that savings could be made then I think he would have been justified in asking for the appointment of a parliamentary committee. Is the road over-officered? Are the rates higher than they ought to be? Or can he point out any other direction in which beneficial changes in the interest of the public could be made? I agree with him almost eye to eye in recognizing the evils of the present system, and I think the way will be paved for the remedy if the hon. member asks for the appointment of a parliamentary committee, whose duty it would be to make a thorough investigation into the circumstances connected with this road, the number of officers, the pay of officers, the rates charged, and everything else connected with its paying capacity, and report on those facts to the House. But we must remember, as I said before, that that road is handicapped as being a political road. Every member in the Maritime Provinces knows it is run on political considerations and not on commercial principles. The hon. gentleman said that he would make a non-political speech, and I have no exception to take to that particularly, but he has drawn a comparison between the deficits on this road existing under the régime of Mr. Mackenzie and those under the present Government, and he gave figures to establish what the loss was each year. But the hon. gentleman should have remembered that Mr. Mackenzie, when he was in power, professed to run, and did run that road, I believe, on a purely commercial basis, and when the present Government came into power they over-rode that controlling idea, and ran the road on other than commercial principles.

Mr. HAZEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that it does not pay to run the road on commercial principles?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say whether it paid or not. I will lay down this proposition, that the road should be run on commercial principles, and I think Mr. Mackenzie did run it on commercial principles; and I say that Mr. Mackenzie closed the capital account of the road at $36,000,000. If I am correct, and the deficit was charged to expenses, we know at once what the real loss on the running of the road was every year. But when a new Government came into power, in 1878, a change was made in the manner in which the accounts were kept; the capital account was re-opened, and it has run up from $36,000,000 to between $46,000,000 and $50,000,000. All that, of course, was not taken out of current expenses, because a large portion of that increase was for building new roads. But year by year very large amounts, which had been charged to the current expenses of the road, were charged to capital account, and even the statement which the hon. gentleman has read does not show what the actual loss has been, because a portion of the ten million dollars increase in capital account since

1878 ought to be charged to the current expenses of the road as well as any deficits. Now, a question comes up whether this road is being run on commercial principles to-day; I do not think it is. From what information I can gather, it is run as a political institution—I do not say it is run altogether on that principle from Ottawa. I do not entirely agree with what the hon. gentleman has said about divorcing the control of the road entirely from Ottawa. There are many reasons, in my opinion, why a continuance of Ottawa control is useful. Local influences are sometimes too strong for the local management, and the general interests of the public are apt to be sacrificed to the particular interests of individuals. I myself believed that a controlling interest from Ottawa is to some extent very good. But take the local management, from Mr. Pottinger, the manager, down, and with a few rare and creditable exceptions it is a political institution, run for political purposes. You have a political army used for political purposes and they are paid political salaries. I believe these evils can be remedied to some extent by the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman; I believe they can be obviated even without putting this road in commission. At any rate, I think we need more information, and that information should be got by a parliamentary committee. It is a little late in the day to have one appointed this year, but I think that in the near future the hon. gentleman would be conferring a benefit upon the people he represents, and upon others, if he would have this parliamentary committee appointed. Now, the Minister of Justice says that it is desirable that this road should not be run entirely upon commercial principles, that other considerations should intervene and control the management. But I say that should be the cardinal principle. I remember taking up the report of the chief engineer in charge of the road, and when he came to account for the loss in running that road he attributed it, to a large extent, to the fact that he carried such articles as coal at a rate below a paying price. What are you doing? You are not carrying that coal on commercial principles. When you come to fix the rates of freight and to determine a commercial rate you must remember that you have got rivals, and the rate must be determined largely by the rate at which your rival will carry it. You have not only a rival in the Canadian Pacific Railway, but you have got a rival route to Boston, and then by water to the Maritime Provinces, and in fixing the rate upon the Intercolonial Railway you have got to be guided by the fact that you have two rival routes to contend with, and you must fix your rates at as low a price as is charged by the other routes. But that being conceded, then you ought to fix the rates upon commercial principles, and fix them just as low as they ought to be. But you do not do that; you carry coal at a loss. An enormous amount of money was expended a few years ago in the building of special freight cars for the carriage of that coal, and I think I am within bounds when I say that two million dollars—I may be wrong; I speak without reference to the book—but a very large sum of money was charged for the construction of these coal cars, and every dollar of that was carried to capital account. That was not running the road on commercial principles; that was running the road in order to develop a particular industry at the expense of the general public. I maintain, and have always maintained, that if you carry a special article in which a special class of the community are interested at a lower price than ought to prevail, you are doing it to the detriment and to the disadvantage of the general tax-payer. I say the farmer whose produce has to be hauled along that line, and the fisherman whose produce has to be carried upon it, have just as much right to have their produce carried at non-paying prices as the man who invests his money in a coal mine, and expects this Government railway to carry it at non-paying prices. There is no use in disguising these facts. That road is over-officered for political considerations, it is run on political considerations, and it is for political considerations that coal is carried at non-paying prices. And that, to some extent, is one cause of the loss. This question cannot be disposed of in a short debate. I admit that the location of the road is fixed, and that it cannot be altered. But the other point on which I think it is handicapped, the political character of the management of the road, can be altered, either by the mode suggested by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), or in some other way, by the Government taking the matter in hand and eradicating the political element, which I do not very much hope for myself. It is said by some hon. gentlemen that this road might be transferred to a private corporation. I do not think that would be justice. I would be opposed to it entirely, and I would be opposed to it for a reason that I think has not been mentioned to-night. My opinion has been for years that Canada is in great danger of being controlled too much by private corporations, and the institution of another corporation in the east with an army of 12,000 or 13,000 men, equivalent to the army of the great corporation in the west, would be a very great danger to the future of Canada. The road can be run properly, and efficiently, and economically in the hands of an economical Government, and if it is found that it cannot be run in the hands of the Government, it certainly can be run in the hands of a commission. The matter has reached that stage when hon. gentlemen will feel justified, in fact, will feel impelled to move for a parliamentary committee to ascertain if the statements made in regard to the political influences which dominate the management of the road are true, and as to what saving in the expenditure can be made, as to the freight charges and other information, and the House will then be in a better position to come to a conclusion as to what should be done with this great national road.

Mr. TUPPER. I think we have enjoyed the very interesting discussion this evening on this very important question, and I am glad the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) agrees with the majority of hon. members who have expressed an opinion in regard to the retention of the control of the railway in the hands of the Government. The hon. gentleman made an allusion to the early history of the road when he spoke of it as a military route, and I thought it might appear a little ungenerous on the part of Canada to complain much in regard to that, or to adopt the language used by the hon. gentleman. "It dances to a military tune and adds a military road to the dance." If we had not adopted that route we would have had neither

road nor dance, for the hon. gentleman will recollect that it was for a good consideration the route was adopted which the Imperial Government desired.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear." He doubts the accuracy of my argument or the strength of that point. But he will remember that at that time Canada considered it necessary to obtain an Imperial Government guarantee in order to raise the money for the construction of the road, and there was correspondence extending for years, if I mistake not, previous to Confederation, certainly on the part of the late Hon. Joseph Howe, as a member of the Government of Nova Scotia and Colonial Secretary, in order to obtain the aid afterwards given at the hands of the Imperial Government. There was no evidence of the slightest ability on the part of the different provinces to construct the road, and it was not contended that the road be constructed as an Intercolonial road without that assistance. I refer to that part of the history for another purpose. We have larger ideas now as to what a road should do, as to what business it should produce, than the people or statesmen who managed those matters 20 or 30 years ago entertained. I think it is justifiable, in view of the remarks made to-night respecting the deficit, to look back and see what was expected when this road was undertaken by a population much smaller than ours, by scattered provinces with means not half so large, and with credit not nearly so high as that of Canada to-day. It is pleasing to look back and see exactly how they estimated the work, and compare that estimate with the result stated to-night, and see whether after all we have not done better than was expected. For instance, in the correspondence to which I alluded between Mr. Howe and the Colonial Secretary at that time in England, both of those statesmen took this view of the Intercolonial Railway, or a railway connecting the different provinces, that it was so necessary to the welfare of those provinces and to the people of North America, that it was wholly immaterial whether it would pay or not, and the Colonial Secretary in a very able despatch pointed out that it could not be expected that the road would ever pay, and perhaps it was not desirable that it should be managed for revenue purposes, and both statesmen dwelt on the tremendous and unlimited advantages accruing from the operation of a railway by the Government for the people and in the interests of the people of the different provinces. If there is loss or deficit, where does it go, except practically back to the people, and is not taken out of trade. The trade east and west is bonussed or aided to that extent, and there is no such loss—although I am not giving my view on the amount—as is represented by the large figures quoted when reference is made to the annual deficits on the Intercolonial Railway, if the deficits are not due to corruption or mismanagement of the character referred to, but are on account of the low rates that are charged upon the freight over the railway. No one has attempted to establish that the carrying over the Government road of goods without charging paying rates is a loss to the country. Hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that at present there is a very interesting discussion being carried on in the English reviews involving a proposition of State ownership of English railways, and the argument is based on the ground of the benefit it will be on account of the enormous sums which are at present taken out of the trade and business of England being left in the hands of those industries, which would be a great benefit to that country. At all events, that is a matter worthy of consideration. We find that the United States are about to appropriate enormous sums to subsidize steamships. We have appropriated half a million dollars in order to subsidize an Atlantic line of steamers to carry passengers and freight from this country to Great Britain. The subsidies proposed in the United States are enormous. All these are based on the same principle as the construction of this road, the creation of a great traffic which will benefit the whole country, even though we may pay in the shape of a deficit. No doubt, it is important in the interest of the country to keep down the deficits. But in considering this question I submit that the question of the canals must come up with the question of railways. The hon. gentlemen have forgotten that we lose about $100,000 a year in the operation of the canal system. If it is a wise thing to run a railway controlled and owned by the Government on commercial principles and charge paying rates, the question of the canal system must be taken up and considered side by side. It would not be tolerated, I do not think it would be contended, that we should adopt one system for the Government railways and another for the canals. The object of both seems to be the same—to benefit the commerce of the country and develop interprovincial trade; and if the Government are unable to manage the Government railways because there is an annual deficit, the same argument will lie, and the Government must be called upon to abrogate their functions respecting the canal system and hand them over to a corporation or a commission. I think that the question will have to be approached in that way. Now, then, we have the opinion of Mr. Potter, who was a great authority in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway system of this country, and we have the opinion of Mr. Brydges, and the opinions of these gentlemen enabled the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when Minister of Finance, to take the country into his confidence and to tell them that instead of the comparatively satisfactory result which has been mentioned to-night in connection with the operation of the road which the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has pointed out, that the country was to be prepared for a loss of half a million a year on the Intercolonial Railway. In 1875 or 1876, I forget which, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as Minister of Finance, advised Parliament and advised Canada that they were to expect a loss of half a million a year on the Intercolonial Railway. No matter how this question may be dealt with, or no matter what the country may deem wise as to the steps to be taken, they have reason to congratulate themselves that the statement then made as to the annual loss was above the mark rather than below it. Mr. Brydges and Mr. Potter, one a commissioner in connection with the road, and the other connected with the Grand Trunk Railway system, both gave it as their opinion that the road could not be run at a loss less than half a million dollars

per annum. Well, the road has been managed, and it has been extended very greatly indeed, and yet its annual loss since the operation began has not been equal to that. The hon. gentleman will remember that irrespective of the point the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) raised about the construction of the British North America Act, and the right of this Parliament now to change the condition of affairs as they were at the union —the House will recollect, that regardless of the letter of the law, or the construction of that Act, that this was the very consideration between the different provinces: that the road should not merely be built, but that it should be built by the Government and run by the Government. I can recollect having read with great interest an able speech by Mr. Brown during the Confederation debate in the old Parliament of Canada, in which he said: So necessary was it for Canada to have that road—not so necessary for the Maritime Provinces by any means—but so necessary was it for all the provinces to have the Intercolonial Railway constructed that the running of it at a loss was a mere bagatelle, and that whether it paid or did not pay the interest, that we could not have Confederation without it, and that he, for his part, was ready to pay the price of five Intercolonial Railways in order to consummate the union of the provinces of British North America. Taking into consideration all these facts in connection with the history of this great work, I say that while we may very wisely and properly set about devising some system of management for improving the running of that road, if it can be improved, and for assisting these merchants and traders of our country who wish to send their business over the road, yet we have no reason to regret from one point of view the present condition of affairs. Bad as anyone may picture the condition of the road, and much as they may regret that the receipts do not show up better than they do, yet they have every reason to congratulate themselves that they are not as bad as all the provinces understood they might be when they undertook this responsibility. So in connection with the canal system, as I have already said. The arguments are familiar to hon. gentlemen, and they apply to a Government railway and to a railway of that character binding the Maritime Provinces with the rest of the Dominion. The canals do incalculable benefit to the commerce of the country, and the tolls and the rates are certainly considered a secondary matter in the canal system. It does seem to me as going to a great length to endeavour to discuss the Intercolonial Railway on any other principle. Hon. gentlemen sometimes run away with the impression that this road is for the Maritime Provinces alone. It has been pointed out to-night that the chief loss occurs on the through business, and on account of the through rates; and if the figures of the traffic were stated I think it would be found that the bulk of that through traffic is from the west to the Maritime Provinces, instead of from the Maritime Provinces west. I hope these tables will be turned some day, and that the Maritime Provinces will send up as much, if not more, than they now receive from the western provinces. This, therefore, is not a question in which the lower provinces are alone interested. It is a question thoroughly national in its inception and in its working out. Some hon. gentlemen have alluded incidentally to the construction of the Short Line Railway, and whatever may be said about that, I do not think that a political aspect can be given to it in this connection, because the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who rather quarrelled about the construction of that road, will remember that a very large proportion of his own colleagues of the Liberal party in this House supported the Government in the steps they took to construct that road. I am one of those who are of the opinion that the construction of that road is not going to injure this country, no matter what the temporary effect is on the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that that road is of great benefit to Canada, and that it will become a greater benefit every year. It is the carrying out of the original undertaking to give us a direct connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway system between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made a passing allusion to coal; but the Minister of Justice pointed out a principle in connection with that well known to railway men. He could have gone further; and I put it to these hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the business of different railway corporations, that they know themselves that the railway companies of this country will carry business for almost nothing, and sometimes actually for nothing, and that they will expend money for the purpose of drawing traffic to their road. Take the matter of construction of hotels along the railway system, which is often an expenditure out of pocket by the railway company in order to obtain passenger traffic over its line. The companies will take an interest in different private matters that a Government railway is debarred from entering into on account of the political difficulties that surround all these transactions, and they will resort to all kinds of schemes in order to bring traffic to the road. The original outlay is brought back to them a hundred fold. But before the rate on coal can be quarrelled with the argument that has been advanced in support of it to-night by the Minister of Justice should be met, and that is, that it applies practically now on the Intercolonial Railway to the Spring Hill mines only. The Pictou mines do not send any coal over the line at the rate of three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. The coal they ship pays a very remunerative rate to the Intercolonial Railway; they ship to Halifax and to St. John and to tide water, and that coal pays, and pays well; but if the rate to the west on the Spring Hill mines coal were increased it would simply either close down the mine or cause such a small output that the flourishing town of Spring Hill—which has grown up, and is absolutely dependent on these mines, and now furnishes the chief customers of the Intercolonial Railway for many miles of the road—would be wiped out, and the loss to the road would be enormous in that respect. These mines bring in a very great amount of freight and machinery for construction purposes, and so on, and they pay a very heavy rate on these articles. The people they employ and the business interests connected with them all through the provinces bring goods over that system; and I do not hesitate to say that railway men everywhere will tell you that if a private company owned the Intercolonial Railway they would make the rate whatever was necessary in order to haul that coal and keep the railway at work, simply for the great benefit that would result from it. But the rate is

not an extraordinary one. I could mention railway after railway in the United States which carries coal at less than three-tenths of a cent a mile. Some of those companies I admit own the mine as well as the railway, and they keep the rate very low; but there are others near Baltimore which carry coal at a less rate per ton per mile, though not connected with the mines producing the coal which they carry. But, at any rate, it is not an extraordinary rate for coal. But I am also informed that on our Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk systems special rates are made, not only with reference to coal, but with reference to other goods, where it is necessary to build up a traffic with which ours could very reasonably compare. But the result of increasing that rate was well explained in this House by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) a year or so ago, when it was proposed to increase it, and it was shown that any increase would simply stop altogether that traffic from Cumberland County to Lévis, and decrease business and traffic over the Intercolonial Railway system very appreciably. These are the remarks which, at the moment, struck me. I appreciate the importance of the question, but I rose particularly to add my voice to what has already been said, to the effect that the feeling in the Maritime Provinces is most unanimous in favour of this road being run as a Government road, as it was run from the first. While they are willing and eager that any useful reform should be adopted, and the system made as perfect as possible, they wish the responsibility to lie where it properly belongs, at the doors of the Government in power at the time: and I think it would be unwise and against the interests, not only of the people of that part of Canada, but of the people at large, to consider the proposition that has been advanced, either of transferring the road to the management of a private corporation, or handing over the responsibility to other individuals than those who constitute the Government of the day. I would hail with a great deal of pleasure any enquiry into the management of the road, and I was surprised that the hon. member for Queen's made the allusion he did, in reference to the employés on the Intercolonial Railway being there for political purpose only.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say that the men were there for political purpose only, because we all know that they are there at any rate to do the work of running the road. But I say that political considerations are paramount in the management of the road.

Mr. TUPPER. They no doubt enter into the selection of those men; but it is well known, and is to the credit of the country in which that railway is situated, that there is not a superior class on any road in Canada, or in the United States, to the men who constitute the workers on the Intercolonial Railway system. It is remarked by the people who travel over that railway every year that a better set of conductors or train hands cannot be found on any system; and the hon. gentleman himself, I am sure, would, on reflection, do the men that justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, yes.

Mr. TUPPER. So that the men under this Government, as under the previous Government, though appointed on political considerations, are not appointed on political considerations only. I know that a most careful examination is not only made of the applicants for office, but I know that it is impossible to retain in the service of the road—I am speaking of train hands; I do not know how far up the rule goes—any man who is unfit for his work. The rules are very severe, and in the case of certain offences, some of them very heinous, it is impossible to secure the reinstatement of any man proved guilty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The rules sometimes are yielding.

Mr. TUPPER. I am speaking of the rules being most unyielding. I know of no exception to the rules to which I am referring; and it may be on account of that rigid discipline that the train hands have won the reputation which they have, and of which any man in the Maritime Provinces has reason to feel proud.

Mr. DICKEY. I feel that the House has unconsciously given the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a certain justification for the suggestion he has made to remove political considerations from the management of Government railways, because we all know, even from the short discussion which we have had in this House, with what difficulty hon. gentlemen on both sides have kept out of the political maelstrom in dealing with their argument. There are two questions touched upon which might be considered as verging on dangerous ground politically. The first is the division of the deficit between the late Government and the present Government; and the second is the coal rate. I do not propose to discuss either of these questions, because I hope that those who address the House hereafter on this question, as those who have already addressed it, will discuss this question purely from a business standpoint, and with the national view of improving, if we can, our railway system, and lessening the deficit that exists on it. With regard to the coal rate, I must be allowed to say that I do not at all admit that that rate is too low, or that it is in itself an unpaying rate. I am prepared to establish the proposition that by comparison with the rates on other railways on this continent the coal rate on the Intercolonial Railway is justified on the ground of its earning power in its present shape. It also brings large benefits to the railway, which would entitle it to be maintained even if it were not a paying rate. But all these questions I waive, because we are here to discuss the question raised by my hon. friend from Albert. I think it is a pity that hon. gentlemen on both sides should show a feeling that almost amounts to a panic with regard to the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. These deficits are to be regretted; but I think the hon. Minister of Marine acted very judiciously in recalling to the House the recent history, which it has apparently forgotten, even so recently as the beginning of Confederation, when everybody accepted this road as a political road and a non-paying road; and we must not let the fact that other roads are run on different principles carry us away from the principle on which this road was built. Now, just consider the position of the road itself. As a comparison, we have the Prince Edward Island line, running through one of the richest countries, I believe, in the Dominion, one of the richest countries in the world, and a comparatively thickly populated country; and yet we find that railway only collects about fifty cents on every

dollar spent in its management. Now, whatever improvidence there may be in the management of that road this loss cannot all arise from political reasons. In the Intercolonial Railway, we have from Moncton to Ste. Flavie—I speak with deference to the views of hon. gentlemen who represent the constituencies between these points—a distance of 290 miles of almost absolutely non-paying road, where express trains run forty to sixty miles without stopping at a station; and not only that, but a road where little freight is taken up or set down, and on which, with the exception of the summer travel of tourists, there is very little paying traffic whatever. Not only that, but from Ste. Flavie to Rivière du Loup, is, I venture to say, the worst road in the world as regards the difficulty of working it in winter. With the north-west and westerly winds driving the snow over it, there is not a road in the world where it is so difficult to handle the snow in the winter. We all know that that one expense has run as high as $100,000 a year, and that is almost all on this section north of Moncton, so that I do not think, in considering this road, we should be at all surprised when we find a deficit in its operations. I may be allowed to make some passing remarks upon what has been stated as to the general principle upon which this road should be run. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says it should be run on commercial principles, and I understood the hon. Minister of Justice to say that that should not be the guiding principle, but that it should rather be run on national principles. Now, I submit that the argument used by the hon. Minister of Marine is perfectly sound in principle. The canal system of this country, the money we vote for bonusing roads, the money we spend in deepening the St. Lawrence River and on our harbours and piers, the money we have spent in building the Canadian Pacific Railway—all this stands on exactly the same principle as the money we spend on the Intercolonial Railway. It was all spent, just as the money on the Intercolonial Railway was spent, for the purpose of making this country a nation instead of a few scattered colonies, and whatever it is necessary we should pay to keep that intact, I believe this Parliament will cheerfully pay, and the country will willingly back us in doing whatever is absolutely necessary to preserve the national character of the road. The limitation must be made, of course, that it shall only be what is absolutely necessary. I am not here to discuss the management of this road in its details. I must say, however, with regard to the observations of the hon. Minister of Justice, that I have not that same confidence in the administration of a Government which he seems to entertain. I believe, and I think that all the evidence leads in that direction, that the administrative test has not yet been made as regards free Governments. Where you have so many forces at work, it is very difficult to get that concentrated and prompt action which is necessary to efficient management. I am not speaking here of one party or one country, but speaking generally of the history of the whole civilized world and of free institutions. We have seen the administration of a free government break down in the Crimean war and in every war England has ever had; we have seen it break down in the United States war, and all recent history carries out my general proposition that free governments are on their trial, so far as administration is concerned. I do not say that we cannot manage this road as a government road. I would not agree with the proposition of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) to put this road under a commission, until further trial has been given of the present direct executive management, or until a very strong case had been made out for placing it under a commission. I will say this, however, that neither the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) nor the Minister of Justice did full justice to the argument of my hon. friend from Albert, as I understood it. The hon. member for Bothwell said that the case of Australia is not parallel to that of Canada, because there are no competing roads there. But the hon. member for Albert's argument was this: I give you the result of running the roads in Australia with no competing roads, but before there was a commission in charge, and I compare that with the same roads as managed by a commission, and I have shown you that the result has been successful. That was the argument of the hon. member for Albert, and I do not think it was fairly met.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will permit me, my observation upon that statement was this: that there was an alteration in the rates, and how far the difference was the result of that alteration in rates, the statement of the hon. member for Albert did not disclose.

Mr. DICKEY. But I also think my hon. friend did not do full justice to the hon. member for Albert on the point I have mentioned. With regard to the instances which the hon. member for Albert cited, there are some very striking peculiarities about the social condition of New South Wales and Victoria. In the first place they are very small countries comparatively, and their population is comparatively within a small compass. In each of them there is a peculiar characteristic, which does not exist in Canada, of a single city containing nearly half the population of the whole country. From this city lines radiate running to the country, and it sounds strange to us as colonists to read the reports of the commissioners in Melbourne, Victoria, stating they propose next year to quadruple the track of a certain line, running out from Melbourne, and to duplicate another track. The figures as to the carriage of passengers are simply startling to anybody who reads them. The total population of Victoria is a little over a million, and yet last year on the Government roads in Victoria they carried 79,000,000 persons, and the House will understand what a tremendous feature that is in the consideration of this question when the Intercolonial Railway only carried 1,000,000 persons last year. I think the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) will admit that it is very difficult to compare the results of any particular tariff of rates on roads where the proportion of passengers carried is about 70 to 1. They also carried about 3 tons of freight to one that we carry. Their freight charges are enormouly larger than ours. I do not think that the people of this country would submit to the freight charges made on the Victoria railways. The people who settled Victoria went out there from England with a knowledge only of the English freight charges, and they have submitted to the charges which their Government have put on them, but we are situated in a very different position. We are by the side of

a country which has about a quarter of the railway mileage of the world and whose freights are cheaper and whose management is cheaper than that of any country in the world, so that our people have an object lesson constantly before them which is more valuable than any commission could offer. We have conditions existing here which I think would very seriously embarrass the management under such circumstances. Still, I believe the scheme of a commission has great merits. I am sure that every member on this side of the House would be only too glad to support any scheme which, while doing justice to the country, would wipe the political aspect out of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and I for one would do anything either in the direction of the appointment of a commission or of any other modification of the management of the Intercolonial Railway so as to bring about that desirable result; but at the same time I would not lose sight of the fact that this is a national road and that, if it is handed over to a commission, the true national ends for which it was constructed shall not be lost sight of in its working.

Mr. FRASER. I am very glad this matter has been brought before the House, and I agree with much that was said by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), which I must admit had a great deal of weight with me. I am aware that the Intercolonial Railway is a bond of union between the provinces, so that the deficit on that road might well be met by the Dominion, but I do not think that, because it is a bond of union, we should always take it for granted that there will be a deficit, and that we should act upon that idea and receive with perfect complaisance the deficits which we have to meet year after year, provided we can avoid that result. If the people of the various provinces are accommodated as they are now, I believe that we can change this deficit, and I think we should have some commission of enquiry in regard to it. Some hon. gentlemen seem to assume that this road was built under such circumstances that there must be a deficit in its working. I do not think the contracting parties believed that there was to be always a deficit on this road, and I think that probably a committee would find many things in the management of this road which might be changed. Within the last few days I have found the manner in which rates are charged on the Intercolonial Railway. For example, a car of flour from Ontario to Nova Scotia can only be paid as far as New Glasgow, and the charge from New Glasgow to Antigonish is five or six times as large as that from Ontario to New Glasgow. Of course I admit that you cannot charge as much per mile for long distances as for short distances.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman repeat that statement?

Mr. FRASER. I say that the freight upon the same car of flour from New Glasgow to Antigonish is five times as much per mile as from Ontario to New Glasgow. I can understand that the freight must, of necessity, be less per mile for the longer distance than for the shorter distance, but let us change the situation. For example, the freight on a car from Antigonish to New Glasgow, 41 miles, is $10, and on the same car from New Glasgow to Spring Hill, a distance of 100 miles, it is only $4. There must be something wrong there. What is the reason for that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You never get the mileage on the long haul the same as on the short haul.

Mr. FRASER. But the charge for a car 41 miles is $10, and for a distance more than twice that, it is only $4.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not so. You are misinformed about that.

Mr. FRASER. I am stating what I had from a business man, who actually had to pay that amount.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was some difficulty a little while ago in reference to some matter of that kind, but it was arranged.

Mr. FRASER. I am only mentioning this in order to show the way in which the Intercolonial Railway is managed, and I say that an investigation should be had into that management. I am satisfied that too much is made of the long rates and that the Intercolonial Railway is not making enough of the local business. I think that the Intercolonial Railway should, like most railways now, begin to see that there is more to be made in the local business than has hitherto been considered, and I believe that, if better rates were given, and the local trade were developed in that way, we would make more out of the road than by continually looking to the longer hauls. Then, as to what the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) says should be taken into consideration, that there is something different in Canada from the condition of the countries to which he has referred. I am satisfied that there could be such a pruning brought about by such a commission as the hon. gentleman has spoken of as would materially reduce the deficit on this road. I am sure that the people of Nova Scotia would not like to see the road handed over to a company, and the reason is plain. They want to have the present rates or more favourable rates for the carriage of their freight; but, for myself, I would not fear that any more injury would result from a company than from the present system under which the road is run, and, if the present rates must be upheld, I would not very much object to handing the road over to a company. As far as the political aspect of the question is concerned, we could never suffer more from any company than we do now as the road is conducted under the Dominion Government. But that aside, as a business matter, I am satisfied, if a commission were appointed, they could make these suggestions. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) spoke about running the road from Ottawa. I must take issue with him there. I think there are men on the Intercolonial Railway, at Moncton, now, to whom if full powers were given, that would run the road better than it is now run from Ottawa. I am satisfied, for example, that the time-table which is dictated from Ottawa is against the views of the best railway men at Moncton, and could be changed for the better. The whole time-table is now made out with the view of satisfying other lines. A good table was prepared a year ago that was satisfactory to the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and half an hour afterwards it was changed from Ottawa. You must

give more power to good railway men such as we have now at Moncton. I think what the Minister of Customs said about the character of the railway men is true. There are no better men on any road than we have on the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, they have not the same temptations as men have on larger roads, and in larger countries, but for all that, they are good, true and honest men. Of course, we always find them on the same side in elections, but barring that they do their work very well. Now, if the suggestion of the member for Albert is carried out, we will be relieved from a difficulty of that kind, and the commission could find out what the facts are about running the road. I am satisfied, for example, that certain rebates are given to certain merchants that should not be given; I am satisfied that conditions are imposed upon some merchants that are not imposed upon others. The committee could enquire into these things. I trust the House will favourably receive this suggestion of the hon. member for Albert, and that the committee will be appointed, and if the hon. gentleman will accept that as a first step, he may get the commission he speaks of later on to run the road. The committee should endeavour to find out where the difficulties are, and I am sure Parliament is very anxious to have them removed. It must not be expected that those who are now running the road do all the work they could; it need not be expected that they run the road on the same business principles they would do if they had fuller power. Everybody understands that now the Intercolonial Railway is expected to be run as a Government institution in the interest of the Government that is in power for the time being. I am sure if this committee is appointed it would not only assist the present Government, but assist all governments in putting the road into a better position. The Government would then avoid the political difficulty of the road, and would be relieved from the anxiety and trouble of making appointments. I am not afraid, so far as the people of Nova Scotia are concerned, that if this enquiry is made, we shall suffer anything in respect to rates. We require only fair rates. If the Intercolonial Railway was built as a bond of union, it was not for the purpose of giving Nova Scotia any better rates than the people of other provinces are getting. We do not want the road to run for our special advantage; we want fair rates and nothing more. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman who spoke last, means anything more than that, namely, that we should get proper rates, but not better rates than any other provinces are getting. I am sure the hon. member for Albert is entitled to the thanks, not only of the people of his province, but of the people of this Dominion, for having brought up this question, and I trust the discussion will be productive of much good.

Mr. GILLMOR. This discussion has afforded me a geat deal of pleasure. It is about the first discussion where Parliament has divested itself of party feeling. It really is a good treat to have this assembly become a deliberative body for an hour. I am glad to see that party has not got so entirely beyond control in this country that we cannot discuss a great public question upon its merits, for once. I have thought a good deal about this railway. I have read somewhat about the workings of railways in the Australian colonies, and I do not think their conditions are similar to ours. I do not think that we can expect to put the Government railways of Canada in the hands of a commission, nor do I think it is necessary. As human nature is at present, I do not believe that it is hopeless that Governments can be found who can work railways and who can do the right thing. I think myself that gentlemen who fill the high and responsible office of governing a country, ought to be the quintessence of honesty, and of honour, and of economy. I do not know where you will get good men that will do the right thing and the honest thing in the public interest, if you do not take them from the men that are chosen by the people to fill the posts of honour and responsibility. Therefore I believe that the railways of Canada can be run economically, and in the interest of the people, by the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches. With regard to railways in Australia, if my reading is not at fault, the improvement in their management is not altogether due to putting them into the hands of commissioners. The conditions of that country are very much improved, as the country has advanced the railways have become more profitable. Their rates are very liberal indeed. For instance, they carry all the school children free who can avail themselves of Government railways. The workingmen living in the rural districts, for a mere nominal sum, have the use of these railways to convey them to and from their labour. Altogether the system is very tempting, but the conditions are altogether different. My own impression is that this discussion will do good, because it will lead to the appointment of a committee to make a candid and serious examination into the working of this railway. There has been just a little trenching upon party lines. I do not like to have my friends compare the present results of this road with the results under the Liberal regime of Mr. Mackenzie, when the road was in its early history. Since that time trade has greatly developed, and you cannot make a comparison between the year when it was first in operation and the present time, when it has become enlarged and trade has been greatly developed.

Mr. McLEOD. As I come from a constituency that is deeply interested in this railway, I think I may be pardoned for making some remarks. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gillmor), that it is very satisfactory to find that this question can be discussed from a non-party standpoint. I think the Minister of Justice and the hon. gentleman who has just spoken misunderstood the position taken by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) in regard to the statistics he presented concerning the railways in Victoria and New South Wales. We all know that the conditions of that country are different from those of Canada, and we do not expect the same results, whatever the condition of the road, as were obtained there. But my hon. friend pointed out that in those countries, where they had nothing but Government roads, they had been managed for some time by the Government; and yet the people were not satisfied, and an effort was made to improve the management. They appointed a commission, and the management of the road improved, the revenue of the road increased, and the road gave very much greater satisfaction. Although the conditions of the countries are not identical,

still it is fair to say, especially when this change has been continued and the people remain well satisfied, that the management was improved by the introduction of the commission. That applies entirely to those countries and to the condition of those countries. We have a road in Canada that has been managed almost twenty years by the Government, and I do not think I say too much when I affirm that the results are not satisfactory. I differ from hon. gentlemen who claim that we should be satisfied, notwithstanding the fact that there is such a deficit, and notwithstanding the fact that we are brought face to face with an increasing deficit from year to year. That is not a satisfactory result. We have had this management under the Governments of both parties, and in both cases there was a deficit. So we may say we have given it a fair trial, and I do not believe the Government of Canada can manage the road as satisfactorily as a commission or a company. With respect to the location of the Intercolonial Railway, I desire to offer a few remarks. I come from St. John and we are deeply interested in the road. I remember there was a great deal of discussion and dissatisfaction in St. John when the road was located, but I am not at all prepared to say that the location is not a proper one, or that it is a very improper one. We have opened up a very important section of province; the road passes several very considerable towns along the north shore, and, speaking as a St. John man, I know our trade from St. John, in that section of the country has increased considerably by means of the Intercolonial Railway. We now have, largely owing to private enterprise, the road down the St. John valley. Then it was said by the Minister of Railways, and put forward very strongly as against the view of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), that this road was built as a national highway, and, therefore, it should continue to be a Government highway, to be operated by the Government. I must say I differ somewhat from the Minister of Justice, in regard to that matter. I know the road was built as a national road, that it was part of the condition of the union of the provinces, the road should be built and should be operated. It has been built, and it has been operated. There is no proposition not to operate it. It is intended to operate it, and the object of my hon. friend's remarks is not to decrease its utility, but to place it in a position that it could be better operated in the best interests of our country. That is the object. It is not at all to do away with the road as a national road, or interfere with the operating of it, but our desire is to operate it more in the interest of the country than is now possible. We have had a trial of the management of the road by the Government, and I do not think it has been satisfactory. For what reason? Let us look around us. It is said our rates of freight are too low. The first thing I see is that it is run as a political road. I do not care what party is in power or what Government, the Intercolonial Railway is a political road, and this fact is against its best interests. Anyone acquainted with the railway counties knows very well the pressure continually brought to bear on the representatives to have men appointed to positions on the road and retained there, and the managers are really only agents so long as the road is managed by the Government, because political pressure is continually brought to bear, no matter what party is in power. So if that fact does interfere with the best mode of managing the road, how shall we obviate that difficulty? Is it not plain that it is to remove this road as far as possible from political influences? It is said that it would not be desirable to hand it over to a private company. I agree entirely with that view. I would be entirely opposed to handing over its management to a private company. But with respect to the other proposition, I am disposed to think—in fact I believe, after giving some study to the matter and reading the results obtained by the commissioners in New South Wales—that a commission should be appointed that would be non-political, the same as are the appointments of the Auditor General and the judges, so they would be free from the control of the Government, and the entire management of the road should be placed in their hands, to be managed on business principles. I believe it should be managed on business principles. I differ in that respect from what has been said by some hon. gentlemen. I do not believe the deficit should be as large as it is, because there is a long section of the road which pays very well, the section from St. John to Halifax. There is a loss I believe, on the northern portion of the road. It is said the trains are run over the road at a high rate of speed for long distances. It may be so; I do not say it is so. A commission would find out if too many trains are run for the business to be done or a too high rate of speed maintained. If those evils are ascertained they can be remedied, and they can be remedied more easily and promptly if the road is placed in commission than if managed as at present by the Government. There is another matter referred to by my hon. colleague from St. John, the management of the road so far away from the road itself. I submit that is not a satisfactory management, and such a management cannot be made satisfactory. I am speaking as a man from a railway constituency, and I know the difficulties attending it, because I feel them every day. I believe even in this particular there is a wrong which may be remedied. Looking at these matters I think the people may fairly come to the conclusion that during the past twenty years we have had sufficient experience of the present system of management and we should have some change. I must say that I am glad that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has brought this question up, and I trust that the Government will give it a fair consideration, because I know that if they do give it a fair consideration they will come to the conclusion that the present management of the Intercolonial Railway is unsatisfactory, and it will be necessary to look around to see what is the best management. If the management is not to be handed over to a private company, then we are bound to consider whether or not a commission will handle the railway in a more satisfactory way than at present.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House at any length, but I wish to make one or two remarks upon this subject, and to call the attention of the House to one or two circumstances which I think had perhaps be better referred to in connection with the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I think we all feel grateful to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) for bringing this subject to the attention of the House, and for the very great

care and study which he has given to the theory which he has advanced. I agree with those to-night who, in referring to this subject, have said that the loss on the operation of the Intercolonial Railway at the present time, do not condemn the political management of that railway. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries called our attention to the history of the construction of this road, and to the inducements which were held out by those who advocated its construction at the time of Confederation. He also pointed out, and very properly pointed out, that the actual results at the present time were very much better than had been anticipated at that early date. If we look now at the history of the operation of this road, from the time of its construction, we will be impressed with this fact: That during the early years after its construction, there was a very considerable deficit in the operation of the road, and that this continued, according to the figures that my hon. friend gave, until about 1880. At that time, I think all in this House who are acquainted with this business of the road, will admit that the traffic increased very largely, that the rates of freights were very considerably reduced, and that as a total result, during these years, the expenses and income were brought very nearly together. There was a small profit for several years, varying from a few hundred dollars to a few thousand dollars. Now, during the last few years, this conditions of things has been reversed, and it does appear to me that there is a very apparent and sufficient cause for this increased deficit, but that it does not point to any laxity, or to any fault in the administration of the road at the present time, as compared with its administration in former years. We know that the opening of the Short Line Railway has very materially reduced the traffic on this road. The Short Line Railway through the State of Maine at the present time, carries practically all the traffic from the city of St. John, and from the Western portion of the Province of New Brunswick, westwards and to the eastward; traffic for these points passes over that road as well. The result of the construction of this additional communication has rendered it necessary for the management of the Intercolonial Railway to increase the cost of operating that road. They are obliged to run faster trains, they are obliged to run more trains, and to give greater accommodation; and if anyone will examine the report of the Minister of Railways for the last year, he will find that as a result of operating that road, they have largely increased the engine mileage. They have increased the car mileage by 4,643,000 miles, the train mileage has been increased 3,380,000 miles, and, while there has been this large increase in the cost of operating the road, in the number of trains run, in the distance travelled, and in the speed of the trains as well, the total traffic receipts have only exceeded the traffic receipts of the year before by some $32,000. It will be found that while the receipts have only grown by $32,000, the expenditure necessary to obtain these receipts under the altered condition of things has been upwards of $300,000. This accounts, to my mind, for the very large deficiency which we have at the present time in the operation of this road. I quite agree with those who wish to make an effort to have this condition of things changed, while I agree with those who have felt that the Intercolonial Railway was constructed as a bond of union between these provinces, and that the Government is bound, under any circumstances, to see that it is operated in the future, yet I am quite willing to aid in any effort to better the condition of things. I wish to say this for my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), that I think he has presented very strong arguments in favour of the scheme that he has proposed to the House. As was pointed out by several members who have spoken, the comparison which he instituted between the management of the Australian railways under a Minister of the Crown, and under a commission, was very favourable to the latter management; and he reasons, and very properly reasons, that the same change in the management here might be attended with the same results. I, however, agree too with this view: that we must in considering the future of the Intercolonial Railway in Canada, consider all the conditions which surround our railway system in this country. Some of these conditions have been referred to by the Minister of Justice; but there are one or two others to which I would like to direct the attention of the House. In considering the broad question as to whether railways should be managed by the Government or by private companies, we must, I think, admit at the outset, that in Canada at all events, the Government management of railways generally is out of the question; that the policy adopted has been rather to place the railway system in Canada in the hands of private companies, and to give such aid as the Government sees fit to give, in the way of subsidies, towards the construction of these lines. Now, we have in Canada, as the result of this system at the present time, two important lines of railway. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and these two important railway corporations control at the present time, two-thirds, I believe, of all the railways in this Dominion; or, leaving out the Government railway, I believe they control something like three-fourths of all the railways of this Dominion. We know, too, that they are constantly, every year, extending the mileage of their railways, and acquiring lines that have already been built, and securing a much larger proportion of the total railway system of the country than they have at the present time. We know, too, that both of these railway companies desire to extend their system to the sea ports of the Maritime Provinces, and that it is generally understood and expected by the people of the Maritime Provinces that that will be done. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway has a line as far as St. John, where it connects with the Intercolonial Railway, and the Grand Trunk connects at Lévis, opposite Quebec. Neither of these great corporations appears to be satisfied with the present arrangement, and I do not think the people of the Maritime Provinces are fully satisfied with it. We know that there has been, and is I believe still, in the Maritime Provinces a great deal of disappointment expressed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not carry out the scheme which was originally proposed to this House, and extend their line by an independent route across the Province of New Brunswick as far as the town of Moncton; we know, too, that during the last session of Parliament the Grand Trunk Company were using their influence in this House to secure to another company a subsidy

to construct a line to connect the Témiscouata Railway across the Province of New Brunswick with the Intercolonial Railway at the town of Moncton: the object of these two companies evidently being to secure independent lines of communication to the sea port of Halifax, as well as the sea port of St. John and the other sea ports of the Maritime Provinces. Now, looking to the future of our railways in the Maritime Provinces, it must be apparent that if this idea is ever to be realized, and these two great railway systems are ever to reach the sea ports of the Maritime Provinces, they must do so in one of two ways—either by building independent lines, or by acquiring the present lines which are part of the Intercolonial Railway and controlled by the Government. If independent lines are constructed, we cannot shut our eyes to this fact: that the result will be to reduce the Intercolonial Railway to a mere local line. The Intercolonial Railway, under these circumstances, would have no western connection; it would not control the western traffic in either direction; and the result would inevitably be that it would divide with the two great companies the merely local traffic in the the Maritime Provinces. We must admit also that multiplying trunk lines of railway does not, to the general public, decrease the cost of carrying traffic. The rules of competition show that Government railways under a great many circumstances do not effect a real reduction in the rates. The traffic has to be divided between a greater number of railways; there is, of necessity, a greater amount of expense in carrying it, and the roads look for a return on a larger amount of capital. I quite agree with those who say that the Intercolonial Railway should not be sold. I can see very serious objections to that course; and I am aware that such a proposition would not generally meet with favour in the Maritime Provinces. If such a proposition were made, or entertained, there would be many difficulties surrounding it. In the first place, I do not think it would be proper to allow to a company which would undertake to purchase the Intercolonial Railway any bonding powers. In the next place, it would be necessary to preserve the rights and privileges of the Imperial Government in the use of the Intercolonial Railway for military purposes. In the course of the discussion to-night, there have been to my mind many strong arguments advanced indirectly in favour of the management of railways by independent companies, rather than by Government control, whether by a Minister of the Crown, or by a commission appointed by the Government. The Minister of Justice, in defending the present rates charged upon the Intercolonial Railway, said that any company under similar circumstances would carry the traffic at the same rates. Then we have had several persons advocating the management of the Intercolonial Railway on business principles. Well, I think it will be generally admitted that if a road is to be managed on business principles, a private company is more likely to manage it on business principles than either a Government or a commission. Then, besides the instance which my hon. friend from Albert has brought forward of Government railways in the Australian colonies, we have before us the experience of the United States. I must admit that I have not studied the subject very thoroughly, although I have endeavoured to do so as well as I could during the last few days; but so far as I have been able to obtain information, I believe that in the United States the principle of placing all the railways in the hands of private companies, has met with most favour—that wherever railways have been constructed by any of the states, and wherever any of the states have attempted to operate them, they have at as early a date as possible disposed of their roads and placed them under the management of private companies on some terms and conditions. Then there were arguments advanced, I think by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that railway companies would erect hotels, and in different ways offer inducements to travellers and business people to patronize their roads which it is impossible for any Government or Minister or Government commission to do. I have said that I do not advocate the sale of the Intercolonial Railway to a private company, although my remarks might rather indicate that that would be the course I would favour. It has appeared to me, however, possible that a scheme might be devised which, while retaining all the advantages which the country would derive from the operation of this road as a Government work, might at the same time secure the advantages of having the road operated on strictly business principles by railway companies. To illustrate what I mean, I will simply offer this suggestion to the House—that for instance, with the Grand Trunk Railway, which connects with the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis, some arrangement might be made by which that company would operate the road from Lévis to Moncton; and then an arrangement might be made by which both companies would have equal running powers over that portion of the road from St. John to Halifax. In that way we would accomplish some very important results. Without the construction of any new railway we would give both of these great railway companies independent access to both direct seaports in the Maritime Provinces. I do not myself anticipate any danger from adopting such a course. I do not fear any disastrous results from the operation of the road by companies such as those, and it does appear to me if the Government, retaining the road itself, should arrange with these companies to operate it or run their trains over it, we in the Maritime Provinces, and the people in the west as well, would have the advantage of the competition which would necessarily result, and which, under any circumstances, must be close between these two companies. If there was any advantage from the competition, and from having the roads worked in the most economical way by large companies, the whole country would derive the benefit. This is the idea which has occurred to me, and as the subject is up for discussion, I have ventured to make the suggestion, and hope it may be thought worthy of the consideration of the Government.

Mr. SKINNER. Whilst not dissenting from the principle of a commission, I think a great deal can be said against it. With regard to the objections made against the Intercolonial Railway being run by the Government on the ground that politics interfere with its proper management, I must say that we do not find this objection exists in the management of our post offices which are under political control. Our judges also are appointed, to a great extent, from political partisans, but

we know that good men are selected, and that, once they assume their duties, politics are not allowed to interfere with the manner in which they are carried out. We also know that all the appointees in the post office are named for political reasons, but I think it may well be said that the management of the post offices is very free from politics and conducted on an economical scale and as satisfactorily as it is possible for any class of business to be done. I think if a commission were appointed to manage the Intercolonial Railway, which would be as much beyond our control as the judges are, they could run the road as they pleased, and it would be very difficult for us to have grievances redressed. If the Minister of Railways or his department would give to Parliament the reasons, so far as they can be ascertained, for any deficit, Parliament would be able to enquire, from year to year, into the deficits, and remedy them, as far as they are capable of being remedied. That would be a step in advance, and all the information necessary might be got, as some gentlemen suggest, through the appointment of a parliamentary committee. Whilst it is recognized that this deficit is large, the Maritime Provinces are no more to be charged with it than the rest of the Dominion trading with these provinces, as the Intercolonial Railway must be considered as belonging to all parts of the Dominion. If to-morrow, since we have what is called the Short Line Railway, the Intercolonial Railway were stopped at some point at Lévis or south of Lévis, you would find the deficit would cease, but it would not be in the interests of the country to do that, as we would thereby fail to accommodate the various portions of Canada which are doing business along that line. The Intercolonial Railway has to contend against the water communication along the Gulf of St. Lawrence and with other railroads built in opposition to it, with the trunk lines that have their termini in the United States and do business with the Maritime Provinces through the United States ports; and, considering all the opposition it has to meet, the road is maintaining itself very well. Again, Canada imported a year or two ago about $9,000,000 worth of goods through Portland and must have sent nearly as much in value through that port to the markets of Europe. If we can by any means develop our trade over the Intercolonial Railway through Canadian ports as against sending it to the maritime ports of the United States, we will soon reduce that deficit. Therefore, instead of considering the proposition to take the road out of the management of Parliament, if we would address ourselves, from time to time, through the Minister of Railways and his officials, to learning how the matter can be remedied, that would be better than giving up our control over this great work. I will not further trespass on the time of the House, but will conclude by stating that, representing a constituency more deeply interested in the road than any other, I am not prepared to give my adhesion to the principle of taking it out of our management.

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

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—construction.....	$24,900.	$50,000

Resolution reported.

ADJOURNMENT—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before the adjournment takes place, I desire to refer to a little matter, and in case there is any doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen as to whether I am paired or not. I desire to make a statement. I did pair with the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) dating from the 3rd August till the 10th August. In order that no mistake might be made. I got from the member for Lisgar a letter which I will read to the House:

"OTTAWA, 1st August, 1891.

"MY DEAR EDWARDS,—I accept your kind offer to pair with me for the whole of next week commencing August 3rd, excepting the vote on the amendment that may be moved by Mr. Desjardins of l'Islet, or a motion that he may bring in on the trade question. On all other questions we are paired for said week.

"Yours,
"A. W. ROSS."

My reason for asking for this letter was that on two previous occasions on which I obliged hon. gentlemen opposite I was very unfairly treated. Another reason was that I believed hon. gentlemen on this side of the House during this session had been unfairly treated in the same way. Not only have I that letter, but on Monday morning, August 3rd, when I returned to Ottawa, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked me if I was paired with the hon. member for Lisgar. I told him I was for that week, that the pair terminated at midnight at the end of that week, and not only did I tell him that I had a letter to that effect, but he came over to my desk and saw the letter. I also saw the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) who asked me the same question, and I gave him the same reply. Not only is this the case, but on the 3rd and 4th August the pairs given by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), those sheets do not include my name. Under these circumstances, though I might dwell longer on this subject, I think I am justified in saying that I have been very unfairly treated. Never have I asked an hon. gentleman on the other side to pair with me to oblige me, but whenever I have been asked I have endeavoured to oblige hon. gentlemen opposite. When I first came into this House, while being a Liberal and holding to Liberal principles, I had no other desire than to remain on friendly terms with hon. gentlemen on the other side, and my very first act was to oblige the late Premier Sir John Macdonald before the session had commenced by pairing with one of his supporters for two weeks. I held to that agreement, and I received nothing but abuse from the Conservative journals because I did so. Last session I was asked to pair with an hon. gentleman, and I said I would see whether I could do so or not. The member went away and gave the pair to the whip without my consent, because I never agreed to it, but I abstained for a week from voting in consequence of that. I think it was very unbecoming on the part of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to get up as he has done to-night and practically charge me with falsehood.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have listened attentively to the statement of the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have nothing to take back. I have paid every attention to what the hon. gentleman has said and I expect the same courtesy will be paid to me. I simply state the facts as I have them before me. A pair was entered into between the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). I knew nothing about it. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) gave a report of the pair, and it reads thus as entered on the pair book which I have, and I presume it reads in the same way in the pair book of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow):

"Mr. Ross (Lisgar) pairs with Mr. Edwards from 3 p.m. Monday, August 3rd, until 3 p.m. Thursday, August 13th, except in regard to Mr. Desjardins' motion."

On every day after that, that statement has been left on the desk of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). I find three or four of those statements here, and to save confusion or after altercations, a copy is always laid on my desk at 3 o'clock, and also on the desk of the Opposition whip, and on these he will find the pairs are recorded as follows:—Mr. Bernard paired with Mr. Welsh for the balance of the session; Mr. McCarthy paired with Mr. Préfontaine; Mr. McKeen (No. 160) paired with Mr. Borden, expires 10 p.m., 12th August; Mr. Ross (Lisgar), No. 175, paired with Mr. Edwards, expires 3 p.m., 13th August. That is on the paper for the 10th August, the 11th August and to-day, and has been on the paper every day since the pair was recorded. After Mr. Daly reported to me, I said to Mr. Edwards, you are paired with Mr. Ross. He said yes. He never showed me that letter. I never saw it or knew the contents of it. I went by the book and by the pair as reported by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) had notice of it. I simply went by the book as reported by the hon. member for Selkirk to the whip's room, and recorded. The member for Perth (Mr. Trow), the whip of the Opposition, had not notice of it, and it was his duty, as it is my duty, whenever he makes a pair, and it is recorded, to go and see the member and ask him if it is correct. It was the duty of the member for Perth to notify the member for Russell that he was reported as paired, and to have the name struck off if it was not correct. It is my duty, when a vote takes place, if a member votes whose name is recorded, to try and have an explanation made, and I did that to-night. The member for Perth had it on the list before him, and has had it for a week. I never knew anything about this letter being in existence, further than the statement that he had a letter from the member for Lisgar. I now make this statement that, so far as I am concerned, no other pair will be entered unless it is signed by both members. The hon. gentleman, in making his statement, said he had in his possession a letter which stated that he was paired for a certain time, and if there was any other entry it was a fraudulent one. The entry that is made here is not fraudulent, it was made in good faith by the clerk of the whip's room, at the request of the member for Selkirk. I knew nothing about the entry, and he had no right to say that it was a fraudulent entry, and I think he ought to retract that statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this whole trouble has arisen from the unfortunate manner in which the whip has chosen to discharge his duty. Had he called my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he was supposed to be paired to a certain day, then this explanation would have been given him, and it would have been accepted. There is no doubt that my hon. friend is perfectly in order, and was correct in saying that the charge was made in an offensive manner against him. There is no doubt that under the circumstances he was not paired for one hour longer than the time he stated, and he should not have been charged, no matter what the whip supposed, with a thing so repugnant to all gentlemanly feeling, as breaking an engagement like a pair. That, I think, is the position of the case, and I think it is very unfortunate indeed that when the whips on either side suppose that, for any reason, a pair has been broken, they should not state their impression in a different way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that is the position of the case at all. The question about pairs has been discussed time and again, and the understanding deliberately come to upon the subject was that a private pair between members not entered in the whips' books, should not be recognized; because when a member goes away, and a misunderstanding occurs, a member is charged with being paired who was not paired, he feels annoyed. Now what occurred this evening was that after the division the hon. member for Leeds rose and called the attention of the member for Russell to the fact that he was paired with the member for Lisgar. I certainly did not understand that he was doing it in an offensive sense; I am sure there was not a member on this side of the House who supposed that the member for Leeds was doing any more than reminding the member for Russell that he was paired, supposing, as everybody who knows the member for Russell, would suppose, that the mere intimation would be sufficient to induce him to withdraw his vote if it were true that he was paired. Now, the member for Russell took offence, and stated that he was not paired. It was not necessary for him to say that he had a letter from the member for Lisgar in his possession, but he went on to say that the entry was a fraudulent entry, and said it in a most offensive way. The fact is the hon. gentleman was not paired, as now appears, but the fact that there was a contrary entry does not justify him in saying that it was a fraudulent entry, and no person who is acquainted with the whips on either side of the House would accuse any one of them with having made a fraudulent entry. The misunderstanding that has arisen is in no way the fault of the member for Leeds. Under the arrangement that was agreed to, he was to take the entry in the whips' book, but he took pains not only to see that that was recorded in the whips' book, but to remind the other whip every day of the entries so recorded. In face of those entries, and having no word of contradiction from the whip on the other side, it was his bounden duty to suggest to the member for Russell that he was not paired, and when the member for Russell replied that he was not paired, my friend from Leeds was satisfied. I think there ought to be as much courtesy shown to the member for Leeds as is desired for the member for Russell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Leeds had been shown the letter according to my friend's statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I prefer my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be very sorry indeed to say anything offensive to any hon. gentleman in this House, on either one side or the other. But I think I was justified in feeling hurt, as I was, when I made the statement that the entry in the pair book of the hon. member for Leeds was a fraudulent entry. I have always understood that it took two to make a pair. I never stated to the whips on this side of the House that I was paired. The statement of the member for Selkirk seemed to be accepted on the other side, and when my statement was made to-night it was not accepted. The member for Leeds got up, and in a very offensive way denied my statement. I will just say that the member for Leeds is mistaken. He came over to my desk, and I told him exactly what the pair was, and I held out the letter to him, and he said: "Oh, that is all right," and walked away. Now, being cognizant as I was of this fact, hon. gentlemen will understand why I felt very much offended at the hon. gentleman's language.

Mr. TAYLOR. I never read the letter the hon. gentleman mentioned. I did not change my mind further than to remember that the pair was recorded, and it was recorded on the other whip's desk that the pair was for ten days, until the 13th. Members on both sides like to have their names appear as being paired, if they are absent, and we have tried to meet their views. As my hon. friend and the member for Lisgar made this private arrangement, and the time was given in writing the whips are not to blame for the mistake. It was given in by the hon. member for Selkirk, and in order to be sure that no mistake would happen a copy was put on the desk of the Opposition whip. If hon. gentlemen will look on Mr. Trow's desk they will see it is there, and it has been there for several days, and they will further see that the pair expires on the 13th. That is enough to justify my course in the matter. I have nothing further to do, and I simply drew the attention of the House to the matter. But the hon. member refused to accept my statement, and offensively suggested a fraudulent entry.

Mr. FORBES. It is the usual practice for the two members both to sign a paper, which is handed to the whip of either party. Then it is recorded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not done once in twenty times.

Mr. FORBES. We are endeavouring to carry out the practice. In this case no signature was obtained from the hon. member for Russell; he signed no paper. How the entry came in the book of the hon. member for Leeds I do not understand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. How is it in Mr. Trow's book?

Mr. FORBES. It is not in his book.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you seen the book?

Mr. FORBES. The only thing is the paper furnished by the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has a book like this one, and I expect it is entered up by the clerk every night.

Mr. FORBES. No, it is not. It makes no difference, because the pair appears in the book kept by the clerk; it was entered by the authority of the member for Lisgar but without the authority of the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. BOWELL. What the hon. member for Leeds said was that the information was given by the hon. member for Selkirk, and not by the hon. member for Lisgar, and supposing he had made a pair between those two gentlemen, he entered it in the book.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Justice seemed to think that the member for Russell was to blame for using the language he used. He overlooked one important point, namely, that when his explanation was given, it was not accepted by the Government whip.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The language used by the member for Russell with respect to a fraudulent entry in the book was used in the same breath as the statement of the hon. member for Leeds, and the latter hon. member had no opportunity of saying whether he accepted it or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even so; after the letter had been shown him, he was perfectly justified.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He was perfectly justified.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The feeling prevails on this side of the House, whether rightly or wrongly, that a great many members have been unfairly and unjustly dealt with through the action of the head whip on the other side. There have been, on the other hand, no complaints made by hon. members opposite of the Liberal whip. How do mistakes occur, and how is it that the head whip is so offensive? Not long ago two hon. gentlemen on this side, whose characters are beyond suspicion, found themselves in the same position as did the hon. member for Russell. It is not a matter to be passed over as lightly as the Minister of Justice treats it. It is true that the newspaper reporters will probably, in a spirit of fairness and after this full explanation, showing how utterly wrong the member for Leeds was and how correct the member for Russell was, do justice to my hon. friend; but except for that fact, the statement might have been read by tens of thousands that the member for Russell had violated what is equivalent to his word of honour. The House cannot but feel how unfair and unjust was the charge made against him. It is due to this feeling to which I have referred more than any other for which hon. gentlemen opposite have to thank themselves if they find difficulty sometimes in securing pairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a feeling of insecurity of being unfairly dealt with; not induced by the instance to-night but by other instances, and this will accentuate the feeling very much.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to have the names of the two members to whom the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Langelier and Mr. Lavergne.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did I not explain that those pairs were made by the French whips, and that it was simply my duty to call attention to the matter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was also alleged that Mr. Colter had voted when he had paired. That report went the rounds of the press, and it was stated he had broken his pair, when such was not the case. This is a most serious matter, because if a member is destitute of honour he is not entitled to sit in this House. The Minister of Justice generally poses as a member desiring to render justice and yet he conveyed the idea that the member for Russell had done something which he should not have done. The Minister of Justice should not try to heap insult on injury in regard to the hon. member for Russell, as he has done by the observations he has made. When the member for Russell gives his word it is as good as his bond, and if he was paired he would not vote.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, member for the electoral district of Quebec West, the witness named in the report of the Select Standing Committee of Privileges and Elections communicated to this House on 12th August, do attend at his place in this House on Tuesday next, 18th instant, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire, in conformity with the notice I gave last night, to call the attention of the House to the desirability of expressing an opinion with respect to a practice which has unfortunately grown up amongst us, and which I conceive to be extremely detrimental to the good government of this country. I propose, at the outset, to read the motion with which I intend to conclude my remarks, and which is as follows:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved: That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of Ministers of the Crown or of any member of their families from contractors, Government officials or other persons having pecuniary relations with the Government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration, and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under Ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

I desire, in the first place, to say that I do not offer this as a motion of want of confidence. It is in the power of the Government to accept or refuse my motion, as they have done on other occasions, as they did very recently in the case of the motion submitted by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), and I trust that, on calm consideration, the Government will see the desirability and propriety of affirming the principles which are contained in the resolution which I have just read, and with which I propose to close these remarks. Now, Sir, I want to call your particular attention, and I want to call the particular attention of the House to the substance of this motion. This motion declares, Sir—and let this be carefully remembered—this motion does not object to and does not censure the acceptance of gifts or testimonials by Ministers of the Crown from their political or personal admirers, unless, indeed, these parties should belong to classes having direct pecuniary relations with the Government at the time. Such a proposition, it appears to me, ought to commend itself to every right-feeling and right-thinking man from one end of this Dominion to the other, and I go further; it ought to commend itself to every honest man and to every right-thinking man under every constitutional government. There could be, in my judgment, no proposition clearer or plainer than this. There could be no one thing which tends more to the interest of good government, and which is more vital to the proper management of the public service, than laying down once and for all the declaration on the part of this Parliament: That it is not expedient that Ministers of the Crown should accept, from persons who may appear before them in the guise of suitors, from persons in regard to whom they stand in position of judges, any gifts or presents of testimonials of any kind or description. I repeat again, Sir, that I am not raising the vexed question as to whether a Minister of the Crown should or should not accept gifts during his term of office from political admirers. That, I have always held, is a matter of opinion, and it must be determined by the peculiar circumstances in each case. But I lay down, with all the emphasis in my power, I call upon this House and I call upon every honest man in this House and out of it, to stand by me in declaring that Ministers of the Crown have no right whatever under any conceivable circumstances, to accept gifts from contractors or public servants or persons having direct relations with the Government. I have always held that Ministers of the Crown were in a two-fold sense trustees. They are trustees of the people by right of the fact that they are the representatives of the people, but they are more than that. They are the sworn and paid servants of the public; they are, therefore, doubly bound to see to it, that no act of theirs should bring their high office into contempt or should be likely in any way to interfere with the proper administration of constitutional government as we have it and understand it. More than that, Sir, as every man who has experience in office knows; as every man who has had experience in public life knows; Ministers of the Crown—and more especially Ministers in charge of great spending departments—are continually called upon to fill the office of judges. They are continually called upon to decide questions involving large sums of money in which their employers, the public at large, stand on one side, and private individuals stand on the other side. Now, Sir, I need not say to this House, least of all need I say to the Minister of Justice, who himself has been a distinguished member of the judicial bench,

that there is no one thing which at all times and at all ages has been held to bring more infamy upon a judge, than the acceptance of gifts or presents from a suitor in his court. What would that hon. gentleman say in his own case; what would he think of the acts of any one of his brethren, if in a suit before him under which, by his decision, a suitor should receive a large sum of money; it had turned out that that suitor had, before the day of decision arrived, presented him with a large sum of money, or let us say for illustration sake, a valuable service of plate. Sir, the case is worse in a Minister of the Crown than it is in that of judges, and for this very obvious reason: What judges do, they do in full blaze of publicity; they do it under the eye of a vigilant bar; their decisions in almost every case are subject to be reviewed on appeal, and, therefore, there is infinitely less danger in their case than there is in the case of a Minister sitting, as one might say, *in camera*; as to whose proceedings very little, often, is known for many years; as to whose proceedings very little can be known, and who may command, and often does command, so powerful a majority in Parliament, that investigation into his delinquencies, if he commits any, is practically impossible for long periods of time, and is often utterly impossible. Now, Sir, having laid down that as regards the theory of the question, I come to the other side of it; that is as to the extreme practical evils to the state which result from disregarding the wise and wholesome rule which is universally established by English practice, and universally established, in theory at least, in all constitutional assemblies. You cannot by possibility—and every man knows that I speak the truth—you cannot by possibility allow a Minister of the State to accept gifts of any kind, without, if the practice becomes known, demoralizing in a very high degree the whole society over which he presides. And especially, there is no one thing which is clearer or plainer to my mind, no one thing which I think will be plainer and clearer to the minds of the hon. gentlemen on either side, than that so soon as the head of a department, whoever he may be, is known to have received gifts or testimonials from persons occupying the relations to which I have referred in this testimonial, that moment, Sir, the demoralization of that man's department is sure and certain. The injury is three-fold; the public purse in such cases is likely to suffer extremely, as we have seen and known; the public service, that is to say the whole Civil Service, and particularly that branch of the service with which such person is connected, is likewise sure to suffer; and public morality, I repeat, receives the worst possible injury it can receive at the hands of any public man, if it become known and patent to the community of which he is chief, that he is willing to accept bribes from parties, as I said, having cases in his court, for that is what it virtually amounts to. Now, Sir, in our own case, with respect to this testimonial business, it is unfortunately too true that the beginning of the evils of which I complain, and which I desire to rectify, took its rise in the first instance, in a testimonial which was presented a considerable number of years ago, to the late Sir John A. Macdonald. That was very much to be regretted, and the more to be regretted, because I have always maintained, and I feel it due to myself to say here now, that in the first inception of that testimonial I believe that the motives of the men who originated it were pure and honourable. The circumstances of the case, which the House will pardon me for reciting briefly, are these: Sir John A. Macdonald had been struck down by a very dangerous illness. It was perfectly well known that he was in deeply embarrassed circumstances; deeply indebted I believe, and that but a very slender provision indeed had been made for his family. Under these circumstances, Sir, if ever, it was quite justifiable for the hon. gentleman's personal friends and admirers to have contributed for the purpose of relieving his family from any danger of want, and had two or three very obvious and very reasonable precautions been taken, no blame could have been attached to the parties who were concerned in getting up that testimonial. Unfortunately these precautions were not taken, unfortunately publicity was not given, as I have always said publicity should be given, to the names of persons who subscribed; and still more unfortunately precautions were not taken to see that subscriptions to that fund were not accepted save from sources from which they could honourably be accepted. Now, Sir, I am not going at the present moment to repeat what I have found it my duty to say on other occasions on that subject. But, as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have lately developed an extreme respect and admiration for an eminent gentleman no longer with us, Mr. Edward Blake, I propose to read to those hon. gentlemen rather than give any words of mine, the language in which Mr. Blake found it necessary to speak of that particular testimonial. What Mr. Blake said was this:

"Another case was the gift several years ago to the present First Minister by means of a settlement upon his family of the sum of about $80,000, which was subscribed for and presented to him or to his family while he was First Minister of Canada. It was so subscribed and presented largely by actual and intending contractors, whose business it was to obtain favourable contracts from the Government, and having obtained them, to get the largest prices for the least returns, and the most liberal allowances for extras that they could manage. It was subscribed largely also by public corporations greatly indebted to the treasury, and dependent upon the Executive for favourable settlements of their indebtedness and favourable adjustments of their financial relations."

Mr. Blake goes on to give a very notable instance, which I will not myself at this present moment read to the House. It referred, however, to the Northern Railway Company; and those gentlemen who desire to see what happened in regard to that matter may refer to what Mr. Blake took occasion to say upon it. I purposely abstain from doing so, because, while it is necessary to call attention to this subject, I do not want to import into this discussion more than is absolutely necessary to prove my case, and for that reason only, and in order that the Government may not plead that unnecessary matters were brought in, I abstain from reading the very notable instance which Mr. Blake gave of the enormous public mischiefs apt to result from the practice which I deplore. But, Sir, there was no doubt that from the neglect of the precautions which I have alluded to, grave scandal arose, grave injury to the public service arose, a very bad precedent was set, and in the nature of the case, after that bad precedent another still worse precedent followed. That, Sir, is the case of the testimonial presented to a gentleman whom I do not know whether I should speak of as the present or the late or the suspended Minister of Public Works. In his case there were no such excuses as those

which existed in the case of Sir John A. Macdonald. No man could look at the public record of the parties who subscribed to the testimonial to the Minister of Public Works without seeing that for the most part they were most undoubtedly men coming well within the lines of this resolution. They were public contractors, or public officials, or parties having pecuniary relations with the Government; and I say, Sir, that the bad precedent which existed in the first case was doubled and trebled in its injury to the public service and to the country at large by the case of the hon. Minister of Public Works. I have observed, Sir, that some of that hon. gentleman's apologists have undertaken to mitigate the error, or the crime, call it which you will, which was committed by the reception of that testimonial under the circumstances, by the plea, which I think was also advanced in the other case, that the hon. gentleman did not know who had subscribed to his testimonial. Such a plea, in my judgment, is a direct aggravation of the offence. A public Minister has no right whatever to allow any gift to be made to him unless it is done publicly, and unless he knows from what sources it proceeds; and, Sir, I would say this, that if a Minister of the Crown tells me that he has accepted a gift, not knowing and not choosing to know from whom it proceeded, so far from regarding such a plea as a mitigation, I say that such a plea raises a presumption of guilt. It was his duty to know it; it was his duty to find out; it was his duty to see that not one penny went into his pockets or into his coffers unless it came from such sources that he could honourably and fairly receive it. Now, Sir, I need not tell this House or the people of this country what followed on these precedents. The country has been for weeks and months a spectator of investigations which go to show that the natural results of these acts have followed—that a great spending department of the public service has become very little better than one mass of corruption; that the name of Canada, more important by far than the name of any individual man, is fast becoming a disgrace and a by-word from one end of the world to the other; that Canada and the reputation of Canadian statesmen, unless steps and very determined steps be very shortly taken to purge ourselves of these scandals, will sink below the level of a wretched South American Republic; that our credit as well as our character will suffer, and cannot fail to suffer if these things are known to have existed, and yet it be found that the Parliament of Canada will not even declare that it is improper that such things can be. Sir, again I say that rather than use my own words, I will read the language used by the gentleman for whom hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House profess such respect. Here is what Mr. Edward Blake had to say with respect to the Minister of Public Works:

"The thing was approved or condoned, and two or three years ago the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) got his testimonial too. Why not? What is right for the chief is right for the second in command. He, it is true, has to do with the great bulk of the contracts for public works. He largely decides upon the conditions for tendering, advertises for the tenders, determines which tender shall be accepted, determines whether the contractor has performed the work. He it is who gives the instructions for changes, who settles the bills for extras, which allow the greatest latitude for favourable or unfavourable settlement. He, I say, even above the others, ought to avoid, as a matter utterly abominable, any relations, except the direct business and official relations, with the contractors who have or may have business with his department. The testimonial he received was about $20,000. And it was largely subscribed by public contractors who had claims against the Government, or hopes or expectations, the realization of which depended almost wholly on its favourable decision. Many of those claims have since been settled. What has happened? This has happened, that many people suspect the Minister of Public Works of having been influenced in his decisions by the relation he allowed to exist between these contractors and himself, as givers and recipient of a large and valuable present. It may or it may not have been so. No man can tell. We cannot judge. God knoweth. But the position is wholly indefensible. To no public man ought it be possible to say: With one hand you took from this man a testimonial; and with the other you settled his claim."

Now, these are the statements of a gentleman whom, now that he is out of the political arena, hon. gentlemen on the other side profess to hold in the highest possible esteem, whose words they are never tired of quoting, when it suits their purpose. I trust they will pay equal respect to them when quoted from this side. Sir, up to the present time, I think but one attempt has been made, to the best of my recollection, to challenge the judgment of Parliament on this most improper and immoral practice. Numerous attempts have been made, it is true, to grapple with the kindred and closely allied one—the cousin german, to say the least of it,—of exacting heavy toll, heavy subscriptions, from contractors for the purpose of carrying elections and for political ends. Over and over again have attempts been made from this side of the House to check that evil. In 1881 a Bill was introduced forbidding contractors, while engaged in public contracts, to subscribe to political funds for either party. As might have been expected, that was voted down. In 1882 a similar Bill was brought up. This they thought it inexpedient to vote down as they had done before, and they referred it to a select committee; and no more was heard of it for that session. In 1883 a similar measure was proposed, and the Bill this time was passed with the vital clause left out. In 1884 we again attempted to introduce the wholesome provision that no contractor should be allowed, under severe penalties, to subscribe to elections while his contract was going on. That was killed judiciously in the Committee of the Whole, I believe, and unless my memory wholly deceives me, my hon. friend behind me brought it up again in a substantial shape, and it was for the fourth time defeated by a former Parliament. Now, in these cases former Parliaments were most directly to blame for many of the results which we have seen occurring through the neglect to take that very proper precaution; and I would call your attention, Sir, to this fact, that when the Parliament of Canada, having been challenged four consecutive times in four separate years, and refused each time to declare that it is improper for public contractors to subscribe to election funds for political purposes how can any man venture to say that contractors who had subscribed to political funds, cannot contend that they have the sanction of Parliament in the clearest possible manner for the course they pursued? Sir, every hon. member knows, every man of common sense in the country knows, that when a contractor subscribes out of his own pocket to a political fund, that contractor means to receive, and almost invariably does receive, three-fold, four-fold, five-fold and ten-fold the amount of his subscriptions from a generous Minister. I have quoted what my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, was pleased to say

on these subjects; but I think the House will bear with me while I repeat a few words that I myself addressed to my constituents two or three years ago, when these matters had become known to every hon. gentleman who paid any attention to public affairs, but before we had obtained the overwhelming proof we have to-day of the results which, as sure as night follows day, follow such practices. I quote this speech the more especially because I felt it my duty to cause copies to be sent to every member of the then Parliament, and I have had reason to observe, in the speeches subsequently delivered by many of them, that they had read though not profited by it. What I said was this, speaking at Ingersoll on the 14th November, 1889:

"I presume if there is any one thing more than another on which honest men of all parties ought to agree, it is this, that no man engaged in constructing public works should be allowed to make presents to public officials, and least of all to Ministers of State. To this I add, nor in all conscience should such a one be allowed to contribute to election funds, either while his contract is going on or while he has unsettled claims awaiting the action of the Government. Surely this is fair and reasonable, and yet four distinct times has a Bill to this effect been introduced into Parliament, and four several times has it been evaded or point-blank voted down; and that, too, in spite of the fact that on one occasion the clause to which objection was taken, namely, that forbidding contractors to subscribe for political objects, has been reported to the House by a Select Committee, of which the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Macdonald, now Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, was one, and though a clause of similar import had been recently made law in the United States. So also was another Bill, dealing expressly with the case of men making presents to Ministers, voted down, its rejection being moved, with a fine sense of the fitness of things, by Sir Hector Langevin, himself the recipient of a testimonial subscribed for by just such persons as I have mentioned above. Ministers should not take gifts. Now surely, if there is any one maxim in political ethics better established than another—if there is any one thing which ought to commend itself to every honest man of every party in Canada, it is this: that under no circumstances should a Minister of State permit himself to accept gifts, either directly or indirectly, while he continues in office. Least of all should he accept them from public servants or from men employed in carrying out contracts of any sort. Sir, the reason is most obvious. From the very nature of the case, the contractor in almost every conceivable public work is, by the expressed terms of the contract, left very much at the mercy of the Minister. That Minister can, as a rule, make his fortune or mar it. At any rate, he can almost invariably affect the contractor's profits enormously, and, if displeased, involve him in a tedious and costly litigation. Consequently the temptation to the contractor to secure the good-will of the Ministers by all means is irresistible. He is really not a free agent, not merely while he is performing his contract, but until he has been finally paid for it, and every sound political rule dictates that such a person should be debarred, under stringent penalties, from purchasing the favour of Ministers, either by subscribing to testimonials (?) or to election funds. If a man's political supporters do really desire to testify their admiration by making him a gift of money, let them wait till he is out of office, and then subscribe to their heart's content. Sir, there is not much fear of corrupt influence then, but very few and far between were the testimonials subscribed for by admirers of the present Government while they were out of office. Perhaps their supporters thought Sir Hugh Allan had done enough in that way. Sir, these are no light matters, and they have led to no light consequences."

These were the words which I addressed not merely to my constituents, but through the press to the whole people of Canada two years ago. By those words I stand, by those words I am willing to be judged, and by those words I demand that this question be adjudicated upon. I need hardly recall certain occurrences which took place in this House a year ago when I was compelled to intimate my conviction that a certain notorious individual was standing on the peak of a veritable continent of undeveloped rascality, and that when he was expelled from this House, the ground he took was that it was very hard that he should be singled out for judgment when there were twenty others as guilty as he. This is a new Parliament, a number of new members are assembled here, to some of whom these facts may not be so well known as they are to the older members of the House, and, therefore, I propose to give these new members a chance of clearing their skirts from old scandals by referring to some former revelations and by making the motion which I am about to do. These new members have clear and strong evidence—evidence stronger than has ever been submitted to any deliberative body within my knowledge—with regard to the facts to which I refer. Let these hon. members take the chance now. They will do so if they are wise. If it is any relief to them to abuse me for what I have said, they may do that. I have been dipped too often in the political Styx to care very much what they say in regard to me, but I say, like Themistocles, "Strike, but hear me." Abuse me if you like, but pass my motion. It would be in their own interest, I think, that those hon. gentlemen should vote for this motion which I propose. If you vote against it—and you cannot amend it; you must vote yea or nay—then you vote that you approve of Ministers of the Crown receiving bribes, because that is what these gifts and testimonials amount to, you vote in favour of their having pecuniary relations with contractors or receiving gifts from contractors or officials. I do not pretend to condemn the gift which may be made to a Minister by his political admirers, but I do complain of any Minister receiving gifts from sources such as these, sources from which he cannot accept without injury to his own honour and to the public treasury. It may be well to consider how the country will regard the action of the supporters of the Government if this motion is voted down. For a long time the country has been rather apathetic in regard to matters that should have stirred the people up, but now there appears to be a spirit moving among the dry bones, and I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that their action in regard to this matter will be very closely watched. Here you have a motion forbidding Ministers to receive contributions from contractors and persons of that kind, and I cannot conceive how any honest or honourable man can defend the practice of making such presents to Ministers of the Crown. Further, the House has to consider what is the effect of this on the outside world. Everyone knows that our conduct in this matter has attracted a great deal of unfavourable and hostile criticism, and I say that, if the result of this debate shows that the majority of the Parliament of Canada sees nothing wrong in Ministers taking bribes, not merely will our reputation, but our credit suffer in the markets of Europe, and that very seriously. If the Canadian Parliament—which I cannot and will not believe until I see the vote recorded—refuses to declare on this plain question that they consider that the taking of gifts by Ministers from those persons who are specified is improper and ought to be condemned, all I can say is that, as a Canadian, I shall regret the result and I believe that Canada will become in the eyes of the world a synonym for rascality. This vote cannot be evaded. Hon. gentlemen are bound to take one or the other alternative. They cannot

plead, if they vote against this motion, but that they have sanctioned the very thing I propose to condemn. I have purposely abstained from going into many details which I might go into, because I thought it was not necessary to give many examples. I did not wish to carry the matter further than I thought was imperatively necessary in order to bring the case fully before the House. I, therefore, move that you do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that all the words after "That" be expunged and the following substituted in lieu thereof :—

The acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of Ministers of the Crown or of any member of their families from contractors, Government officials, or other persons having pecuniary relations with the Government is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration, and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under Ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to say a few words in reference to this matter and to express the views in regard to it which are entertained by members on this side of the House and particularly by members of the Administration. We have to consider this resolution in connection with the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for South Oxford, some of which certainly commend his resolution to our acceptance, and some of which make us regret that the proposition to express an abstract principle should be put before the House accompanied by statements likely to arouse hostility, likely to arouse animosity out of past transactions, and likely, perhaps, to lead to a misapprehension among those who are not well informed as to some of the transactions of the past. Now, referring, first, to the observations of the member for South Oxford which, it seemed to me, were hardly necessary to be expressed this afternoon, and which are calculated to arouse the feelings I have mentioned, I would refer to what he said with regard to the testimonial which was presented many years ago to the late First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comparative moderation with which the hon. gentleman spoke with regard to some of those transactions, notwithstanding that I deplore that he did make comments upon that and other transactions which are to be regretted. The hon. gentleman evidently spoke under a certain measure of self-restraint, especially considering that some to whom he referred were on terms of active political hostility with him, extending over a long period of years. But as one member of this Administration, and I think I am speaking for my colleagues—I must say with regard to the testimonial presented to the late Sir John A. Macdonald, which was so long ago as upwards of 20 years, that that matter has been so well discussed, so well ventilated, and so well considered in Parliament and throughout this country, that there ought to be no misapprehension about it, and there ought to be no association of any incident connected with it, with observations condemning a practice which the hon. gentleman asks the House to declare should be condemned, as likely to lead to corruption. I think the hon. member for South Oxford felt impelled, in introducing his observations in regard to that testimonial, presented, as I have said, upwards of 20 years ago—I think his innate sense of justice compelled him to admit that that testimonial was

prompted by honourable feeling and could be accepted without the slightest stain upon the honour of the great public man to whom it was presented. The hon. gentleman admitted, for example, that the impulse which led to the gathering of that testimonial and its presentation to Sir John A. Macdonald, was due to the fact that at that moment he was supposed to be upon his death-bed, he was supposed to be about to close a career which had been magnificent for Canada and for British America, and the testimonial was about to be presented to him under a general impression that his family needed the provision which grateful fellow-countrymen could make for them, and which the patriotism and self-sacrifice of the head of that family had prevented him from securing for them. I might refer to another circumstance to convince the House, as I am myself convinced, that the hon. gentleman felt that he should not throw the slightest stain upon the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald, in connection with that transaction, or to impute any tendency even, with regard to that testimonial, to corrupt those who were connected with the late Sir John Macdonald's department ; for, if I am not mistaken, it is a matter of fact that the hon. member for South Oxford himself was one of the contributors to that testimonial. Now, Sir, I beg to say further, that this is not the first time that this subject has been discussed in this House by any means. I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact that after that testimonial had been presented, and after some bitterness had been aroused in consequence of the keen and critical state of politics in this country at that time, an enquiry into all the transactions connected with the testimonial was conducted by a committee of this House, with a result which has ever since been satisfactory to this Parliament and to this country. So much for that particular instance. I must refer now, very briefly indeed, to another instance which the hon. gentleman gave—the instance of the testimonial to the ex-Minister of Public Works. The hon. member for South Oxford forebore, himself, to criticize in terms of great severity the conduct of the ex-Minister of Public Works in accepting that testimonial, or the conduct of those who joined in making it ; but he read to the House some words which he thought would commend themselves to members upon this side of the House on account of the great authority of the gentleman from whom they came. Well, Sir, with regard to those observations which were put forward in a past session by the Hon. Edward Blake upon that question, I have this to say : That Mr. Blake's abilities and Mr. Blake's services are admired by many members on both sides of the House ; but the hon. gentleman need not suppose that we are to accept everything that Mr. Blake has said in the bitterness of a political conflict—and no man could be more bitter, and at times more unjust than he—merely because since then that gentleman has assumed an attitude of the most direct hostility, upon some public questions, to the gentleman with whom, and over whom, and under whom, he formerly served. When a public man upon the other side of the House undertakes to make statements against the policy of his party, and when he undertakes to warn the country against the policy of his party, we have a right to quote his opinions, and to give them all their due weight, without being saddled with the responsibility of everything that gentleman has

said in a long political lifetime, and in all the political struggles in which he has engaged. The terms in which Mr. Blake alluded to the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin, in my humble opinion, were unjustly severe, and the observations which the hon. member for South Oxford himself made this afternoon with regard to Sir Hector Langevin, were, I submit, simply uncalled for. The Rules of the House would not permit me, even if I were disposed, even if I thought it necessary to enter into an elaborate explanation of the circumstances connected with that testimonial, as they have been detailed elsewhere. I should feel disposed, even if they did permit, to refrain from doing so, for the simple reason that in a few days the report of the committee, sitting with judicial functions with regard to that whole question, will be laid upon the Table of this House, and this House will surely suspend its judgment, and the members of the committee even will suspend an expression of their opinions, upon every branch of the case, the testimonial branch being one of them, in the meantime. But I have this to say, as has been stated in this House, and to the public again and again, that up to a few days ago the late Minister of Public Works was not in the slightest degree acquainted with the names of any but one of those who contributed to this testimonial. The hon. member for South Oxford has declared to the House that that makes the case worse. We will discuss that in due time, when the case of the late Minister of Public Works comes before this House; but in the meantime I must add this, and every man whose judgment is not warped by the most dreadful prejudice, will agree with me, that if it is true, as cannot be doubted or denied, that the names of the contributors to that testimonial were unknown to the late Minister of Public Works, it cannot be said that his judgment was blinded, that his judgment either concerning those who were in his department, or those who were contracting with the Government, was in any degree warped by the circumstance of that testimonial having been presented to him. Another observation which the hon. member made, to which I must take exception, is his allusion to the present state of public morality in Canada. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that while the fame of Canada had been great for purity in public life, its name had lately become a by-word among the nations. As one member of the House I must protest against that statement. I declare for my part that nothing which has transpired of late in connection with the public service of Canada warrants any such expression here or abroad. I am aware, Sir, that there are rumours in the air, that there are statements made, with respect to a case which the hon. member for South Oxford forgot in choosing the illustrations by which he wished to embellish his case to the House this afternoon, not connected with the public life of the Dominion of Canada, but connected with one of its provinces, which, if half true would cause the reputation of that province to become a by-word throughout the rest of the Dominion. But, so far as the public life of this Dominion is concerned the investigations which hon. gentlemen are disposed to make can go on from this time forward, and if they meet with no greater success or development than they have in the past, they will not elicit anything which will justify any man here or elsewhere saying that the public life of Canada is a by-word or reproach. No one is disposed to deny or will deny that irregularities have existed in the public service, all of which have been condemned by members on both sides of the House as soon as the irregularities have been discussed. But they have been magnified abroad in a way that could only be regarded as wilful slander on this country. For example, when it was stated a little while ago that violations of the Civil Service Act had been committed, inasmuch as certain officials receiving regular salaries had received additional emoluments for additional work, their cases were promptly dealt with, and, perhaps, severely dealt with. But what was the statement made abroad with respect to these cases? The statement made was that it had been discovered that, in one of the great departments of this country, the regularly paid officials, while receiving the regular salaries given to them by Parliament, were receiving, nearly every one of them, an additional salary for his wife and an additional salary for his sister out of the work which he did himself. Any person who is disposed, I will not say to magnify, but to falsify circumstances in connection with public life in Canada, can bring stain and reproach on its reputation. But, thank Providence, they have to do that before establishing that the allegation of the hon. member for South Oxford this afternoon, that the name of Canada has in any degree become a by-word or reproach as to impropriety in public life, is in the slightest degree justified or justifiable. The hon. gentleman likewise referred, and this is another observation to which I must take exception, to a case which we had under consideration last session; and the hon. gentleman, although he has admitted on former occasions that ample justice was done in that case by this whole House, has raked up an expression which was used by the individual against whom the censure of this House was expressed. This was done for what purpose? For the purpose of casting a stigma on a large number of members of this House. The hon. gentleman has stated that when Mr. Rykert was practically expelled from this House, he went out and publicly declared that the great hardship of his case was that he was singled out for individual punishment, while the cases of many members of Parliament were as bad as his own. Mr. Rykert did make that statement. Mr. Rykert made it in his own vindication, or in mitigation of the sentence pronounced upon him by this House, and which was likely to be pronounced by the public throughout this country, and he made several other statements which I know to be destitute of a particle of truth. Although the hon. gentleman charged that member with falsehood, charged him with corruption, charged him with the most discreditable and corrupt conduct, he now undertakes to use his assertion here for the purpose of throwing an insult across the House, at the very time he is asking the deliberate and honest judgment of the House on a great moral question which, he says, should be kept entirely free from party bias and animosity. Now, Mr. Speaker, having commented on the observations to which I felt bound to take exception in the hon. gentleman's speech, I must refer to some observations connected

with that speech and connected with that resolution which I think we are bound to take into consideration in voting on this resolution. The first is that the hon. gentleman has expressed in connection with his resolution a limitation, which it was absolutely necessary he should concede, and which must be conceded as to every country, namely, that this resolution is not intended to be aimed, and the censures which the mover has expressed are not intended to be aimed at those who in public life receive from political admirers or for legitimate political purposes contributions or testimonials such as he has mentioned. But the hon. gentleman has asked the judgment of this House on this resolution and upon the principle of this resolution in the abstract and, apart from anything connected with the past, has asked this House, as being an entirely new House, to adopt and affirm not a new but a broad and general principle. If the resolution which the hon. member for South Oxford put forward contained half that his speech contained in reference to the past, half the insinuations which his speech contained in reference to the past, it would be necessary to ask this House, out of self-respect and out of justice to vote it down. But the hon. gentleman has declared that such is not his intention; that he invites the House simply to affirm the abstract principle contained in this resolution; he has, notwithstanding the objectionable features of his speech to which I have alluded, shown considerable restraint for him in commenting on transactions which he has stigmatized very severely, very vigorously, and very unjustly elsewhere and in times past. The hon. gentleman has likewise stated that the resolution is not proposed as a vote of want of confidence, notwithstanding that it is put forward to intercept us for the moment in going into Supply. Considering these circumstances, and apart altogether from the observations which I have commented on as being undue and, as I thought out of place, I have to say that, as regards the general principle of this resolution, accompanied as it is by the disclaimer of the hon. member for South Oxford, it is one which the House may, in my opinion, adopt, and as it is not put forward as a vote of want of confidence, so far as the Government is concerned, we are disposed to accept the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. I congratulate the Minister of Justice upon what I conceive to be the very wise course he has now taken, but I still more congratulate the hon. member for South Oxford on the signal victory he has obtained. He has laid down a principle which has been long contended for on this side of the House, which has always been refused on the other side of the House, but which, at last, circumstances compel the Government to accept. While I congratulate the Minister of Justice on the attitude he has taken, it seems to me that his conduct would have been still more praiseworthy if he had accepted the amendment, not only in its terms, but also in the same spirit in which it was offered to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford. The hon. gentleman admits himself, to some extent, that every word of the speech made by the hon. member for South Oxford, with one or two exceptions, to which I will allude, is correct. Certainly, nothing whatever said by my hon. friend with respect to the testimonial given to Sir John A. Macdonald, by his friends, could be found fault with. Every word which he said will be endorsed, not only by his friends, but by his opponents as well. The testimonial to Sir John Macdonald, as was said by my friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), was conceived in a very proper and laudable spirit, at a critical time in his life, when his life was despaired of, and with a view of providing for his family, since he had not been able himself to provide for them. So far so good. The only thing, however, with which my hon. friend found fault in regard to what was done on that occasion by the friends of Sir John Macdonald, was that instead of it being done publicly, as it should have been done, it was done in secret. I assume, and I have no doubt, that at that time there was no intention on the part of those who started the movement, to conceal anything whatever; but at all events the circumstances that afterwards developed showed, that if the testimonial and everything that was done in connection with it had been done in open and broad day, certain facts which took place would not have taken place; certain contributions which then were offered would not have been accepted, because public opinion would have resented it. Of course in the matter of this testimonial, it is an act absolutely indifferent in itself. It may be wrong or it may be good, according to circumstances, but if such an act is done in the open light of day, then, Sir, it is the best prohibition that there can be against any wrong taking place, but, Sir, with regard to this testimonial, and the testimonial offered a few years afterwards to the late Minister of Public Works, the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), between them there is a marked distinction. The Minister of Justice said a moment ago in reference to the testimonial offered to the hon. Minister of Public Works, the member for Three Rivers, that that hon. gentleman did not know who were the subscribers. Sir, if he did not know, why did he not look at the list? If the hon. gentleman did not know, it was because he chose to remain ignorant of who were the names on the list, and if he chose to be ignorant of the names which were on that list, is it not because his moral sense told him that he might there find names of persons giving contributions, which should not be accepted at all? Is it not simply because his conscience told him that if he were to look at that list he would find there the names of men who were every day suppliants in his office for favours? That is the reason why the hon. Minister of Public Works did not choose to have a look at that list. If that is not the reason why did he choose to be blind on that matter? Then I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to tell what is the reason, if there could be any good reason for it. Certainly there could be nothing, wrong in the admirers of a man in public life coming to his help and rescuing him; but it seems to me that the recipient of such favours would naturally be too glad to know who are the persons to whom he owes gratitude, and if he does not choose to know who are those to whom he owes gratitude, it must be because his moral sense tells him that he would find there names which would be a condemnation of his accepting such a testimonial. I may say this to the Minister of Justice: If the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), if the then Minister of Public Works, did not know who were the names of persons who subscribed to that testimonial, he was the only man in Canada

who was so ignorant. He was the only man in Canada, I say, because it was a fact of public notoriety that the subscribers to that testimonial were the contractors of the Public Works Department. The fact was known in the press at that time, and it was made known, not in the press of the Opposition, but made known in the press of the Government. It was made known in the public press of Montreal, and some few years ago a series of articles were published in the organ of the Government, *La Presse* of Montreal, which afterwards were collected in pamphlet form, and I have the pamphlet in my hands, and this is what I read in it:

"By the aid of this ingenious system which is called 'public subscription' in the case of a Minister, and 'blackmail' in the case of a poor devil, Sir Hector was able to add $25,000 to his economies, and the public works of the country cost to the country $500,000 more than it would have paid if the contractors had not been friends."

Sir, after this, could the Minister ignore who were the subscribers to his fund, and is it possible to say at this day, after this statement was made and published, not in the press of the Opposition, but in the press of the Government, that the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) the then Minister of Public Works, did not know who were those who were tendering him the money for this testimonial? I repeat, Sir, that if the then Minister of Public Works did not know who were those who gave him that testimonial, it was because he chose to remain blind, for what he did not know, every man not only in the House but in the country at large, was aware of. Then the pamphlet goes on furthermore to say:

"The name is kept in the Public Works Department of a well-known contractor who had been soliciting for two years an indemnity for public works in the city of Quebec, and who had been most anxious while petitioning to subscribe $1,000 in favour of the chief. That contractor knew very well how men are taken, and when he was asked for the amount of his subscription he declared categorically, that he would not pay one cent unless his claim against the Government was settled. Lucky man: his claim was settled within three days."

And, Sir, I repeat, that is not in the press of the Opposition, but in the press of the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It is too often this statement has been made. At that time *La Presse* was the bitterest enemy of the Government, and the pamphlet which my hon. friend is quoting from, and which is called "Le Métier de Ministre," is the strongest and the most bitter charge ever made against the Government. *La Presse* was then a paper which was the bitterest enemy of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Those are very big words, Sir, but I know what is in them; they are perfectly hollow. That newspaper, *La Presse*, at that time was against the Government on the Riel question, and upon no other question. That paper, *La Presse*, had done like ministerial members whom I see here, protested against the execution of Louis Riel but came down underneath at the proper time. That paper, *La Presse*, was the subsidized organ of the Government at all times, and when the hon. gentleman says it was the bitterest opponent of the Government let him tell me one question, except the Riel question, on which it was against the Government. I will ask the hon. gentlemen furthermore, if it is not true that a few months afterwards, when we were in the thick of the election, *La Presse*, was in the forefront supporting the Government as usual? If these statements, as I said a moment ago, had been said in the press of the Opposition, I could well understand that no value could be attached to them on the other side of the House, because I am sorry to say the press has become so partizan on both sides of politics, that, for my part, I would not be bound by anything said by a journal opposed to my views. But, Sir, this is not one of the Opposition papers which were fighting them. It was from one of the papers which were supporting the Government that the charge first came, and again I say, Sir, that in the face of that, it is preposterous to tell us that the Minister of Public Works did not know who were the contributors to his fund. Now, Sir, upon this question I will say no more for the present time. There are other questions to which my hon. friend has alluded simply to say that they were a reproach to the name of Canada, and I will not discuss these questions to-day. The only thing I would say in reference to this is that I am sorry to see that the Minister of Justice has already, perhaps, anticipated what will be the judgment of the House in a few days. I shall not do anything of the kind. I shall keep my judgment perfectly unbiassed even to that time; but if only one-tenth of the charges made by the hon. member for Montmorency are proved, and more than one-tenth are proved already, they will cause the name of Canada to be a by-word and a reproach.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I listened with attention to the remarks made by the hon. mover of the resolution in amendment to going into Supply, now before the House, and I must say that I have no reason to complain of that hon. gentleman's speech. I have perhaps reason to feel somewhat gratified that he made no personal allusion to me; but, on reading the resolution, I find that I am indicated as one of the parties who received a testimonial. The resolution refers not only to Ministers who have received testimonials from contractors, but it includes members of the Government who receive contributions from contractors or other persons having pecuniary relations with the Government, as well as officials. Now, I may state briefly the circumstances under which I became the recipient of a testimonial in the shape of a house. Hon. gentlemen may not be aware, or, the fact may be of little interest to them, that I at that time had served as the representative of my constituency for about twenty-four years. I had served that constituency as a poor man. My coming here in the first place was not the result of any personal ambition on my part to enter public life; but I was induced to do so by my constituents for their interests rather than my own. I accepted the position, however, and I have held the confidence of that constituency for upwards of thirty years; and during that time I have endeavoured to discharge my duty faithfully. While not posing as a man of perfection, while professing to be human, and liable to err like all men, I do not plead guilty to any dishonest or dishonourable conduct; I do not plead guilty to any improper motives, or even to the possibility of being improperly influenced in the discharge of any public duty. I could not be guilty of that, because whatever other faults I have, I thank God that I have strength enough to prevent me from disgracing myself in that way, as well as disgracing the men who have

reposed confidence in me for so long a time. It was first intimated to me some seven years ago, or thereabout, that a resolution had been formed to provide a house for me by my friends. When I say my friends, I refer to special circumstances. I think I have explained to the House before that when the late leader of the Government, Sir John A. Macdonald, called me to accept a seat in his Cabinet, I did not at all flatter myself that I was selected because of any special ability which I possessed over others who might have been called to fill that position; but I believe my selection was due to special circumstances. A vacancy having occurred in the Cabinet for New Brunswick, and the principle having been established that there should be a representation of Catholics in the Cabinets of our country, I was called in on that ground more than on the ground of any special ability I possessed, to take charge of a department. And when the testimonial of a residence to me was discussed, I took for granted that it was coming from those gentlemen who sympathized with me, and who looked upon me, though I might perhaps unworthily fill the position, as their representative, I had not the slightest objection to accept that token of their esteem and confidence. In accepting that present from them, I had not thought that it could in the slightest degree affect my honour or my standing in this House, or in the country as their representative. Without that testimonial I felt it to be my duty to devote myself to their interests and to promote their interests in every legitimate way I could; and all the testimonials that they might give me, and all the millions of money they might pile up for me, could not strengthen my hands or induce me to do more than I would have done if this testimonial had never been given. I have one more statement to make. When the Government decided to accept this motion on the general principle as laid down by the mover, I think they did perfectly right. I have one thing further to state, to be short, and not to weary the House. I accepted that testimonial in good faith, believing that I had not failed in the obligations I owed to the country or to my constituents. I did not know at the time who the subscribers were. The hon. member for South Oxford, in dealing with this question so far as it affects others, says that they should have known who the subscribers were. Well, the subscription to my testimonial went on for some time. I was not in a position to know who the subscribers were. I was under the impression that the subscriptions were coming from friends of mine whose particular representative I might be considered to be. Less than two years ago the gentleman who managed the legal part of the matter, called my attention to the fact that upon the house which had been presented to me, a balance of $1,000 remained unpaid; and it was then that I became aware of the contributions which had been sent in, and I arranged for the payment of the balance due on the property in order that the matter might be settled. On that list there are only two or perhaps three names of contractors, principally Irish Catholics. There is the name of at least one firm of distillers in this country; and there are the names of one or more officials who might look for promotion in my department. Now, I propose to meet that in a very satisfactory way, I think, if the hon. gentleman will meet me in a fair spirit. I propose to hand to the mover of this resolution that subscription list, which will show every dollar that has been paid in for the purchase of that property; and I will ask him to associate with himself, not a Conservative or a friend of mine, but any two gentlemen he may choose from his own side of the House to go over that list and take the records of my department and examine them at the same time. He will find there, for instance, the name of the firm of Messrs. Gooderham & Worts; all our dealings in the department with them are a matter of record. And if the hon. gentleman finds that there has been any transaction in that department on which a suspicion might be based—I will not ask him to prove a charge or to take evidence to establish a charge; but if he, or the gentlemen associated with him, will, after examination, say that they find a reasonable ground even to suspect that some favour has been shown to Messrs. Gooderham & Worts—though I deny it entirely—then, in that case, and in every other case in which they find any ground for suspicion, I will undertake to refund the money which was subscribed. Not that they could prove any case, because it would be impossible to prove that I was influenced in any improper way; but, if on the face of these facts, as they find them, they can say: Here is a concession made to a man who contributed to that fund, and from which they could draw a conclusion that I was influenced by the fact of that contribution—if they even go only so far as to find the slightest suspicion that I was influenced thereby—I will refund the money to every man affected. I have no more to say than that.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion I desire to say that some time ago the Hamilton *Spectator* stated that I had contributed $400 to the Langevin testimonial. I would not take this opportunity of denying it—because the Hamilton *Spectator*, on seeing my denial, at once took back the assertion—were it not that the St. Catharines *Standard* still persists in repeating the story promulgated by the Hamilton *Spectator*; and as the hon. Minister of Public Works evidently did not know, nor the country generally, who the subscribers to that testimonial were, I wish to state most distinctly to the House and the country that I never subscribed a single cent to the Langevin testimonial, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the permission of the House, I wish to add something which I forgot to mention. I covered three points. Some officials, I think—very few—contributed to that fund. I would ask the hon. gentlemen to take the Civil Service list and look very closely through the promotions in my department; and if they find that any officer who contributed to that fund received one dollar in the way of promotion or increase of salary, which might possibly lead to the conclusion that I was influenced by his contribution in giving him that increase or promotion, I am prepared to refund in that case also.

Mr. OUIMET. Before this motion is adopted I wish to say a few words, and would preface my remarks by saying that it is very much to be regretted that the practice of the House of Commons in England should not be followed here. I refer to the practice of giving previous notice of important motions such as this, which here are always

sprung on the House, without the members being given any opportunity of knowing what the subject under discussion will be. I do not charge the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with being discourteous to the House, for he has followed the practice which obtains here of giving private notice to the leader of the House of motions he intends to present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I gave public notice from my place last night.

Mr. OUIMET. I must admit that I am then in the wrong; but I, in common with a great many people, believe in going to bed early. But, Sir, if notice had to be given to the House generally, it would appear in the Journals of the House, and then every member would have to take notice of it: and I think when important questions such as this come up for debate, every member should know it in advance, and not only two or three on each side; for I do not suppose that this House is a ring, and that we are here to witness two or three members on each side fighting for the flag. I think if notice were given in the Journals, the House would be in a better position to discuss these matters and pronounce a sound judgment on them. Now, Sir, with regard to the question under discussion, the principle laid down in the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford certainly commends itself to the common sense and the good judgment of the House; and I for one am ready to endorse it. For my part, I wish it had been followed in the past. But, Sir, things have gone differently. To-day, in another part of this building, a great state trial is going on. Two hon. members of this House are now under trial before a Special Committee, and I think it would be premature—not only premature but unwise—for this House to pass judgment in advance on those hon. gentlemen. We have not before us, as members of this House, the evidence which has been adduced, and I do not think it is right for the hon. leader of the Opposition to pass judgment, in the name of his followers, in the name of the House, and in the assumed name of the country, on those gentlemen now undergoing trial. The motion in itself I am ready to accept; but when I am told by the leader of the Opposition, that, by accepting this motion, I am going to endorse the remarks he has addressed to the House to-day, I say that I am not ready to do that. I am not ready to do what is not fair, and it is not fair now, when we have no evidence or documents before us, when the case for the defence has not been closed, to pronounce judgment, not a direct but an indirect judgment, and to say in advance that we should, on one point of that trial now in issue before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, namely, the testimonial presented to the ex-Minister of Public Works, pass our condemnation. I am not ready to do that, and I am sorry that we should be given a lesson of morals here. We all know what morality teaches, and we are supposed to know, just as well on the right side of this House as on the left; and these general propositions which hon. gentlemen opposite want to thrust down our throats, I say if I am going to swallow them at this moment, I will do so with a certain amount of distrust if not disgust. We know what the teachings of morals are as well as the Opposition, and I say this is not the right time for them to give us these teachings, the more especially when they couple a resolution, which in itself is very good and cannot be refused by any one, with condemnations against hon. members of this House who are now undergoing their trial elsewhere, and upon whom we will be called in a few days to pass judgment. With these restrictions, I am disposed to say that the resolution is in itself acceptable and commendable, although the speeches with which it has been accompanied are not acceptable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. leader of the Opposition inferred from my remarks that I had formed a judgment on certain matters with regard to a case not concluded. In speaking of irregularities, scandals and so forth, I left that case entirely out of consideration as on which we ought not to speak, and was referring to a case on which I suppose we are entitled to speak.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I rise only for a word of explanation, which is not exactly connected with the subject of the motion, but which is necessary after the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think it is my duty to do so, as some effort has been made to connect me with disparaging writings that have appeared, in some time past, in the public press of this country. The leader of the Opposition, speaking of subscriptions and testimonials given to Ministers, quoted a pamphlet which he says emanated from *La Presse*, a Conservative organ. This is most unfair. That pamphlet was published during the Riel excitement by *La Presse*, which then headed the movement against the Government. The pamphlet is well known in the Province of Quebec as one of the most bitter attacks ever circulated during an election, a pamphlet which has been quoted to me again and again in the elections that took place from the latter part of 1885 until the elections of 1891. The little pamphlet I hold in my hand is the same as that which has been quoted by my hon. friend, and I may say misquoted. This is not the way in which a leader of a great party ought to instruct public opinion. He has not the right, in quoting from a pamphlet violently attacking the Government, to say it was an expression of Conservative ideas in the country. Here is the pamphlet, "Le Métier de Ministre," the most bitter, the most venomous pamphlet that was ever written against a man, and against the party with which he was connected. It was written against Sir Hector Langevin in particular, but it was also against Sir John Macdonald, and against the colleagues of Sir John Macdonald, and it extended its blame as far back as 1858. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the book, he will find that it goes back to the condemnation of the "double shuffle," in 1858; of what it calls the stealing of the elections in Quebec in 1871. I repeat that the newspaper which published that pamphlet was at the time the bitterest enemy of the Government of which I was a member. The reason of the explanation I am making is the position of *La Presse*. Up to 1884 *La Presse* did not exist. There was a newspaper called *Le Monde*, which was the property of the late Senator Senécal, and another gentleman who was acting with him. That paper was bought by a certain number of Conservative friends from Quebec. That was an independent paper before, and it was continued in Montreal as

Conservative organ. Immediately afterwards, think the next day, another paper, called *Le Nouveau Monde*, was published. An action was taken against those who had sold the good-will of *Le Monde* by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), enjoining them not to publish the paper *Le Nouveau Monde*, because the use of that name was not in accordance with the bargain made by those who had bought *Le Monde*. To put an end to the lawsuit, the title *Le Nouveau Monde* was dropped, and *La Presse* was published. That paper remained for a time a Conservative newspaper, but in 1885, when that unfortunate outbreak happened, that paper took such a strong stand in regard to the matter of Riel that it became not a Conservative but an independent organ, and in November, 1885, after Riel's execution, *La Presse* was the strongest and bitterest enemy the Government had. It was in the middle of that turmoil and of that opposition that this little pamphlet was published, and I remember, and my hon. friend opposite knows it well, that, at a meeting held at Longueuil, when the mob that had been excited against me, the mob that had been made drunk in order to drive me from the platform and to drown me if possible, burned me in effigy, whilst extracts of the pamphlet were read in order to show the indignity which was intended for myself and the Conservative party. My hon. friend from South Oxford seems to think that the recollection of these past times might be amusing, but it was hardly amusing to me. I regretted that my friends had opened that bitter campaign against the Government, and I remonstrated with them so that a few months afterwards *La Presse* came back not as a Conservative paper—it has not been a Conservative paper except for a short time, about three years ago—but as an independent paper. I wish to state this because it has been often said that *La Presse* is the expression of the opinion of my humble self, and people have often been quoting it in that way for appreciations of men and measures, at a time when the paper was in opposition to the Government. I acquired some interest in it in 1888, and since that time, if it is not altogether orthodox, it is good enough to be called Conservative. I state this in order to show my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that in the fair warfare of politics, when a man accuses another man it is within his right to use severe language; and I forgive even violence of language of which no doubt I have often been guilty outside of this House if not inside this House, but I will not allow anyone to give any quotations calculated to mislead the House. As to the motion which is under discussion, I may say that I have received two or three times testimonials in my public life, and at one time it was for an act of which I have not yet repented. I was a member of the House in Quebec at the time, and I think I was then a member of the Government which resigned in 1874. I went to the North-West and pleaded a case there, the case of Ambroise Lépine, one of the leaders of the Manitoba rebellion of 1870. When I came back my friends gave me, not for my fees, which I refused, a testimonial on the occasion of my wedding. I never knew the names of those who subscribed to that testimonial, but I was aware that from the smallest newsboy to the highest banker in Quebec, people contributed to that testimonial, but I never asked for names. There was another occasion on which I was presented with a testimonial, in regard to which I cannot plead ignorance, because the names of the contributors are inscribed on an address which hangs on the wall of my house and which was exhibited in the window of Mr. Dawson, in Montreal, for nearly a month, and that was a handsome set of tableware. In regard to all these matters, I think there has been a kind of extravagant severity in the way in which public opinion has been manufactured, in the way of creating scruples that are not natural and are not true, in saying that whatever was done in favour of a public man means secret bribery or corruption. In other countries testimonials have been given to public men. It is true that the leader of the Opposition says that sometimes testimonials have been given to men in high public positions which redounded to their glory instead of their being blameable for having accepted them. I have stated this as a general proposition. It may be that considering how public opinion stands at the present moment, that it is time to make a new departure, as I may say. Taking that view, I would accept this motion as the expression of a new departure. I think it is right that Ministers should not receive testimonials presented by those over whom they have special control, and whose position, pecuniarily speaking, depends upon them, and this remark applies to those who have contracts with the Government, or who furnish supplies to the departments presided over by the Ministers accepting the testimonials. I say that is a good rule, and it is in that spirit that I shall accept the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. But I say again that those who, in the past, have accepted such testimonials have only their own consciences to consult, and if they have accepted testimonials, knowing full well those presentations were inspired simply by gratitude for the kindness and courtesy received at the hands of those to whom they were presented. If there is any wrong proved to have been done in consequence of these testimonials, that would alter the view which should be taken of them. We know very well that the great object which certain members of this House have in view is to influence the decision in a case which is now pending before one of the Standing Committees of this House. On that case I can express no opinion; it would be contrary to my duty as one of the judges sitting on that case, as a member of this House, to express an opinion upon it at this moment. No judge has a right prematurely to express his opinion upon a case before him until all the evidence has been put in. I endorse the observations of my hon. colleague, the leader of the House, in accepting this proposition; but I desire to qualify my acceptance on the understanding that the resolution does not apply to the past, that it does not condemn the acceptance of testimonials which have been made in years gone by.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Secretary of State has made one or two observations which require to be noticed. The hon. gentleman tells us that he accepts this motion on general principles, but he does not accept it as applying to any act in the past. Sir, it is the acts committed in the past that have led to the moving of this resolution; it is because of the fact that events have transpired in the history of this country of a character to debase public morals, that this resolution at the present

moment is offered to this House. The hon. gentleman is quite willing that the resolution should be accepted, if it does not apply to him, if it does not apply to anybody else. Sir, the resolution must apply to those who have sinned against the principle that is condemned by this resolution; it must apply to the hon. gentleman himself, if he has accepted testimonials in a manner contrary to the principles of the resolution; it must apply to any member of the Government sitting in this House who has violated the principle of this resolution; and I for one do not intend to vote for this resolution without protesting against the statement of the hon. gentleman that the resolution does not apply to the past, that it does not apply to him, that it does not apply to any member of the Government. I repudiate that statement, and I shall vote for the resolution as one that does apply to the past, does apply to every case where the principles that are condemned in this resolution have been violated. We are told by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that the evidence was not before the House upon which this resolution is based. Sir, this is a general resolution, it condemns certain acts, and in the course of the discussion upon this resolution, the fact that a testimonial has been received by a Minister of the Crown not very long ago, has been alluded to. There is no question as to the fact of the acceptance of that testimonial; there is no question as to the names of the parties who contributed to that testimonial. The question now under investigation before a Committee of this House, is, what were the results of the acceptance of that testimonial? To what extent did it lead to the failure on the part of that officer to discharge the trust that he owed to the people? The question is, whether a large loss to the public occurred in consequence of the acceptance of that testimonial? There is no question about the individual accepting the testimonial, and this resolution condemns, not the consequences that followed the acceptance of that testimonial, but it condemns the acceptance of it under circumstances such as these by officials of the Crown. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice asserted, in the course of his speech, that no influence had been produced by these charges upon public sentiment abroad, that the charges had had no effect whatever in prejudicing the interests of Canada, or in lowering the character of Canada, or the character of the public men of Canada, in foreign countries. Well, Sir, I do not think that the statements of British newspapers, of American newspapers, of continental newspapers bear out the Minister of Justice in the insertion he has made. I believe, Sir, that the revelations made in connection with the investigation of the Public Accounts Committee and the Privileges and Elections Committee, have produced a profound sensation abroad, wherever Canadian interests receive attention. I believe these revelations have injured our character, have injured our credit, and have earned for us the reputation of being, perhaps, the most corruptly governed country in the world that professes to be a free country. I find a quotation from the *Pall Mall Gazette* showing the estimation in which we are held in England by the editors of that paper. I will read what it says:

"LONDON, Aug. 10.—The Pall Mall *Gazette* to-day in a long and prominent editorial headed 'Canadian Experiments and Corruption,' refers in a caustic manner to the scandals unearthed by the investigations at Ottawa. The *Gazette* says: 'One of the most prominent arguments against the annexation of Canada to the United States has been the value of the Canadian experiments in Government. It was thought by those opposed to annexation that it would be an advantage to have each country work out its own institutions and thereby teach others.'

"The *Gazette* questions that there is any ground for satisfaction in the Canadian experiments. 'As just exposed, the *Gazette* declares, 'a more sordid spectacle of corruption has never been presented by a free people. Whatever defence individual officials and politicians may make in the United States, it is abundantly clear that the cancer of corruption has eaten deep into Canadian institutions. Political life in the United States is not particularly pure, but we would be exceedingly surprised if the Canadian record could be beaten.'

"The *Gazette* expressed satisfaction that it is the avowed intention of the investigating committees to probe the scandals to the bottom, and concludes with the words: 'In a free country with a healthy public opinion, the exposure of scandals means their cure at no distant date.'"

And so, Sir, one of the hopeful indications of the present is that these scandals have been exposed that Ministers of the Crown rise here this afternoon and confess their sins, and apologize to the country and say they will not do it again, and deprecate the wrath of the country being visited upon them, and accept the resolution that is offered condemning this principle in general terms. I am glad that the resolution has been accepted, I am glad that the Government have not done on this occasion as they did a few days ago in connection with the timber limit scandals—have not decided to place themselves on record as condoning and approving the practice. It is highly satisfactory to find the Government taking this course. I do not wish to go into a general discussion of this question, but I will refer for a moment only to a position taken by the Minister of Justice with regard to an investigation alleged by him to have taken place in this House with reference to a testimonial presented to the late Sir John A. Macdonald. Now, the Minister of Justice was not in the House at that time, and I think he is in error, if my memory serves me right, in asserting that the matter was referred to a committee. The question of the propriety of the presentation of the testimonial to Sir John, so far as my memory goes, was not passed upon by the committee. The committee did investigate the question of the payment by the Northern Railway of Canada of $2,500 to Sir John A. Macdonald, and it did decide that the payment was improperly made. Further than that I am not aware that this matter, or any of its bearings, has been the subject of investigation by any committee of this House. Now, as the ground was taken that Mr. Blake had never condemned the acceptance of that testimonial on the part of Sir John, and had never pointed out any of the evil consequences resulting from that acceptance, I may, in conclusion, call the attention of the House to that portion of Mr. Blake's speech referring to the payment of this testimonial, and to the influences produced by the payment of a testimonial to an officer through whom corporations had dealings with the Government. Mr. Blake said:

"That company (Northern Railway Company) was indebted in an enormous amount to the Government of Canada. It was a bankrupt concern, and acknowledged its inability to pay its debts. It was calling upon the Government to ask Parliament to compromise the debt and to take for it a comparatively small sum. And while that was the relation of the Northern Railway Company to the people and to the Parliament and to the Government of Canada, they found money out of their poverty out of their bankrupt exchequer, out of that exchequer

which they declared could supply only a small composition on their debt to the public, to pay $2,500 towards the testimonial to the First Minister. (Cheers.) There was not money to pay you, but there was money to subscribe for him. What happened? That which you might expect to happen. Shortly afterwards a Bill was brought in by this same Government for the relief of the Northern Railway (applause), under which it was proposed to accept in full a small proportion of the debt. It came down very late in the session. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of the Opposition, objected to the concession and insisted that it was too late in the session to press such a Bill and declared that if it was pressed he would fight it. (Applause.) The terms were too favourable to the company which should have been required to pay more. I heard the First Minister tell Mr. Mackenzie that he ought not to resist the Bill: that he would be responsible before the people for obstructing wise and useful legislation and that the people would condemn him for it. (Laughter.) However, Mr. Mackenzie took the responsibility. (Cheers.) He was not a man to flinch from responsibility, and he thus defeated the measure. (Renewed cheers.) What ensued? Mr. Mackenzie attained office a year or two later and he had to deal with this question, the settlement of which he had prevented on the terms proposed. His Government made a settlement with the Northern Railway Company $500,000 better than the settlement which was proposed by Sir John Macdonald which we had obstructed. We saved the public that amount. (Loud cheers.) But we received no testimonial from the company. (Cheers and laughter.) I could give you other instances of those who subscribed to this testimonial and what their relations with the Government were, but one is, perhaps, enough for a sample."

The assertion made that the testimonial referred to by the hon. gentleman to my right was a perfectly proper one, and that the receiving of it was not of a character to work any injury to this country, will hardly be borne out by the fact, and I felt perhaps it would be proper to make allusion to the matter in face of the assertion made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIN. The debate on this motion submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has taken a course which illustrates the difficulty of having in this House, what pleased the soul of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) a night or so ago, a debate purely on the merits of any question that may be brought before it. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford and I listened with pleasure and surprise, because I think to the utmost of his power, considering what must be the inveterate habit of his rhetoric, he confined himself pretty much to the motion. I was glad when the Minister of Justice rose and stated that, fencing the motion round with a statement that everything that was said or might be said in debate must not be imported into that motion, the motion would be accepted by the Government. I think that here in this House, and on the part of the Government and of all Governments, we ought to act on the principle that Cæsar's wife should be above suspicion. I do not want to say one word respecting, nor would I condone, anything that has taken place in the past. What has gone on in the past is not before us, by this resolution; but it is of happy augury on this the first session of this new Parliament that we should unite unanimously on a motion that will, I suppose, lead to such action as will prevent Ministers of the Crown from even the appearance of evil. There is no harm in a Minister of the Crown or a public man receiving such a testimonial as was described by the hon. member for South Oxford from warm admirers expressing admiration and endorsation of his course; but it is apt to mislead, to put it in the mildest form, the public mind, and it is apt to lead to misconception if men in important positions accept testimonials of a character peculiarly valuable. I do not think the fact that the names of contributors were not known, that the Minister should have avoided knowing the names, should lead us to endorse the practice in future. I do think that Ministers of the Crown are not properly paid. Considering the great responsibilities thrown on them, considering the labours thrown on them, and considering what salaries are given to Ministers of the Crown elsewhere, I am quite certain Ministers of the Crown in this country are not properly paid. Then again, we have not the practice in this country that has obtained in England. In England, when an eminent Minister dies, if he leaves debts unpaid, if he leaves a family unprovided for, his family is taken care of, and the country pays his debts. And, if we had been accustomed to act with anything like that generosity, there might not have been the temptation, on the part of strong supporters of Ministers, to get up contributions for them. In regard to the contribution to Sir Hector Langevin, I can say that certainly one or two persons subscribed very small and modest sums indeed to that testimonial who were not contractors, and in one case the gentleman had at the time never spoken a single word to Sir Hector. But the gentleman who waited on one of those persons respecting the testimonial, told him that Sir Hector Langevin had been twenty years in public life, that, if he went out of public life to-morrow, he would not have a roof over his head; and this person said to him: "Well, if a man has been in public life all that time and held office so long as Sir Hector Langevin has, and is thus poor, he must be an honest and faithful servant of the public, and I for one am ready to give my mite to the testimonial." At that time the person of whom I speak knew nothing whatever as to who were to be the persons who would swell that testimonial. We cannot help forming an opinion even now on evidence that is not before us, on informal evidence, and even while a case is *sub judice*, because, after all, political transactions are not exactly on all-fours with a case in court. There is a very distinguished precedent for that. When Lord Melville was impeached, while his case was *sub judice*, before judgment was given—and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, he was acquitted—Mr. Pitt had, as he declared with tears in his eyes, done the hardest act of his life, namely, caused Lord Melville's name to be erased from the list of Privy Councillors. I merely rose to say this, that I agree with the motion taken in the abstract; I do not want, it is not the place to do it, especially as we might anticipate what will have to be considered soon, to throw any reflection on anything done in the past; but I will say this, generally, that it is a pestiferous custom to give testimonials and presents to men in high places and persons connected with men in high places. The result of such examples is that they will be followed by poor people, and thus we may see the poor driven into the ditch, while the rich and those highly paid go scot free from all censure whatever. I for my part believe in dealing out equal justice to rich and poor, high and low, distinguished and obscure, and I do not believe in visiting some obscure persons with condign punishment while other persons go free. So, I say, I approve of the motion in the abstract, and I am glad it was brought forward in that way and in that sense has been accepted by

the Government. I regret that after it was so accepted by the Government, after it was accepted in a speech placing it in a true light before this House and the country, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should have so spoken as to endeavour to give to what has occurred to-day a party character and to wring a party advantage from it. If I were to discuss the motion in that spirit I would depart from those happy lines that pleased the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) so much; but if I were, Sir, then we could go into the actions of these hon. gentlemen at another time, and I am afraid that the position of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) here to-day, in the speech which he made, would be like that of the Pharisee, who thanked God that he was not as other men, and not like that poor Publican who stood afar off. I do not want to go into any party discussion of the question, but I repeat: I am glad that, even at this inconvenient time, the broad principle has been affirmed; I am glad that the foundation has been laid for preventing even the appearance of evil in the future. If it is necessary for the friends of the Ministers to get up substantial testimonials, then, it is for the people of this country to consider, whether, if they have public servants, they ought not so to pay them as to remove them from the influence of such loyal attentions on the part of their friends.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the House do forthwith resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is rather an unprecedented motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

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

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway $323,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will be very inconvenient, and contrary to all our usual practice after a motion of this kind has been passed which declared that the Speaker should not leave the Chair, to proceed at once with the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. But the House has declared that the Speaker should leave the Chair, and in obedience to that he has left the Chair. The only reason why last night, and the night before, we took one item is that the Opposition took so long in discussing the question before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I like that, upon my conscience. Upon my word, Mr. Chairman, I may say to the Minister of Finance: If you will hand over to us all the gentlemen who spoke last night as members of the Opposition, I am not quite sure that we will not call it square. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was the man who commenced the discussion, and if my recollection serves me, half a dozen gentlemen whom I see behind the Government were the persons who continued it. It was not our doing last night, if you spent from half-past nine until half-past one o'clock, or thereabouts, in debating an interesting question of public policy, but one that did not very specially appertain to the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite true, I think, that more gentlemen on this side of the House took part in the debate last night than on the other side; but that was because it was a non-party debate. If it had been otherwise I imagine it would have been the other way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, just at present, I do not want to stand in the way of doing some work, but there are a number of our friends absent who want to say something about this particular item.

Mr. FOSTER. That certainly is not our fault.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is quite true, but the custom of the House, as the hon. Minister knows very well, is that when an amendment of this kind has been accepted you usually change your position.

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not mean to say that it is invariably the rule, but it has been our custom.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only the case very late at night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have known the matter to occur at an hour in the evening which would allow a reasonable amount of business being put through. However, give an explanation of why you want this increased accommodation at Halifax?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Better wait until we read all the items through.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take them one at a time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then we will keep to that rule.

Increased accommodation at Halifax $136,800

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide additional freight accommodation. The freight shed room is limited at Halifax. This is done in order that the business may be conducted more satisfactorily than at present. It is proposed to procure a block of land bounded on the north by North Street, and on the east by Water Street, on the south by Cornwallis Street and on the west by Lockman Street. This block of land is about 2,500 feet by 330 feet. I may state that the assessed value of this property is about $450,000, much higher than the sum we are taking at present. The tracks and buildings are estimated to cost about $175,000, making a total cost, with the land if it is all purchased, of about $625,000. Of the sum now being voted, about $2,000 is intended to provide additional machinery in the shops at Halifax. The accommodation in the city is too small for the business done there, and it is deemed not only advisable but absolutely necessary to procure more land.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it proposed to increase the passenger and freight station accommodation?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not proposed to extend the passenger station, the land lies to the north of it.

Mr. FLINT. Is not this property covered with buildings?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I fancy that is why it is assessed so high.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister give us any idea of the amount of money that has been expended there, and the extent of terminal accom-

modation provided, such as station grounds, storage, wharfage and everything of that kind?

Mr. BOWELL. There are two freight sheds, one flour shed and a passenger station at that point, besides a wharf, an elevator and a large shed at the deep water terminus. We propose building another shed which may be termed a sufferance warehouse for Customs purposes. We have found it difficult to provide for passengers' goods landed in winter. There is no place to put them, and for years I have been demanding this accommodation from the Railway Department. The goods will be placed in the sufferance warehouse, for distribution afterwards or for Customs inspection. The total amount expended in Halifax up to the 1st of June, 1891, was $1,395,666.16.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is possible that this large expenditure was necessary to enable us to properly utilize the Intercolonial Railway at the port of Halifax. At the same time I understand that from the point where a junction is made with the Canadian Pacific, a very large amount of freight is carried over the road and landed at Halifax. That is virtually carried on the Canadian Pacific Railway, instead of over the entire line of the Intercolonial Railway. If that is the case, it is time that we should have some understanding with the other railways which are participating largely in the accommodation there furnished, so as to make them bear a share of the expense. As the hon. Minister has stated, we have expended $1,300,000 in terminal accommodation, and he is asking us for an additional sum of $150,000. It may be advisable, in order to secure additional yard accommodation, to purchase the property he has referred to; but before consenting to an increased expenditure at that particular point, we should be sure that there is an absolute necessity for it. Therefore we should have some idea of the increased traffic necessitating it, the amount of tonnage received and removed at that station on account of the Intercolonial and also on account of the Canadian Pacific. I would like to know what running arrangements there are between the Canadian Pacific and the Intercolonial at that point.

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks made by the hon. member who has just spoken apply with greater force to St. John than to Halifax, because the Canadian Pacific Railway, Company in carrying their freight over the Short Line, take it direct to St. John, and thence to Halifax over the Intercolonial. So that, in fact, the terminal point in Halifax is exclusively Intercolonial Railway or Government property; the Canadian Pacific Railway, in taking their goods over our portion of the line, will be treated in the same manner as any other foreign line. I do not think the remarks made would apply with any force as to any portion being paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of freight trains in Halifax, because they have to pay for passing over the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax, and the goods warehoused there will be treated precisely the same as if they came over our own line. I am not in possession of the tonnage to which the hon. gentleman refers. I think he desires to have the tonnage, not only carried by the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Halifax, but also from St. John, which passes over the Short Line to Halifax.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to furnish the Committee with the tonnage received at the port of Halifax for a number of years, so as to show the increased amount of work performed, and in order to give us some idea why the hon. Minister asks for the $150,000 increased expenditure, to provide accommodation at that point. We could then come to some reasonable conclusion as to whether the demand was necessary or not, but without having some specific return of the amount and freight and tonnage received at that particular point, we are in the dark as to the work done. I have been told that it is the custom of the department to contract for the delivery of freight at Halifax at the same price as for its delivery at St. John. I understand they deliver flour at Halifax as cheaply as at St. John, although the distance from St. John to Halifax is 278 miles.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the case. With reference to the tonnage the statement the hon. gentleman requires could be procured, but I would have to send to Moncton for it, as there is no record here. If the hon. gentleman deems it advisable, I will obtain such a statement. The Grand Trunk Railway, in making contracts in the west for the carrying of flour to the east, has a minimum rate at which the Intercolonial Railway will carry it over their portion of the road, and the Canadian Pacific Railway has precisely the same arrangement. The same arrangement is made with these two companies regarding freight from the east over the Intercolonial Railway. They can make any arrangement for carrying freight westward, but the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have a minimum rate, below which the Intercolonial Railway cannot go in making rates.

Mr. McMULLEN. A large shipper of oatmeal told me that he was surprised that he could ship to Halifax as cheaply as to St. John, and I wish to know what particular reduction the Intercolonial Railway gave in order to enable the other lines to carry oatmeal to St. John?

Mr. BOWELL. The manager says that information is not correct, and that oatmeal or any other freight is not carried from the west as cheaply to Halifax as to St. John.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the volume of flour from the west received at Halifax larger than that received at St. John?

Mr. BOWELL. It is larger at Halifax.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand a report is being made by the chief engineer upon this proposed extension.

Mr. BOWELL. He says he has made a report, but it is not here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I understand the proposition, it is to expropriate two blocks of inhabited houses to the south or south-west of the present station. Is this estimate of $150,000 made upon any valuation of the expropriators, or a mere assumption?

Mr. BOWELL. It is expected the lot to be expropriated will cost at least $450,000; and with the improvements and work to be done, the cost will be about $625,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that this $150,000 is a mere vote on account of a contemplated expenditure of at least $600,000, and that is assuming

the lands will be expropriated for the figures the chief engineer has given. We may, judging the future by the past, assume that this expenditure will reach in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, for when you come to expropriate a large number of small holdings in a large city like Halifax, you will find that the sum you will be called on to pay will be considerably in excess of the chief engineer's estimate. It is well the House should know that we are entering on a scheme involving the expenditure of over $600,000 to $1,000,000. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, after the land has been expropriated and becomes part of the railway station, a new station will be built for passengers at the south end. This is the scheme as understood by the citizens of Halifax; and whether the present station will then be turned into a freight station.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the present intention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will be glad if the hon. gentleman will lay on the Table the report of the engineer upon this contemplated scheme for increased accommodation.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax... $136,800

Mr. AMYOT. I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that I have received a letter from my county stating that, during the last election, Mr. McDonald, superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, wired to the chiefs of the Conservative party in the parish of St. Michel, about four days before the voting, stating that a station would be built in that parish similar to that in the parish of St. Eloi.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are on the item of increased accommodation at Halifax, and I have been requested to take up these items one by one. When the hon. gentleman comes to Rivière du Loup, he may be in order, but we will go on by items.

Mr. AMYOT. I am speaking on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway, and I am opposed to spending any more money in Halifax if other places do not receive justice. If it is a ruling of the Chairman that I am out of order, that is one thing; but, if it is only an expression of his opinion, I will go on. I desire to inform the Minister that St. Michel is one of the finest parishes in that part of the country below Quebec, and there is no accommodation whatever in that parish for the people who want to take the Intercolonial Railway train. Those people have been asking for a long time for a station, and now that the elections are over, and that no political influence should prevent these people from obtaining justice, I think the Government should pay some attention to that part of the Intercolonial Railway. There is a great deal of commerce at that place. I do not object to all the other parishes or to cities like Halifax having their stations and all the accommodation possible, but I object to the systematic deprivation of accommodation in our portion of the country. I must take advantage of this occasion to inform those who are in charge of the Intercolonial Railway that, doubtless without their knowledge and certainly without any malice on their part, the hours of the running of the trains are not at all suitable to the people. In fact, I know that the farmers prefer to drive fifteen or sixteen leagues rather than to take the trains to Quebec, because the hours are not suitable. As to St. Michel, it is too bad that it has not a proper station. No lady, for example, can possibly wait at that place. I know the Minister is well disposed, and I think it will suffice that he should be made acquainted with the facts in order to see that justice shall be done.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman did not inform the House who sent him the telegram to which he referred.

Mr. AMYOT. I am informed it was a telegram from Mr. McDonald, the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, who resides at Fraserville. I do not complain of it because it did not prevent me from being elected. All these promises which have not been fulfilled did not prevent me from carrying the county; but I go a step further and I say that some people do not believe themselves bound by electoral promises, but the people at St. Michel are entitled to a station at that place, and I ask the Minister to give them one as a matter of justice.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that no person had any authority to send a telegram such as has been referred to by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). As to the merits of the case, the department has not thought it necessary in the past to build a station there in the interests of trade; but, if it should be thought necessary or advisable that there should be a station at that place—a small one I suppose would answer the purpose—in the interest of the country and of the Intercolonial Railway such a station will no doubt be built. I am not prepared to give an opinion myself on this subject, because, during the short time I have been administering that department I have not had time to look into all the matters which are involved, but the representations of the hon. gentleman shall have all the consideration they deserve.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very glad to hear that the officer had no authority to send that telegram, because, if he had any authority and his promise had not been fulfilled, it would place the Government in a bad position; but now that the Government have been informed in regard to the matter, I hope they will take the necessary steps, so that officials may not in future endeavour to buy or unduly influence votes by making promises which they are not authorized to make.

Mr. BOWELL. I am thoroughly in accord with the hon. gentleman on that point. No official of this or any other department has any authority to make promises which he is not authorized to make, and I shall instruct the chief engineer to make enquiry in order to find out how any officer came to make this promise, if ever made.

Mr. MULOCK. I am very glad to hear the statement of the Minister. I hope we shall hear more about this before the House rises. I think it is time for the House to take action in regard to

officials who so grossly abuse their positions as this official appears to have done. I hope the decision of the Government will be reported to the House before prorogation. I may remind the Minister that he promised to give some information as to this vote for Halifax, and in order to place the Committee in a position to deal with the matter, I suggest that it would be well to lay on the Table an outline of the plans of the increased accommodation at Halifax, and that we should have also the survey. The Minister will understand that it is owing to the fact that there has been so much money expended on the Intercolonial Railway in the past that we feel it our duty to criticise further expenditures in connection with that road, because they may be investments upon which interest will have to be paid. It was said last night that this extension was in the general interests of Confederation; but, while we may admit that, we say that we should be very careful in adding to the sums we have already invested in that particular enterprise. Now, I am not going to challenge a vote. Possibly there is a necessity for increased accommodation at Halifax; I have no doubt the engineer has come to the conclusion that it is necessary. But the Committee themselves want to be satisfied that it is necessary, and we only ask to be furnished with information which will enable us intelligently to decide for ourselves that it is necessary. This afternoon the acting Minister of Railways stated that the probabilities are that it might cost four or five hundred thousand dollars before it is completed. Now, we know that in the past we have sanctioned extensions and expenditures in connection with the Intercolonial Railway that have cost us, in some cases, two or three times the anticipated outlay. Now, it is understood, this outlay will be above half a million. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) stated this evening, that from past experience we might look forward to contributing, possibly before this matter is completed, a million of money. Now, as I have already stated, we have already expended $52,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, and it is not paying a farthing to the people in return for the outlay and interest. I say, in the face of that fact, we ought carefully to examine and investigate any further expenditure we are asked to make. In the first place, we would like to know if the engineer is prepared to state to the Committee the increased quantity of business done at Halifax for two or three years? What evidence is there to show that this expenditure is necessary? Is the acting Minister prepared to say that they have been so far cramped during the last year for accommodation, that this extension has become absolutely necessary? Perhaps the acting Minister, from his limited experience, has not been able to make that investigation without consulting the engineer. I daresay he has tried to post himself upon all the items connected with the vote, and that he has done his best; but all the same, we would like to know if the past volume of business has so increased that it has become absolutely necessary that this expenditure should take place.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error when he states that I promised to lay before the Committee, after dinner, the figures of the increased tonnage of the trade in Halifax. I spoke then in reference to a report which had been made, and not of the tonnage; because, if the hon. gentleman will remember it, I stated it was impossible to get the statistics he asked for without first communicating with the head office at Moncton, and that might take some days. However, I recognized the propriety of laying the figures, which the hon. gentleman asked for, before the Committee, and I must express my regret that they have not been prepared sooner, so that they might be given to the House for its information. The hon. gentleman and the Committee, upon this occasion, will have to take the information which I myself have gained in my limited connection with the department. We may take it for granted that the engineer, or the manager, has recommended this increased accommodation from a knowledge of the fact that it is an absolute necessity. Certainly there can be no other object in increasing the accommodation in Halifax than to provide for an increased traffic. The engineer tells me just now that at the present moment the freight sheds are filled almost to the roof, with freight, which prevents, as the hon. gentleman well knows, the expeditious shipping of goods when it is required to do so. The shipment of a certain consignment might necessitate the overhauling of a pile of goods reaching almost to the roof, in order to get at the particular goods required. I may say, however, that the land which is shown in the rough diagram I have given, is not all required to be used at present, as the engineer tells me, at the present moment; but the rapid increase of business on that road, more particularly since the Short Line has been constructed, taking it both ways, is so great that, ultimately, all the land would be required, and he thinks it is in the interest of the railway and the country, financially, that the whole land should be secured. If we only purchase a part of it now, a few years hence the rest will have so increased in value that it will cost a great deal more money than it would at the present time. If, however, an equitable arrangement cannot be made with the city of Halifax, then the Intercolonial Railway will have to go further out of town to the northward, in order to obtain the necessary accommodation or expropriate the land.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister will quite understand that before recess I asked for the information in regard to tonnage, with regard to the volume of trade done. I did not for a moment expect that he would have this information at his fingers' end, but I expected that the engineer in charge, certainly, would be so familiar with the gross tonnage at all points besides Halifax, that he would be able to give the Committee that information at once. Now, the hon. gentleman is quite aware of the facts I have already stated in regard to the character of the investment, and he should have expected, at least the engineer should have expected, that the Committee would ask for and require minute information in regard to this proposed expenditure. In my humble opinion the engineer should have been prepared to lay before this Committee a better drawing, a better outline of the property we are asked to purchase, than the mere pencil drawing which has been given us. The engineer must certainly have known that this Committee were going to be asked to consent to the purchase of a property, the first instalment of which would be $150,000, a property that he virtually admits will eventually cost the country

half a million of money. Now, does he really think that this Committee is so indifferent to the duties devolving upon us as an Opposition, that we are going to accept from the engineer's hands a pencil drawing on a piece of paper of that kind, and be asked to assent to the initiation of the purchase of a property, and the extension of railway accommodation, that is going to cost the country half a million dollars? I do not think it is treating this Committee with the courtesy that we have a right to expect, to ask them to accept a drawing of that kind to show us the position of the property in question. The engineer in charge is a very excellent officer; I do not wish to criticise his capabilities for a moment, and I am satisfied he is able to present to this Committee something like a respectable drawing of what we are asked to consent to. I say it is playing with the Committee, in my humble opinion, to ask us to accept that drawing.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not repeat the courtesy again. It was a rough draft made by the engineer a few minutes ago, for my own information, and I thought it would be a courtesy to the hon. gentleman to show him the draft in pencil such as it was, and the thanks received are the remarks the hon. gentleman has just made. It is true that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asked for certain particulars as to the increased tonnage at Halifax, in order to form an opinion as to the necessity of increased accommodation. It is equally true that I told him plainly that such a statement could not be laid before the House until we had received it from Moncton. Having received that answer, I do not see any point in the hon. gentleman repeating the demand. The Committee must not consider that any discourtesy has been shown because a rough draft was shown to a member of the Committee. Had it been suggested that a plan would be wanted, a more scientific one might have been prepared. This information was never asked before, and I did not think it necessary to obtain it. It is somewhat singular that this item should have aroused so much discussion now. This is the third season it has appeared in the Estimates. It was placed there in order that there might be some money at the disposal of the Government to acquire land when they could do it in an economical manner; but we have not succeeded up to the present, nor are we yet sure we can accomplish the object in view in securing the land indicated by the plan. The House is asked to revote $150,000 and to place that sum at the disposal of the Government in order to effect some arrangement with the city of Halifax, if possible, for the securing of more land required for the increased traffic of the Intercolonial Railway at that point. If there is any further information I can possibly give I shall be glad to furnish it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood the plan submitted was in answer to demands made before recess. I fully understood we were to obtain some information, and if we did not get the figures asked for, we might get a draft of the present accommodations and station yard. When this draft was brought up I looked upon it as an answer to demands made. Two years ago the Railway Committee decided to compel promoters of railway Bills to submit a map of the projected line, with stopping points and general information. If such was necessary in the Railway Committee it was still more necessary in this House when we are asked to deal with such important matters. We should receive from the Minister of Railways a carefully prepared map showing the property the Government desire to purchase, also the yard accommodation and other evidence showing the necessity for the addition. The Minister has, however, shown nothing; we have not even a plan of Halifax harbour or the present railway accommodation.

Mr. FRASER. Has any arrangement been made with the city of Halifax regarding their proportion of the expense?

Mr. BOWELL. Negotiations have been going on continually during the past year.

Mr. FRASER. Every one understands that this is simply a vote, and no intention exists to carry out the work, and therefore the plan submitted is equal to the investment that is going to be made. The work was promised, and the promise must be continued. Anyone knowing Halifax well understands that there are a number of people who desire this work. There are a few interested in the land that is wanted and they keep up the agitation. I do not say the Minister understands, but those who press the revote perfectly understand, that there is no intention of going on with the work. It was never seriously thought of, but is kept dangling before the people. I can, therefore, well understand how the department did not incur any expense in preparing elaborate plans. The department understands very well that it is useless to expend money in getting up plans when there is no intention of going on with the work. There is no need for the vote, as no definite arrangements have been made with the city of Halifax as to its contribution. The business course to adopt is to make the arrangement with the city of Halifax and then ask Parliament to pass a vote. Halifax is ready to take $400,000 from the Dominion, just as it took $400,000 out of the Province of Nova Scotia some years ago. Suppose $150,000 is voted, we can well understand how anxious the people of Halifax would be to get part of it in order to start the work; but we should first have information as to what the city is ready to do, and whether the Dominion Government can hold the city by such contract and compel the people to pay their share. While the country would be benefited, of course Halifax is most largely interested, but everyone knows that the proposed block would furnish more land than the trade of Halifax would need for the next 500 years. Half a million dollars would not begin to buy the land, and the land is largely covered with buildings. Then, if you cover the property with railway buildings an expenditure of millions would be needed. This is a vote that is not required. It is really a visionary scheme, and a scheme that will never be carried out. I have no doubt that additional accommodation is required, but before voting this money the business-like way would be that Parliament should have some well-defined plan before it, and that the price should be agreed upon.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think there will be any objection to the Committee voting the amount in the humorous sense suggested by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I fancy that the Minister of Railways would be equally glad to get it, no matter with what light

heart the Committee should vote the amount. The facts of this case are known to the people of Halifax, and I have no doubt are well known to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) as well. The railway terminus in the city of Halifax at one time was at Richmond, which was from two to three miles from the post office, but subsequently, in the year 1873 or thereabouts, perhaps in 1875, the passenger station was extended to North Street, which is at least a mile and a-half from the old Richmond terminus. The object of the Government—in fact the object of both sides of the House, because the Government of that day in making the extension to North Street were carrying out the policy which had been pretty well settled upon by their predecessors—the object was to furnish better accommodation to the city, and more business-like accommodation for the railway itself by approaching nearer to the town. The passenger station then was located at North Street, and a small freight accommodation was found room for on the same premises. For years past the necessity of better accommodation for freight has been imperative, and has been notorious in the city of Halifax, and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, as well as the other railways, are demanding it. We have been, for the last two or three years, making shifts from place to place with the greatest difficulty, and the merchants of the city have been complaining bitterly of the want of accommodation. The other railways, also, have been complaining of the want of such accommodation as would enable them to bring the freight to the city. The House has already twice voted this appropriation in recognition of the demand for greater accommodation there; but the reason, as I understand it, why the expenditure has not been entered upon has been the difference of opinion which has existed in the city itself between the city authorities on the one side and the Board of Trade on the other. The Board of Trade, representing a large number of merchants, insist that the better plan for furnishing this accommodation would be to extend the railway down the wharves, at least as far as the ordnance property. My own impression, from the information I have had, and from the reports made on behalf of the city and others, is, that that scheme would perhaps not furnish the accommodation which is required, but would demand an indefinite sum of money for the expropriation of this valuable wharf property. The city, on the other hand, has strongly pressed the view that the increased accommodation ought be afforded by taking in the two blocks which lie directly in front of the North Street station. The City Council of Halifax, as well as the Railway Department, has, to a great extent, adopted that view. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) states that this property is absurdly out of comparison with the quantity of land needed, but it really contains but seven and a-half acres. It is covered with buildings, but the buildings are generally old and dilapidated, and of not much value. The assessed value is, I believe, something over $400,000. One reason why the city desires to co-operate in this matter is, that the railway is approached from the city by a street which is less than the usual width, and far less than the width necessary for the convenience of travel. The city desires to widen that street, and a strip of land necessary for that would be taken out of the seven and a-half acres which I have referred to; and on this property would be laid the tracks and freight sidings, if the scheme is carried out. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is mistaken in supposing that no negotiations have been going on. The delay has occurred in consequence of the difference of opinion which has existed, and the reluctance, both of the Department of Railways and of the City Council, to force their view in that matter, as against the view expressed by the Board of Trade. Twelve months ago, when the late Minister of Railways visited the city of Halifax, my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and myself, were with him, when he attended at the city hall and had an interview with a deputation representing the City Council. That was by no means the first communication we had on that subject, but it was the first opportunity for a personal interview, and they expressed very strongly their desire that an agreement should be come to at once and this important matter settled in the interest of the city, as well as in the interest of the railway. My hon. friend says that the first step ought to be to enter into an agreement with the city authorities for some definite sum before that vote is passed by this Parliament. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that that cannot be done. If this vote, after being carried for two years, is struck out of the Estimates, the Minister of Railways is not in a position to go to the city authorities and say that he has the permission of Parliament to make any agreement for the acquisition of a single foot of land. On the other hand, this vote will enable him to enter into an agreement with the city for the making of this improvement, and the sum of money which is asked now to be voted, although not sufficient to accomplish the purpose, would be as much as would be required to be expended before the next sitting of Parliament.

Mr. FORBES. As a Nova Scotian, I can testify that the railway accommodation at Halifax is much less than is required. At present, the accommodation, both for passengers and freight, more especially the latter, is very much less than the demands of the traffic require. I do not know how it is, however, that the Government should call upon Parliament to vote this large sum of money, in face of the protest of the Halifax Board of Trade. There are two representative bodies in Halifax, one the City Council and the other the Board of Trade. These bodies are directly antagonistic on the question of the best means of improving the railway terminus, so as to afford facilities for passengers and freight. They have had numerous consultations and conferences together, and the matter has been thoroughly discussed between them, and in the month of May last, at a meeting of the Board of Trade, the matter was reported from a subcommittee, and a memorandum of that report was prepared to be sent to the members in this House from the city of Halifax. I see the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) present, and he probably will corroborate me in this. I would like to put the opinion of that committee before the House. Here is an account of the meeting of the Board of Trade on 8th July:

"The first business was the reading of the following, which was addressed to Messrs. Kenny and Stairs, the members for the county at Ottawa:—

"At a meeting of the Board of Trade in May last a memorandum was submitted from the City Council *re* railway extension to Cornwallis Street. In order to reach some

definite proposal, which might be mutually concurred in by the City Council and Board of Trade, a committee of six members of the Board of Trade were appointed to confer with a like committee of the City Council; such conference resulted in the recommendation that a right of way, according to the Government plans, be granted the Dominion Government by the city for the sum of $350,000. Such recommendation was concurred in by the Board of Trade, not because the extension to Cornwallis Street was considered equal in advantages to the wharf extension, but in order, if possible, to obtain some settlement of that much vexed question, railway extension, and, as it was said, to be a preliminary step to the water front extension from Cunard's wharf. At a subsequent meeting of the City Council the recommendation of the united committee was rejected and a resolution passed requiring the Dominion Government to pay $400,000 for a right of way to Cornwallis Street. This action of the council was not concurred in by the Board of Trade, and a committee, viz., Michael Dwyer, G. J. Tropp and J. A. Chipman, were appointed by the Board of Trade to see what could be done with the wharf extension, believing that a right of way might be secured for a much less sum than $400,000."

Now, here is a committee of the City Council putting the approximate value of that property on Cornwallis Street at $400,000. Now, the Board of Trade, who are anxious to bring the extension down to the head of the wharves, and who argue that it would afford better accommodation, represent by far the greater proportion of the commercial element of the city, and I think their views should be well considered before the Government pledge themselves to the expenditure of money to buy property on Cornwallis Street. The report goes on :—

"To the board the committee named in the above addressed the following:

"The first thing which the committee did was to obtain a copy of the total assessment of all property on the east side of Water Street, lying between Deep Water and the ordnance, a memorandum of which is herewith annexed, showing a total valuation of $474,300. Out of this valuation it seems apparent to the committee that right of way should be secured for a very moderate sum, as there are but few obstacles along the surveyed line, the chief obstructions being a few wooden sheds and portions of some half a dozen wooden warehouses. A difficulty seems to arise on entering Roche's from the Dominion wharf, as the former wharf is some eight feet lower than Water Street or the Dominion wharf. In an interview recently held with Mr. Chandler, C.E., who made the surveys and original plans, it seems, in his opinion, Roche's wharf could be greatly improved by raising it some 3½ feet higher; then by cutting down the approach from the Dominion wharf some 3½ feet the seeming difficulty of entering to Roche's would be overcome. After going over the route with one of your committee Mr. Chandler suggested, as an alternative scheme, that the track might be run along Water Street on the west side of the elevator and approach the water front in an angular line starting to the south of Roche's property."

And this is the idea to which I want to draw the attention of this Committee. There seems to be a scheme devised for the purpose of meeting the views of both commercial elements of the city of Halifax, that is, to bring the line at an angle from the present depot down to Water Street, and then along Water Street.—

"It has been said that when negotiations were pending some time since for this railway extension, that through the influence of Sir Charles Tupper negotiations could have been entered into with the Imperial authorities for securing one or other of the properties known as the ordnance and Queen's wharf. Under these circumstances, it has occurred to the committee, who are authorized by the Board of Trade to secure negotiations, that you should ask the Dominion Government to appoint appraisers to assess as soon as possible, the value of the damages or benefits to the respective property and wharf owners along the line, and upon such assessment being made, to take evidence and hear arguments before the Court of Appeal of those who decline the appraisement. If the damages adjudged by the court were found greater than in the opinion of the Government they could afford to pay—in other words, should the owners and proprietors be enabled to show serious damages, then the Government could abandon the project if the expenditure was found unwarrantable. The committee are of the opinion that the extension along the water front by acquiring the ordnance as a depot, would be accomplished for an infinitely less sum than would be required to complete the Cornwallis Street extension, and when completed, would combine many advantages over the other scheme."

Now, there is a unanimous report of the committee of the Board of Trade. It is specific, and in plain language it asks this Committee of the House of Commons to defer assenting to the purchase of Cornwallis Street, and making it the depot for the railway extension. The committee go on to say :

"We may state, for the information of the Government, that the property owners included in this route, amounting in assessed value to about $196,000, intimated their willingness to contribute a free right of way, and your committee hope these gentlemen may confirm this in event of the extension being carried into effect. The Board of Trade, in discussing this matter, were struck with the fact that the Government might take the entire water front, that is, all the property on the east side of Water Street, including all warehouses and wharves from Deep Water to the ordnance, at its assessed value, which would cost little more than the right of way to Cornwallis Street, a phase of the subject seemingly hitherto overlooked."

Now, there are two schemes, by the respective representative bodies of the city of Halifax, put before the Government. One undoubtedly shows, according to the assessed value of that part of Halifax, which nobody will deny is put as high as possible, that the property proposed is worth $474,000, and the other valuation put upon it is $400,000. The committee of the Board of Trade say that $196,000, or in round numbers $200,000, of that $474,000 will be granted by the property-owners giving free right of way if the railway is brought there. That means a cost of not quite $300,000 if the line is taken down to the heads of the wharves. The committee of the Board of the Trade are not pledged to any particular scheme at all. All they want is some measure of railway extension which will satisfy the growing demands of the commerce of Halifax. That commerce is growing fast every year, and they must have railway extension, and the duty of Parliament is to get it in the cheapest and most advantageous way possible. The committee of the Board of Trade suggest that the line should be carried at an angle from the present junction down to Water Street, and then along Water Street to the heads of the wharves.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's plan seems to depend on the possibility of getting the Queen's wharf property.

Mr. FORBES. It does not depend entirely on that. The Board of Trade suggested that the Queen's wharf and the ordnance properties, both of which belong to the Imperial Government, might be an obstacle, but they suggested that they might be obtained as other property is obtained.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that some months ago the Marine Department proposed to the Imperial Government the acquisition by that department of the Queen's wharf, and the reply was that under no circumstances would the Imperial Government part with that property, so that it would seem to finally settle the proposition of the Board of Trade.

Mr. FORBES. It apparently settles it in the Minister's mind, but I do not think it does settle the matter, because the Board of Trade's suggestion is that property can be purchased or obtained for this purpose and the road can run along Water

Street on the west side of the elevator and approach the water front in an angular line.

Mr. BOWELL. Will it have to pass through the ordnance land?

Mr. FORBES. No: the ordnance lands and the Imperial property are out of the question.

Mr. TUPPER. How will it pass?

Mr. FORBES. It will pass on the west side of the elevator through the city proper. That is done in New York and Boston to-day, and in Portland.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. $2,000,000 would not pay the right of way.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. Minister must surely know that the street will still be used for further purposes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The track could not be laid upon it without an Act of the Local Legislature; compensation would have to be given the proprietors for the injury done to their property, and in addition to that, you have two miles of Water Street property covered with wharves which you would have to buy.

Mr. FORBES. You have not to buy the wharf property at all if you go down Water Street. The proposition is to go directly down the street, and there is no insurmountable obstacle.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If you have the money.

Mr. FORBES. There is another feature I would press on the attention of the Government, and that is that they should defer further action until they have considered the three schemes proposed. The Board of Trade, the most representative body in Halifax, have asked the Government to defer this expenditure, not that they consider it insufficient or too much, but because the lands required would not suit the wants of the trade. The extension near the water front is what the merchants require. The item passed, I admit, in the last Parliament, but this Parliament is not responsible for that, and many of the members of the old Parliament have not been returned. This Parliament is alone responsible for this appropriation. All I ask the Government to do is to defer, if they cannot adopt the suggestion of the Board of Trade, proceedings for the present, and have an enquiry made before the proper court into the valuation of the property to be taken, and the Government will then know what it will cost to get the property, and if it turns out to be impossible to get the property along Water Street, let them consider the feasibility of the scheme of going at an angle from the present depot down through Water Street.

Mr. STAIRS. As the city of Halifax is very much interested in this item, it is but right that I should say something about it. The importance of the question cannot be overestimated. It is but a question of a year or two when additional station accommodation will have to be found in Halifax. That was admitted by the late Mr. Pope, Minister of Railways, when the amount we are now considering was put on the Estimates originally; but though it was admitted then, it has not been decided, as far as I am aware, what is the best way in which to provide that accommodation. One thing is quite certain, and I want that to be thoroughly apprehended by the Committee, that, as far as my colleague and myself are concerned, though we are anxious that the requisite accommodation should be provided, we do not want any money to be spent at Halifax, unless spent to the best advantage, in the interests both of the city and the Railway Department. I do not wish to cast any reflection on anyone who has had charge of railway expenditure in Halifax in the past, but a good many mistakes have been made in that city. Some of the station accommodation proved, in the course of a few years, to be wholly inadequate to the requirements of the trade. There is no doubt that some money has to be spent in Halifax, and it is admitted it must be in a little while, and I believe a plan should be so chosen that will be sufficient for the needs of the trade for many years, so that the Government may not have to come back to Parliament in a few years and ask a further sum for railway accommodation. I regret I was not in the House when the item was first discussed. Had I known it was to come up, I would have been glad to be in my seat, and I regret that I did not hear those hon. gentlemen who spoke on the other side, but I rather gather from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice that he has fully replied to the arguments put forth by these hon. gentlemen. There is one point we cannot settle here to-night and I might remind the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) of this fact. It is impossible for us to go into details and say what particular scheme, of the different ones suggested, should be adopted by the department. It is sufficient for us to know that something must be done. The department, in conjunction with the City Council and the Board of Trade of Halifax, I have no doubt, will, in the course of time, find out what should be done, and I am not going to pronounce any opinion whatever upon the merits of the various rival schemes suggested. I only want it to be understood that we must find out what is the best to be done before any move is made in the matter at all. I am glad to say that the trade of Halifax has increased in the last few years, and it is on account of this increase our station accommodation is altogether inadequate for the needs of the city; but I point out one feature in connection with what was said by the hon. member for Queen's that, in considering the question of railway extension, we must take into consideration the needs of the city as regards the handling of the freight of the city. It will not be sufficient to provide access to the centre of the city along the streets for freight to be distributed in carloads, but you must have the ordinary station accommodation by which freight will be received and distributed in small quantities. The item now before the Committee, should, I think, be allowed to pass; and, judging from what has been said by the Minister of Justice, it may not be sufficient to carry on the extension required, but, as he also explained, if a further vote is needed it can be obtained before the expenditure is required to be made. What I impress on the Minister of Railways is that he should take steps to settle this point as soon as possible in conjunction with the City Council and Board of Trade and representatives of Halifax, coupled with the very best advice he can get from his engineers as to what is the right thing to do from a railway standpoint. He should make up his mind as

quickly as possible and then take the necessary steps to carry out this work.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has addressed to this House a speech in which he intimates that he has not yet made up his mind as to which of the rival routes is to be selected. The hon. gentleman represents the city of Halifax. His mind at present is too fair to lose its balance and decide in favour of which road the merit lies. It seems to me that, until he has made up his mind, and until the Government have made up their minds, it would be premature for the House to vote any appropriation for this purpose, because it may be a long time before the hon. gentleman will be able to decide which of these rival pieces of property should be preferred. The city of Halifax is a place of great expectations. I believe a few years ago that city expected to become the emporium for the shipment of all the grain raised in British North America and in the Western States. At that time they required a great deal more accommodation than they do now. They began to erect elevators on the strength of this hopeful outlook. They erected one as a sort of promise of what was to come. That elevator was constructed just before an election, and I do not know whether any grain has been stored in it or not. I have been informed that there was one carload stored in it since it was erected. The people of Halifax were assured that their city was to be the sea terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and in fact of the whole Canadian railway system, and that it would be rather a good thing if the Americans were to adopt the policy of non-intercourse and shut the Canadian railways out from any intercourse with the United States, and that the worse they endeavoured to do to us in that particular, the better it would be for us, and especially for the cities of St. John and Halifax. It seems to me that we ought to have a little further indication that what has been already voted was applied to useful purposes before we are asked to make any further expenditure on schemes which one hon. gentleman says are not likely to be realized. I have no doubt that the acting Minister of Railways will feel that he is discharging his duty to the people of Nova Scotia if he obtains this appropriation. He is like the man who led the horse to water and could not make him drink in the rainstorm. The hon. gentleman takes the appropriation, and then it is not his fault if nothing is done. My hon. friend to the left says nothing is required to be done. The Minister of Railways has shown that that is a mistake. He has left the impression on my mind, and particularly the hon. member for Halifax has left the impression on my mind, that Halifax is not ready to do anything in this way. The hon. gentleman is the organ of that city, and he says that there are two pieces of property upon which railway buildings might be placed, but it is impossible for him to say which is the best. He is in the clouds mentally, and that being so, I think this appropriation should remain in the clouds until he is ready to come down.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think those who have to pay for this large expenditure should have something to say about it. Knowing nothing whatever about the rival sites, and knowing nothing about the city of Halifax, I would ask the acting Minister of Railways whether the Government are bound to place their required accommodation on either of these places which have been referred to. I think the trade of Halifax is not the principal element to be considered in this matter. I understand that the great bulk of the freight for which this increased accommodation is necessary is not freight in which the city of Halifax is interested, that is to say, that it is not for the trade of the city itself, but that it is freight passing through from the east to the west, and, therefore, it is a matter of great importance to the producers of this country, to the exporters and importers, to obtain this accommodation, but that is a matter entirely distinct from the interests of the city of Halifax. If the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway were dealing with this question, they would regard the interests of the city of Halifax as being of very minor importance, and, if they could find a proper site elsewhere, they would not attend to any representations of the Board of Trade or the City Council of Halifax. I ask the Minister whether he is bound to bow to the decision of the city of Halifax as expressed either by the Board of Trade or by the City Council in regard to the selection of the site. If there is an alternative, I think it should be made use of without reference to the people of Halifax unless they are prepared, as they ought to be, to assist the Government in obtaining this trade. If the people of Halifax are desirous to have this trade concentrated in their city, they should be prepared to give some assistance to the Government, instead of trying, as I think they are doing, to make a good thing out of the Government by the sale of this property. I ask the Minister of Railways, therefore, before he makes any deal of this kind, whether there is not a site independent of these rival interests which will enable him to obtain a proper location for the trade which we are all interested in seeing developed. I think this is the course which should be pursued and which any other railway company would pursue, and I think it is only just to the tax-payers of the Dominion that the hon. gentleman should ignore all these local interests. If he takes that stand, and lets the people of Halifax understand that he is doing so, I believe he will find them more reasonable to deal with. I am as anxious as anyone in Halifax can be that that city should be made the great eastern port of this Dominion. This country has already made great sacrifices and great expenditures in order to make that our eastern port, and, if possible, the port for the trade of the Western States, and for my part I am prepared to make further sacrifices to the same end, so that it is from no jealousy or desire to see the port of Halifax belittled in any way that I make these remarks; but I consider that we are bound to see that the interests of the producers of Canada are considered more than any local interests.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government is in no way pledged to either the one scheme or the other. The requirements of that terminus of the road render it absolutely necessary that further accommodation should be given not so much for the through trade as for the local trade which is increasing to a great extent. The past difficulties in the acquiring of property have arisen from differences of opinion between certain parties in Halifax and from the fact that the Government has refused to accede to the

demand of either the City Council or the Board of Trade. If the hon. gentleman has been in Halifax and knows where the terminus is, and if he knows that Halifax lies on the side of a hill and that the only possible place for a terminus is down at the water's edge, he would see the impossibility of obtaining it elsewhere, unless we were to go out of the city further to the north. I only repeat that the Government is in no way pledged, neither have they made up their minds as to any particular course they will take. That would depend altogether upon the terms which could be made with the parties in Halifax, and if no agreement can be come to with the City Council on behalf of the city, then the Government would have to assume the responsibility of expropriating such land as is absolutely required for the purposes of the railway. That explanation, I hope, will satisfy and ease the mind of the hon. member for Queen's, who is very anxious that the Government should not put itself in a position to be compelled to follow the course suggested by either of those corporate bodies. They are as free to-day as they have ever been, in reference to what may be done in the future. That would depend altogether upon circumstances, and if they cannot make arrangements with the city, they will have to take the course which is taken by every private corporation, and expropriate the lands required for their use, independently of the wishes of the people of Halifax. The hon. gentleman has suggested various routes. If you touch the ordnance land, the Imperial Government seem to have as high an opinion of the value of land as the people of Halifax have; they refuse to allow it even to pass through the ordnance land without going to the Queen's wharf, and demand some $400,000 to allow us even to pass through the ordnance land, a sum which I do not think this Parliament is prepared to vote for that purpose. The rough draft that I have before me shows the land that is suggested by the engineer as best in the interest of the railway and of the traffic. If that could be acquired at anything like a reasonable cost, the Government would enter into an arrangement to purchase it; if not, they will have to pursue some other course.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand you to say that the Government is not committed to this particular route?

Mr. BOWELL. They are not committed to anything.

Mr. FORBES. I understood you to say that the representative bodies in Halifax are not committed.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I said the Government is not committed to take any route, or to purchase a foot of land anywhere. They are at liberty to take just such a course in the future as they think best in the interest of the country.

Mr. TUPPER. I was present at the interview referred to by the Minister of Justice, between the city authorities and the late Minister of Railways, and it seems to me that he put the subject to them very clearly, so that there can be no misunderstanding about it. He told them that the necessities of the road were such that certain lands would have to be acquired for giving terminal facilities at Halifax sufficient to accommodate the trade. So far from its being a local trade, it was local in this respect only, that it was composed chiefly of grain and flour. Now, the merchants there suffer tremendous inconvenience, because the moment a shipment arrives they are compelled to do what merchants are not compelled to do on any private railway system, take delivery of that car immediately, or else the car is moved away and they must follow the car up the track, or wait delivery and pay demurrage. The freight accumulates there to such an extent that, as he explained it to them, the Railway Department will have to obtain extra accommodation. Two propositions were put forward and they have been explained to-night. Both of them involve more money than the Railway Department would have to expend if it consulted merely its own immediate interests. For instance, it would take less land than is involved in either scheme, and, therefore, would require less public money. The proposition, as put by the late Minister of Railways, was this: He had the estimate, he had the plan, and he had the amount, therefore, of what the department would probably have to expend irrespective of the City Council or the wharf owners, who were then interested in the other view now represented in the Board of Trade. But he put it to them that the Railway Department would be willing to contribute its quota to the scheme most acceptable to the locality, but not one dollar more. They were both pressing on the Railway Department to assume the whole burden. The answer was that there was no necessity on the part of the railway of expending a dollar more than was absolutely required. More than that would be for local interests in the strongest sense of the word. Now, if these parties do not come to an agreement, the Railway Department is left free to make such an arrangement as is absolutely necessary in the interest of the traffic of the road. With reference to the allusion of the hon. member for Bothwell, concerning a grain elevator and the general election, I may say that it is not a public work done in the interest of any particular party. There was a great agitation in the city, and members of both parties took part in that agitation. They claimed they had great confidence in the possibility of a grain trade for shipment and export being obtained at that port. The meeting at which these gentlemen attended and made their public demand upon the Government, was a meeting in which prominent Liberals took a very prominent part. Mr. Dwyer, particularly, was loud in his denunciation of the want of action of the Government in not providing sufficient freight facilities at a port such as Halifax, such as are offered at American ports by private railways, and the claim was, as the hon. member for Queen's recollects well, that it was due to the city and due to the road to equip the road with proper terminal facilities such as any great railway system like the Intercolonial Railway ought to have on the sea board.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whether they were used or not.

Mr. TUPPER. These gentlemen believed and they argued that it only required an appropriation and the construction of a grain elevator for the immediate fulfilment of their hopes. I recollect perfectly well that the best business minds in that city at that time, no matter what has happened subsequently, were of the opinion that an enormous

amount of grain would come down to shipment at the port of Halifax.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) misunderstood what I said, as did also the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I endeavoured to state the facts of the case as clearly as I could. I want the Committee to understand that, as representing Halifax, as the hon. member for Bothwell says I did, and as I admit I do, I do not come here to press upon Parliament the expenditure of any money except that which is in the interest of the railway itself. I think I cannot state anything more fair than that. In reply to the member for Muskoka, I repeat what I said to the acting Minister of Railways, that the additional accommodation that it is proposed to provide at Halifax, is for local traffic. By local traffic I mean the freight which goes out of the city and comes into the city for the supply of the citizens, not that which is brought into the city and shipped away by vessels, and has no connection whatever with the accommodation that is provided for steamers bringing freight going to the western portions of the Dominion. I, therefore, think that the argument of the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) was altogether a mistaken one.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In that case you do not surely propose that half a million dollars should be spent out of the public funds to provide for the local trade of Halifax.

Mr. STAIRS. When the Government of Canada own and operate a railway we expect they will proceed as a private company would proceed, such as the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am sure that is what is expected by the people of Halifax. A private corporation has to find its station accommodation in any city which it enters. The different proposals discussed will result in this, and I think it is what the citizens want, that so soon as the railway department has thoroughly satisfied itself as to what is the right thing to do in the interests of the railway as regards providing additional internal accommodation, the work will be carried out. That is what I wish the Minister would do as quickly as possible. Why I mentioned the opinions of different bodies, such as the City Council and the Board of Trade, was simply as affording one means by which the Department of Railways could satisfy itself as to what was in its own interests and what would be the best way of providing terminal facilities, but I do not consider, by any means, that the Government is bound in any way by those opinions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What does the hon. gentleman think a private corporation would do in a case of this sort, when its expenditure exceeded its income by $750,000 a year?

Mr. STAIRS. I think that would depend a good deal on the class and the amount of business being done in the city. A company might be forced into a capital expenditure to provide sufficient accommodation, even if its business showed quite a serious loss in running expenses. It might not be able to help itself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think a good deal as does the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that we should criticize closely the proposed vote for expenditure in Halifax, especially as the item is only the beginning of a work which will amount to half a million dollars. Judging from the estimates submitted in times past it would be safe to say that if we enter on the expenditure it will amount to a million and a-quarter or a million and a-half instead of half a million. We should be very careful in entering upon it. I do not think the expenditure is required, for the terminal facilities of the Intercolonial Railway in Halifax are as good as those of any private corporation I know of. I guarantee that the terminal facilities of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway in Toronto are no better than those of the Intercolonial Railway in Halifax.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have had a great deal to do with the Intercolonial, and we have sent a great deal of freight to Halifax, and I know what the terminal facilities are. They are, I repeat, very good. There is a branch line running round to Dartmouth, so that the people there receive freights without a dollar being paid for switching. A car-load of flour is delivered at Dartmouth at the same price as at Halifax. That extension has cost much money to this country, and in regard to general facilities in Halifax proper they are certainly very good. The Minister of Marine said that a merchant receiving a car-load of flour would be obliged to remove it at once. Is that not the case with any railway? The car must be unloaded within 48 hours, if not $2 a day for demurrage is charged.

Mr. TUPPER. They cannot get 48 hours under the present system.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They do get it.

Mr. TUPPER. I am speaking from representations made by the merchants of Halifax.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am speaking from my personal knowledge, from communications and from my personal experience in Halifax. Every railway will give 48 hours to unload a car. When a car comes to Halifax the same rule applies as in any other part of the Dominion. The receiver must unload the car within 48 hours and provide storage. In Halifax, the railway having a large freight house, it is the custom to unload flour there, and it can remain there for a certain time by paying small sums as storage. This is a considerable advantage. In Toronto a man receiving a car-load of flour finds there is no accommodation at the railway and that he must provide his own accommodation elsewhere. The accommodation at Halifax is certainly very good, and all that should be expected for the Dominion to provide. I do not blame the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who naturally wants this money expended. He is anxiously looking after the good of his constituents, and it would be very nice to have a million expended in erecting large warehouses there. But the people of the country will have something to say in regard to this unnecessary and unwise expenditure, and we should pause before we enter on it. The estimates also contain an item of $78,000 for increased accommodation in St. John. We have sent a good deal of flour there, but have had no complaints in regard to the accommodation. It is no wonder merchants desire to have longer time in which to unload cars if increased accommodation can be obtained at Dominion expense, but it is wrong to provide it at the Dominion expense. Both in Halifax and St. John large quantities of goods do not come by the Intercolonial but by steamer from Boston, which is a

very convenient mode of shipping freight to those points. It is unloaded on the docks and every receiver provides his own storage. We should hesitate before entering on this large expenditure, which is not at all required at the present time.

Mr. FLINT. I believe, notwithstanding what my hon. friend has said, if it were clearly shown to this Committee that increased accommodation for handling the freight coming to Halifax by the Intercolonial were required, this Committee on both sides would receive that information with a great deal of generous consideration, and this House would be disposed to assist in every reasonable way to carry out the requirements that were shown to be necessary. I am of the opinion that increased freight accommodation is required in Halifax, but to what extent I am not prepared to say. We know that in a few years the trade of the Intercolonial Railway has developed very considerably. There has been great improvement in the traffic on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, and within a few weeks the line between Halifax and Yarmouth has been completed, which goes into Halifax, and this, taken in connection with the completion of the Short Line and other facts which are probably quite familiar to all members of the House, makes it quite apparent that there must be considerably increased trade and increase in the quantity of goods coming into the city of Halifax to be handled by the railway company, and by the consignees of these goods. Consequently, I think, care has not been taken by the Minister in charge of the department at present, to show to what extent there has been an increase in the railway traffic, requiring this new and extensive accommodation. I think that several questions asked by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) were quite pertinent to this question; but I presume it would require notice to be given to the department to produce these figures before the House. The department has not as fully informed the Committee as might be expected as to their ideas in making this initial expenditure of $150,000. We find from the discussion which has taken place, and from the interesting remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and my friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes), that the whole situation is involved in obscurity, that the merchants of Halifax are apparently hopelessly divided as to which will be the best plan for improving this accommodation, and that the department has no scheme in view. Even admitting the necessity for increased accommodation in the city of Halifax, and I believe the time is coming when it must have increased accommodation, yet the lack of information on the subject placed before the House, renders this criticism legitimate. It has been an unfortunate fact in the history of this country, that whatever merits our friends on the other side of the House may have, yet in the matter of what I may call financial perspective, they have always manifested themselves to be very much behindhand. Scarcely any of their estimates for public works have been borne out by the ultimate facts, and, consequently, they have taught the House to be very suspicious when appropriations are asked for these works. I think from my knowledge of the locality, that the amount tentatively suggested by the acting Minister of Railways, is far less than must be required to carry out the plan which is proposed.

Mr. BOWELL. What amount does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. FLINT. The hon. Minister suggested that he thought that the expropriation of the land described by him would cost about $450,000. That, I think, is far below the mark. However, I would be perfectly willing to hold my personal opinion in abeyance, if definite statements were placed before the Committee, showing the size of these lots, the character of the buildings on these lots, and their estimated value based on the assessment by the city of Halifax. This is a very extensive lot of land and it is covered, I understand, with brick buildings, and wooden buildings, and in some cases, stone buildings. It is situated in the heart of the city and I think the estimate for this expropriation is below the mark. There is another fact which should be taken into consideration in connection with this matter. I think that we should have an estimate by competent engineers, as to the amount that would be required to grade this seven and a-half acres and to render it fit for laying the necessary tracks on it. We have no information as to the character of the warehouses, and the freight sheds, and all the various buildings which we require for this terminus. I think that, considering the history of my friends opposite in connection with public works, and from my personal knowledge of this locality, that a million dollars would be much nearer the mark for the carrying out of this scheme, than the modest sum of $600,000 suggested by the Minister. I believe that additional accommodation is required in the city of Halifax, and I am quite prepared to vote a reasonable sum for that purpose; but I believe that the Government are not treating the House fairly in not laying before it more details as to how they intend to expend this money. The Government admit that they have no accurate information to place before the House to enable us to form some reasonable conclusion as to what this work will cost. I trust that the House will not commit itself to the expenditure of so large a sum of money, even to the city of Halifax, without getting more information.

Mr. TUPPER. What, in your opinion, would be a reasonable sum?

Mr. FLINT. I do not know what a reasonable sum would be; but I believe that if the House commits itself to this scheme proposed by the acting Minister of Railways, it will involve the expenditure of nearly a million dollars, and I believe that the House should not consent to that without receiving more definite information. I can see no very great difficulty in delay in this case. It may be, that if the Government and the city of Halifax come to some conclusion, the Government would require some small amount of money at its disposal to close the bargain, but as the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has said, there is not the slightest possibility of one cent of this money being expended within the next twelve months. Whenever a definite scheme of anything like a reasonable character is proposed to furnish additional accommodation to the city of Halifax, I believe it will receive generous consideration from the members on this side of the House as well as from the other side.

Mr. MULOCK. I think everyone in this House will sympathize with the remarks of the last

speaker when he stated that when a definite, business-like proposal is made, it would receive the most favourable consideration from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. When I consider the form in which this proposition was submitted to the Committee, I am compelled to come to the conclusion that the Government is not in earnest in presenting it. First of all, the acting Minister of Railways gave some slight verbal explanations, apologizing for his inability to go into the matter more fully, on the ground that he has been but a short time in the department. Later on, however, seeing that it was only right that the Committee should have information, he had a small pencil sketch prepared, which he submitted as representing the scheme in question. If I am right, his sketch was wrong, because it is quite clear now that it did not indicate the location of the proposed site. What was the object in presenting that sketch to the Committee? It showed the lots proposed to be bought; it set forth two blocks of land, and but for the subsequent discussion I, for one, would have been under the impression that had we voted this money it would have been for the acquisition of the two blocks shown in that sketch. It might have been from inadvertence that that sketch was presented; but it is well that the discussion has taken place, because it is quite clear now that everything is at large, that there is no definite proposition and no definite consensus of opinion between the Government and the people of Halifax, or between different sections of the people themselves. In fact, there is no unity between those who are advancing the scheme. If they desired to defeat it, they could hardly present to a deliberative body a better plan. The Minister of Justice, while advocating it by his words, condemned it by his argument. He said it was a matter in respect of which there was to be co-operation on the part of the people of Halifax. What co-operation? What did he mean by that? He meant, if he meant anything, that there was to be substantial co-operation—that if there was to be expenditure by the people of Canada there was also to be some substantial consideration conceded by the city of Halifax. Therefore, the Minister of Justice argued that it would not be right for us to go into the scheme proposed, except on joint terms with the people of Halifax. Having in that way condemned the scheme in advance, by showing that there was no such co-operation, he dropped the case, and left it for the junior member for Halifax; and how did he present it? He told us, in answer to the hon. member for Muskoka—and I interpret his prior remarks in the light of his subsequent statement — that the scheme was a local one, that it was to meet local needs. In saying that, he cut away a good deal of the argument in favour of the scheme, because his colleague, the hon. member for Muskoka, took strong exception to so large an expenditure merely to serve a local want. Therefore, in admitting the weakness of the scheme, he as much as asked the Committee to disapprove of it. Further, he said that it was necessary to go very slowly and very carefully, that there had been serious mistakes made in Halifax before in connection with such enterprises, that there was also a difference of opinion down there, and he had not the slightest idea in his own mind which was the better scheme; so that, he left it in as unsettled a condition as it could possibly be placed in. I suppose a brief speech had to be made by him, in recognition of ante-election speeches, and to that extent he may think he has discharged his duty to the good people of Halifax. But, substantially, he has given this scheme a very serious blow by his argument. Then, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, bringing his local knowledge to bear on the subject, stated that while some expenditure on the part of the Government might be justifiable, yet there ought to be a very considerable expenditure on the part of the people of Halifax if this large scheme were to go through. So that all these hon. gentlemen have as much as possible discredited the scheme by saying that it is crude, that it is wholly unsettled, that there ought to be joint action by other persons not represented here, that there are various propositions the merits of which are not agreed upon, and that it would be premature for Parliament now to make the grant. That is about the case which has been made by these alleged advocates of this movement. Now, Sir, I join with all the members of this House who may agree with me in my desire that we should build up a port such as Halifax, even if in doing so we are benefiting the people of that locality, because, while it may benefit the neighbourhood it will serve a great purpose. We cannot ignore the fact that Halifax is our winter port, begging the pardon, of course, of the hon. members for St. John, and not discrediting the port they represent; but I think I have even their concurrence in saying that Halifax is the great hope of Canada, so far as a winter port is concerned.

Mr. HAZEN. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, subject to the claims of St. John, which may have its turn too. At all events, we are going to have a maritime port, and we are going to develop the trans-Atlantic traffic when we get an active Government in office that will be able to promote a fast line of steamships. Of course, the present Administration having forgotten that scheme, there is not the same need for an Atlantic port as there will be when we have an active and business-like Administration. I am in favour of developing the important port of Halifax, and it is important that in the public interest a proper, business-like scheme should be laid before Parliament. This is but an initial investment, which must be followed up by a very considerable expenditure, amounting, some gentlemen say, to a million. I do not know how much, but the Minister of Justice admitted that the actual purchase of the land would cost over $400,000, at which sum or more the property was assessed. It is quite clear that we shall not be able to acquire that property and improve it to any appreciable extent except at a cost in the vicinity of the sum named by the last speaker. Therefore, could there be presented to the Committee a more unbusiness-like proposition than that which we are now considering? We are asked to authorize the Government to enter upon a transaction which is vague and indefinite, the ultimate cost of which is not known, but to which Parliament would be committed by making the original purchase. I, therefore, feel that the hon. gentlemen have been unjust and unfair to the interests which they profess a desire to promote, in presenting to Parliament in this crude manner a scheme of the

importance of that under consideration. We have every reason, I think, to criticize, not in a spirit of obstruction, but in a spirit of carefulness and caution, all propositions involving such large expenditures. Why, Sir, every public work that has been undertaken under the authority of Parliament for years past has exhibited the same features and has disappointed the country. We know that the expenditure has, I may say, invariably exceeded by large figures the original estimates. Representations of a flattering character are made at the initial stage, and perhaps accepted with a good deal of confidence by the House, but the end is disappointment, owing to a lax administration or a careless regard for the people's money. And I trust that we are inaugurating a new regime, and whilst not prejudging an enterprise of importance in a narrow spirit, yet we should act in a prudent, careful way, whereby we shall know well in advance before we take the leap what is to be the cost; and at this stage is the time for us to have this information. We are now some little distance from prorogation, and I think it would be well for the Administration to take a few days to consider this scheme and present it to us in a more business-like way, and one which would entitle it to the best consideration of the Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice the hon. Minister intends asking a grant of $80,000 for terminal accommodation at St. John. With regard to the Halifax terminus, I wish to know whether it is his intention to extend the other termini of the Intercolonial Railway. We have St. Andrews, St. John, Moncton and North Sydney. Is it the intention of the Government to make Halifax the principal terminus of the line? Are we going to have the five termini, or concentrate the whole in one?

Mr. BOWELL. I never knew before that St. Andrews was on the Intercolonial Railway. However, the longer we live the more we learn. Halifax is the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway proper. Cape Breton is another road altogether. Of course, under the Act passed this session all these branches are made portions of the Intercolonial Railway, and the only answer I can give, is, that the Government will do what they think is necessary to procure increased accommodation at all points along the road, as the traffic may demand it. An item has been put in for St. John and one for Moncton, and also one for New Glasgow, and when we come to these I will give the reasons why the appropriations are asked, but they do not in any way affect the item before the Committee. This is simply to place a sum of money at the disposal of the Government, as has been done in the past, to be used as soon as an arrangement can be made which will justify the Government in acquiring more land and in the construction of freight sheds. With regard to the objections urged by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), he is just as much interested in the accommodation at Halifax in order to supply the wants of the roads to which he has referred, and which now make connection with his own city, as the people of Halifax are. He says it is going to cost a great deal of money; and he complained repeatedly, during his short speech, that sufficient information had not been given. I gave him all the information I could, and quite as much as ever has been given in the past. I told him what I thought the cost would be if the demands of the city of Halifax were acceded to. I also told him that the Government were not committed to their demand or to any particular scheme, but this increased accommodation was absolutely required for the increased traffic, and it was necessary to have a certain sum of money placed at the disposal of the department in order to secure that accommodation if possible. I also informed the Committee what the estimate was for laying the tracks and what the cost of the erection of the buildings would be, which would be about $175,000. Now I do not know what the Committee or the gentlemen who have spoken require beyond that, unless they want the plans laid upon the Table and detailed estimates of the work, which I would not have the slightest objection to laying before the Committee, if they were in such a state as to enable me to do so. I can assure the Committee it is not the intention of the Government to spend more than is absolutely necessary. I must, however, dissent entirely from the theory laid down, that local traffic is not a traffic that should be cultivated. Nor is it any reason why accommodation should not be procured to assist in the storing of goods brought to the termini of any road because it happened to be local. We all know that on the Intercolonial Railway, taking from St. John to Moncton, and from Moncton to Halifax, and on the Windsor Branch, all these roads being more of a local character than the whole through line, are the most profitable, and if the local traffic pays best it should have the same accommodation as if it were the through traffic. When we apply the word "local" to railway traffic, that does not mean providing ordinary local accommodation for the city of Halifax, but accommodation for that trade which is rapidly growing in the Maritime Provinces, to such an extent, that I hope the day is not far distant when the road will not show a deficit every year or any year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I put my question, because I heard Sir Charles Tupper, when Minister of Railways, speak in the highest terms of these four different points, and I was not quite certain whether the accommodation at each was equal or not. I did not know whether it was the intention to make equal accommodation for the whole or finally decide to make Halifax the principal point.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. Minister of Railways account for the great increase of the deficit in the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was not here last night. We said something about the deficit then.

Mr. MULOCK. But we did not get an explanation of the deficit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understood from the Minister of Customs that the object of this increased accommodation was to build freight houses and warehouses.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a portion of the expenditure, as I have already stated.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would you propose to allow receivers of flour, pork or corn to store their goods in these warehouses free?

Mr. BOWELL. This is for the ordinary freight business at that port, and for the reception of goods brought there either from the ships or as

local freight. The warehouse accommodation at Halifax is not sufficient for the purposes of the road.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The custom on every railway that I know of is that where there are broken carloads of freight they are unloaded in the company's warehouse, and must be removed within a certain time or storage will be charged. When full carloads come in there is no provision made for unloading in the company's warehouses, but the receivers must unload within 48 hours. I know that is the case in Halifax, but there the receivers have a further privilege of unloading in the company's warehouse, and they can allow their goods to remain there for one or two months by paying storage. I think the Government should make receivers of flour and other cargoes provide their own storehouses, and many people in Halifax have storehouses, and would be willing to store goods for other persons, and then I believe the Government would find they have sufficient accommodation without going into this additional expenditure.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope the Minister will answer the question I put to him a little while ago.

Mr. BOWELL. I have answered this question four times. The misfortune is, members of the House are not in their seats when the discussion takes place. They drop in at various periods, and we have to go over the same thing several times. The deficit on the Intercolonial Railway to which the hon. gentleman alluded arises from many causes. No doubt one cause was the construction of the Short Line, which diverted a large portion of the trade from the Intercolonial Railway. How long that is going to continue I am not prepared to say. Further, after the opening of that Short Line it was necessary, in order properly to compete with it, to put on fast trains which did not then exist, and they cost a great deal of money. There has also been a large amount of money expended in some years more than in others in keeping the track clear on the northern section. I am informed that it requires a large number of men to be constantly employed in keeping the snow off, besides the use of the snow plough. From the little enquiry I have made in reference to that, I should judge that the expenditure on that part of the road costs 50 or 100, or even 200 per cent. in some years, more than the expenditure for similar purposes on any other road in the Dominion. We can understand that in a severe winter a large amount of money must be expended to keep the road open. There are various other reasons which have led to the deficit on that road.

Mr. MULOCK. These are possible reasons. What I asked was, what was the cause of the increase in the cost for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1890?

Mr. BOWELL. The first reason I gave was that a great deal of it was due to the opening of the Short Line, which had diverted a large portion of the trade. That is a positive reason and not simply a possible one, because we know by sad experience that it has had that result.

Mr. MULOCK. That road was opened some years ago.

Mr. TUPPER. It was opened during that fiscal year in June, 1889.

Increased accommodation at New Glasgow..... $10,800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is that?

Mr. BOWELL. That is necessitated by the opening of the Cape Breton Railway. Another district has been created, and new district officers have to be appointed, and also additional sidings and baggage accommodation for the opening of these two sections for traffic. The offices and station buildings will cost about $8,000, the baggage room and shed $600, removing freight house, $1,400, and an additional siding $1,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this cover the whole expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that this is all that is required. No portion of this has been expended yet.

Mr. FRASER. Is the building to be erected on the site of the present building?

Mr. BOWELL. Not quite. It will be erected a little east of it.

Mr. FRASER. Is it to be an enlargement of the present building or a new building?

Mr. BOWELL. It is a new building. It will be a two-storey building.

Mr. FRASER. Of what material?

Mr. BOWELL. Brick.

Mr. FRASER. Will the baggage-room be in the same position?

Mr. BOWELL. It will be a little west of the station.

Mr. FRASER. The freight building in New Glasgow is about the poorest building to be found in any town in Nova Scotia, or anywhere else. I am bound to say that this expenditure is all right, and I do not say so because I live there myself. The wretched building now in use was erected when the road was open only as far as New Glasgow. At that time, perhaps, it suited the conditions of the place.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you think $8,000 will be sufficient?

Mr. FRASER. I have no doubt the Government have informed themselves before to-day.

Increased accommodation at Moncton...$7,650

Mr. BOWELL. I have called the attention of the chief engineer to this heading of increased accommodation. It is the form of heading that has been used from the beginning in preparing estimates. The vote is for the purpose of supplying more machinery for the Moncton workshops, and for a new shop that has just been erected.

Rolling stock..... $18,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How many new cars have been put on last year? The principle laid down with regard to rolling stock has been, that when a car was used up and another was substituted it was charged to working expenses. I presume the item we are now voting is to be charged to capital account.

Mr. BOWELL. The same principle prevails now as formerly. When cars are broken or used up, and others are substituted, the latter are charged to working expenses; but if any additional new cars are purchased they are charged to capital

account. This item is for the purpose of supplying what is termed the Westinghouse air-brake to the freight cars on the road. There are 136 freight cars which, at $65 each air-brake, make a total of about $10,000. It is also to purchase an apparatus for heating the passenger cars by steam direct from the engine; also for the purpose of fitting up locomotives.

Mr. McMULLEN. This item should have been entered for the improvement of rolling stock.

Mr. BOWELL. These expenditures are necessary for the safety of life, and also for economy in utilizing steam from the engine, instead of using coal for heating.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand that it is necessary that these improvements should be made. I do not know what the system is upon the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether they usually place to capital account charges of this kind. My own opinion is that they should be charged to working expenses. However, as the system has been introduced of charging such items to capital account, I presume it is not necessary now to discuss the wisdom of that system. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how many new freight cars were put on the road this year in place of old cars?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the Grand Trunk use the Westinghouse air-brake on their passenger cars, but they have not yet applied it to the freight cars. The Intercolonial Railway has taken a step in advance of the Grand Trunk Railway, and we are going to place that air-brake upon our freight cars for the greater safety of the brakesmen. As to the number of additional new cars and the number of new cars substituted for old ones, the hon. gentleman will find the information on page 17 of the report of 1889.

Mr. MULOCK. What change in the books takes place when there is destruction of rolling stock? Is there any writing off of capital for destruction or loss of rolling stock?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand the question to be, how do you treat cars that have been destroyed, and when others are purchased or built? It is charged to revenue.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you keep up the insurance? Is the Government its own insurer?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, rolling stock, after it is once charged to capital, is always maintained in a state of efficiency.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the principle.

Mr. MULOCK. It is lived up to substantially, I presume.

Mr. BOWELL. With increased traffic you must increase the rolling stock and keep up a sufficient number of cars. If destroyed, they must be replaced.

Extension on front of City of St. John.. $15,300

Mr. BOWELL. This is simply to carry the line to the wharf, the city having furnished the right of way, and holding the Government harmless from any damage which may arise, or any suit instituted by anyone affected along the line. I believe a special Act was passed in the New Brunswick Legislature giving them power to do it.

Indian Town Branch..... $5,400

Mr. BOWELL. This is $4,000 balance due to Mr. Snowball, in settlement under a contract, and $2,000 to cover a land claim. Mr. Snowball is also claiming $70,000 for extras, which claim is not recognized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the state of the claim?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a suit under a petition of right.

St. Charles Branch..... ..... $45,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this another instalment of the interminable claims for damages presented to the House every year?

Mr. BOWELL. It is the result of a judgment of the Exchequer Court, with $5,000 for local expenses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Ever since I have been in this Parliament we have been voting sums for the St. Charles Branch. Can the Minister give any assurance that we have nearly reached the end of the claims?

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid not. I am told about $60,000 is still in litigation or amounts are claimed to that extent. Whether that amount will end it or not I cannot say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the total amount paid for damages in connection with this branch? It may serve as a pointer to new members when they are asked to vote moneys to new railways.

Mr. BOWELL. The expenditure under this heading was, up to February, 1891: for lands and damages, $863,905; for works, buildings, &c., $822,828, being a total of $1,686,743. To this must be added $45,000 which the Government now ask, and there are other claims of about $60,000, or altogether $110,000 additional.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What estimate was made by the department when the money was asked? I think it was $200,000.

Mr. BOWELL. My recollection is that it was $350,000. When the amount paid is considered it is really appalling. The lands were expropriated, and the arbitrators placed values on the lands. The parties appealed, and the courts gave these large sums. Nearly every claim has been paid only after we have been obliged to pay it by decision of court.

Additional property accommodation at St. John..... $72,000

Mr. BOWELL. Although I am not a practical railway man, I was satisfied, when I visited St. John, that the accommodation was altogether too small. A high fence running close to the station on the Harris property suggested that the adjoining property should be acquired for railway purposes. Whether it could not be obtained at the time I am not prepared to say. An arrangement was made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government to use the same stations and freight sheds, and this necessitates the acquisition of more land.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand it pays a certain proportion for the use of the freight sheds and for terminal purposes in connection with the road.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What does this land, which is about to be taken, consist of ?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand it is a strip lying alongside the station.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood it was part of the Harris car works.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be included in their yards.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How is it proposed to utilize this new land? I understand that some property was taken there some time ago which has not been utilized yet.

Mr. BOWELL. They propose to utilize it by laying down new tracks, sidings, and so on. The engineer tells me that they could not use the additional land to which the hon. gentleman referred, simply because it was too small for the purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Could the hon. gentleman state the size of the land that they took some time ago ?

Mr. BOWELL. About 100 by 60 feet.

Mr. McLEOD. I may say that this additional accommodation at St. John has been very much needed for some years, and it has become still more necessary since the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the traffic which it brought to the city. The railway has not at all sufficient accommodation for track room to hold their cars there. The Harris property has provided tracks of its own, and these tracks are nearly always filled with the Intercolonial Railway cars, because they have no room on their own line. In addition to that, some of the cars are at Fairville, outside of St. John, and a great deal of difficulty is experienced in having sufficient cars at the city, so that we have been continually suffering for the want of car room. This is a matter which has been urged upon the Government by the citizens of St. John and the people interested in it for some years. I remember speaking to Mr. Pope, the late Minister of Railways, some four years ago, and urging him, at the request of the citizens, to secure this additional car room, as the freight there was continually increasing. It will not be necessary for the present to build any additional freight sheds, but it will be necessary to lay such additional tracks as are necessary to provide accommodation for the cars. It has always been a matter of surprise to the citizens, when they were taking the land for the new station in the first instance, they did not take this land also. A good many hon. gentlemen who have been at the station might have noticed that all the car room they have is between the station and the city, and as the street runs by the station that accommodation is very limited. I am interested myself in a property close by the railway, on which we have provided a track of our own, down to the wharf, and that track is nearly always filled with cars of the Intercolonial Railway, because they have not room enough on their own lands. The people there connected with the handling of freight are continually complaining of the want of this accommodation, and I am glad to see that the Government has at last placed in the Estimates an amount to secure it. I am sure that after the discussion we had last night about the unfortunate deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, it must be pleasant for the members of the House to know that the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway is increasing, and that the traffic between Halifax and St. John has increased very materially. I think the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to Halifax as being the winter port, but we believe, and we have no doubt whatever, that St. John will be at least one of the winter ports as well as Halifax. The Canadian Pacific Railway has increased our business, and is increasing the traffic of our port, and I am sure that if hon. gentlemen were acquainted with the locality they would see at once the necessity for the additional accommodation.

Mr. SKINNER. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) as to why the property acquired by the railway some years ago cannot be used without taking this additional property, I may say that the property mentioned is 60 by 100 feet, and that the 60 feet is fronting on the street and the 100 feet runs parallel with the railway land. You will easily see that you could not build on a sharp curve like that, and the property which it is now proposed to take, along with the present property, will enable the Government to afford accommodation which is badly required for the use of the railway.

Mr. McLEOD. I should have said that between the Harris property and the street, the Government, a few years ago, took a property 25 by 50 feet, or something like that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And has been vacant ever since.

Mr. McLEOD. It has been vacant because it could not be utilized without the property which it is now proposed to take. It was necessary to obtain that property, and we then supposed that they intended also to obtain the Harris property. But when this is obtained, it makes all the property useful and all can be utilized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I am not going to pit my opinion in any way against that of the hon. gentlemen who represent the city. I take it that they are more qualified to express an opinion than I am. At the same time, I think it right to state to the Government that I was in St. John a short time ago, when my attention was called by some of the citizens to this property, and there was a general feeling expressed by those present that it was not at all required, but that it might be turned into a sort of a job. I asked the hon. gentleman some time ago for these papers, and the reason I asked for them was that I was anxious to know whether or not the chief engineer of railways had committed himself to a statement that this property was necessary in the public interest, and I find that he had not. I find, in the papers brought down, a statement from the station master at St. John to the effect that "increased accommodation is required," that "we particularly need more sidings at the western end of the yard," and "please have this matter looked into as soon as possible." He says : "I beg to call your attention to the urgent need of more siding accommodation at this station." This is what Mr. Robertson said last April, about a month after the election. Now, Mr. Pottinger endorses that : "I endorse the ap-

plication of Mr. Wallace for increased accommodation at St. John." Very well, that is sufficient for the Government to go on, if they choose; but what I want to point out to them is this, that there is no report showing the necessity of any such purchase as they contemplate making from the Harris estate. I want to know from the Government to-night whether there has been any private agreement as to the price to be paid for this land?

Mr. BOWELL. No; so I am informed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I would like to know how the value of that will be settled?

Mr. BOWELL. The proposition is that if an equitable arrangement cannot be come to with the parties the price will have to be decided by arbitration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe these car shops are not working now?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. HAZEN. It is evident to my mind that the hon. gentleman, when in St. John, had not a clear distinction between the Harris property, now proposed to be purchased, and the property obtained by the Government a year or two ago from Mr. E. R. Moore.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was not that some kind of a factory, too?

Mr. HAZEN. It was used some years ago as a nail factory. That fronted on Main Street and adjoined the station. It must have been the intention of the department, when taking that property, also to take the Harris property, because one without the other is absolutely useless for railway purposes. In order to make either valuable, the Government require to have both. Now, this accommodation is an absolute necessity. Anyone who knows anything about the business of St. John knows that the yard room at the station at present is not at all adequate to the requirements of the city. This is the universal opinion of the business men of the city.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why?

Mr. HAZEN. For the simple reason that there is not yard room for the cars. Those acquainted with the city know that the railway approaches it through a natural valley. After it crosses under the bridge at Garden Street you see the tracks spreading out on the left hand side, like a fan, as you look towards the station, while on the right hand side they do not spread out, because the Government do not own land there. The consequence is that there is not room for the cars there, and they have frequently to be placed up the track—I do not think I exaggerate any when I say a distance of several miles. The Harris property lies on the right hand side of the track of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This firm are car-builders, and have tracks of their own which they carry into their factory and use for the purpose of running the cars they manufacture out upon the lines of the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then there is the track called the "Long Wharf track," in which my hon. friend is interested, and which they have constantly covered with their cars also; and everyone who knows the city knows that it is an absolute necessity that there should be more room and more accommodation at the city of St. John for its business interests; and my only wonder is that the Government have not, previous to this time, made application to Parliament for a sum to enable them to provide that increased accommodation. That is practically the way the matter stands.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I said a little while ago, that the value of the property would be ascertained by arbitration. I meant to say by expropriation.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this needed accommodation for cars, I fancy from what the hon. gentleman has just said that it is required particularly for empty cars to stand there until they are required again. That appears to be the necessity.

Mr. HAZEN. Not altogether. That is a portion of the necessity.

Mr. McMULLEN. Taking that as the necessity, let us see what the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways do. Do they buy land in the heart of the city, where it is expensive? The Grand Trunk, for instance, has sidings for unused cars at the Scarboro' Heights, three or four miles out from the city of Toronto, and the Canadian Pacific has similar accommodation at West Toronto Junction, where land can be got cheap; and if the accommodation at St. John is wanted, as my hon. friend says, for empty cars to stand upon until they are brought into use again, it is folly, and worse than folly, to buy expensive property right alongside of the station for that purpose. Why not buy property outside of the city, where it is cheap and let the cars stand there until they are wanted again, when they can be brought into the city? That is the course all prudent railway companies adopt.

Mr. BOWELL. How long is it since the Grand Trunk purchased the property at Scarboro' Heights? Only a few years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. About twenty years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I would ask him how long ago the Nipissing Railway was built?

Mr. INGRAM. A few years ago the Grand Trunk needed the yard at York, and the cars are stored there now. That has only been the case for a few years.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are talking about the Scarboro' property, which the company owned when the Nipissing Railway was completed, and they own it still. If it was for station, or storage, or elevator accommodation, I could easily see that that would be required at the terminus or within convenient distance; but when you merely want siding accommodation for empty cars, it is worse than folly to buy expensive property.

Mr. SKINNER. This increased accommodation is not required for empty cars alone, but for cars laden as well as empty cars, in order that the traffic may be handled. In addition to what the Intercolonial Railway requires, the Canadian Pacific Railway also send their traffic into the same station yard, under the agreement they have with the Intercolonial Railway; and, therefore, for several years past, it has been known they could not

accommodate the traffic in the way it should be handled. The hon. gentleman is therefore mistaken when he thinks the increased accommodation is simply for placing empty cars upon it. It is intended for freight cars, laden as well as empty, and the general business there. The valley is very narrow from which the Intercolonial Railway comes into the city, and it might very well have been that the increased accommodation was required years ago; but it is a matter of public notoriety that for years past it was considered that the Intercolonial Railway authorities required this increased accommodation, and the pressure for it has existed for several years past. Only now, after five or six years' attention has been given the subject and requisitions made by the merchants and traders in the city for it, have the railway authorities at last acknowledged the urgent necessity of meeting this want. It is not a new idea, but an outgrowth of the increased business brought to that locality by the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. It must be borne in mind that years ago all the import trade of St. John came into the harbour, but since the completion of the Intercolonial Railway and the road from St. John to the United States a very large amount that used to come through the harbour comes through the railroads, and the demand for increased accommodation has been felt from year to year, until now it has become absolutely necessary for the handling of the traffic that this increased accommodation should be had.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I just wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this fact, that on the 1st July last I moved in this House for all correspondence, letters, applications and reports, relating to the proposed increased accommodation for the Intercolonial Railway at St. John, and not a letter, telegram, or application from any business or other man in St. John did I find, asking for that accommodation at all. Now, if there is this extraordinary demand, it is curious that the department are not in possession of a single application on the subject. The only thing I could find was an application, dated one month after the election, from the station master at St. John endorsed by Mr. Pottinger, asking for increased accommodation. Other gentlemen may give what value they like to his endorsation; but I do not attach much value to it. I would be better satisfied if the chief superintendent, who has examined the station since the Canadian Pacific Railway have been running their cars into it, had made a report to his principal, stating he believed this expenditure of $80,000 was necessary; but there is no application from any resident from the city of St. John or anybody interested in the railway nor any report from the chief engineer. I acknowledge, of course, the explanations given by the gentlemen representing that city, who are in a position to know what its requirements are, but would like to have from officials who are responsible for their report some statement showing that increased accommodation is required before being called on to vote such a large amount of money. We know very well what the result will be. Valuable property will be taken in the city by expropriation, for which we will have to pay enormous sums; and the fact that we are asked to vote $80,000 is to the best evidence that that the Government themselves expect to be bled pretty freely. If this expenditure were necessary, I would be the last one to vote against it, but we ought to have some ground for this demand, we ought to have some evidence that the necessity is recognized by the gentleman who should be responsible. We ought to have a report from the chief engineer. He will be held responsible, and I do not know why he has not made himself responsible by reporting on the subject. If this thing had been the subject of a great deal of correspondence, and if the people interested have been pressing this matter on the Government, how is it the chief engineer has not made any report? I expect the whole money will be used up in the purchase of a vacant lot because it forms part of the old Harris property. The hon. gentleman who last spoke said I must have been misled. No; I was not. My informants pointed out the old nail factory, taken some years ago by the railway, and which has never been used since—

Mr. McLEOD. It was taken and paid for last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—and it has not been used since. I was pointed out this property, and the only thing my informants were not quite sure of was whether it belonged to the Harris property or to Mr. Thomas Robertson, and the impression in their minds was that the purchase money would go to Mr. Robertson.

Mr. McLEOD. No; Mr. Robertson is a son-in-law of Mr. Harris, and Mr. Harris owns the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; and a very prominent supporter of my hon. friend.

Mr. McLEOD. He is not any better than Mr. Harris, probably not quite so good.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will acknowledge that everybody interested in this land is a strong supporter of my hon. friend.

Mr. McLEOD. I doubt that; I think some of them are against me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think Mr. Harris is a strong supporter, and also Mr. Robertson.

Mr. McLEOD. He is; but there are a good many who are not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I am not mistaken, he was a very active and prominent supporter of the hon. gentlemen at the last election; and a curious coincidence is that, although there was an absence of demand on the part of anybody for this increased accommodation, the station-master made his application a month after the election.

Mr. McLEOD. If my hon. friend knew the circumstances of the case as well as I do his opinion would be entirely different. If the same circumstances existed in his own constituency I believe the hon. gentleman, though he is opposed to the Government, would be here as strongly advocating those claims as he now appears to oppose these. Without intending to be offensive, I may say that I believe he is taking this course because he does not understand the circumstances of the case and what we require, because I feel sure that if he did he would not offer the opposition he does to this vote. He said that Mr. Robertson was a strong supporter of ours. There is no doubt of that, and there is no doubt that Mr.

Harris has been for years and years a supporter of the present party.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has he bled freely?

Mr. McLEOD. I do not know that he has. I must say, though this is my first session in this Parliament, that I do not think such an insinuation is fair, and that I very much regret, when questions of public importance come up, that gentlemen on the opposite side should throw across the floor the insinuation that these measures are being advocated, not on public grounds, but for partizan purposes. I think we ought to be able to deal with public questions which affect not only localities but the whole country, by laying aside party feelings, and that we should discuss these questions on public grounds. We have plenty of time and plenty of opportunity to deal with political questions; but apart from that, let us deal fairly with these matters, which are of common interest to us all, no matter on which side of the House we may sit. As to this question, I do not think the hon. gentleman will venture to assert that this property was bought from Mr. Robertson simply because he was a Conservative. I can assure him that it is not so. The property belonged to the Harris estate, and Mr. Robertson is the husband of one of the heirs of that estate; but I know that some of the sons-in-law are opposed to the present Government. The hon. gentleman said there is no correspondence in regard to this. For that I cannot answer; but I know that the citizens of St. John have demanded this, and that some years ago, when there was no election pending, and I came up here on business, I was asked by several citizens of St. John, and by members of the Board of Trade, to have an interview with the Minister of Railways, and impress upon him the necessity of acquiring this property. I stayed here a day or two longer than was necessary for that purpose, and the Minister of Railways told me that we had enough accommodation already. I said: No; we are to have the Canadian Pacific Railway in St. John, and then we will require increased accommodation, and we do not want, after the business has come there, to have to turn round and look for accommodation. I urged that strongly upon him, but he said: We will wait until the Canadian Pacific Railway gets there, and we had to wait. The business did increase; and it became practically an absolute necessity to get additional accommodation in some way, and that is why we have pressed upon the Government the desirability of taking in this property. This is not, as the hon. gentleman supposes, a question which originated within this year, but it is one we had been seeking and desiring to obtain for two or three years, and I am sure that whoever gave the information to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) could not have shown him the property we are seeking to obtain. I know that, if the hon. gentleman went to the station and walked up to the mountain line, and looked at the place there which they have for cars and other rolling stock, he would himself see the necessity of this proposition. He refers to Mr. Wallace, the district superintendent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The station-master at St. John made his report to Mr. Wallace.

Mr. McLEOD. I think if the hon. gentleman examines this matter he will see the necessity for this vote.

Mr. McLEOD.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would remind the hon. gentleman of one or two matters. He has administered a very mild lecture to the Opposition in reference to the criticisms which we passed upon the Government expenditure, and that will do very well for what he says is his first session in Parliament; but after a time I think he will see the necessity for these votes being criticized, and even severely criticized. Has he not heard to-night that it was estimated that the St. Charles Railway would cost $200,000, and has already cost $150,000? Has he not learned that the Short Line Railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, which, according to the statement of the then Minister of Railways, was to shorten the distance by forty miles, turns out, after an expenditure of a million and a-half, to have shortened it by only seven miles. He must see that it is the duty of the Opposition to closely examine and criticize public expenditures; and when I see that a demand is made from the city of St. John for increased accommodation, without any representation to that effect by the Board of Trade or by any citizen, I think it gives rise to fair and reasonable comment. If a live and active body such as the Board of Trade of St. John is—and we know that the merchants and the city of St. John are not sleepy—if they do not ask for Government aid, I say that, in the absence of all these parties and in the absence of any report from the chief engineer, I was not only justified in calling attention to this singular vote, but I would be recreant in my duty if I did not call attention to it. The hon. gentleman may be satisfied that this money will be properly expended, but I assure him that I will be very careful to see what report the chief engineer will make next year as to the use of the money included in this vote.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly any hon. gentleman has a right to take part in the discussion, and to condemn any vote which is brought forward. If the hon. gentleman thinks he is right in condemning this expenditure, surely my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. McLeod), who represents that constituency, has an equal right to defend that expenditure, though he is told by the hon. gentleman that he is a young member.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not at all. I was only replying to the lecture he gave me.

Mr. BOWELL. I am surprised at my hon. friend sitting there and laughing, because I understood that laughing was considered by him to be insulting. He considered it an insult to him the other day because I smiled.

Mr. INGRAM. I think there is a point that has been entirely overlooked. I find that the station agent complains that he has not sufficient yard room. The custom on railways generally is that where the station agent finds that he has not sufficient accommodation, he calls the attention of his superior officers to the fact, and they take steps to obtain it if found necessary. In this case I find that the Intercolonial Railway have not sufficient ground of their own for yard room, and they are asking the Government to purchase an additional amount of land. The climate in that section of the country is very severe in the winter time, and there is a great deal of snow, and they have to store away on this long track a number of loaded and empty cars. The hon. gentleman must see that such a state of affairs

as this requires a great deal of switching to be done. There is nothing unreasonable in asking for additional yard room. The railways have it in the city of Toronto and in the city of London. In Toronto, the Canadian Pacific Railway have their yard room at Toronto Junction, because the road continues from Toronto Junction eastward ; and so with the Grand Trunk Railway; they had not sufficient yard room in the city and they had to enlarge it from the Junction at little York.

Mr. HAZEN. The reports of the station agent at St. John, and of the district superintendent, Mr. Wallace, have been referred to. I have read both reports. Mr. Robertson gives statistics showing the increase in the traffic for the last two years, and the consequent need of additional yard room. Mr. Wallace, addressing Mr. Pottinger, declares that the railway is cramped for the want of additional siding and unloading room. It seems to me these two letters, sent from the station-master and from the district superintendent, both gentlemen being familiar with the facts, should satisfy every hon. member that it is necessary to have that increased accommodation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree that increased accommodation may be necessary. If it were for freight sheds or for a station house, I would assent that the proposed purchase might be necessary. But when it is only wanted for siding accommodation, it is quite clear that you can secure that at, perhaps, one-tenth of the price that you are going to pay for this piece of property, and by using the accommodation you now have, you would have ample room to store away empty cars and to load and unload cars. Of course, the hon. gentleman thinks it would be very convenient to have accommodation for loading and unloading cars in the centre of the city. In the city of Toronto, on the main line, the Grand Trunk Railway has only three or four sidings altogether, until they get to their freight sheds where there is an enormous amount of freight, while their accommodation for empty cars is away out at Scarboro' Heights. In this case you could buy property outside the city admirably suited for railway accommodation, for one-tenth the money you are going to pay for property in the centre of the city, when you only want it for siding purposes. Would the hon. gentleman state what is the arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway with regard to the mutual use of this proposed purchase ?

Mr. BOWELL. I have already told the Committee that the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway was that they pay a certain proportion of the wages of the men, and a certain amount for shunting, and for the wear and tear. They pay their proportion according to the work that is done by them, as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. I have not here the figures showing what that proportion will be ; but I will try and lay the papers on the Table.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the engineer say this land is worth the money you propose to pay for it ?

Mr. BOWELL. No sum has yet been arrived at as the value of the land. I may say frankly that a sum has been mentioned which the Government would never think of paying unless compelled to do so by a court of law. We all know that when a Government railway or any public corporation require land, the owners put a much larger price upon it than they expect to get, or than they would sell to any other person. It is the same with this land.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the engineer recommend the purchase of this particular piece of land for which money is being voted ?

Mr. BOWELL. All he says is that further accommodation is required. That is the only land that can be purchased, and consequently if he recommends anything, it involves the purchase of that land.

Mr. MULOCK. Does he assent to that statement ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, he assents to that statement, or I would not have made it. He says more, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were not there, we would not require it.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope the Exchequer Court will see that the award is no more than it should be.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell that to the Exchequer Court judge.

Mr. MULOCK. I would not hesitate to tell that to the judge of the Exchequer Court. There is very serious ground for questioning the findings of that court in regard to values of land. Enormous verdicts are rendered by the Exchequer Court for lands expropriated by the Dominion. There is no use mincing matters. The judge of the Exchequer Court, if he is not experienced or had dealings in land, may be very easily mislead by testimony as to values. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction in my part of the country with the awards of the Exchequer Court with regard to the expropriations of land. This applies to the present incumbent of the Exchequer Court, and to him I refer.

Sufferance warehouse at Halifax $2,700

Mr. BOWELL. This is for the construction of a Customs building on the wharf for the accommodation of goods coming by steamer.

Mr. HAZEN. Before we leave the subject of the Intercolonial Railway, I desire to say a few words in regard to affairs in the railway station at St. John. What I desire to say I and my colleague already have brought under the attention of the present Minister of Railways, but as he is only the acting, and not the permanent Minister, he declined to take any responsibility in the matter. I trust whoever occupies the position of Minister of Railways will look carefully into the salaries prevailing on the Intercolonial Railway and the wages paid to employés in the city of St. John, for there is no fair basis at the present time. In the station of St. John the amount paid a porter for doing his work is $1.20 per day. In my opinion, considering the nature of the work and the high rents and taxes, and the high incidental expenses in a large city, the wages paid are not sufficient to allow those people to live in the state in which they ought to be able to live. In addition, the people employed as porters at the station receive wages of $1.20 per day, and these men, who are intelligent men, are sometimes placed in positions where they do checkers' work, and yet year in and year out they are allowed to go on receiving porters' wages while the proper pay for a checker is $50 per month. The men are not

promoted to checkers' pay, but continue to do this higher work for the same pay they received when they did more humble work, as porters or labourers about the building. There are men in the machine shop working side by side who have been there an equal length of time and who are employed on the same class of work, who, nevertheless, receive different wages. These are matters I feel it my duty to bring forcibly to the attention of Parliament, and I trust they will receive careful attention and careful consideration from whoever may be called on to fill the position of Minister of Railways permanently. There are, moreover, a large number of grievances existing among officials employed in and about the station. I give one example, and there are many such examples. A man who sells tickets on the Intercolonial Railway handled last year for the Canadian Pacific Railway and Intercolonial Railway $169,000 in cash. For that service he received $60 per month. He was receiving, however, $60 per month before the Canadian Pacific Railway came into the station, and that road added very much indeed to the work he had to perform. He is employed from early in the morning till late at night and on Sunday evening when the Canadian Pacific Railway train goes out. Yet the Canadian Pacific paid the Intercolonial Railway authorities $28 a month for the service of a ticket agent, and so that man who was handling the large amount of money I have mentioned costs the Dominion Government only $32 a month. There is another case of the same kind, that of the man who handles the freight. His work has been increased very much since the Canadian Pacific Railway came into the station. The Dominion Government receive a sum from the Canadian Pacific Railway towards the payment of his services, and yet he obtains no portion of the amount. I think these are all matters which should be carefully investigated and considered, and justice should be done to persons employed on the road by whoever becomes permanent Minister of Railways. There are a number of other matters respecting which there are grievances, not fancied but real grievances; but at this late hour I will not refer to them. I trust these matters will meet with the consideration they deserve at the hands of the Government and department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has brought up the question of the pay of the employés on the Government road, and has spoken especially with respect to employés on the St. John branch of the road. I have no knowledge of the facts, and I express no opinion on them. As the matter has been called to the attention of the Committee, I again bring to the notice of the department the fact that a very unjust discrimination was made years ago between the pay given to employés on the Prince Edward Island road and to employés on the Intercolonial Railway. There was no justification for the discrimination made. The man in Charlottetown who was paid $1 a day was paid at Moncton $1.25 or $1.35. That cannot be defended on any grounds. It was once attempted by a Minister of Railways, and his effort was looked upon as an insult by everyone in the Island, for his defence was that potatoes were cheap on the Island. The cost of living is as great in Charlottetown and Moncton as in St. John. The employés of the Island road, moreover, labour under the disadvantage that they have not the chances of promotion which are open to employés on the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial is a very large institution, and if a man is sober, attentive to his duties and prompt in their execution, he has a very fair chance of being promoted to a higher grade from time to time. But the Island road is a very small one and the Government do not promote men from that road to the Intercolonial Railway. The men there, with a smaller chance of promotion than possibly on any other railway in the Dominion of Canada, are paid a lower wage for doing the same work, than men similarly employed on the Intercolonial Railway. That thing cannot be defended, and I bring it to the attention of the Government as a gross injustice which should be removed. It is a small matter, perhaps, and it would not amount to many thousands of dollars all told. I do not speak of the higher order of officers, I am speaking of the lower grade of officers on the road; the conductors—and there is no more efficient body of men in the Government employ than the conductors on the Prince Edward Island Railway—the baggage-masters, the carpenters and the workmen in the shops. These men are paid lower wages for doing the same work than are paid to the same class of men on the Intercolonial Railway, and it is galling and annoying in the extreme to a respectable artizan or mechanic, engaged at work in Charlottetown, to find that he is paid by the same Government a lesser sum than the mechanic doing the same work right across the Straits. It cannot be defended; it never has been defended in this House and I will never cease raising my voice against it until it is remedied. If the hon. gentleman for St. John (Mr. Hazen) had not brought the matter up I would have probably waited until the new Minister of Railways is appointed, and I would have hoped to make some impression on him, because the injustice of the thing is so apparent that I do not think any just man could resist my appeal. When I brought this matter up before the answer was given me: You would not expect that the superintendent or other officers of the Prince Edward Island road, would be paid the same salary as the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway. Certainly I would not, because they have not the same responsibilities nor the same work to perform; but I speak of the labourers, and the skilled artizans, and the conductors, and the baggage-men, and others, who discharge the same duties and work the same hours as the same class of men on the Intercolonial Railway and both being Government roads, I say it is an unjust discrimination which has been maintained for years back, and I hope that, at an early date, this injustice will be rectified.

Mr. McLEOD. At this late hour, I will not take up any time discussing the question, save to say that I agree in what my colleague (Mr. Hazen) has said in regard to this matter. I think that there should be a fair rate of wages for these men, and that a man should be paid for the work he does. If a man is doing checkers' work he should get checkers' pay. There is the difficulty that when a man is employed as porter, and put on to checker work, he is held responsible for any loss that would occur, and you can well understand that if a man getting $30 a month has $2 or $3

deducted out of his month's wages, it is a considerable thing to him. I trust that whoever is to be permanent head of the Railway Department, he will see that the wages are put on a proper basis, and that a man should be paid for the work he does. If a man is doing porters' work let him get porters' pay, and if he is doing checkers' work let him get checkers' pay. There are various other officers on the road, and I am sure if I brought their case before the House, hon. gentlemen would see that they are entitled to better pay for the work they are doing than they are getting now.

Mr. SKINNER. I support the observations of my hon. colleagues in reference to the pay of the men at St. John, on the Intercolonial Railway, with all the strength I can bring to bear upon it. But there is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Railways, and it is a matter that should be remedied at once. For years and years the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway at St. John were allowed a few days' holidays during each summer.

Mr. MULOCK. During election time?

Mr. SKINNER. It had nothing to do with elections at all. Elections generally take place in winter with us, and therefore the election has nothing to do with the holidays. The holidays have been taken away from the men, and they have to toil on very small salaries year in and year out, and cannot get a few days' holidays, unless, out of the small pittance which they get, they can employ substitutes to perform the labours in which they are engaged.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has not his eye on the Public Accounts Committee now.

Mr. SKINNER. If I have not got the Public Accounts Committee in my eye, I have the interest and welfare of these men in my eye, and that is of more importance to these men, I think. For years the holidays for the men used to be arranged in such a way that only one or two would be off at a time, and then the others by extra work would double up, and so the work was carried on without any loss whatever to the public service. All that the men ask now is, that from the beginning of the season to the end of it, by gradual steps each should be allowed to have his holidays, and the duties would be performed by the others doing extra work without any extra pay. If this were allowed, the public service would be well attended to, the men would be treated with ordinary humanity, they would have the holidays which they are entitled to and which I hope that the Department of Railways will see that they get.

Mr. MULOCK. It is to be regretted that these four speeches were not delivered last night before the Minister of Justice delivered his speech in regard to the proposition of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). Had they preceded that discussion the Minister might have seen the propriety of placing this road in commission.

Mr. HAZEN. The small increase of salaries which we ask for these employés, would be but a drop in the bucket, a small item in the expense of the road, and it would be doing an act of justice to these men.

Cape Breton Railway—Construction and equipment $27,000

Mr. BOWELL. This vote, I am informed, will complete the work. It is a revote, having lapsed on account of the lateness of the session.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways as to the freight rates that will be charged over this extension of the road. Is it proposed to make the rate on flour to Antigonish the same as to other points on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. BOWELL. The complaint which the hon. gentleman formerly made, if I recollect right, was that there were different rates of freights on the different sections of the Intercolonial Railway. The New Glasgow, and Cape Breton, and all the lines are now treated as one road, so that if the hon. gentleman desires to forward his goods from Chatham to Cape Breton, he can do so at one through rate, just the same as if he were sending them to St. John or Moncton or Halifax.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The same rate will apply?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, at the same rates.

Train ferry between Mulgrave and Point Tupper, including cradles and approaches..... $90,000

Mr. FRASER. This expenditure will be for a boat, I suppose?

Mr. BOWELL. It is for the purpose of transshipping freight cars from Mulgrave on one side of the Strait of Canso to Point Tupper on the Cape Breton side. A propeller and two large barges are proposed to be provided, the barges being towed across by the steamer, when the ice will not prevent this being done. Then the ferry steamers will take the passengers from the passenger train across from one side to the other. If a train ferry had been established for these, when the ice packed so that it could not cross, there would be no means of taking the passengers over. It was, therefore, thought better to adopt this plan. The train ferry would have cost about $400,000, and the present system if carried out on the first expenditure, will cost about $100,000: the steamer $75,000, the two barges $10,000, and the cradles and approaches $15,000.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not proposed to convey the passenger train across?

Mr. BOWELL. Not the passenger trains, but the freight cars. The passengers will be transshipped by the steamer.

Mr. FRASER. It will make quite a difference to the passengers crossing if the barges have freight cars aboard.

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer tells me that the proposition is that as soon as the train arrives the passengers will be taken on the steamer and carried over at once without having to wait till the freight cars are taken.

Removal of Summerside Station..... $4,500

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) How are you going to remove this station?

Mr. BOWELL. It is dangerously located, it being impossible to approach it without crossing several tracks. It is alleged that a number of very narrow escapes from loss of life have occurred, and

it is to avoid these that authority is asked to purchase a piece of land alongside of the main street on which to place the station, and that the building be shifted to the new site, and set on a stone foundation, so that the passengers can go direct from the street into the building.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fully concur in the necessity of this removal, and in the dangerous character of the approach to this station, and my only wonder has been that some serious accident has not taken place. I suppose the station will be put on the north side?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes: on the north side.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines.—(Mr. Tupper.)

CARLETON BRANCH RAILROAD.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 158) to authorize the sale of the Carleton, City of St. John, Branch Railway.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that will about pay 10 per cent. on the outlay we are about to make in the city of St. John for increased accommodation?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very likely you are correct.

Bill reported.

PICTOU HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 150) to amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, N.S.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. Clause No. 3 of this Bill stood over, as I desired to re-cast that clause in reference to expropriations. The object of the Bill is to enable the harbour commissioners of Pictou to borrow money for the purpose of improving the harbour; and the expropriation clause in the original Bill was apparently drafted by the commissioners from local statutes. I propose to substitute the following clause:—

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, upon the application of the said commissioners, and with the approval of the Governor in Council, may, for the purpose of enabling them to obtain such lands as in their judgment are necessary for the purposes of the corporation, take such lands under the provisions of 'The Expropriation Act,' and in such case all the provisions of the said Act shall apply:

The lands so taken may be conveyed by the Crown to the said corporation upon repayment of all damages, charges and expenses incurred by the Crown in respect thereof:

The Minister shall not take any such proceedings under this Act until the said corporation has made deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Minister, to satisfy all claims against the Crown by reason of any proposed expropriation.

The usual clause in all these Acts relating to harbour commissioners makes applicable the statute regarding the expropriation under the Railway Act, but it is considered that this is a more convenient way of proceeding directly in the name of the Crown, upon the Crown obtaining the necessary indemnity. That is the only change from the ordinary clauses in these Bills.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister whether the latter portion of that clause will meet his view:

"The Minister shall not take any such proceedings under the Act until the said corporation has made deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Minister, to satisfy all claims against the Crown by reason of any proposed expropriation."

Supposing that the award for the land expropriated exceeds the amount that the Minister has contemplated. What provision is there for paying the extra sum?

Mr. TUPPER. If the judgment of the Minister had been erroneous; the title would be in the Crown, and the conveyance would not be made by the Crown to the commissioners until they supplemented that amount. In such a case the object would not be obtained until the commissioners pay this amount. The conveyance does not take place, and the Crown would be left with the property. But upon the amount being ascertained, the estimate under the Order in Council being fixed, the Crown would proceed, and vest the title in the Crown and pay the money. If the money was short of the necessary amount, the harbour commission would not be entitled to obtain the title until they made up the deficiency.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But that is the very point in which I think the Bill is a little weak. There can be no possible objection to this Bill except that it offers the mere possibility of the general public incurring liability. We do not want that, the hon. gentleman does not want that, and our joint object is to make such provision as will ensure that while the harbor commission's object shall be carried out without any undue friction, at the same time the public shall not be mulcted in the payment of money. Now, I think it highly undesirable that any lands which these harbour commissioners may desire for the improvement of the harbour should be vested in the Crown at all, unless proper steps are taken to ensure that they shall repay the money; and I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman whether it would not be well to insert a clause providing that if the amount deposited with the Minister is below that subsequently awarded, no further proceedings in the expropriation shall take place until

the difference is deposited by the harbour commission.

Mr. TUPPER. That is really the first proceeding taken. The commissioners fyle a plan showing the property and tendering the amount. While there is a bare possibility of what the hon. gentleman apprehends, that friction will occur and that the Crown will be left in possession of a piece of property, it is most improbable to happen. The larger portion of the property which the commission would require for the construction of a wharf, is already vested in the Crown, so that the expropriation would practically apply only to the shore; and it is difficult to conceive a case where the estimate of the amount required to be deposited would fall short. The risk to the Crown is so slight that, considering that the object in view is the public improvement, and that nothing can be done without the approval of the Governor in Council, I think it might be as well to adopt the course provided for by the Bill. Otherwise, it would be necessary to revert to those cumbersome proceedings which other commissions are forced to adopt, where the commissioners themselves are the moving party. It is a quicker and less cumbersome system in which the Crown directly proceeds.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I admit that the change facilitates the proceedings, and I do not object to it in that respect at all, nor do I wish to be captious; but the hon. gentleman knows that since our experience with the Quebec harbour commission, we are not anxious to make provisions with respect to these commissions so loose that the public interest may be damaged. But I want to point out to him what probably will take place. The Minister, when he fixes the possible sum to be paid for the value of the lands about to be expropriated, will be almost sure to err on the low side, because the commissioners will say: You must not assess these lands at a large sum, for the expropriation authorities will not go below that sum, but rather above it. So that when the Minister fixes a sum, it will be a controlling guide to the authorities when they come to assess the value of the property. I think there might be a simple provision put in to provide that the tolls should go to the Government until the expropriation is completed.

Mr. TUPPER. We would have the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But it would be of no earthly use.

Mr. TUPPER. If the commission decides to get a property, and the Governor in Council decides that it is necessary for the shipping interest, I do not think there is much danger that any extra amount necessary would not be at once paid by the commission.

Bill reported.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: We had overlooked in the amendment made in 1889, chapter 23, 52 Victoria, and accidentally repealed it. This applies to cases like the steamship *Halifax*, which had an English register, and was sailing between Halifax and Boston carrying passengers. It was discovered that we had no power to cause an inspection to be made, without this amendment.

Amendment concurred in.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 117) further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Sections four and five were allowed to stand, and I move now that they be struck out.

Motion agreed to, Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GRANTS OF LAND TO THE MILITIA.

Bill (No. 159) to make further provisions respecting grants of land to members of the Militia force on active service in the North-West, was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 126) to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. This Bill, as far as it goes, is a good Bill, and will meet certain desires of the people of the North-West Territories, but at the same time it leaves a good deal undone that many of us in the North-West would like to see done. When we go into Committee I intend to move the addition of a clause to the following effect:—

Section 7 of the amending Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

The persons qualified to vote at an election for the Legislative Assembly shall be the male British subjects by birth or naturalization (other than unenfranchised Indians and members of the North-West Mounted Police) who have full attained the age of 21 years, and so on.

It will be very important to have that clause inserted, which will prevent the members of the North-West Mounted Police voting for candidates for the Assembly. Take the constituency of North Regina, and at the last voting, Jelly had 227 votes and Brown had 135 votes, and there were 80 police votes polled for Jelly, so that Jelly won the election by a very small majority of the civil vote. If Brown had had a few more votes, the police vote would have decided the election, and I think that is very undesirable and creates a great deal of ill-feeling that the constituency should be watered by a vote that is not permanent, because the members of the force are moved from one place to another, have no special interest in the place, and have no reason for devoting their attention to the matters which might affect legislation in that Assembly. I need hardly say that I do not approve of that standpoint in politics which looks to the United States as having everything superior to ourselves, as if we had not as great natural advantages as they have, and as if we could not hope to build up as great a nation as they have built up; but at the same time there is no reason why we should not learn something from what has been done in the United States, and I should have been glad if this Bill had contained some things which it does not contain. However,

this Bill goes a great deal further in the direction of giving the Territorial Assembly the mastery of North-West affairs than any previous Bill. For instance, under this Bill the Assembly will have power to deal with its own elections, and there is a clause that gives the Assembly the power of deciding other important matters. I consider that the principle we should go upon is to give that Assembly, as far as we can, the power of dealing with all things which the British North America Act places within provincial control, always excepting the power of borrowing money which the people do not desire. I think that a great deal more might with propriety and with great advantage to the North-West be placed in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor and the Assembly. For instance, I have been pressing on the attention of the Government and of the Hon. Mr. Carling the propriety of placing funds at the disposal of the North-West Government to enable them to deal with immigration. There is no reason why a sum should not be given to the North-West Assembly to enable them to supplement the action of the Dominion Government in bringing immigrants into the North-West. The Dominion Government very properly takes control of the immigration for the whole of this country, but in addition to that the different provinces put forth exertions of their own. British Columbia can put forth exertions of its own, so can Manitoba, so can Ontario, and so can all the provinces, because they get a lump sum paid to them by the Dominion which is based on certain calculations. Probably we may have the census returns in our hands before we get through with this Bill, and I believe that, if you take the population of the North-West Territories and the fact that we have no public debt whatever, and take all the circumstances into account, you will find that we are entitled to a far larger sum than we receive at present from the Dominion treasury. Therefore, there is nothing unreasonable in asking that a sum shall be placed at our disposal to enable us to put forth our energies for the encouragement of immigration. A few days ago, I was speaking with a gentleman who had been up in the territories looking at the development of the country in the interests of his friends in the old world. He said he was told in Winnipeg, that the country near Regina was barren. Now, no matter whether you go to Alberta or to Assiniboia or the Saskatchewan, you will find the country is rich in farming lands, and Mr. Duncan McIntyre and Mr. Angus, who have visited the delta of the Nile, found the same character of deposit in the Regina basin as they found there. Yet this gentleman was told that there was nothing but barrenness around Regina. We, therefore, ask that there should be at the disposal of the Assembly power of action and amounts to enable them to have immigration agents, some from the Saskatchewan, some from Assiniboia and some from Alberta, so that they may go either to Dakota, or to England, Ireland or Scotland, or to Germany or Scandinavia, and to supplement the work of the general Dominion agents in pointing out the advantages of the different North-West Territories. Now, I will call the attention of the House to what is done, and has been done in the states, when making territories. When Minnesota was organized into a territory on 3rd March, 1849, it had a population, according to the census of 1850, of only 6,077, consisting in the main of French Métis in the employment of the American Fur Company. When Dakota Territory was organized, which took place on 2nd March, 1861, the population amounted to 4,837. Montana, which was lifted to the position of a territory on 26th May, 1864, had only a population of 20,595 in 1870. Wyoming, which was organized on 25th July, 1868, had only a population of 9,000 odd in 1870. Now, if you look at the progress they have made you will find it set forth by the following figures :—

	1880.	1890.
Montana	39,159	132,139
Wyoming	20,789	60,705
Minnesota	780,773	1,301,826
North Dakota	36,909	182,719
South Dakota	98,268	328,808

We know now, as a fact, that the attractions of the North-West of Canada are greater than the attractions of those places. If you take the North-West of Canada you will find that, compared with any of those territories, some of which have since become states, in farming land, in forest, in mines, in rivers, our North-West, in most all those points, are richer than the states I have mentioned. Now, I will call the attention of the Government to what has been done for a territory in the United States. It is given a governor, judges and executive officers appointed, and salaries paid by the Federal Government at Washington—that we do ; a legislature chosen by the people—that we do ; federal appropriations for legislative expenses for a session of 60 days, public buildings, and military and territorial roads—that we practically do ; lands for schools and universities, one-eighteenth of the area of the territory—we have lands for schools, but no land has been set apart as yet for a university. Last year I was a member of a body that met together, persons who were supposed to have some fitness for speaking on educational subjects, and we passed a resolution which I think was sent to the Minister of the Interior ; we passed a number of resolutions which, I fancy, the secretary of the school board, Mr. James Brown, sent to the Government, in favour of having land at once set apart for a university in the territories. I will say that that cannot too soon be done. Now, that is what we do not do, and I say it is a thing that should be done. The United States make land grants to the territory for 1,800 miles of railway, to be organized and controlled by the Legislature. And what is the advantage of that ? At the present moment, in the State of Minnesota, at 3 per cent. on the gross earnings, those railways, organized by means of such help as that, now return an income of $600,000 per annum to the treasury of the state.

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in the organization of a territory they specially set apart lands, of which the Assembly of the territory have control, for railway purposes ?

Mr. DAVIN. I do.

Mr. TISDALE. In what territory have they given it ? If it is so, I am informed otherwise. I merely want the hon. gentleman to name the territory.

Mr. DAVIN. I will name the territory—Minnesota.

Mr. TISDALE. When it was a territory ?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. And in the others, Wyoming and Montana?

Mr. DAVIN. When Minnesota was a territory it got 1,800 miles of railway, and after it had been a State for some time it got a large amount of its swamp lands.

Mr. TISDALE. Was not that part of the Northern Pacific, a transcontinental railway? I understood that the only roads built through Minnesota while it was a territory were a part of the United States system of railways.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says he understands that; but all I can tell him is that his understanding is not as sound on that matter as it usually is on other subjects, because he will find, if he looks into the history of Minnesota, which he will find in the Library——

Mr. TISDALE. What was the railway that received this aid?

Mr. DAVIN. I state, with the responsibility that belongs to my position here, that that was done, and that they are taking $600,000 a year at this moment, at 3 per cent., from the railways they themselves subsidized. Then there was a representation by delegates in Congress that bettered that. When we got representation we also got a vote. Now, there were subsequent grants, as I have said, to Minnesota that put it in possession of a third of the lands of the State. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that as we are giving the North-West a new start it would be well for the Government to consider whether they should not treat the territories of the North-West just as you treat a young man when you are setting him up in the world, giving him something on which to trade for himself. At present, what we do is to vote certain sums for specific purposes, and we may get, I assume, the power to deal with this; but what we should do is to give them some capital on which they can go on for themselves; we should give them some of the lands in the Territories that they may deal with themselves, and give them a subsidy to be expended on immigration, and on other purposes that may strike them as necessary for the country, give them a sum in addition to what you now give them. I do not want to give up voting specific votes, but to give them a sum in addition to that which will enable them, to use a colloquial expression, to go on their own hook in some matters, which will call forth the enterprise of their statesmanship. I think if these suggestions are adopted it will be found that immigration will increase, the population will go ahead at a greater ratio than it has in the past, and the territories will be more prosperous. I may say that the Bill is one that I think will satisfy the people of the North-West, qualified by the criticisms I have made.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This Bill which proposes to confer upon the North-West Territories very important rights and very extensive powers, leaves untouched one subject which is, perhaps, if not of the greatest importance, of very great importance, especially in view of what we may hope to see realized, a great extension of population, of wealth, of industry and of enterprise, in those territories—that subject is the subject of education. Now, I find that the 9th clause of the Act which is now being amended, is not referred to at all in this amending Act. By that clause it is enacted that:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall pass all ordinary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and, also, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

Judging from the wording of the Act and from there being no reference to this clause one might reasonably assume that it was intended that the power of dealing with the subject should be left in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I understand, however, that it is contended that by the interpretation clause this power, herein apparently given only to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, is also vested in the Assembly, to which new and extensive powers are given. I think, even if that is the case, it would have been better if the Act had been so worded that there should be no doubt as to that point, but that when we are giving this body the power to deal with property and civil rights and a variety of other subjects referred to in the Act, this subject of education, if it were to be dealt with by it, should be specially mentioned. However, that is not the subject to which I wish to direct the attention of the House. This clause which I have read establishes in the North-West Territories, whether the people desire to have it or not, the system of separate schools. The question that I wish to bring before the House to-day is, whether this legislation we are about to pass, giving these territories practically provincial powers, should contain an enactment, which, whether the people like it or not, will compel them to establish separate schools. I use the word "compel" advisedly, because, although the term is permissive, yet we know perfectly well from experience in other provinces that although the word "may" is used it is virtually as imperative as if the word "shall" was used, and therefore I am justified in saying that the intention of the clause is that there shall be in these Territories separate schools, and there is no option given to this, I will not say newly constituted body, but this body to which these extensive powers are given, to say whether they will or will not have them. In consequence of this restriction of the legislative power of this Assembly we shall have again within a very few years the same controversy and agitation which have recently occurred in Manitoba, and we shall have in the North-West Territories, if I am not much mistaken in the temper of the people living there, and who may be living there within a few years, a determined effort made to get rid of this restriction and to assert the right to say whether or not they will have separate schools; and they may go perhaps further than the people of Manitoba have gone, and although in the present case there will not be the doubt as to their power, as in the case in Manitoba, yet certainly we shall have the attempt made to assert a right to which, under all the circumstances, they are entitled, namely, that they shall, at all events, have power to say whether or not separate schools may be established. I do not propose to enter into the question whether

separate schools are advisable, whether our experiences in the various provinces, especially in Ontario, where in regard to this matter we have had the largest experience, and where it has been productive of the most important results, would lead us to decide the question as to whether it was advisable or not that separate schools should exist in any of the provinces of the Dominion. We know very well what the result has been. We know very well that in several provinces an agitation in opposition to these schools has taken place and has generally been successful. We know perfectly well that if Ontario had the power to-day to say whether separate schools should be abolished or not there would be a very strong expression on the part of the majority that separate schools should be abolished. I do not speak of the subject as having myself any dislike to religious education. On the contrary, as far as my personal feelings and convictions are concerned, I would very much prefer a system of education which would be essentially a religious system. Unfortunately, under the existing circumstances of the country, no province has been able to devise a plan by which such system could be established; and we find the only result of the adoption of that principle is, that one particular denomination has established schools, by means of which it has sought in various ways to extend its influence politically or otherwise, and has never been content to stand in the position in which it was placed by the British North America Act, but in the various provinces it has extended its power until in Ontario there is a very general determination, which to some extent has been carried out, that that body shall be compelled to revert to the position in which it is placed in the British North America Act. I shall simply content myself on the present occasion with contending that as regards this question of restriction imposed by section 9 of the present Act it should be removed, and the Assembly should be given power and control over education, and no restriction should be imposed by this legislation as to whether separate schools shall be established in the North-West Territories or not. I do not propose to enter into the question as to whether it is advisable to have a separate school system, but I confine myself to the contention that this Assembly should have power to deal with the question. I go further, and say that as this Act makes no special reference to education, and as before very long there will be another opportunity of dealing with this question, and taking up the whole subject of education, which is virtually not taken up by this Act, and as no particular harm can result from postponing the question for a short time, I will not at the present time go further than to say that I trust the Government will take the subject into its serious consideration, and will decide, in view of all the circumstances of the case, considering the views of all the provinces, considering what the future of the country is likely to be, before next session whether or not in conferring these great powers, which they have conferred on this Assembly by this Bill, they will not go further, and give them perfect and absolute control over education. It may be said there are no petitions from the North-West Territories asking for this. I think we have had some evidence that there is a strong feeling on the subject, but even were there not one member from the North-West to rise in this House and endorse the view for which I am contending, it must be remembered that we are not legislating for the comparatively small handful of people in the North-West Territories, but we are legislating for the large number we hope to see there within a very few years, and I think we may fairly assume that the Bill giving these sive powers is intended, although there is no limit stated as to the period of its duration, to remain in force for a very considerable period of time. With the powers that are given to the North-West Territories under this Act there will be no reason for giving more extensive powers or for creating separate provinces for, very probably, a good many years to come. And, Sir, what will be the position of those who may then be prepared to contend, as I contend now, that this subject should be dealt with by the Provincial Assembly? Why, Sir, we shall have the cry that has been raised so often in reference to this question, as well as to kindred questions in the Dominion of Canada; we shall have the cry that those who were in favour of separate schools have had them established by law, that they have been existing for so many years, that a vested right has been created in them, and that this right ought not to be set aside. The difficulty placed upon those who feel as I do on this question will be very greatly increased if we allow this period of time to elapse without removing the restriction imposed by the 9th section of the Act to which I refer. I say that for this reason this restriction ought to be removed before this system becomes finally established in the North-West Territories I think the proposition is a reasonable one; I think it is a proposition which the Government ought to accede to, and it is a proposition which I hope they will accede to. I hope that now when they are establishing this principle, giving these extensive powers to this Assembly, they will give them the power of saying whether or not there shall be separate schools in the territories, if they are to have the subject of education in their hands at all. I repeat again that this is a reasonable proposition; it is a proposition which the Government ought to accede to, and it is a proposition which I hope they will accede to. However, under existing circumstances, I do not wish at this period of the session to raise a debate which probably would create a good deal of angry feeling, and which undoubtedly would produce a discussion which, considering the many pressing matters now before the House, and in the present condition of the Administration, it is desirable to avoid if possible. And I venture to say, in speaking on this subject, that I am giving expression, not only to my own opinion, but to the opinion of many other members of this House who hold the same opinion as I do in regard to this matter. Under these circumstances, I do not propose, while the present Act is under consideration, to offer an amendment myself to the Act as it now stands; but I tell the Government—and I say it with all seriousness and all determination—that unless they either deal with the subject now, which is the proper time to deal with it, when they have the Act before them, or unless they will, during the recess, consider the question, and before the next session bring forward an amendment to the Act in the direction I think it should be amended, then I can tell them that they have not heard the last of this question, and that at a time which shall be

more convenient for raising this discussion it will be raised in this House, and they will be compelled to meet it, and to let the country understand distinctly whether or not they are prepared to remove this restriction. I think, Sir, there is nothing else I need say on this question now. I think I am making a reasonable request; I am making a request which I am very certain will be supported by a majority—I will not say only of those whom I represent—but a great majority of those who are represented in this House—at any rate, by the members from the Province of Ontario. I think that a similar expression of opinion would be given also by the electors in many other portions of the Dominion. The subject, of course, is one that is comparatively new, for all our dealings with the North-West Territories have been so far tentative, and experimental rather than absolute. We are now, however, going a step further. We are now giving to this Assembly powers which it has not hitherto possessed; and there is one thing which may be taken for granted, that with the acquisition of the new powers given under this Act the people of these territories will enquire why they should be restricted in this great and important particular. It is because I think such is the case, and because I do not wish on a future occasion, when this subject comes again before the House for further legislation, that those who think as I do on this system of education should be met with the objection that so many years ago this system was established by law and that, therefore, a vested right is created which the Legislature should not now interfere with. Why, Sir, it would be almost fair to argue that this would come within the provisions of the British North America Act. If not in reality it would by analogy, because the British North America Act secured to the provinces which came into Confederation whatever rights were enjoyed by the supporters of separate schools at the time of Confederation, and if we create new provinces out of these territories it may fairly be argued that the analogy of the British North America Act will apply, and that in creating new provinces and bringing them into Confederation there will be something like the same rights guaranteed to the supporters of separate schools which were guaranteed to the provinces having separate schools before coming in under the British North America Act. Sir, under all these circumstances, I think I am taking a reasonable course in calling the attention of the Government to this matter, and in telling them that unless they are prepared either to remove this restriction now when the Bill is before the House, or unless before next session they will make up their minds to remove it, the subject will again be brought up, and brought up with perhaps not, as I may say, the studied moderation with which I have brought it forward on this occasion. I can tell the Government that the whole subject of separate schools will come up, and possibly a demand will be made in this House and supported by public opinion in this country which will go a great deal further than the moderate proposal I now submit. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to offer any opposition to the second reading of the Bill. I am not going, as I said, to bring forward myself a resolution on this subject when the Bill is in Committee; but I hope the Government will take the course I suggested, and if they do not take it, then they must be prepared at the next favourable opportunity, having had full time to consider this question, to state whether or not they will meet the proposal, which I think is a moderate and reasonable one.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives of the territories I may say that I believe the people of the North-West Territories will be willing to accept this as a temporary measure. It can be nothing else than a temporary measure, because it is the hope, not only of the people of the territories, but I believe of the people of all Canada, that the condition of that country may alter and improve so materially that by the end of the next three years another form of legislature will have to be granted, or perhaps some legislative divisions will have to be made in the Territories. Just now Parliament has been devoting its attention to the question of immigration, and should the measures taken by the Dominion Government prove of use, and should a large number of immigrants come into the country, it is considered by the people living there that the population will have increased to such an extent that it may be advisable to divide the territories, and to perhaps carve out one or two provinces. I think, as the territories exist just now, it would be a mistake to alter the conditions affecting the schools. I, for one, am pledged to the maintenance of separate schools at present, and when my hon. friend the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) warns the Government that if they do not next year bring in a Bill to place the question of schools, and the prohibition of separate schools, if necessary, in the hands of the Legislative Assembly, I may warn him that as one of the representatives of the territories I am pledged during this Parliament to oppose such a measure. I believe that the people of the North-West are very liberal in their opinions. The Protestants who live there have their own schools, and they do not in the least object to the Roman Catholics educating their children in the manner in which their conscience dictates. I believe at the same time that there is a very strong hope amongst the people of the North-West Territories that the children of Canada may know that there can be nothing very detrimental to religion in learning reading, and writing, and arithmetic, and other teachings such as that, in the common schools of the country. But they recognize that, as long as there is a strong prejudice on the part of a large section of the people throughout the country, arising simply from a good motive, it must be respected. During the last session of Parliament, when my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) introduced in this House a measure affecting the schools of the North-West, he stated that the different representatives of the territories did not represent the feeling of the people there. Well, Sir, we have had a general election since then. In my district there is not only a large number of Roman Catholics, but also a large number of North of Ireland Orangemen; there are Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and adherents of almost every denomination; and at every single meeting I attended, whether in a Roman Catholic settlement or an Orange one, when I was asked to state what course I would pursue in regard to this school question I boldly replied that I would pursue such a course as would be favourable to maintaining the separate schools and respecting the religious

opinions of the different sections of the people. There is really no hardship at all to the Protestants of the North-West in the separate schools as they are at present constituted, because the present Act, which I presume will be continued after this Bill passes, provides that Protestants shall be taxed for the maintenance of Protestant schools, and that Roman Catholics shall be taxed for the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools. No Protestant is taxed for the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools unless he chooses, and at the same time no Roman Catholic is taxed for the maintenance of Protestant schools unless he chooses to be taxed in that way. I do not think there is any great danger from a system of that kind; and if the hon. gentlemen who espouse so warmly the interests of the North-West would turn their attention to the material welfare of that country they will find that the people of the territories are able to take care of their own spiritual interests. Now, the hon. gentleman, in referring to this question, says he is not sure whether the British North America Act controls the question of schools in the North-West Territories or not. I can hardly believe that it does, for there is a provision at present on the Statute-book providing for the maintenance of separate schools in the territories. It, therefore, appears to be plain that this House regulates these matters; and I would warn the hon. gentleman, before he brings a measure before this House for the purpose of abolishing separate schools in the territories, to consider the constitution of this House. The hon. gentleman says I have misunderstood him—that he did not intend to abolish separate schools, but merely wished to give the people the right to say whether they would have separate schools or not. I may say that I am opposed to that while the constitution of the territories exists in its present form. When those territories are divided into provinces, then they may be given control of their schools; but while they continue to be territories it is better to leave the school question as it is. When they are divided into provinces there will be a sufficient population of the different denominations to guarantee that no one denomination shall be treated unfairly. But I believe, further, that when that happens the provinces must be given control of their own lands, and be given proper subsidies to ensure the efficient government of those provinces. I know that the hon. member for Bothwell will immediately say: Here are those North-West political highwaymen after our pockets again. But, Sir, it would be useless to establish Provincial Governments in the North-West unless we gave them the means of carrying out their purposes. I consider that the time is not ripe for establishing Provincial Governments in the North-West until you give them good and solid means to enable them to redeem their responsibilities. At the same time, I believe that this House has shown its responsibility in regard to that country. It has chartered railways throughout the North-West in every direction. This is practically the Provincial Government of the North-West as well as the Dominion Government; and when we who represent the North-West appeal to the Government, and the Government appeal to this House for subsidies to assist our railways, I think hon. gentlemen forget that whereas they who belong to the older provinces have power to obtain assistance from the Provincial Governments, we in the North-West Territories have no such power: and, therefore, if we were to ask the Government, and the Government were to ask this House to grant double subsidies to railways in the North-West Territories, they would act on a sound basis; because they would grant one-half in their capacity as the Provincial Government and the other half in their capacity as the Federal Government. Now, Sir, there was one other question referred to by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia; that is the question of immigration. I do not think I need say very much on this question to impress upon this House still more strongly than it has hitherto been done that the question of immigration is one of the most material questions in the North-West. The hon. member for Assiniboia suggested that a sum of money should be provided by this Act to be given to the Government of the North-West to be expended on immigration. I think myself that that would be a very wise thing indeed, and I hope that when the Supplementary Estimates come down we shall find a sum in them for that object. But there is one defect in this Act which I hope will be remedied. The population of the North-West has increased very much since the last North-West Act was passed, and the electoral districts for the last Provincial Legislature were drawn out. Now, by this Bill you are cutting off the three legal experts of the Council, and I would ask the Minister not to increase the number of the Assembly, but to provide for three new elected representatives to take the place of those three legal experts, one of those representatives to come from the district of Saskatchewan, and the other two I think my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Davis) is fairly entitled to claim, according to the population of his district. If this is done it will give the greatest satisfaction to the people of the North-West. I think the Bill will then be satisfactory to them as a temporary measure, because it can only be a temporary measure, if the North-West continues to grow as we hope it will.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not intend to find fault with the Bill; but I would ask the Minister if sub-section (*f*) of sub-section 2 of section 6 gives power to the Assembly to establish the ballot in local elections?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sub-section (*f*) gives power to the Legislative Assembly to give the ballot. That is the intention.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I was rather astonished at the remarks that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) on this particular occasion. We have heard a good deal before on this question of education as well as that of the dual language, and in most of these instances the objections came from representatives of the Province of Ontario, who, being unable to impose their own ideas in their own province, are trying to impose those very ideas outside of the Province of Ontario itself. The question of education is one of those which have been well guarded in the constitution; and I may say that, upon reading the British North America Act one cannot fail to notice that the spirit, as well as the letter of the constitution, is in favour of separate schools. Clause 93 is as follows:—

"In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—

"First, nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union: Second, all the powers, privileges and duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects of Quebec: Third, where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.' "

Therefore, when a system of separate schools existed prior to the Union, or was thereafter established, it was provided that that system could not subsequently be altered; and I say that, this being the case, the spirit of our constitution is in favour of the system of separate schools. In the case of the North-West Territories, before we enacted legislation to govern those territories there were schools in existence, and those were separate schools; and when this Parliament, in giving a constitution to those territories, enacted that the schools to be thereafter established would be separate schools, we have only continued the system that was already in existence, and a system already under the protection of the constitution. The British North America Act provided that what existed in the provinces that were then united should be extended also to the provinces afterwards taken into the Union and to-day form part of Confederation, and that provision applies also to the territories we have acquired since. Therefore, I may say, that in leaving what is well alone the Government is only carrying out the spirit of the constitution, as I have already explained. With regard to the feeling of the people in the Territories, I may say that the feeling out there is just as has been represented by the worthy representative of Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall). Last year a large number of petitions were addressed to this Parliament asking that the same system which was in existence should be maintained, and protesting against any change such as was then contemplated by some hon. members of this House. This year, I may say, I have a certain number of similar petitions in my desk, which I did not deem advisable to present to this House, because I did not think that this question would be brought up for our consideration. I am glad, however, that the hon. member for Muskoka has only put in his remarks as a protest, and does not intend to raise otherwise this question during the present session, and I hope we will never hear any more of those very nasty questions, and that of education, which should not have been raised on this occasion.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire just to say a few words with reference to this matter. I would not have said anything at all had it not been for the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend opposite; but I think it is well that I should at once remove what seems to be a complete misapprehension from the mind of my hon. friend. He says that some persons in Ontario, unable to carry their own views as to education into effect there, desire to impose those views upon people in other portions of this Dominion. Now, that is an entire misconception of what has fallen from the hon. member for Muskoka. Nothing more entirely opposed to the remarks which I, at least, had the pleasure of hearing from him, could well be imagined than that statement. What my hon. friend said was this—if I could state the exact logical opposite of what has been cited by the hon. gentleman opposite—not that he desires to impose the wishes of people outside the North-West Territories upon the people of the North-West Territories in reference to this matter, but that, on the contrary, he desires to take care that the wishes of no one outside the North-West Territories shall be imposed upon the people there with reference to this matter. He wishes to have safeguards taken lest at some time the wishes of other people should be imposed upon them. He wishes to take care now that we do not do something which will prevent the people of the North-West having the power to carry out their own views in reference to this matter; and surely it is scarcely fair to my hon. friend to represent that he has any desire to force the wishes of other people on the people of the North-West Territories. When my hon. friend understands what the hon. member for Muskoka really means I hope he will have the kindness to get up in his place and withdraw the observations he has made, which, I am sure, were not meant in unkindness, but which really were not doing justice at all to what has fallen from my hon. friend. For my part, I should like to see the people of Canada, if it were possible, educated in one school. I should like personally to see the young people brought up in the closest possible friendship with one another. I think that would be for the benefit of the people of Canada, but I quite recognize the fact that other people differ from me in that respect. I quite recognize the fact that they may be right and that I may be wrong, and all my hon. friend says and all I say in regard to this is that we should take care that those in Canada who think as we think in regard to this matter should have the opportunity of carrying out their wishes, and that those who think differently should have the opportunity of carrying out their wishes. We simply hope that we shall not now do anything which will prevent the people of the North-West Territories in the future from dealing with this matter in any manner they please. If they wish separate schools, let them have them; and if they do not wish separate schools, do not force them upon them. That is all my hon. friend says, and if that is not a fair and reasonable proposition I do not see where a fair and reasonable proposition can be found.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. When I made my remarks I had in my mind the last fight that took place in Ontario, and from what I read in the newspapers and the speeches that took place I formed the opinion on which I made my remarks. As to leaving this to the Local Legislature, the experience we have had in Manitoba is so sad that we cannot agree to leave our interests to a set of demagogues, who try to impose their own views on other people, without any regard to the interests or the welfare of the minority.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not make a speech, as he has already spoken. He will have an opportunity to speak in Committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very glad to see that we will not have a repetition this year of the animated discussions on this subject which took place before, but I do not think the occasion should pass

without my stating my views in regard to this matter. I humbly submit that this is a very important question, that it has a great deal to do with some rights which we should not infringe upon, that it touches the constitution itself, and the consent of the parties to that constitution. When the question came up to incorporate Manitoba and the North-West in the Dominion some great troubles arose. Troops were sent there, and then, on the invitation of the Ottawa Government, delegates were sent here. The Government of England took great care that the incorporation of that province in the Dominion would not be effected without the consent of the parties interested. The delegates came to Ottawa with a Bill of Rights. I hope that the hon. gentlemen who place themselves under the flag of equal rights will not desire to see any rights infringed, and they will see that the North-West would not have joined the Dominion if the claim made by the North-West generally, and not only by Manitoba, had not been accepted. Those delegates who were specially appointed, in conformity with the invitation of the Government of this country, came to Ottawa and presented their Bill of Rights. The seventh clause of that Bill of Rights says:

"That the separate schools be preserved and the money for those schools be divided between the different religious denominations and their respective populations, according to the system followed in the Province of Quebec."

Section 16 says:

"That the French and English languages be common in the Legislature and in the courts, and that all the public documents as well as the Acts of the Legislature be published in both languages."

And in a report elaborately prepared by His Grace Mgr. Taché, dated the 27th December, all the facts that occurred then are related, and it says at page 7:

"The question of separate schools as asked for in Article 7 of said Bill of Rights was taken under consideration. The delegates were assured that not only would they have the benefit of the clauses of the British North America Act, but that they might assure their people that in the Red River district the separate schools were guaranteed to them, and the usage of the French language as an official language was also granted as it had been asked in Article 16 of said Bill of Rights. Moreover, it was promised that we would receive what was asked in Articles 17 and 18."

I did not mention that Article 18 states that a judge of the Supreme Court will speak both French and English. The bishop goes on to say that these claims were all granted as a matter of course. If the granting of the same was not in terms identical with the demand which was made, at all events it was substantially granted in order to satisfy the interests of the different parties. That was one of the bases of the convention, and the Dominion of Canada has been allowed by England to acquire those territories on the special condition that the French language and the separate schools should be maintained. That is a contract. It is the basis of a constitution, and if we begin now to change that constitution we may shake the tree of Confederation in such a way that perhaps it may not live long; we may prevent it from having large branches which would shelter a large, a healthy and a happy population. The hon. gentlemen who look for equal rights must not at the same time try to take away from others the rights which are guaranteed by charters. I may be told that this is not a British charter. That is true. As far as Manitoba is concerned, the charter is British. As far as the North-West is concerned, it is a Dominion charter; but it results from the stipulations which were made when Manitoba was allowed to join the Confederation, that the same basis would be adopted by the Dominion for the North-West Territories, and we cannot now take away the rights and privileges which were granted to the minority in any of those two provinces without abusing our powers and without acting unfairly and unjustly towards those minorities. If there was something against the common good when a man worships his God according to the Catholic religion, if there was something against the public good when a man speaks French, then I would say: all right, you act for the common good; but where is the man of common sense who will say in this House of Parliament of Canada that it is wrong to worship God according to the Catholic religion? Where is the man who will say it is wrong to speak French? Do we not in our language teach our children to respect the property of their neighbour? Do we not teach them to be loyal to the Queen? Do we not teach our children all those rules of morals necessary for the welfare and safety of a people? If, then, in the Catholic religion, and in the French language, there is nothing against public good, you must respect the conditions concerning them, which were established when those parts of the Dominion joined the Confederation of Canada. I maintain that in our Confederation, under our system of Government, we must follow the constitution as it has been agreed upon; and if we go astray from it we lay down principles and make precedents which will bring us into a state of division and trouble, and which might demolish the whole work of Confederation. Those who look for unity instead of union do not understand the system under which we live. There is a great and essential distinction to be drawn between the two things. The essence of a Government by a King or an Emperor, as in England or France, is unity? The essence of a Confederation is not unity, it is union, and there is a wide distinction to be made between the two. On this point, I will quote from a high authority, "Lectures introductory to the study of the Law of the Constitution," by Dicey. I draw to this work the attention of the hon. member for Muskoka, whom I know to be animated with honest and honourable motives, who is sincere in his convictions, who acts in what he believes to be the real interests of the country. I ask him to look at that authority and to follow my quotation, and to learn how to respect the sentiments of those who have not the honour of speaking his language or of professing his religion. We respect his rights; we want equal rights for all—equal rights for the Protestant and for the Catholic religion, for the English and for the French language. Those rights cannot be infringed upon without troubling the harmony and the welfare of our commonwealth. On page 129 of his work Dicey says:

"A second condition absolutely essential to the founding of a federal system is the existence of a very peculiar state of sentiment among the inhabitants of the countries which it is proposed to unite. They must desire union, and must not desire unity. If there be no desire to unite, there is clearly no basis for federalism: the wild scheme entertained, it is said, under the commonwealth of forming a union between the English Republic and the United Provinces was one of those dreams which may haunt the

imagination of politicians, but it can never be transformed into facts."

At page 130 he says:

"The sentiment, therefore, which creates a federal state is the prevalence, throughout the citizens of more or less allied countries, of two feelings which are, to a certain extent, inconsistent—the desire for national unity and the determination to maintain the independence of each man's separate state."

At page 132 he says:

"From the notion that national unity can be reconciled with state independence by a division of powers under a common constitution, between the nation on the one hand and the individual states on the other, flow the three leading characteristics of federalism—the supremacy of the constitution—the distribution among bodies, with limited and co-ordinate authority, of the different powers of government—the authority of the courts to act as interpreters of the constitution."

Now, Mr. Speaker, under our system we have that constitution which must be our sole guide; we must not depart from it in any way. A part of that constitution has been granted by the Queen, and the other part has been granted by this Parliament, in virtue of the powers given to us by the Queen. The constitution as it stands is the consequence of the act and the direct will of the people at large. It follows that that constitution must be stronger than the courts, stronger than Parliament, stronger than any power in this world. We have consented to enter into Confederation under certain stipulations, and they must remain our rule. Of course, some human power will have to interpret some acts of the Legislatures to find out whether they are conformable to the constitution, but the constitution itself must always remain as our guiding star. What does the hon. gentleman, with a good motive, doubtless, ask us to do? He asks us to change that constitution. I say that he cannot receive the consent of those who look seriously to the future of this country. The generous spirit of all the parts of the constitution, either Imperial or Federal, is that the two languages shall remain in the right of the different populations, of the different people composing the federation; secondly, that separate schools shall remain intact. Separate schools are allowed under law to remain separate in the Province of Quebec, and if any member of this House, or any one out of the House came into the Province of Quebec and asked us to do away with separate schools, to keep only the schools of the majority, you would find the whole Catholic population of the Province of Quebec rising as one man and saying, No. The Protestants are entitled to their Protestant schools; they entered Confederation with that stipulation, and they will keep them. I was happy when I saw in the neighbouring province, the great and prosperous Province of Ontario—when I saw there a Prime Minister, to whatever party he may belong, rising up from his seat and, in the name of a great party, saying: "I will defend the separate schools because they are established by the constitution, and I must observe the constitution." I deprecate the Acts of Martin of Manitoba, to whatever party he may belong, when he got a law passed to change the constitution, which he had not the right to do, concerning the separate schools and the French language in that province. I will not for my part consent to be a party to any law entrenching upon vested rights. The people professing the Catholic religion in the North-West are in a minority to-day; who can tell us that in 100 years, or 200 years, they will not be the majority? Then if the majority becomes Catholic, and if that majority is asked to establish separate schools and to do away with the Protestant schools, following the rules of the Catholic Church, the majority, then being Catholic, will say, "No; vested rights must remain vested rights, and nobody must infringe upon them." That is, Mr. Speaker, the general understanding, and we must not infringe upon it; that is my way of looking at the constitution of the country, it must be our guide and our only guide. It is the only way of forming a grand people in union under the British flag, of making everybody happy, feeling that his rights are respected, that the future of his children is assured, and that his religion, as well as his language, are not exposed to be taken away from future generations for whom he is responsible. Now, the same authority which I quoted a moment ago, gives general rules as to that constitution. He says, page 144:

"Under the federal system it is otherwise. The legal supremacy of the constitution is essential to the existence of the state."

The words are clear. He speaks thus of the United States:

"The glory of the founders of the United States is to have advised or adopted arrangements under which the constitution became in reality as well as name the supreme law of the land. This end they attained by adherence to a very obvious principle and by the invention of appropriate machinery for carrying this principle into effect. The principle is clearly expressed in the constitution of the United States. 'The constitution,' runs article 6, 'and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws in any state to the contrary notwithstanding.'"

The same authority, speaking of our British North America Act of 1867, page 153, says:

"Throughout the Dominion, therefore, the constitution is in the strictest sense the immutable law of the land. Under this law, again, you have, as you would expect, the distribution of powers among bodies of co-ordinate authority."

Where is the consent, I will not say of the majority, but of the minority of the North-West, who joined the Dominion under a special compact, to do away with separate schools or abolish the French language in any part of the public or official proceedings either of courts or of Parliaments. If you do any man in the North-West the injustice of taking away from him vested rights in that respect, if you do him the injustice of not allowing him to speak in Parliament or read the Acts of Parliament, or the decisions of the court in his own language, you do not act with justice but with tyranny; you use force towards the minority in order to take away the rights belonging to them, and which the majority had given to that minority. You trespass on private rights, you deprive a body of people of their vested rights without their consent, and I do not believe it will be noble, fair and even excusable on the part of this enlightened Parliament to do any such action, when we boast of the great education and the great liberty which every one enjoys under the British flag. In the name of the constitution, in the name of vested rights, in the name of equal rights, because equal rights do not consist in taking away rights from others, in the name of the future of this country, of the peace, harmony and welfare of every part of this Dominion, I implore this Parliament not to infringe on vested rights and

to maintain for the North-West, as for any other part of the Dominion, all rights granted to the people by the constitution, which has received the sanction of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) seems to confuse a portion of the constitution with the constitution itself. That portion of the British North America Act referred to provided for a condition of things that was in existence in two provinces of the Dominion when Confederation was accomplished, and that is the reason those rights were given to those provinces by that Act. Among the exclusive rights given to a province, as stated in clause 93 of the British North America Act, was :

"In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions."

These provisions were made to apply to a condition of things prevailing only in two provinces of the Dominion when Confederation was about to take place. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) forgets that there are some provinces that have not the right to separate schools to-day, but which came in under the constitution, the same as the North-West Territories or Manitoba did ; and it must be remembered that these provisions were applicable to a condition of things that existed in Ontario and Quebec alone, and they were framed to meet that condition, and not to apply to other provinces or territories that might come in hereafter. The member for Bellechasse says we have a right to maintain that provision. I believe we have the right to do so. We went into Confederation on the understanding that the British North America Act should be our future constitution, and there is no violation, when we are giving a constitution to the North-West Territories, in granting the new province the right contemplated to be given to all provinces, to deal exclusively with the subject of education. In New Brunswick the people have that right, in Nova Scotia they have it, but in Ontario and Quebec they have not that right, because separate schools were established anterior to Confederation, and they must be retained in accordance with the constitution. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) says those provisions have the sanction of law to-day in the North-West. The hon. gentleman refers to a section in the old Act. I should like to ask, When was that passed? It was not passed at the time we acquired the North-West Territories, but was inserted in a provisional Act in order to give quasi-legislative power to the Lieutenant Governor in the North-West. If there is any force in the arguments of the hon. members for Bellechasse and Provencher, they must show that by law or usage the educational system of the country, anterior to the time we acquired Manitoba and the North-West, separate schools existed, and, if such were established, there might be some force in the contention that the people had the right to retain the power they enjoyed and exercised. But I do not understand that the clause of the Act that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) read is part and parcel of the constitution, but simply a clause of the North-West Territories Act. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) said that the people of Ontario should not force their opinion into legislation for the North-West Territories. He forgets that he is adopting that course himself, because he does not belong to the North-West Territories, but to the Province of Manitoba. But it is not a matter of jurisdiction limited to members from those Territories, when we are framing a constitution for that western country, but the right to take part belongs to every member of this Parliament. We are making that constitution, and it ought to be in harmony with the provision of the British North America Act, if I rightly interpret it, which is that every province that enters into this Union shall have certain exclusive rights as laid down in the British North America Act, and one of these rights is, that in and for each province the Legislature may make laws in relation to education. It goes on and says "subject to the following provisions ;" but, as I before stated, the provisions were only made to provide for a condition of things that existed in two provinces, not all the provinces, and therefore we may fairly leave that part out of consideration. I must confess that I agree very largely with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). If it is possible for us in giving a constitution to the Territories to give it such exclusive rights that they may deal with education, as every other province in the Dominion has the right to deal with education, then I think it is fair and just that we should do so. Nor do I think we should be hampered in the discharge of our duty, notwithstanding the clause of the British North America Act which has been already cited, and a clause which was made long after we bought the North-West Territories.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I would ask my hon. friend to look at sub-section 3 of section 93. My hon. friend has only read up to sub-section 2, but he will find that sub-section 3 applies to the province where a system "will be thereafter established."

Mr. SPROULE. Sub-section 3 reads :

"Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education."

This provides for where the legislation has provided for separate schools, or where separate schools existed when the province was brought into Confederation. I do not understand there was any law to provide for separate schools in the North-West Territories when they came into Confederation, and therefore I say that this cannot fairly apply.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. My hon. friend knows that the British North America Act applies to all the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. It certainly does, but I say that the sub-section which the hon. gentleman has asked me to read :

"Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union——"

I claim it did not exist there by law at the Union.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. It says "or thereafter shall be established."

Mr. SPROULE. This is an Act that was passed long after the Union, and it did not exist by law at the time of the Union, and therefore I say that it cannot be fairly applied to this particular case. In view of the trouble we have seen in the Province of Manitoba lately in regard to this question, and

in view of the troubles that have taken place in other provinces, I think we should be very careful in dealing with this subject here. If there is any one principle more than another by which we should be governed it is that principle that we have acknowledged, the principle which we have in every province in the Union, save and except the provisions that were made for conditions that existed by law anterior to the Union. I say it is right to give to the provinces the power to deal exclusively with education, as was contemplated by the British North America Act, if I correctly interpret it. I do not know whether at the time that this Act was written this provision for educational powers was overlooked, or that it was intended to allow the law to remain, but I think it would be better to give a free constitution to the territories, as they are about to organize a Legislative Assembly, and to give them the same rights and powers that are exercised in every other province of the Union to-day.

Mr. AMYOT. Without the right of changing anything as to education and language. We have been kept as a protection here.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not spoken about language at all. I have spoken with regard to the subject of education, and according to my interpretation of the British North America Act it allows every province to have exclusive right over that.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, before this Bill receives its second reading I wish to say a very few words upon it. I am satisfied that this Bill meets with general approbation in the North-West Territories, and I shall raise no discussion with regard to the stand that my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) takes in reference to it; but I will say this: That this question of education is one on which there is very little said in the North-West Territories, and had it been included in this Bill I, for one, would have stood up for separate schools. You may say that ever since the North-West has been the North-West, and in fact when it was originally settled, the first schools that were established there were Catholic schools, and I cannot myself see why we should take any rights away from these people which they had. I believe in fair-play the world over. Even if the Roman Catholics are now in a minority, there is no reason why the majority should dictate to them, and say: You shall not have what was granted to you when you first came into Confederation, as we might say. There will be time enough when we are divided into provinces, which will be, I hope, at no distant date, to discuss this question. Then, if we are to have a new constitution it will be good and seasonable time to discuss this question, but at the present time I say: Let it alone. Now, with regard to the provisions of section 2 of the Bill now before the House. That section provides that there shall be twenty-two members in the Legislative Assembly, but when the Bill comes up in the Committee I shall move that the number be increased to twenty-five members. We have had taken from us three of the legal experts, two of whom came from the district of Alberta, and I shall give my reasons for saying that we should have two additional members in that district. When in 1888 the proportion of the members was granted it was taken from the number of names that were on the voters' lists at that time. Alberta was entitled to six members at that time, Assiniboia to eleven, and Saskatchewan to five. As we cannot yet get the proper estimate by the last census, it is only fair that we should take the same proportion now as was taken three years ago—that is, by the number of names on the voters' list. If the division was fair, then it is fair now. I find that in Alberta there were 6,492 on the voters' list, and that divided by six would give 1,082 voters which each member in the district of Alberta represented. In Assiniboia, east and west, there were 7,255 names, which, for eleven members, would give each a representation of 659 voters, as against 1,082 for Alberta. Now, I am only asking for two members, which will leave me still to the good, with each member representing 816 voters in Alberta as against 659 in Assiniboia. I think I have a just claim in asking for these two additional members, and if there were a redistribution according to the number of names on the voters' list at the present time I think Alberta would be entitled to four members instead of two. I may say that I have heard no complaints from any portion of Alberta with regard to the clauses of this Bill. They have not even found fault with the representation, as they thought I would look after that myself. I have my schedule drawn out in reference to the representation, and I will produce it before the Committee when it comes to the question of redistribution, provided we are allowed the two extra members. I do not propose to detain the House any longer at this stage, but when the Bill comes up in committee I shall have something to say upon it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just one remark in reference to this question. I regret that the hon. gentleman should have debated at such length, and with, as I thought, unnecessary warmth, the subject of the introduction into the North-West of any provision with respect to education. My hon. friend to my left spoke about this subject as if an attempt were being made to interfere directly or indirectly with the rights which are secured by compact to the Province of Quebec, the Province of Ontario and the Province of Manitoba. I do not understand that any intimation was given in that direction, and if it was, it certainly should not, so far as I understand the question, have any sympathy or support from me. I think those rights are sufficiently guaranteed by the British North America Act, and I have not heard that any agitation exists in any of those provinces for the purpose of having any of those rights interfered with. I would not have said a word on this Bill except for the remarks made by these hon. gentlemen; and I desire that it should not be understood on this occasion that Parliament is bound by the silence of one or all of its members from expressing its views when those territories are erected into provinces. My opinion is now, and has been for years, that when that time comes you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education in one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this Parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect those territories into provinces that Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the dif-

ferent provinces so created to decide what system of education they shall have. I do not discuss that question now. I only express this view, lest I might be supposed by my silence to give assent to some extreme doctrines which hon. gentlemen have propounded. In view of the remarks which have been made, I thought it necessary to disclaim that, in assenting to the passage of this Bill, I bound myself for all time on this question of education. I do not. Although we are giving powers almost equal to those conferred upon Local Legislatures, we are not erecting the territories into separate provinces. When that is done, I suppose it will be done by the Queen in Council under the 146th section of the British North America Act, and I simply claim the right when that time comes to determine for myself. In accordance with the view I have always held and hold now, I have no hesitation in expressing, respectfully, that the people of those new provinces should have the right to determine what system of education they shall have.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the question of the representation of the minority in the Legislature of the North-West Territories was brought up last session of the last Parliament, by the reading of a letter from Mgr. Grondin, Bishop of St. Albert, in which is to be found the following passage :—

"Although in the minority, we might be able, nevertheless, to send two representatives in the House, but they have succeeded in making this a thing impossible for us. I again charge the Dominion Government, who in marking out the electoral districts have divided up the two French centres in such a manner that it is impossible for us to secure representation."

During the debate on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to abolish the French language in the North-West Territories, the question was again brought up by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), in a dialogue which took place between him and the hon. Minister of Justice, when the latter introduced his famous amendment. This dialogue is to be found in the last year's debates of the House, column 882. I will now read it :

"Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. the Minister of Justice said, before he moved his amendment, that the whole North-West should have fair representation in the Legislative Assembly before that question was dealt with by that Assembly. I should like to ask him, does the Government contemplate a re-distribution of seats in the North-West Assembly? because otherwise the population of the North-West will not have the fair representation they are entitled to.

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a matter which will have to be dealt with by Parliament, as the subject-matter of this resolution will be, should it be adopted. The Government will consider that subject before bringing down a Bill.

"Mr. MACDOWALL. I understand that there will be a re-distribution of seats for the North-West Territories, and the French population will be given a representation before this question has to be dealt with.

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will understand that if it is shown to the Government that there is not a fair representation in the present system of distribution this Parliament will beyond doubt remedy the evil."

I wish to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Government has studied the question, and whether it is ready to say whether the French population of the North-West is to be represented in the Legislature, for it has been shown that there exists a just grievance, and the Government has promised to remedy this grievance when it should be shown. In section 2 of the Bill now before us the Government refers to a schedule containing a description of the electoral districts, according to which the elections shall be made. However, the Bill contains no new schedule, and before it be read for a second time I wish to know if the Government is ready to fulfil the promise which it made, of giving the French population of the North-West a representation proportionate to its importance ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should have been better pleased myself if the measure we have before us had made some provision for the creation of an executive responsible to the Local Legislature, and controlling the expenditure of moneys placed at the disposal of the Legislature of those territories. I notice in the Estimates which we have before us certain sums of money voted by this House for certain specific purposes ; and I think, when the territories have grown in population to such an extent as to justify them in having a representative Assembly to legislate for them, that we ought to hand over a reasonable sum of money, such as we are voting here for specific purposes, to the control of that Assembly, and allow it to determine how and for what purpose that money shall be applied. When we undertake to confer representative institutions on the people of the territories we are assuming that they are in a condition to exercise the functions of self-government ; and one of the earliest functions of self-government would be to apply the revenues placed at their disposal to those purposes which they think most necessary for the welfare of the territories. That, I think, is a matter of very considerable importance. I do not overlook the fact that the population of this vast area is not a homogeneous population, in the sense of being united together and capable of understanding each other's wants, in the same way that a population in a well-settled province could. It is highly probable that it may be found, in the interest of good government in those territories, that at no distant day they should be divided, and that it will be found that they will be capable of carrying on the local legislation in a way more satisfactory to themselves if they had separate districts, each of which is separately represented, than by undertaking to embrace nearly one million square miles within the area of one Local Government, and bringing together representatives of distant settlements, who cannot understand each other's wants and can know little or nothing about each other's circumstances. That fact alone will make any Assembly which may be called together there different from what a representative Assembly would be in a well-settled province. I observe, too, that by section 3 you give to the Lieutenant Governor the powers and prerogatives that belong to the Crown ; you give him the power of dissolution. I think that is very questionable. You say that the Legislature, when elected, shall be elected for three years, unless sooner dissolved by the Lieutenant Governor ; but why should the Lieutenant Governor have the power of dissolution, when you have not given him any responsible advisers ? The advisers he may have are not responsible to the majority of the Legislature. It does seem to me that the evils which might arise from this power being held by an irresponsible officer are far greater than those which would spring from the continuance of the Assembly for the whole period of its election. The Assembly

exists, under this section, for a period of three years, unless sooner dissolved. Why should it be sooner dissolved? Why should it not continue, as a county council does, until the period for which it is elected expires? Why give an officer appointed by the Ministers here the power of dissolution? His Excellency the Governor General exercises that power, but he does so upon the advice of Ministers who are responsible to Parliament for the advice they give. But out there you have no Ministers, you have no advisers who are responsible to the Local Legislature and can be dismissed from their positions by the action of the Local Legislature for having given bad advice in this matter. I think that is a power which ought never to be vested in an officer appointed by the Federal Ministers, or His Excellency upon the advice of the Federal Ministers, unless surrounded by men responsible to the Local Legislature for the advice they give. I especially invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to this section of the Bill, and when we go into committee I think we should amend this, and unless the Government are prepared to say that the time has come when the Lieutenant Government of the territories shall be surrounded by men responsible to the Local Legislature for the advice they give, and that the moneys given by this House shall be handed over as a subsidy to that Legislature to distribute as they may see proper, under the constitutional provisions which pertain wherever parliamentary government exists, we ought not to take this step, because it is one which ought necessarily to be accompanied by the others I have mentioned.

Motion agreed, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There can be no doubt that the time has not come when the territories, as a whole, should be given the position and powers of a province; and, in all probability, this Parliament will entertain the view that those powers are not to be conferred upon the territories, as a whole, at any time, but that provincial powers should be withheld until the time comes for subdividing the territories. In the meantime, the provision is that the Legislature shall hold office for three years. Under the present system there was no power of dissolving the Assembly before the expiration of that period. The circumstances under which a dissolution of an assembly of that character, not possessing full constitutional powers and not guided by an executive, should take place, would be very rare indeed; but the power of dissolution, I think, ought to be given. It is proposed that that power should be vested in the Lieutenant Governor of the territories. Hon. gentlemen opposite are of opinion that that will make him a despot, who has power at any moment, at his will and pleasure, to dissolve the Assembly. I have only to say that, according to my humble opinion, if the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories should be a person of that disposition, who would dissolve the Assembly of his own motion, he ought to be dissolved himself as Lieutenant Governor before the election of a new Assembly, because the law provides that he shall govern the territories under instructions given him by the Governor in Council or the Secretary of State for Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the old irresponsible Colonial Office system.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. While the powers of the North-West Territories and the functions of their Government are limited, this Government is the executive for the North-West Territories. There must be an executive somewhere. We do not propose that there shall be an executive in the North-West Territories itself, and we have never yet conferred executive powers on any body there, although we have had an advisory council possessing a shadow of executive authority there. Nevertheless, even when the advisory council had its functions the Government of Canada was the executive for the North-West Territories in the sense that the Provincial Government of the North-West Territories is, to all intents and purposes, the Government of Canada. Therefore it is that executive powers of that kind should be exercised, under the direction of this executive, by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. Is there no responsibility in this connection? If this Parliament is the Parliament which passes the laws for the North-West Territories, except in so far as we have delegated powers to pass ordinances on certain subjects, this is the Parliament that ought to control executive matters in the North-West Territories, and, therefore, the executive ought to remain the Dominion Government. I said a few moments ago, and I think everybody will agree with me, that it would very rarely occur that a power of this kind would have to be exercised. Nevertheless, anyone who has listened to or has read the debates which have occurred in reference to North-West matters during the last year or two can realize that an occasion might arise when the dissolution of the Assembly would be very convenient in the interests of the administration of the affairs of the territories. One of the subjects which might be referred to, as suggested by the debates which took place last year, might be the occurrence of the question as to conferring upon the North-West Assembly powers larger than they have hitherto possessed as to dealing with the liquor question. Last session this House would have been probably willing to agree that the power should be conferred on the North-West Assembly, but we were practically unanimous in the view that it should not be so conferred until the new Assembly should have been elected under a different system; and so, instead of being able to confer these powers at once, we were obliged to say that, although the interest of the North-West Territories might, in our estimation, induce us to confer such powers at once, such a proposition could not take effect until the expiration of the term of the present Assembly. It would have been more convenient for us to pass an enactment to come into force at once, and to leave the new members to exercise such enlarged powers as this Parliament could confer. This House will be continually hampered in dealing with the North-West Assembly and changing the limits of the districts, and matters of that kind, under the present system, because everything will practically have to be deferred until the expiration of the period of three years. Suppose that, in the course of a year or two, by a large

increase of population, a considerable portion of the territories should be unrepresented in the Assembly, it would be practically beyond our powers to change the representation. Of course, this is not likely to occur, but I think the power of dissolution should be vested somewhere. It cannot be vested in the Assembly itself, and I think it should be vested in the officer who exercises executive powers under the direction of the Government here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not disputing the proposition that the power of dissolution ought to be vested somewhere, but I am simply pointing out that the mischiefs which might arise from the House sitting out its full period would be less likely to be serious than those which might arise from vesting this power in an irresponsible officer. It is true that the Lieutenant Governor is responsible to the Government here for his exercise of these powers, but that is simply in the same way as the Colonial Office, which was responsible to the Imperial Parliament, exercised large powers over this country in the past. For instance, Sir Francis Bond Head was responsible to the Colonial Office, and the Colonial Minister was responsible to the Imperial Parliament, but that did not prevent serious abuses, which led to an insurrection in what is now Ontario and Quebec. I think we might start with this proposition, that although it is not desirable, perhaps, to confer upon the inhabitants of the territories the same wide measure of authority that is conferred upon the Local Legislatures in the provinces, yet, as far as you do confer power upon them, that power ought to be exercised in connection with a responsible executive. You have got rid of the appointed members of the Local Legislature. You have an Assembly of persons representative of the people. Why should not the limited authority you entrust to that Assembly, and the executive authority in connection with it, be exercised upon the advice of men responsible to the Assembly for the advice which they give? Why, for instance, should we vote a considerable sum of money here, stating remotely the purposes to which it is to be applied, and not allow that money to be under the control of the Local Legislature of that territory and to be distributed upon the advice of the men who enjoy the confidence of that Legislature? I understand that some difficulties arose two or three years ago between the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly in regard to pecuniary appropriations. You expect that a portion of that territory may be organized into a province at no very distant day. It will then have full provincial rights. You will then have to determine, as in the case of Manitoba, with what amount of debt it may enter the Confederation and what you may charge against it. You may charge your public works, as you did against the older provinces, charge the expenditure on public works which took place before Confederation, and you admit that they are entitled to a certain subsidy for their Local Government. How are you going to carry this out? Are you going to make up a bill against the new province by putting in the amounts of which you control the expenditure, and which you will not allow the Legislature of the territory to control? It seems to me that, while we should be careful, where people are not in that state of what I might call organic cohesion which exists in the older provinces, where they consist of a number of separate and distinct settlements, still there ought to be a corresponding executive power to that which exists in the older provinces, and that power should be exercised under the control of the Legislative Assembly. At present we make no provision for that. We give them powers of legislation, which are of no great value as long as we withhold from them the power of control over their expenditure, which is made for the purpose for which they are allowed to legislate, and in this case I say we place them in a position of helplessness. We limit their authority in a way that we should not and which will cause dissatisfaction.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not think this will injure the North-West, because the power will be exercised in Ottawa, and I think the territories are safe, at all events, for three years to come. Had the Lieutenant Governor exercised the power of dissolving the Assembly within the last three years I think that would have ended the difficulty, because the difficulty arose from the existence of the Advisory Board, and if the Advisory Board had been able to advise His Honour to dissolve the House I believe they would have had a majority, and the whole difficulty would have been got over. In regard to creating an Executive Council, that is practically granting Provincial Government to the North-West.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MACDOWALL. It is one of the large steps towards granting executive government. The executive would have the power of direct taxation, the power to raise a revenue and some means of paying themselves. The sentiment of the people of the North-West is against anything approaching responsible government at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One remark with respect to the quotation the Minister of Justice made from the Act, and which seemed to the hon. member for Saskatchewan to answer the argument. The second sub-section of section 4 says:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall administer the Government under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council, or by the Secretary of State of Canada."

So far so good; there is no doubt about that. But as a general rule, and in cases which are not explicitly or expressly defined, where the powers are not expressly marked out by the statute, he is to be controlled by the instructions he gets from Ottawa. But that clause does not refer to powers which are expressly conferred by statute upon the Lieutenant Governor himself, powers which we are conferring here, stating expressly that the Lieutenant Governor should have power to dissolve the Assembly and cause a new one to be chosen. Now, then, the explicit and express powers are not controlled in any sense by the general declaration in the statute, that, speaking generally, he is governed under instructions from Ottawa. The larger power does not minimize, or control, or negative, or override the specific power which we are giving here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg to differ from my hon. friend. I think the very power which is vested in him is, by express terms in this statute, subject to the control of the Government here, and that the Government here is responsible for what he does in so far as he acts under our instructions. But the hon. gentleman can readily see that the

first step to take as regards statutory powers of the kind conferred by this Bill will be to give to the Governor instructions as to how he shall exercise powers of that character. Now, with regard to the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), indicating that this is virtually establishing, in regard to the territories, a parental control, such as the Colonial Office exercises, that is undoubtedly true; that is the system under which the territories have been governed ever since we acquired them, and it is the system which must prevail in every country which has not entire responsible government. It is the system which prevails now in every Crown colony, and the only alternative which my hon. friend can suggest is to have a small executive there with limited power, as he has mentioned. Now, I beg to assure him that this subject has received the greatest consideration and the most careful thought that can be given it, and the experience of the past, as well as careful reflection on the subject from every point of view, has led us to the opinion that it is unwise to confer upon the executive there executive powers and responsibilities. If you do that you have, in the first place, a divided executive responsibity; you have an executive responsibility here and you have an executive responsibility there. You have a divided authority likewise, which is an evil of itself; but, above all, the effect of that is to create in the mind of the Territorial Government the impression that while the principle is conceded to them of responsible government they do not enjoy a full measure of liberty.

Mr. AMYOT. With the right of appeal here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; and people entrusted in that way with partial powers, if the doctrine of self-government is established and the principle recognized, will never submit to be controlled by an appeal from their executive in executive matters; and the effect of it would be simply that you would create an impression that they were not put in the same position as the provinces were, and that only the shadow of authority had been given them. It is better, I think, to retain all the executive powers in one body, and I believe the people of the territories will be better satisfied themselves, and there will be less agitation in the territories if the people are told in a straightforward way at the outset: The time has not come when you can have responsible government; for the present, the greater powers of legislation must remain in the Parliament of Canada, the executive powers must remain in the executive of Canada, and when the time comes to give you provincial powers you shall have them *in toto*, and you shall stand on the same footing as any other province.

Committee rose: and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill No. 126 to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There does not appear to be any provision by which the returning officers will be appointed. The absence of such a provision is, in my opinion, a very serious defect in the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are no officers in these small districts.

Mr. MACDOWALL. It is better to allow some latitude, and to leave the matter in the Lieutenant Governor's hands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a subject on which the Legislature should have power to legislate. If there is any doubt, we should not tie their hands, so that they cannot make provision legislatively for returning officers. I think the words "unless otherwise provided by the Legislative Assembly of the territories" should be added.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to add these words, and I will consider the clause carefully.

On section 13,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In that section, is it the intention of the Minister to give power to determine the succession of property and to determine the mode of registration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is all subject, as you will see by the main section, to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the Minister is there any difficulty in sub-section 4 about bonds issued by a municipality. Then irrigation companies are excepted, and I think it would be an advantage that they should not be excepted. It may be said that irrigation companies would have to do with the public domain, which is controlled by the Dominion Parliament; but I should think that the territories might have power, subject to certain conditions, to organize irrigation companies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The incorporation of telephone companies in towns is far less important than some of the other powers we give.

Mr. DAVIN. This sub-section will prevent us giving a charter to a little street railway. I would suggest that the Government would permit the municipalities to have a charter from the Local Government for a short railway.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any reason why the Government should not give them power, as the provinces have, to incorporate any railway company?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think there is good reason, because this House has assumed the incorporation of railway companies in the North-West Territories. Railways in the North-West cannot be built without financial assistance, and this Parliament should have power to charter them until the North-West is able to give the necessary assistance.

Mr. MULOCK. The granting of a charter is one thing and the granting of aid to build railways is another. I should think that the people in the immediate locality would be the best authorities to pronounce in favour of a railway, and the corporation afterwards could appeal for aid to whatever source it liked. I am surprised that a member from the territories should desire to prevent the Legislature incorporating a company. It is a great deal more expensive for men to come to Ottawa to obtain a charter than it would be if they could obtain it

within the limits of their own territory. I can see no possible harm in the territories having that power; they need not exercise it if they do not like. If I represented a constituency in the territories I would be in favour of having such power given to the territories, trusting to the wisdom of the people that it would be exercised for the public good.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. In the first place, it is not very much cheaper to get incorporation in the North-West Assembly than it is here. They can get a private Bill passed through here just about as cheaply as they could in the Assembly. One object I have in view in saying that this House should keep the power of incorporating these railways is that I think it would teach this Parliament what its responsibilities and duties are to the North-West. The incorporation of railway companies is one of the most important things connected with these territories, and I think that when a Bill connected with the incorporation of railway companies passes through this House hon. gentlemen will perhaps appreciate their responsibilities to the territories more than at present.

Mr. TISDALE. There is another objection to this. If this power is given to them they would have to pass a General Railway Act, which would involve very heavy machinery, until they are incorporated into provinces, and we would have another set of railway Acts to come in contact with the Railway Act of the Dominion. I think that until the territories become provinces they should not have this power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the power to incorporate Railway Acts in that territory, as long as it remains an undivided territory, would be far more extensive than the power to incorporate a railway in the provinces. You do not know what extent of territory you will assign to a province in that country yet. Suppose you were to make a province of the Saskatchewan district at this moment, the majority of the people living in that district could incorporate a railway extending all the way to the North Saskatchewan, at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. A railway of immense extent could be incorporated in a territory although the vast majority of the inhabitants may reside in a very limited district. I do not think, however, that would apply to tramways, which are in their nature local, and extend to a very short distance; nor do I think it would apply to telephone companies in towns. I do not see why, if you confer any municipal institutions upon them, you should not confer the power to incorporate a telephone company. You have given them powers implying a much larger degree of responsibility, and it seems to me that powers relating to tramway and telephone companies might safely be entrusted to the Legislature of the territories.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I agree with the hon. member, and there is no objection to striking out the words "tramways and telephones." But I think it advisable that we should keep in our own hands the control of the water powers. That is a very important matter, and I believe that companies will be formed for the development of the water powers there. But until provinces are established in the territories I think we should keep the control of the water powers in our own hands.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the arguments used by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) should have some weight, especially with members from the North-West. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) express the opinion that we should curtail the powers of the North-West Council. That body represents the people of the territories, and I think they should have all the powers of a Local Legislature, which they ask for. We can easily understand that a North-West company might wish to organize for the purpose of building a tramway or short railway——

Mr. MACDOWALL. Tramways are included now.

Mr. WATSON,—for the purpose of opening up a coal mine, for instance, or a steamship company for the purpose of owning a steamship. Under this Bill that Legislature will not be able to exercise such powers. What harm could arise from the representatives of the North-West having power to grant the privilege of constructing a railway? I do not agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan that it is necessary to subsidize every railway in that country. I think men might have sufficient interest there, they might acquire sufficiently large tracts of land or coal-fields, as to justify them in building a railway without coming here for a subsidy; and I would prefer seeing the hon. member for Saskatchewan, with his knowledge of the North-West, showing a disposition not to be tied to the apron strings of the Dominion for so many long years, but rather to have the people of the North-West depend on their own resources, and do their own business in their own way. The provinces have power to grant railway charters, though that power was interfered with for some time, we know with what result. I do not see why the North-West Assembly should not have the same power, and I am rather surprised at an hon. gentleman coming from the North-West wishing that it should not be granted.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think I can remove some of the surprise of the hon. member. He represents the small Province of Manitoba, and, when I say the small province, I speak comparatively. The North-West Territories are immense, and, compared with them, the Province of Manitoba is of small area though thickly populated; and it has a much larger revenue, because the total revenue of the North-West Territories, from all territorial sources, does not exceed about $20,000. Therefore, it would be premature to grant the North-West Assembly those extensive powers. It is in the interest of the people of the North-West that we should make the hon. members of this House understand that they are the Provincial Government of the North-West Territories, that upon their shoulders rests the responsibility of aiding the construction of railways in those territories, that they must redeem the responsibilities of the Provincial Government, as well as the Dominion Government, so long as they continue to possess those powers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that we ought to make provision for the constitution of the Legislative Assembly, for conferring upon it power over its own existence, power to provide for the division of the country into electoral districts, for

the qualifications of members and for the qualification of electors.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIN. I would urge upon the Government that they should consider sub-section 2. The next is a very useful sub-section, and will meet a difficulty which occurred in Calgary, but this sub-section will work in this way: The Legislative Assembly is to have power to determine by an ordinance where a deputy sheriff may be appointed, and then it is provided that each sheriff "shall appoint a deputy or deputies at such places within the district" as are determined by the Legislative Assembly. I think the sheriff in Regina has jurisdiction as far as Moose Jaw in the west, and as far as Fort Qu'Appelle and Qu'Appelle Station in the east. Mr. Davidson represents Fort Qu'Appelle, Mr. Sutherland will no doubt again represent Qu'Appelle Station, and Moose Jaw will be represented by another member. Each of these places will urge the Assembly to pass an ordinance compelling the sheriff to appoint a deputy, so that you will have three deputies. Speaking subject to correction, I believe that all over the Dominion the sheriff is only obliged to have one deputy, but here you put this burden on the sheriff at Regina, who is not paid within one-tenth as much as most of the sheriffs throughout the Dominion. This will reduce his income, and the Minister of the Interior, who knows the North-West well, knows what the scanty income of the sheriff amounts to. It will reduce the income of the sheriffs to such a small sum that you cannot get a respectable man to take the office. Let me point out, further, that you are making a provision here for the deputy sheriff giving bonds. The sheriff has given bonds; he is to be responsible for himself, and he is also to be responsible for the deputy sheriff.

Mr. SPROULE. So he is in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIN. Ontario is a very much richer province, and he is only to appoint one deputy. Here he may have to appoint three.

Mr. SPROULE. The deputy gets constables often to do his work.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say he does, but so does the sheriff get constables in the North-West to help him. But I want to point out that you will reduce the income of a sheriff to about $500 a year, and you will not get a respectable man to take it. Now, if there were four or five centres represented by a member in the Assembly you would have each one of them clamouring to have a deputy appointed. We know the state of things in the territories very well, and we know that if you lay before the members of the Assembly any means of increasing their patronage they will try to do it.

Mr. GILLIES. Would not deputy sheriffs be required?

Mr. DAVIN. Let me give an illustration: He will go to Fort Qu'Appelle, he will go down to Qu'Appelle Station, or to Moose Jaw, but at the same time without being compelled to do it. He has a deputy in Moose Jaw, he has a deputy at Fort Qu'Appelle, and at Qu'Appelle Station, and he can take a gentleman engaged in one kind of business or another, pay him a small commission, and the man is ready to act for him. But the minute you make it compulsory to appoint a deputy, then you place somebody in a position to exact a much larger remuneration from him. I never heard that there was any inconvenience; I doubt very much if either of my hon. friends from Alberta (Mr. Davis) or Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has heard any complaints as to the way the work of the sheriffs has been done in their district. I never heard any complaint, and it seems to me to be almost wanton to try to remedy a grievance in regard to which there has been no complaint. I think the difficulty arose in regard to the sheriff in Calgary, who insisted, himself, in going long distances. I think there was some difficulty of that sort, and it was in order to meet that difficulty that this clause has been introduced. I think, myself, that you might devise a sub-section that would prevent any grievance occurring.

Mr. MULOCK How are you going to get along with the incapacity of a sheriff?

Mr. DAVIN. There is a sub-section dealing with that afterwards, in case of a vacancy arising by reason of the sheriff's incapacity or otherwise.

Mr. MULOCK. It says his deputy may perform his duties until his successor is appointed. I am supposing that there is no deputy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have had a communication from the sheriff in my district since this Bill was printed, and he did not appear to object to the power of appointing deputies, but he did ask that the deputy should be compelled to give security. There is no particular object in that which I can see. I suppose the sheriff could take security from his deputy when he appointed him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Because he is responsible.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No representation has been made to me, but I understand there have been requests made for more judicial districts. There was a difficulty in getting different processes and taking out registration papers, and they wanted more judicial districts, which meant more judges and a full court. That was thought to be advisable, but that if it was found necessary, in the interest of the country, that these deputies should be appointed, it would meet their wishes in that regard, and there will be deputy sheriffs in different points of the territories to get over that difficulty.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. FLINT. I think there is a great deal of weight in what the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says. I think that it is almost too hard upon sheriffs to compel them to appoint deputies. I also observe here that the Legislative Assembly is given power to prescribe the duties of the deputies. I should think it would be better that each sheriff should appoint a deputy, leaving it to be inferred that the powers of the deputy are the usual powers of a deputy under the common law, or under any law of this Parliament. But here we give a legislative body power to confer powers upon deputies, which may possibly differ from the powers of the sheriffs themselves. There is no definition in this Act of the powers of the sheriffs and clerks, and I think we are going out of our way to allow the Legislative Assembly to define the powers of deputies

and clerks. I think myself that the sheriffs are probably the most poorly paid officials, as a rule, in the country, and legislation tending to diminish their revenues ought to be very carefully considered. If the Legislature provides that the sheriffs or clerks may appoint deputies it would be ample to protect them and also to protect the public.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the Minister of the Interior to state that there are some very large districts over which the sheriff's duties extend, and it was found to be some inconvenience to go to the sheriff whenever it was necessary that that official should be seen, or should be called upon to discharge certain duties, and it is proposed to divide his district into sub-districts, requiring him to appoint deputies in certain portions of the district over which he is sheriff. If that is so, and if it is a choice between requiring the deputy to act and the appointment of a new sheriff, then it might not be possible to leave it as a matter of option with the sheriff to appoint a deputy or not. It might be necessary in the public interest that a deputy sheriff should be named. In this subsection, if it is allowed to stand, I do not think these words are necessary :

"That such powers as are from time to time determined by an ordinance of the Legislative Assembly."

Of course, there are no ordinances any longer. When the Assembly becomes a representative body its Acts are not ordinances, but Acts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are all called ordinances still.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is simply because, as the Minister will remember, there were certain nominated members sitting in the Assembly. The distinction is perfectly clear in law between an ordinance and an Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no doubt that that would be a more suitable expression. For three years past there has been no Council, but an Assembly. We have not changed the original Act, which provides that they should be called ordinances.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We should do it now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. Let me take a general view of the situation as regards sheriffs and clerks. Dealing first with the remarks of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), I may say that the sheriffs are a little better off in the territories than in some parts of the Dominion, for in the territories, in addition to the fees, which are very liberal, they each receive a salary of $500 a year. During a visit I paid to the North-West I had the same experience as was encountered by every Minister, namely, that at nearly every settlement I heard complaints of delay, of expense and inconvenience in litigation arising from the absence of deputy sheriffs and deputy clerks. They all said: "We want a sheriff; we want a clerk." I explained that the policy was to have a sheriff for each district; but I saw no reason why a deputy sheriff should not be appointed at each place. The North-West Assembly has to enact the sheriffs' fees and to pass an Act regulating the number of deputy sheriffs and deputy clerks, and to provide a scale of remuneration for the officers, and the whole thing is subject to our review. If the Legislative Assembly should insist on too many deputies and provide too low a scale of fees, the ordinance must be amended or disallowed. But the difficulty presented by the people is a very serious one. Take the district of Alberta, for instance. The sheriff lives in Calgary. If a person in Edmonton desires to have a writ issued he must send the writ down to Calgary to be issued. It is delivered to the sheriff at Calgary, the sheriff sends some one up to Edmonton, and he is paid travelling allowances for the whole distance. When the time comes for judgment he cannot get judgment at Edmonton, but he has to send to Calgary. He must get his execution, and the officer must then travel to Edmonton again. There is no reason why there should not be a deputy at Edmonton capable of serving a writ the moment it is issued, or of issuing execution on the judgment. But to make it effective, there must be a deputy clerk who can issue a writ. When that is done the creditor at Edmonton having a debtor alongside him does not need to go to Calgary, but he can go to the clerk next door and have the writ issued, and can go to the deputy sheriff near by, and he can serve the writ on the debtor immediately. The whole proceeding could be accomplished in a few moments and at very little expense. There would be no cost to the sheriff, but the Local Assembly should provide the way the deputy sheriff should be compensated for the service rendered in serving. When the time came for the creditor in Edmonton to get judgment against a debtor in Edmonton, instead of going to Calgary he goes to the deputy clerk and has execution issued. The execution is enforced by the deputy sheriff. But in order to carry out that system we must give the Local Assembly power not only to say what they shall be paid, but to prescribe their duties, and unless this is done the deputy clerk would have no power to issue a writ unless he received instructions from the clerk, and the deputy sheriff would have no power unless he received instructions from the sheriff. But we enable the Legislative Assembly to introduce a system which is similar to that prevailing in the provinces.

On section 10,

Mr. FLINT. A sheriff or clerk may have several deputies, and the provision does not say which one shall perform his duties in case of death.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is to keep alive all their powers in their respective districts.

On section 80,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These provisions of the North-West Territories Act were inserted at a time when the powers of the North-West Legislature were very much more limited than they are at present. When we propose to confer upon them the power for the administration of justice in the North-West Territories, as an incident of that power would be the power to establish gaols and lock-ups, and so on; and yet we retain here all the power of providing places of confinment, the same as if the original condition of things was to continue. It seems to me that these provisions of section 80 ought to be considered, and that our legislation should be of a temporary character, and should provide for being superseded by the legislative functions of the Government of the territories.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that by section 13, sub-section 3, we give the Assembly power to maintain and manage prisons. By this section we simply take concurrent power with them, in view of the fact that they have not the means at their disposal of keeping up the prisons necessary. Besides, the question of expense, the duty devolves upon us for providing for long term prisoners. This section simply enables us to exercise concurrent powers in keeping up goals and establishing as penitentiaries any building that may be available for that purpose. We have one at Prince Albert and another at Regina, and under powers like these, we will make them both penitentiaries and we take power here to arrange as to the way prisoners should be kept.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister will see that he is taking power here to provide places where prisoners may be detained for trial. That is an ordinary gaol and not a penitentiary. It seems to me that this legislation should be temporary, and that we ought to indicate that our powers are temporary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We must have power at present, because we must provide the accommodation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Or give them the money to do it, which would seem to me to be the better way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We keep up the police prisons at present and we do all that kind of work. I fancy that for a good many years to come these are the powers under which the prisoners will be taken care of, and not the powers that we give to the Assembly. The whole Act is temporary of course, in view of the fact that ultimately the districts will be formed in provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the Minister knows how much more easy it is to assume expenses of this sort than it is to shift the burden on some one else at a future period; and if we are going to shift the burden, it ought to be clearly indicated. I think it would be a more prudent course in the end to furnish the North-West Assembly with the means of establishing gaols and lock-ups where the population is very sparse than it would be to undertake to provide them ourselves.

Mr. FLINT. I see that a change has been made in the wording of clause 80. It formerly said that the Governor in Council "may cause to be erected" these buildings, and this clause simply says that he may direct that any building or buildings shall be a gaol or lock-up.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Instead of erecting a building for the purpose, we may want to use one already erected. But the mere power to erect buildings there is practically useless, because we shall have to come to Parliament for the necessary funds.

On section 17,

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see very well what advantage there is in making this change. It seems to me that it will play entirely into the hands of the North-West Mounted Police. Suppose an informer goes to a policeman, and then the policeman goes and lays the information; the policeman will get half the fine and not the informer, although after all it was the informer who brought the guilty act to justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The matter has been brought to our notice by one of the judges in the North-West, who represents that there is great difficulty sometimes in ascertaining who the person is who is entitled to the moiety of the penalty. The informer, using the term in its ordinary sense, may be one person or several who give the information on which the proceedings are taken; and as there is often strife as to who should have the moiety, we think it better to say that the person who lays the information shall be entitled to it.

On section 18,

Mr. FLINT. Suppose the person has no money to pay the fine, should there not be some power of imprisonment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is provided for in the Summary Convictions Act, and the procedure follows that. The change made is simply this: In one of the districts a permit to A.B. to have five gallons of liquor enables C.D. to have it in his custody. If C.D. be a saloon keeper, as he often is, he may have a permit for every letter of the alphabet, and still no permit of his own; and this is to oblige the person who has the liquor to show a permit to himself. It is to make the law as to permits more stringent.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I would like to explain a case which I have seen happen with my own eyes. Suppose a man has a bottle of brandy, and another man who sees it informs upon him, he will be fined this $200 or go to prison. I think the clause is extreme.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose it is; that is the case with every law. It is easy for any person who is willing to do so, to fabricate evidence or commit perjury. But with regard to all these laws for the punishment of statutory offences, we have to make the possession of the forbidden article *primâ facie* evidence of the guilt of the party. I do not see any other way of doing it.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). The way I see of doing it is to do away with the obnoxious law.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course the Assembly will have power now to deal with that matter; but it seems pretty hard that a hotel-keeper is liable to be punished if the liquor is found upon the person of a guest. The hotel-keeper might be punished and not the man.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The man is on the premises, and the liquor is on the man.

Mr. DAVIN. The man might have liquor in his room, and it would be on the premises of the hotel-keeper

On section 20,

Mr. AMYOT. When I had the honour of addressing a few words to the House on this subject, I quoted some of the clauses of the bill of rights submitted to the Government of the Dominion, concerning the rights and privileges of the minority. I omitted, however, to quote section 10, which says that the transfer by the Hudson's Bay Company to the Government of this country would not prejudice, in any way, the rights of the people of the North-West. If I understood the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) rightly, he said that it

would not be contrary to the constitution to deprive to-day the French population, the minority in the North-West, of the right to speak French, because the statute incorporating that country to the Dominion is a federal statute.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me, because I never said anything about the French language.

Mr. AMYOT. Then I did not hear sufficiently from my seat what the hon. gentleman said. I am going to draw the attention of the House to a most important question. I humbly submit that we have no right whatever, under the present circumstances, to pass this clause. I admit that the Government, in respecting the rights of the minority as to education, have made a step in the right direction, and I fully endorse their action in that respect. I admit also that to preserve the right of the minority to the use of the French language before the courts, is another good feature of the Bill; but they are giving power to a local council to regulate, by ordinance or otherwise, what language they will be pleased to use in their proceedings and the reports of their proceedings. That amounts to saying that this Parliament *de facto* abolishes the French language, as far as that goes, for, as we well know, the majority there will, on the very first day, declare that the expense and trouble of having their proceedings recorded in both languages will be too great and the French language will be abolished. Moreover, we are admitting a principle I cannot endorse, and which I am sure a great proportion of the people of this Dominion will not support. That is the principle that, at any moment, we may grant to the majority of a province the right to take away the liberties, the franchise and the privileges of the minorities, with regard to education or religion, which amounts to the same thing, and to language. I am opposed to that principle. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said he was in favour of provincial autonomy, and wanted to leave to the provinces full control in these matters. I am also an autonomist, but will not go so far as that. I hold that when interests are common, when it is a material question, when the question is one which relates to commerce or civil property, in which the interests of all are homogeneous, every Parliament should have full power, within its jurisdiction, to deal with such questions. But no authority should be given to Local Parliaments to decide upon questions of education and language, where the interests are not common, where they are often hostile, and in which it is only by the spirit of Christian philosophy and forbearance these hostile interests of religion and language can exist peacefully together. If you touch those questions, by giving the right to a majority to take away the rights of a minority, you are carrying the principle of autonomy too far. You are not only giving the power of preservation to the local authorities but you are giving them a power of destruction. You are giving them power to destroy vested rights, and acting in direct opposition to our constitution, not only to the law of this Parliament but to the law as formulated by the English Parliament. I have already expressed the sentiment, and I am not ashamed to repeat it, and in doing so I speak the sentiment of a great many, that I am first of all Catholic, that I am, in the second place, an English subject speaking French, and that it is only in the third place that I am a politician. Whenever the interests of my religion are concerned, they take precedence over all other interests. The question of language occupies the second place, and it is only in the third place that I am a politician; and all the interests possible of party will never make me change one of my convictions with regard to the religion or the language of my forefathers. It is all very well to say that a motto of a party is such and such. My motto is, first, that the vested rights of religion and language shall be respected, and to no party in the world shall I submit my convictions in that respect. My religion teaches me to respect the rights and privileges of others, and I will do so; but in return I ask that the privileges, the vested rights, so far as we are concerned, shall be also everywhere respected. In the preamble of the British North America Act, I find these words:

"And whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the Union of other parts of British North America."

Now, if we refer to clause 146, we find it is there provided that the future admission of provinces must be subject to the provisions of this Act. That is very explicit. It makes the British North America Act apply to the other parts of the Dominion, when admitted as provinces. Now, what do we find? I beg to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the Statutes of Canada of 1872, in which he will find a copy of the Address of both the Senate and the House of Commons, praying Her Majesty the Queen to issue the proclamation necessary to bring these territories into the Union. We are to-day responsible for what was agreed to by the House of Commons and Senate then, and Parliament then said:

"We most humbly beg to express to Your Majesty that we are willing to assume the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these territories; that in the event of Her Majesty's Government agreeing to transfer to Canada jurisdiction and control over the said regions, the Government and Parliament of Canada will be ready to provide that the local rights of any corporation, company or individual——"

Company or individual—

—"shall be respected."

Do we respect those rights? I say we do not, when we give to the majority the power of taking them away in certain respects, and if we admit the principle once, we commit a wrong that will open the door for future abuses and expose this country to tremendous dangers. If we do that, we will change the spirit of the constitution, the *entente formelle*, the express agreement, the formal will of the people, and legislate against the interests there protected. We will then see every year claims, either through excessive zeal or other causes, to destroy, one by one, all the guarantees which have been given to us. For my part, I will not propose an amendment. If one is proposed I will vote for it; but I desire to register my protest, and to say that from my point of view we should in no way extend the principle of autonomy so as to give to the majorities the power to take away from the minorities privileges which they enjoy, where their interests are not common but are hostile. However, I have done my duty, and I will take no further responsibility in the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The clause as it is inserted in the Bill and supported by the Govern-

ment is not based on any ground of autonomy in regard to the territories. On the contrary, as to the territorial Government, as it is established either by the original Act or by this Bill, the whole system is temporary, and the provisions of the law now being enacted are temporary. Parliament will have complete control over the whole subject when it lays down the constitution which may be given to any provinces which may be created in the North-West. In the meantime we are simply adopting the terms of the resolution on this subject passed last session, and the language which then received the approval of the House. In fact, this section carefully preserves the language of the resolution of last session, and after the most careful consideration it was then adopted with a degree of unanimity which was very satisfactory in view of the feelings which were likely to be evoked in dealing with a subject of this kind. In addition to the provision that the *status quo* shall be maintained for the present, there is the provision that, after the next Assembly is elected, the Assembly shall be allowed to regulate its own proceedings as to the language to be used in the Assembly itself, as to the language in which the proceedings shall be recorded and as to the language in which those proceedings shall be circulated. The hon. gentleman will see that, while it is only a reasonable concession, it is also an inevitable concession, because any legislative body will inevitably regulate the mode in which its business shall be conducted, and, if even there were no obligations resting upon any Legislative Assembly to listen to the views of a gentleman who desired to express himself in any other than the English language, I am sure that in this country and in almost any civilized country, the views he desired to so express would be heard with due respect. I cited to the House last session, when this matter was under discussion, instances which had occurred to my own knowledge in provinces where there had been no idea of preserving the French tongue by law and yet where that language was heard with as much respect and attention as the English tongue when any gentleman chose to use it. It is also to be observed that we still have a parental hand over the territorial Government and Assembly, and that it is in our power, if at any time the Legislature should not think fit to print the Acts in the French or German or any language required to give complete publicity amongst the settlers in the North-West, to see that that provision is made in the most ample manner.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very much pleased with these remarks of the Minister. I am pleased with his statement that there will be a guarantee in the future, when we want to use the ideas of the framers of the present Bill, and I am not so prejudiced as not to recognize the peculiar circumstances which surrounded the discussion of the Bill of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last session. It is not necessary for me to say now all that I think in regard to this matter, and I am glad to find that this Parliament remains as a safeguard for the rights of the minority. I think we sanctioned a false position last year, and I protested by my vote then, and I now protest by my words against the same error. In Manitoba, in spite of the constitutional principle, the statutes are no more printed in French, though a large number of the population are French. They were the majority a few years ago, but they are not so any longer. Is it not the right of those people who contribute their share to the public purse to have the laws of the land published in their own language? I am sure that no court of justice which has any self-respect will declare that this law is not *ultra vires* according to the laws of this country and according to the laws of England. In the meantime, however, its provisions are carried out. Considering actual circumstances, the declaration of the Minister of Justice is a great satifaction to me, though I have lodged my protest against the present measure.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is a matter of great satisfaction that this clause has been brought forward. I regret that the Government has not seen its way clear to have also provided that the proceedings before the courts should have been dealt with in the same way as the proceedings in the Legislative Assembly, and that full power in that matter should be given to the North-West Council as it is to the Local Legislatures. We have a much larger French population in Ontario than there will likely be in the North-West Territories for many years to come, and I believe we have found no difficulty or no serious inconvenience from the fact that we have only one official language in the courts in that province. In fact, every man, whether French, English or German—because we have a very large German population in this province also—has experienced no practical difficulty in regard to this matter in the Province of Ontario, and I apprehend there will be no serious difficulty whatever in the North-West. But this matter is one that the provinces have a right to decide for themselves, and the Government is wisely conferring the power upon the North-West Assembly after the next election to exercise that power so far as the proceedings of the Assembly are concerned. Another question which comes up in the same connection and which has been referred to this afternoon is the question of having separate schools, if it is the wish of the people in the locality. That is a question, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said in his speech, which is a very large and important one, and I think cannot be fully and freely dealt with at the close of a session such as this. I am gratified by the statement of the Minister of Justice which if I understood it was that Parliament shall have complete and untrammelled power in the future to confer upon those territories the provincial rights which the other provinces possess, to legislate on all those questions, not only as regards language but as regards schools and all other subjects over which Local Legislatures have complete control. I am a little surprised at the action of the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot), whom I have heard in this House on so many occasions, asserting the inalienable right of the provinces to legislate in their own interests without being trammelled in any way by the Dominion Parliament, and now taking a complete somersault, and advocating that the provinces should not be given those rights, but that they should be retained by the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, I think, is performing a somersault too. He

forgets that he has just now made a tumble. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Minister of Justice again to give his attention to the use of this word "ordinance." The expression is used all through the Bill, "ordinance" instead of "law," and "ordained" instead "enacted." Of course unless you define the word in the sense in which you use it, it would be really necessary to make the law conform to the present state of things, which it does not by the use of that word.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give attention to that before we go into Committee again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Committee rises I would call attention to section 95 in section 18 of the Bill, and to the words "in whose possession or on whose premises any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant of any kind is." The Minister will see that that is not a *primâ facie* presumption of guilt, it is a conclusive presumption, it is one that cannot be explained away by shifting the burden of proof from the party who will be inculpated. He has no permission to show that the liquor did not belong to him, or that it was brought on his premises by some other person. In the criminal law you have a provision that the party in whose permises counterfeit dies are found, is held presumptively guilty, but he is not conclusively guilty. He may prove that the dies were brought there by some other person. It seems to me those words would make the guilt conclusive, and the party would not be at liberty to show that the liquor was not his and that it was not brought here by him.

Mr. AMYOT. About the somersault, we may as well settle that question at once, seeing that we are not very much in a hurry. I am surprised that a love for the autonomy of the provinces has arisen so suddenly in the breast of the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace). He did not seem to understand that question until he had an opportunity to attack the Catholic religion and the French language in the North-West. Then, suddenly he becomes an autonomist, and he understands the full obligation of this Parliament to grant all possible powers to the Local Legislatures. Before that he did not understand it at all. Heretofore he wanted this Parliament to retain every power, and he desired that the Local Legislatures should have as little power as possible. But when he wanted to give equal rights to the Catholics by taking away from them their right to separate schools, and when he wanted to give equal rights to the French people by taking away from them their right to speak French, then he began to understand provincial autonomy. When he perceived that in this Parliament he would have to face one-third of the members of the House, he would have to face the possibility of a division within each party, and that he might endanger his own party, then he found the splendid plan of the autonomy of the provinces, and he said: Let us give to a majority in the North-West, favourable to the sentiments of my heart, a power that we cannot exercise at Ottawa; let us delegate to them such powers that they may be able to do to the Catholics and to the Frenchmen in the North-West that which we are not able to do at Ottawa. If ever there was a somersault performed, the hon. gentleman has performed it very skilfully and very elegantly. I will tell the hon. gentleman what we understand by the word "autonomy."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

We believe that Confederation consists of diverse parts. There is a Government for the common interests of the whole, and there are local Governments for the diverse interests of the parts. Each Legislature has got special rights defined by the constitution, and within those rights each Legislature must be entirely free and all-powerful within the limits of its jurisdiction. That is the autonomy of the provinces under Confederation. One of the principles of Confederation was that the basis of union would not be infringed upon. What was the spirit of the Act at the opening of the conference? It was that the religion and the language of every subject should be respected. Would the hon. gentleman seriously tell us that if, in the beginning, we had been told that under Confederation some means could be devised and attempted to take away from us the right to speak French or to worship God in the way our conscience dictated—does he suppose that we would ever have consented to join the union? He knows better than that. It is only by hidden ways, by devices which are not avowed, that he tries to reach his object. I am sure that with his good heart, if he perceived that he was doing a real injustice, he would step backwards. I am sure he will not try to use his influence to take away from a fellow-subject the right to act, or to speak, or to pray as he pleases, and as the sentiment of his heart may inspire him. What would he say if we, in the Province of Quebec, endeavoured to take away from the minority any right that they enjoy as to language or religion? I may tell him that, whether we would be wrong or right, we shall not do it, because we are just. We have learned in our language the laws of nations and the laws of forbearance; and we have learned in our religion the laws of personal property, and that material property is nothing compared to spiritual property. If he loves Confederation, if he loves the British flag, if he desires to form a grand nation on this continent, let him learn to exercise forbearance. Let him tend to the union of the hearts, let him give to everyone the privileges he cherishes, let him grant liberty to every one, and he will see that party differences will be no cause of harm, and that whatever may be the party to which we belong we will be all Canadians, loving each other and fighting in common for the welfare of the whole people.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman would practise a little more of the virtues he preaches he would be a little more consistent in his character. There was no proposition made by me that any rights and privileges should be taken from any person. On the contrary, I proposed a recommendation that the people should be given more power to control their own local affairs in accordance with the system prevailing in other provinces, and that a portion of the rights and liberties given to Quebec and other provinces of the Dominion should be given to the people of the North-West Territories. That is a reasonable proposition, and it is one the people will demand and obtain. Although the country is not ready for a complete system of self-government, and the population is not sufficiently numerous to have all the machinery of the Local Government as in other provinces, yet by this Bill the people of the territories will gradually get their rights, and the measure will have to be extended still further to give them the right of con-

trol over their local matters, the proceedings of their courts, and of their Legislature, and the conduct of their schools. That is all I advocated. If that is an example of want of liberality, of want of Christian spirit and of proper consideration for the feelings of others, I must plead guilty.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I am perfectly ready to agree to the proposition made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). If Parliament will give to the North-West Territories the same laws as they have imposed on Quebec, we shall be satisfied. The hon. member must know that not only the Imperial Statute has not given to the Province of Quebec the right to prevent part of the population from speaking English, but it has gone further, and created a province within a province by enacting that the limits of 15 counties, in which at that time the majority of the people were English-speaking, could not be changed without the consent of the majority of their representatives. Even in the case that the whole of the other 50 members of the Legislative Assembly should consider the change necessary, such a change could not take place without the consent of the majority of those 15 members. Far different is the position in the North-West. Not only is there no French province within the province, but to this day we have been unable to obtain a pledge that any representation would be given to the French element in the territories. Such is the difference at present between the Province of Quebec and the North-West Territories, so far as language is concerned. So far as religious schools are concerned, is the hon. gentleman prepared to give to the territories the same rights and liberties we enjoy in the Province of Quebec? Then give us at once the widest law for separate schools that exists in the Dominion, for such is the school law of the Province of Quebec. The Dominion Parliament has no power to legislate on the question as to the language in which the laws shall be published, or the debates of Parliament conducted both in the Parliament of the Province of Quebec and in the Dominion of Canada. The Imperial Parliament has put these two questions outside of the limit of provincial legislation, and laid down these two principles, which are at the basis of the constitution: the equality of Roman Catholics and Protestants, so far as schools are concerned, and the equality of the French and English-speaking populations, so far as the official languages are concerned. These two fundamental principles we desire to maintain. We want it formally recognized all over the Dominion that those rights now existing, both by usage and by law, shall be preserved, and therefore we protest against the granting to the Legislative Assembly of the territories of the right to abolish the French language, which is established by the constitution, and which cannot be taken away without violating the constitution and destroying the harmony, good-will and happiness of the population of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not desire to move the clause to which I spoke on the second reading, but I ask the Government to kindly consider it. The section I intended to move was as follows:—

The persons qualified to vote at the election for the Legislative Assembly, shall be male British subjects by birth or naturalization (other than unenfranchised Indians, and members of the North-West Mounted Police), who have attained the full age of twenty-one years, who have resided in the North-West Territories for at least twelve months, and in the electoral district for at least three months, respectively, preceding the time of voting.

The object of inserting such a clause was to prevent members of the North-West Mounted Police voting for any candidate for the Local Assembly, and I would impress on the Government the reasonableness of this suggestion. Remember, it is a quasi-military body—that the members are shifted from one place to another. These are not the only considerations; they will vote for a candidate for an Assembly which has no power whatever to make laws affecting them. They are outside of its jurisdiction, and yet they can come in and water, so to speak, the stock of the civil vote. At the election in North Regina there were 360 votes given, and of these 80 were police votes, and all were thrown for one candidate, not a single policeman voting for the candidate who was beaten there.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Is the vote by ballot?

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is an open vote; but by-and-bye it will be vote by ballot. The Assembly will have power to deal with that matter, but not as regards the next election. I do not press my clause, but I ask the Government, as I understand the Bill will remain in Committee, to consider the suggestion and decide whether this clause is necessary or not.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am sorry to differ from the hon. member for Assiniboia. We all know the members of the North-West Mounted Police are the sons of either Ontario or Quebec farmers who go out there, probably, in the first place, to perfect themselves in military organization and in the next place, to become settlers in that district. If at legislative elections in Ontario farmers' sons have the right to vote, I think the Parliament of this Dominion should grant the North-West Mounted Police the same right; and indeed, I think it would be unfair to take away from them the right to vote they enjoyed in Manitoba, Quebec or Ontario. With all due respect to the member for Assiniboia, I am obliged to differ with him in this respect.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend will see that I am not very particular in pressing the matter. I do not think the members of the police care one pin about having the vote, and so far as I know it is of no advantage to them whatever. If it were any advantage to them I certainly should not wish to take it away. The reason I wish to take it away in regard to Dominion elections is, that it is of no advantage there at all, and they wish to be deprived of it. When they are farmers' sons in Ontario, as farmers' sons the Legislature of Ontario can pass Acts that will affect them; but as members of the Mounted Police, how can this Assembly pass any Act that will affect them? However, as the question is not to be pressed to-night, I will not speak further on the matter.

Mr. TROW. I think the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) can speak feelingly in that respect, because I am aware that a very large proportion of those who voted for him were navvies, and have no permanent place of residence, and were from all parts of the Dominion, and many from the United States. I think he, certainly, above all other men, should advocate that.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I say right here to the whip for the Grit party on the other

side of the House that he is entirely mistaken in what he says. The electors who voted for me were electors who were on the Dominion voters' lists; they were British subjects; they were twenty-one years of age, and they were entitled to vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You need not say "louder," because you can hear me well enough. I defy any man in this House or any man in this country to say that anyone voted for me in the district of Algoma who was not entitled to vote. But, under your one-sided Ontario Election Act, one-half of these individuals were not entitled to vote, whereas under the Dominion Franchise Act any man who is a British subject, twenty-one years of age, in receipt of an income of $150 a year in our district—it is $300 every place else—was entitled to vote. The hon. gentleman says they were navvies; a navvy, as I understand it, and I have some experience in that way, is a man who delves for a living. He is a man who delves with the shovel, and puts it into a wheelbarrow, and wheels it off to a dump on a railway. That constitutes a navvy, and there was not a navvy in the whole district of Algoma during last election, because there were no railways building there. The men who voted for me were railway men, fishermen, farmers, lumbermen and miners. I tell the hon. the chief whip (Mr. Trow), on the other side of the House, that he is mistaken when he makes the statement that he did just now.

Mr. TROW. The lists were made out years before——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would point out that this Bill does not apply to Algoma.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment that is proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will be considered between now and when the Committee meets again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ADJOURNMENT—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is carried, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word or two with respect to an incident in the debate yesterday. The House will remember that an offer was made to me across the floor, by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, that I should appoint a couple of persons, if I liked, to investigate the names of the persons who had subscribed to a testimonial to him. I desire to say, explicitly, that I made no reference to the Minister of Inland Revenue, or to the testimonial presented to him, because I did not regard the testimonial presented to him as coming substantially within the lines of my resolution. It may have been—I was not aware of it until he mentioned it himself—that there were a small percentage of those who subscribed to his testimonial who would have been embraced in the resolution that I moved; but I do not think myself that his was a case similar to the others, nor do I believe that he was influenced to the detriment of the service by the subscriptions that he might have received. Therefore, I did not then deem it necessary, nor do I think it necessary now, in any shape, for the clearing of the hon. gentleman's character from imputations—which I beg to say I did not at all level at him—that any investigation should be made. It was very right and proper of him to offer it; but I, for my part, did not intend at all to include him within the scope of my remarks.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I think after the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) it is proper that I should express my gratification that he has made this statement. Not only do I consider it satisfactory to myself and my friends, but I think it is one of those incidents that every man in this Parliament must feel pleased at the occurrence of. I think it is a pleasant thing that the hon. gentleman, occupying the position that he does on the other side of the House, and during a session of Parliament of considerable excitement and acrimony, should have the fairness to make the statement freeing me from any charges of having been improperly influenced on account of such testimonial. I thank him for the very candid expression he has given, clearing me from any imputations which might be made.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the additional evidence reported this day by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts *in re* Langevin Block, be added to that submitted to the House with the Thirteenth Report of the said Committee, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Seventeenth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved:

That all accounts for goods furnished to the Public Works Department by H. Bourcier or Bourcier & Co., Ottawa, and cheques for the payment of the same during the years ending 30th June, 1884, 1885 and 1886, be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the regular way in which we have been proceeding. The way in which we have proceeded so far in the case of any papers which have not been before the House, is to pass a resolution in the Committee itself, embodying a request to the House that they be referred to the Committee. I think the same course ought to be pursued in this case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. One reason why I make the motion in this way is, that early in the session I moved a similar motion, and no objection was taken to it; and another reason is, that the session is coming to an end, and I want to expedite matters so as to get at these accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very true that a motion similar to this went through without our under-

standing it. There will really be no delay, because a report of the Committee can be got at the next meeting.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I object altogether to that statement. A notice may be required, but any member of the House has a right to move to refer any matter to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. And any member has a right to object.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, object here.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Committee is subordinate to the House, and yet the hon. gentleman lays down a rule that a request must be submitted by the Committee to this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not lay down such a rule at all. I said that was the practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I submit that is not the practice, and it ought not to be the practice. I am not a member of that Committee; but it is appointed as a convenience for the discharge of duties that belong to the House as a whole, and any member of this House who is not a member of that Committee, if he desires to have any matter referred to the Committee, has a right to ask the House to refer it. The Committee have no right to intervene. All the references made to the Committee are references made by this House on its constitution. You do not appoint a Committee giving it nothing to do, and then ask it to advise the House what business shall be brought before it; and as you do not do that with reference to the accounts of the year, neither do you do that with reference to the accounts of the previous years. It is the right of any member of this House to bring before the House and move its reference to the Committee, any matter not before the Committee; and it is the business of the House, in the discharge of its duties, and in the exercise of its judgment, to say whether it is a proper subject for the Committee to investigate or not. That is not for the Committee to decide.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. Minister of Finance has not said it is not competent for the House to make any reference to the Committee which it pleases, but that it is not usual to refer to it accounts of eight years ago which are not in the possession of this House at all. What he says is, that before the House passes that resolution, the Committee should be consulted in regard to it, and I think that is a very salutary practice with reference to papers which are not before this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Objection having been taken, I shall, of course, have to rule that this motion is not in order, notice not having been given of it.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you make that ruling, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. Minister of Finance that this is a practice which might perhaps be characterized as sharp practice at this stage of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. No sharp practice about it.

Mr. LAURIER. I say, at this stage of the session. The hon. gentleman ought to be anxious to facilitate business.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. This is not facilitating business at all. The practice we have followed has been to assume that a report was made by the Committee on Public Accounts suggesting the production of certain papers, and to have a motion made for their production, waiving the notice. The Committee is not sitting to-day, and my hon. friend is anxious to bring something before the Committee; and at this stage of the session, when Parliament has been sitting nearly four months, if we are to proceed and to have prorogation within a reasonable time, it seems to me that every one should be anxious to facilitate business. I do not see that there is any more reason for the hon. gentleman to take the point of order at this stage than there would be if the matter had been already before the Committee. I do not think the hon. gentleman is doing what he might to facilitate business.

Mr. BOWELL. If we are to adhere to the Rules of the House, notice should be given for the production of these papers, and after they have been produced and laid on the Table, it will be within the province of any member to move their reference to the Committee. These papers have never been asked for, and if there is any sharp practice at all, it is on the part of the hon. gentleman making the motion. We ought to have a little regard to the Rules of the House, so that no one will be taken by surprise. When hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side of the House, I never could get a paper unless I moved for it in the House after giving a regular notice; and then when it was laid on the Table, I moved its reference. This motion can only be adopted by our setting aside the Rules and practices of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. The Rules are made for the public convenience, and they are not to be followed so rigidly that we cannot waive them at times in order to facilitate the public business.

Mr. FOSTER. What I suggest will not keep the hon. gentleman back one hour. Our investigations in the Committee are such as to forestall that motion, and if the Committee passes it at its next meeting, of which I have no doubt, then by following the usual practice the hon. gentleman will have his papers in time for the subsequent meetings of the Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I moved a similar motion to this before, and no objection was taken, and that is why I move it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The motion was objected to and stood over by way of notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion itself is defective, because the hon. gentleman asked that a certain account be referred to the Committee of Public Accounts, and that account is not in possession of the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is similar to the motion I made before, and which went through all right.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 162) to correct a clerical error in the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 81.—(Sir John Thompson.)

COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

Mr. DEVLIN (for Mr. RIDER) asked, 1. Is there a commercial treaty in force between England and France? 2. When was such treaty made, and

how long will it remain in force 3. Are butter, cheese and other farm produce, in virtue of this treaty, admitted into France at lower rate of duties than similar articles coming from countries with which France has no such treaty? 4. Are butter, cheese, pork and lard, when imported direct from Canada, admitted into France at the same rate of duty as similar articles of English production?

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask that this question stand.

Mr. LAURIER. This question has been asked to stand at the request of the Government already five or six times. There ought to be no delay in answering, if the Government are willing to give the information.

Mr. FOSTER. When the question was asked, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), speaking across the floor, said he doubted whether I would have that information at all. I thought, however, I could get the most of it, but found upon enquiry it was impossible to give full information. I stated that to the House and that I had written to the High Commissioner for full information, which I would place before the House as soon as I received it. That is the only reason why the answer has stood. I have a partial answer here, if I can find it; but I still think it would be well to wait a week or so until I can get full information.

Mr. LAURIER. If you can get it in a week that will be all right.

Question allowed to stand.

CONTRACTOR OF CHATHAM POST OFFICE.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, 1. What is the name and address of the contractor who built the Chatham Post Office? 2. What was the amount of the original contract? 3. What amount was paid for extras upon said building? 4. What was the total cost of the building? 5. How many tendered for the work, and was the lowest tender accepted; if not, why not? 6. From whom was the land purchased upon which the building is erected? 7. What was the price paid for said land?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. John E. Askwith, New Edinburgh, Ontario, is the contractor. $27,640 is the amount of the original contract. Extras paid on contract $1,294.55; stone sidewalk, drain, Post Office and Customs fittings $7,653.75. Total extras, $8,948.30. Total cost, $36,588.30. Four tenders were received. Tenders were received from James H. Oldershaw & Otis B. Hulin, $38,700; John E. Askwith, $27,640; Thomas Sutherland, $37,750; G. & Robert Crain, $21,989; an Order in Council states that, owing to an evident mistake in the tender of Messrs. Crain, they asked to be allowed to withdraw their tender, the withdrawal of their tender was granted and Mr. Askwith accepted. The land was purchased from A. Northwood, $8,000; and James Ronald, $2,500. The total cost of land, $10,500.

P. E. I.—PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS.

Mr. PERRY asked, How many piers, wharves and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island have been repaired by the Dominion Government during the year 1890? How much has been expended on each of these public works during said year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Amounts expended on repairs on harbours, piers and breakwaters, Prince Edward Island, from 1st January, 1890, to 31st December, 1890, are as follows:—

Annandale pier	$ 335 21
Bay View	17 85
Belfast pier	1,041 84
Chapel Point wharf	433 83
China Point pier	63 00
Georgetown	200 00
Hickey's pier	395 16
Malpeque breakwater	1,247 14
Montague, Steven's Point	199 96
New London breakwater	1,240 28
North Cardigan	46 63
North Rustico pier	637 81
Pinette pier	448 71
Pownal pier B	99 95
Red Point B pier	700 69
Sturgeon pier	12 50
St. Mary's Bay	200 59
Victoria pier	613 81
Total	$7,934 56

WILLIAM BATTELL.

Mr. CAMPBELL (for Mr. HARGRAFT) asked, 1. When was William Battell appointed clerk of works in respect of the Cobourg Post Office and Custom-house building, and what were his duties? 2. How long did he hold such office? 3. Is he still in such office? 4. What was his salary? How much has been paid him as such salary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. William Battell was appointed 24th September, 1888, and was put in charge of the work on 1st January, 1889. His duties were to be on the work daily during work hours and to see that they were carried out strictly in accordance with plans and specifications, to measure the works and materials so far as to form basis for progress estimates, and to report any matter which might arise in connection with the works during progress. He held office from 1st January, 1889, to 31st March, 1891. He is not still in office. His salary was $75 a month. He was paid at that rate from 1st January, 1889, to 31st March, 1891, $2,025.

DREDGE *ST. LAWRENCE*—RESTIGOUCHE RIVER.

Mr. BROWN (Chateauguay) (for Mr. MOUSSEAU) asked, 1. What work in dredging did the dredge *St. Lawrence* do in 1887 and 1889 in Restigouche River? 2. How long was she thus employed? 3. At whose request was the dredging made at Dalhousie, for the purpose of making a winter harbour for the SS. *Admiral?* 4. What was the cost of dredging in the said River Restigouche?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No work was done in 1887. In 1888 and 1889, at the request of Messrs. Moffat and Riopel, M.P's., the *St. Lawrence* was brought to the Restigouche and employed in dredging on the traverse between Dalhousie and Campbellville, and whilst there did some dredging between the wharves at Dalhousie at the request of the captain and purser of the steamship *Admiral*. This latter dredging was done to enable a steamer to winter in safety, and thus accommodate the traffic later in the autumn and earlier in the spring than

could otherwise have been done. The dredge was employed altogether six months during the two years. Cost of dredging at Traverse, $9,008.64; at Dalhousie, $6,543.08.

TAY CANAL.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. Were tenders called for, for the construction of the Tay Canal from the Rideau Canal to the basin in the town of Perth? If so, was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer? 2. What was the amount of the lowest tender? 3. Who was the lowest tenderer?

Mr. BOWELL. Tenders were called for the construction of the Tay Canal from the Rideau Canal to the east side of Craig Street, in the town of Perth, and the contract was awarded to the lower tender on the recommendation of the late Mr. Page, then Chief Engineer of Canals. The amount of the lowest tender was $186,444. A. F. Manning, and A. P. Macdonald were the lowest tenderers. Tenders were called for the extension of the Tay Canal from the east side of Craig Street to the south side of Peter Street, in the town of Perth. The then Chief Engineer of Canals, the late Mr. Page (May, 1888) did not recommend that the work be given to the lowest tenderer. The amount of the lowest tender was $44,207.50. Kavanagh, Macdonald & Kavanagh were the lowest tenderers. The contract was given to Messrs. Davis & Sons, by Order in Council 29th May, 1888, at the amount of their tender as extended, $44,457.

MONTREAL CUSTOMS-HOUSE—IRREGULARITIES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is there an investigation being held, or has such been held recently, in connection with the Montreal Customs-house officers? If so, for what reason was it considered necessary to hold such an investigation? Have any irregularities been detected or suspected, of what nature and to what extent? Does the Minister of Customs intend to lay on the Table of the House a report of the investigation before the session closes? If not, why not?

Mr. BOWELL. All the officers are inspected by the inspectors annually or oftener when required. In the present cases, I admit it is necessary to have a special investigation, with a view to better economy in working the office. Two irregularities have been discovered. In one case the officer was behind in the funds. The deficiency has been fully paid, and the officer was dismissed. In the other case, one of the officers from the warehouse was discovered to be behind a small amount. I am not able at present to tell the House how much. He is dead and the deficiency was discovered after he died. Whether I will be prepared to lay the report before the House, which is an unusual thing to do in matters of this kind unless moved for, I am unable to say at present. It depends altogether on the length of the session.

MONTREAL P. O.—LETTER COLLECTING CONTRACT.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Who has the contract for gathering the letters from the several boxes in Montreal city? 2. For what length of time was the contract let? 3. When does it expire? 4. Was the present contractor the lowest tenderer? 5. If not, how did it come that he got the contract? 6. Did a previous contractor give up his contract? If so, why were tenders not asked for the work before letting to the present contractor? 7. The names and amount of each tender, the last time tenders were asked for?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to these questions, I may say: 1. Mr. P. Kennedy. 2. For four years. 3. On the 31st of August instant. 4. No, as tenders were not invited prior to the making of the present contract. 5. The contract preceding the present one was renewed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2, section 61 of the Post Office Act. 6. Yes, a previous contractor did give up his contract. Tenders were asked before the contract fell into the hands of the present contractor. 7. The last time tenders invited for this service was in July, 1883, and the following tenders were received at that time:—J. Kennedy, $3,200; P. Martin, $3,285; P. Cosgrove, $3,300; J. Belanger, $3,400; J. MacAlpine, $3,470; J. Heart, $3,483; Patrick Kennedy, $3,600; J. Quin, $3,650; G. Bowie, $3,775. Regarding the awarding of the contract to Mr. P. Kennedy, whose tender stands 8th on the list, it is to be observed that, up to the time when these tenders were called for, the manner in which this service was carried on was the subject of much complaint, and it was recognized that the unsatisfactory character of the service was due to the insufficiency of the amounts for which this service had until that time been undertaken. In order to put the service, if possible, on a satisfactory footing, it was determined to have a special enquiry made as to the competency of each of the tenderers, beginning with the lowest, before the contract was let. The official instructed with this duty reported that though several of those whose tenders were lower on the list than Mr. Kennedy's were responsible men, who would be likely to give every care to the carrying out of the service, still in view of the special nature of the service, and the variety of requirements involved, Mr. Kennedy was the first on the list whom he could recommend. The recommendation made on that occasion has been amply borne out by the manner in which the service has been performed by Mr. Kennedy. It is for the reasons mentioned that Mr. Kennedy's contract has been renewed from time to time as the date of expiration approached.

QUEBEC POSTAL DIVISION.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, 1. Are the Government aware that Mr. Laberge, assistant postmaster of Quebec, is still practising as a notary? 2. That the said Mr. Laberge is secretary-treasurer of St. Roch-Nord? 3. That Mr. F. E. Blondeau, chief railway mail clerk, is acting as Mayor of the Municipal Council of St. Roch-Nord aforesaid? 4. That Mr. Bolduc, Inspector of the Postal Division of Quebec, allowed to certain railway mail clerks, for going to Lévis or South Quebec, to label the pigeon-holes, on postal cars, in payment therefor, one night, that is to say, the mileage from 8 o'clock p.m. to 8 o'clock a.m., at one cent per mile, amounting to the sum of $4, when they had not performed the said journey? 5. What has been the cost of the maps, plans and other requisites applied

for at the Post Office Department, by Inspector Boldue, in order to carry out the views of Mr. Blondeau in respect of his new system of examination for mail clerks?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to these questions, I have to say: 1. The Government is not aware of the fact, and has reason to believe that the fact is not as alleged. 2. The Government is not aware of the fact, and has reason to believe that the fact is not as alleged. 3. This is understood to be the case, but his hours of official duty are in no way interfered with. 4. The Post Office Inspector states that this was not done. 5. The cost is estimated as not exceeding $200.

POSTMASTER AT SUMMERSIDE.

Mr. PERRY asked, When was Mr. Harry Green, late postmaster at Summerside, P.E.I., dismissed? Why was he dismissed? Who is now postmaster at Summerside? When was the new appointment made, and when did it take effect? What is the salary of the present postmaster? What was the salary of the late postmaster? How many assistants and clerks are now in the office? How many assistants and clerks had the late postmaster? What salaries are the present assistant and clerks getting? What salaries were the assistants and clerks getting under Mr. Green? Is the present postmaster now a civil servant? If so, when did this take place? Is Mr. Green to get a retiring allowance? Did Richard Hunt apply for the office. If so, when? What other applications (if any) where made besides Mr. Hunt's?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that: 1. The departmental order for the removal of Mr. Green is dated 5th August, 1891. 2. Mr. Green was dismissed on account of culpable neglect of duty in connection with the mislaying and detention in his office of a letter posted by Mr. F. H. Arnaud, at Charlottetown, on the 26th of February, 1891, addressed to "Merchants Bank of Halifax, Summerside," his general management of the post office being also very unsatisfactory. 3. The person who has been nominated for the postmastership is Mr. Richard Hunt. 4. The nomination was made on the 5th August, 1891. 5. The transfer of the post office to the charge of Mr. Hunt has not yet been reported. 6. The salary at present attached to the Summerside office is $1,100 a year, with an indemnity of $80 for forward duty. This is the salary which the late postmaster had, and which the incoming postmaster will have until the next revision of salaries takes place, when it may be either maintained, increased or diminished, according to the figures before the department. 7. The department is not aware how many assistants are now in the office. The postmaster appoints and pays his own assistants. 8. The late postmaster employed one assistant only, his son Fred. Green. 9. The department has no knowledge as to the salaries allowed or to be allowed to the assistants in the office. 10. The present postmaster is not a civil servant within the meaning of the Civil Service Act, or the Superannuation Act. 11. This did not take place. 12. Mr. Green does not receive, and cannot receive, a retiring allowance. 13. Mr. Richard Hunt did not apply for the office. 14. The only application made for the office was from Mr. Fred. Green.

Mr. RINFRET.

LABOURERS ON THE ALBERTA RAILWAY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron), asked, 1. Has the Government paid the labourers on the Alberta Railway Company, the balance due them for work done on the said railway in pursuance of the terms of a mortgage on said railway property, made by the company to the Government in 1886? 2. If so, how much, to whom and when paid? If not, why not?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government, in pursuance of the terms of a mortgage on the said property, paid the president of the Alberta Railway Company the sum of $4,836 on account of the amount due the labourers.

EXTENSION OF THE TAY CANAL.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, 1. How many tenders were received by the Government for the construction of the extension of the Tay Canal from the Basin to Haggart's mill, Perth? 2. Who were such tenderers? 3. What was the amount of each tender by quantities? 4. What was the amount of each tender when the quantities were worked out? 5. Did deposit receipts marked "Good" accompany each tender? If so, what was the amount of each cheque? If not, whose tender was not so accompanied by such cheque? 6. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not? 7. Were any of such cheques forfeited? If so, whose, and why? 8. Do the costs of construction of the new iron swing-bridge to replace the iron bridge form part of the $18,466, the costs of such extension? If not, how much will such new bridge cost?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. Four. 2 and 4. Allan & Fleming, $16,267; J. O'Tool, $18,466; Smith, Wurtele & Co., $19,888; John Nicholson, $23,454. 3. Tenders did not specify quantities. 5. Each of the tenders was accompanied by a cheque for $250 and were certified by the bank on which drawn. 6. The lowest tenderer wrote on the 5th January, 1891, that they had made an error in their figures in earthwork, and asked permission to withdraw, and permission was given by Order in Council dated 16th January, 1891. 7. None of the cheques were forfeited. 8. The cost of the new iron swing-bridge does not form part of the $18,466. The cost of the new iron swing-bridge is $3,987. The town of Perth has paid $4,000 towards the cost of the bridge.

WHARF AT EDGETT'S LANDING, N.B.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. KING) asked, Whether the ballast wharf at Edgett's Landing, Albert County, N.B., has been let by contract? If so, who was the contractor, and what was the price agreed on? Is the work now being carried on by the contractor or otherwise? If otherwise, who has been named to superintend the work and what rate of wages is paid him? Has there been more than one person employed as superintendent, timekeeper, or in any other capacity than labourer? If so, who is he and what wages does he receive? When is it expected the work will be completed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the 15th January, 1889, a contract was entered into with Messrs. Wallace & Derry for the construction of a ballast

wharf at Edgett's Landing, for the sum of $4,386, the inspector of works being J. W. Steeves at $2.50 per day. The appointment was made on the 25th September, 1889. An Order in Council was passed cancelling Wallace & Derry's contract. The reason of the failure of Mr. Wallace to carry on his contract was ill-health. The work was continued by day's labour under charge of W. H. Cross, as foreman of work, who was paid at the rate of $3 per day. No timekeeper or other superintendent were employed. Carpenters and labourers were engaged as required; carpenters' wages being $1.75 per day, labourers, $1.25. It is expected that the work will be completed before next winter.

BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, The total cost of Banff Springs Park and Reserve, including all expenses of every kind incurred from time of its location down to 30th June, 1891? Also total receipts from all sources in connection with the said park and reserve for the same time?

Mr. DEWDNEY:

Year.	Expenses.	Receipts.
1885-86	$ 4,500.00	.....
1886-87	36,170.97	.....
1887-88	36,612.48	$2,951.58
1888-89	24,684.20	2,528.73
1889-90	19,296.61	1,094.37
1890-91	16,999.84	2,347.35
Totals	$141,254.10	$8,922.03

THE OLD WALLS OF QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government of Canada has received a petition from the corporation of the city of Quebec, or from the citizens of Quebec, asking that a passage be made through the old walls of Quebec, in order to permit of the prolongation of McMahon Street as far as Richelieu Street? Has the Government any intention of granting the necessary authority for carrying this out, and when? Does the Government consider the old walls of the present fortifications of the city of Quebec (exclusive of the Citadel) as necessary or even useful for the defence of the city, or does it consider them as relics of the past?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The petition referred to above was fyled in the Department of Militia on the 10th March, 1883. The petition was not granted. The papers were asked for by the House of Commons in April, 1889, and were produced. The old walls of the fortifications and the Citadel of Quebec are all part of the defences of the city, and were handed to Quebec by the Imperial Government for defensive purposes in connection with the fortress. Besides this, they are also considered as relics of the past.

GRADUATES—MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1. How many students, graduated from the Military College at Kingston, are now employed as civil or military engineers in Canada? 2. What are the names of those who are thus employed? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to keep up the Military College at Kingston, at its present cost to the country?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. Fifty-one graduates are now employed as civil or military engineers in Canada, and six in the schools are liable to perform military engineering at any time. 2. The following are the names of the graduates practising civil engineering in Canada: MacPherson, D.; Davis, W. M.; Freer, H. C.; Dixon, F. J.; Laurie, R. C.; Ross, A. B.; Gibson, J. G.; Doucet, A. E.; Coryell, J. A.; Yates, B. W.; Shaw, G. W.; Hubdell, E. W.; Drury, E. H.; Kirkpatrick, A. K.; Greenwood, H. S.; Wetmore, A. R.; Hodgins, A. E.; Stewart, W. J; Leonard, R. W.; Weller, J. L.; Newcomb, Coutlee, C. R. F.; McColl, R.; Morrow, H. A.; Jack, R. B.; Grant, W. W.; Perley, G. E.; Graham, W. T.; Hesketh, J. A.; Brough, W. C.; Smart, J. A.; Fraser, B. H.; Whitehead, A. E.; Gillmore, E. T. B.; Leckie, R. E.; Domville, J. W.; Houliston, J.; Rose, G. G.; Emery, F. D.; Mackay, J. D.; Kerby, F. N.; Almon, M. B.; White, J.; Lambe, L. N.; Campbell, R. C.; Woodman, J.; Evans, A. T. K.; VanBuskirt, K. F.; White, F. W.; Warner, W. G.; Forston, W. G. The following graduates of the Royal Military College are commissioned in the permanent corps and liable to perform military engineering at any time: Capt. V. B. Rivers, R. C. A.; Capt. T. Benson, R. C. A.; Capt. G. H. Ogilvie, R. C. A.; Capt. F. M. Gaudet, R. C. A.; Capt. R. Cartwright, I. S. C.; Lieut. J. H. Laurie. 3. It is the intention of the Government to keep up the Royal Military College, and an estimate is now before Parliament for that purpose.

P. E. I.—OYSTER BEDS.

Mr. PERRY (for Mr. DAVIES, P.E.I.) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lease all or any of the oyster beds of Prince Edward Island to private parties or companies? If so, what beds is it proposed to lease, and to whom, and for what rent or on what terms?

Mr. TUPPER. Numerous applications from Prince Edward Island for licenses or leases, under section 21, sub-section 4 of the Fisheries Act, are now under consideration. None have yet been granted. It is not proposed to lease beds now fished by the public, but rather those exhausted from over-fishing in the past.

P. E. I.—FISHERY WARDENS.

Mr. PERRY (for Mr. DAVIES, P.E.I.) asked, Have all or any of the fishery wardens in Prince Edward Island been relieved of their offices? If any have been so relieved, what are their names and what salaries did they draw respectively, and what means are being adopted for the protection of the fishing rivers of which the discharged wardens were the supposed guardians?

Mr. TUPPER. The services of the fishery wardens in the various counties of Prince Edward Island were dispensed with and special guardians will be employed from time to time, when required, in accordance with the terms of an Order in Council of 15th November, 1890, as is done in other fishery districts in Canada.

POSTMASTER AT LYSTER.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Did the postmaster of Lyster resign his position, or was he dismissed therefrom? If he was dismissed, what were the reasons? Why does the department no longer per-

mit the depositing of letters at the house of Jean Baptiste Houle?

Mr. HAGGART. The postmaster of Lyster, M. C. King, resigned the postmastership on the 21st June, 1891. The arrangement under which correspondence intended for the post was left at the house of Mr. J. B. Houle, Lyster, was not authorized by this department, but seems to have been made by the postmaster of Lyster, with a view to meeting the convenience of the public at that end of the village, the postmaster's own office being located at the other end. Then the Lyster office was removed to a point near the church, and in the centre of the village, all necessity for continuing the arrangement in question is believed to have ceased.

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the work on the Miminigash breakwater, Prince Edward Island, going on? Has the contractor given up the contract? If so, when, and has the Department of Public Works advertised for new tenders? Has any work been done to said breakwater since the 1st April last? If so, what is the nature of the work and to what amount? Have the department a report from the resident engineer on said work, since 1st April last? If not, why not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The work is not going on. No contract was entered into, because Mr. Alex. Macdonald, whose tender was the lowest, refused to sign the contract. New tenders have not been called for, as the season is not a proper one for procuring timber. No work has been done since 12th April last, and no report has been furnished, because there is nothing on which to report.

CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. BROWN (Chateauguay) (for Mr. MONET) asked, Whether the Government gave out any contract for furnishing, breaking and spreading the stone placed in the bed of the Chambly Canal since 1887? To whom did the Government award such contract or contracts? Was the work done by the original contractors, or by sub-contractors? How many toise of stone were to have been placed, and how many were placed in the said canal, under such contract or contracts? What amount of money has been paid by the Government for the said work?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government have not given any contract for furnishing, breaking, and spreading stone in the bed of the Chambly Canal since 1887, nor has any stone been placed in the bed of the canal.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Is the following item in the Auditor General's Report, page A—43, for the year 1888, correct? "McNamara, M., Customs, subcollector, Walkerton, share of Customs seizures, $236.44." If correct, what service did Mr. McNamara render for it?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount referred to is correct and was paid him as his share, under Customs Act and regulations, of penalties imposed *in re* seizures, in which he was interested, as one of the officers concerned in working up and making the seizures, as per Order in Council passed on 4th June, 1876, on the recommendation of the Hon. Isaac Burpee, then Minister of Customs, viz., seizure No. 420,223, amount of penalty, $1,043,75; amount awarded to him, $231.94. P. E. 1,691, penalty, $9—amount awarded to him $4.50; making the total of $236.44 as shown in the Auditor General's Report.

COMMISSIONS—MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether, when vacancies occur in the permanent corps, they are offered to graduates of Kingston Military College. If not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some commissions are given to gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military College and others to members of the present militia force. The department has considered that the force should be represented on the permanent corps for past valuable services.

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Did the Government grant a subsidy to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company? If so, what was the total amount of such subsidy? What payments have been made on account thereof? What was the date of each payment and the amount of such payment? Has the whole subsidy been paid?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government did grant a subsidy to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company by 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a sum not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding on the whole, $108,800. By 51 Victoria, chapter 4, a sum not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding on the whole $147,200 were granted; or a total of $256,000. Payments have been made to the amount of $222,400. The date and amount of each payment was as follows, viz.: 31st July, 1889, $84,000; 19th September, 1889, $44,300; 2nd November, 1889, $42,000; 18th December, 1889, $30,910; 18th January, 1890, $27,580; 24th August, 1890, $10,300; 7th August, 1891, $3,300. To the fifth question I reply, no. The length of the road is 73¼ miles, which at $3,200 amounts to $235,200; amount paid, 222,400; unearned, $12,800.

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, What changes were made in the specifications for the contract for the Owen Sound harbour improvements after it had been let to the present contractors, Porter, Reid & Carman, and what difference in the cost was allowed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No changes have been made.

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. AMYOT. Before the Orders of the Day are called I beg to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the final estimate or at least the last progressive estimate in the matter of the Kingston graving dock has not yet been brought down. I went to the department this morning and asked the officer present if he would send the documents over to the Minister who is acting for the late Minister of Public Works, so that we

might have it in time for the discussion. The ex-Minister of Public Works had promised to bring down all the original documents, but we have not the final estimates of that work, although it is about being completed. If the final estimate is not brought down we should have at least the progress estimates, because that will be absolutely necessary. Neither have we the quantities upon which the extra work to the entrance, amounting to $34,000 or thereabouts, have been expended, and we shall want that too. If we had these documents we would have the record complete as it has been promised to this House. I hope that the Government, as now constituted, will see that these documents, which the House has ordered, will be produced immediately.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will send at once to the proper officer and ask him about the papers.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 158) to authorize the sale of the Carleton, City of St. John, Branch Railway.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, N.S.—(Mr. Tupper.)

BOUNTY ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution providing for the payment of a bounty on beet-root sugar.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well if we had some vindication of a resolution of this sort before it was submitted to the Committee. The hon. gentleman, when he gave notice of a resolution proposing to pay a bounty for an agricultural production, ought to have given the House some information upon the subject, to show why this particular branch of industry should be gone into; in what particulars he expected the agricultural population would gain by it, and if it were a profitable product to introduce into this country why it was necessary to make it an exception to ordinary agricultural products and to impose burdens upon other industrial occupations in the country in order that it might be sustained. I may say for myself, that I am opposed to the granting of any such bounties, but I am not more opposed to it with regard to an agricultural product, than I am with regard to products of any other kind. It is impossible that you can take moneys out of the public treasury and hand them over to any person for the purpose of producing any particular article, without, to the same extent, taxing the industrial pursuits of the population. If you give a bounty for the production of beets, you are imposing a tax upon the production of wheat, of turnips, of cattle, of wool, of mutton, and of every other agricultural product in the country, and I know no reason why the one should be discouraged by taxation and the other encouraged by the offer of bounties. That is precisely what the hon. gentleman proposes. Now, if the production of beets for the purpose of being manufactured into sugar is a profitable branch of agriculture, there is no more propriety in giving the producer of beets a bounty, than there is in giving it to the producers of cabbage, of barley, or of oats. They all stand exactly upon the same footing; there is no difference between them, and the hon. gentleman, by imposing this duty, puts impediments in the way of removing burdens of another character. I hold that our right of taxation is a right conferred upon us for the purpose of raising funds for the ordinary expenses of the Government, and that every attempt to go beyond that and to interfere with the industrial freedom of the population, is an utter abuse of the authority of the Government as it is an abuse of the authority of this Parliament. If the production of beets is more profitable than the production of barley, or of oats, or the raising of cattle or horses, then agriculturists will turn their attention in that direction. They do not require a special bounty to enable them to do so; they do not require special interference of the Government to enable them to accomplish that object. The Government here have the right to raise taxes to pay the salaries of the public officers who are necessary to carry on the public business. They have the right to raise taxes to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government, but this is not an ordinary expense or function of the Government. The care of the agricultural population, of property and civil rights, are not placed under our protection or under our authority. We grossly abuse the authority of the Government when we impose Customs taxes to encourage people to engage in unprofitable manufactures. We have misdirected an immense amount of capital in this country; we have misdirected capital in the manufacture of cotton, until if all the cotton mills were run to-day they would produce twice the amount of cotton for which we could find a market in the country. That is one of the effects you produced. Then, also, you have combines for the purpose of keeping up the prices and for closing certain establishments, and dividing the profit of those who labour with those who do nothing. They share alike, and that is done in order to counteract the effect of the mischievous policy that has been indulged in by this Government during the past thirteen years. Now you propose to extend that system; you propose to reach a certain class of the agricultural population. Certain persons have a craze for the production of the sugar beet in this country, assuming that it is going to be a profitable branch of agriculture, and if it is, farmers will turn their attention in that direction. If you can show them that the production of an article is especially profitable they will engage in the production of that article. But you have to do a number of other things in connection with the manufacture of beet-root sugar. On the continent of Europe a portion of the refuse beets is used for the feeding of stock, but another and a large portion is used for the purpose of distillation, being converted into methylated spirits—a policy which you have agreed by a resolution of this House to appoint a commission to put an end to if possible; and you propose to introduce a branch of agriculture into this country by granting special favours to it that are conferred upon no other branch of agriculture—a branch of agriculture which, in order to be profitable, must be accompanied by the conversion into distilled spirits of a large portion of the product that cannot be converted into sugar. For this where are you

going to obtain a market? You propose to promote temperance and prohibition; you propose to discourage the consumption of distilled spirits; and still you propose to encourage the population to engage in a kind of agriculture which is necessarily associated with it, and which must be associated with it, if it is to be made at all profitable. Sir, I speak for myself: I say I am opposed to this principle of granting bounties. I am anxious that every class of our population should engage in whatever they can make profitable, and that they should engage in that without taxing any other portion of the community to maintain them—that they should engage in it without the special encouragement or discouragement of the Government. Let the Parliament of this country keep its hands off the industrial occupations of the people, and let every man assume the responsibility of engaging in that business which he himself believes to be most beneficial to his own interests, whether it be stock-raising, or the production of grain, or fruit or beet-roots, or anything else he chooses; let him be free to engage in it upon his own responsibility. I am opposed to the imposition of a tax of one dollar for any other purpose than the purpose of revenue. We have introduced another system. We have encouraged people to engage in profitless enterprises; we have stimulated the misdirection of capital; but let us cease. Let us put an end to that policy; let us travel that road no further. I do not say that we ought to wipe out instantly all the incidental protection which has been given to certain enterprises which have already been established; but I say that the sooner it can be withdrawn, with a due regard to these interests, the better it will be for all classes of our people. You have not diversified industry to the extent of a single new occupation by what you have done; people have followed in the same grooves that they were in before; but you have taken from certain industries of the country millions of dollars and turned them in other directions in which no market can be found, and the result is that you have a fitful pursuit of those industries; you have thousands of people left at times without employment and sustained at the expense of the rest of the population; you have industries called into existence to a large extent that would have otherwise existed to a very small extent, and you have denuded the rural districts of their population, to remove them into towns where they are less profitably employed, either for themselves or the country at large. You diminish enormously the value of real estate by the policy which you have pursued, and if you continue that policy you will bring still greater calamities upon the people.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to follow my hon. friend in his rather wide range upon this simple and single resolution. The hon. gentleman has taken an opportunity of again declaring his undying opposition to everything protective, and announced his resolution—in which I suppose he has fortified his party—of destroying as soon as possible every vestige of duty which is at all protective in this country, and bringing himself and the country down to a simple tariff for revenue purposes. Well, if the hon. gentleman wishes to accentuate that position again, and make his declaration of faith here for the hundreth time, I am not going to quarrel with him. The quarrel will be between the people and my hon. friend, and not between my hon. friend and myself. He has also taken occasion to deprecate the introduction of a system of bounty for this particular industry. Now, I am going to confine myself entirely to this particular resolution, and to saying simply and frankly what has induced the Government to extend this resolution in the way it has. It is to be borne in mind, in the first place, that the resolution as I introduced it at first, made provision for the payment of a bounty for sugar produced from the beet for one year only, to an amount exactly equivalent to the protection it would have had if the duty on raw sugar brought into this country had not been removed. It will be within the memory of the House that at that time I stated that neither myself nor the Government bound ourselves to the bounty system for the encouragement of the cultivation of the beet-root in this country. Since that time, however, a good many views have been brought to the attention of the Government, and have been urged with more or less force; and it is in consequence of those views, largely from the Province of Quebec, but from sections of Ontario as well, that the Government has been induced to enlarge the resolution to the extent of one year, so that a bounty, exactly equivalent to the protection that would have been had if the duty on raw sugars had been maintained, shall be given to sugars produced from the beet for two years instead of one. The reasons which have led the Government to this action are these: For ten or twelve years in the Province of Quebec experiments have been made, not only in the cultivation of the beet, but as well in the production of sugar from the beet. It is claimed that, as in the case of all new industries—and more so for certain reasons in this than in most other industries—these different experiments have not been attended with success; nor have they, at least up to within a short time ago, been conducted upon a sufficiently satisfactory footing to be relied upon as a test. We simply recommended enough at the time I introduced my resolution to keep from loss to the extent of the bounty, on the operations which had been undertaken on the faith of the tariff law as it stood for the present year. It has been represented, however, that the fact that we only extended it for a single year, actually prevented the possibility of the farmers receiving a due equivalent for this year, because they say that, unless there is a hope held out to them, for a succeeding year's planting they would not take sufficient interest in cultivating beets for this year; and that, consequently, those who were working the factory or factories would not be in so good a position, to prove their capabilities, and would have been, probably, under the necessity of giving up the whole venture for this present year. It has also been represented that it is possible to make the cultivation of the beet, and the producton of sugar from it, successful in this country; that under a new method and under different management they have brought the experiment where they believe they can prove it to have a successful outcome, and that, if the opportunity is afforded in this and a succeeding year, that at least can be proved, under what they say to be a good and fair condition for the test. It is asserted and I believe the assertion is true, that it is possible to raise a sample beet in this country, in Ontario and Que-

bec, having just as strong a proportion of saccharine, and being just as good a beet as can be raised in any one of the states of the United States, with possibly the exception of California, and to raise a beet of a quality, both in strength and other ingredients, equal to what is raised in Europe, where the beet-root industry is carried on to a very large extent. If by the operations of this year and next it can be satisfactorily proved that the beet-root sugar can be economically made from the beet of this country, that information ought to be had, and Parliament should have a chance of digesting that before pronouncing ultimately and irrevocably upon the system of bounty for beet-root sugar; and it is with this purpose in view that conditions should be kept as favourable as they assert they are at present in the work and operations of the factories at work in the Province of Quebec, by assuring to the farmer the fact that he will have another year's crop and that the seed can be distributed, as it has to be, early in the fall of this year, in order that he should have planting and work next year. It is with the view of preserving these conditions and to have a successful experiment, as conducted upon these two conditions, represented to Parliament, so that it can be seized of the facts, experimentally in this country as well as experimentally and theoretically in the other countries of the world. We propose in the meantime, in view of the strong representations that have been made, to have a thorough enquiry into the cultivation of the beet and the prospects for its economical culture, and the making of beet-root sugar from it in this country, and to have this investigation conducted by Professor Saunders, of the Experimental Farm, a thoroughly competent man, and to have the result of his researches put before Parliament at its next session, so that Parliament, next session, may be seized of all the facts in the case, not only in other countries, but in Canada, and then make up its mind as to what it will do. In the meantime, we propose to continue this system for two years in order to keep the industry in practical operation as it is to-day, and also give a chance of proving, if possible, that we can economically manufacture the sugar from the beet as raised in the Province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. How long have they been making sugar from beets in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. Experiments have been carried on more or less fitfully, probably, ten or twelve years in the Province of Quebec, so far as I am informed.

Mr. MULOCK. If I understood the hon. Minister of Finance rightly, representations had been made in Ontario especially in favour of this legislation. Would the hon. Minister state from whom those representations came?

Mr. FOSTER. I have most of the correspondence, I think, in my office. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that the Guelph experimental farm has been conducting experiments for a couple of years in beet culture, has been disseminating seed and collecting samples and analyzing them, and has issued a pamphlet embodying the results, which results are very satisfactory, so far as the quality of the beet and the percentage of saccharine matter obtained are concerned. He is also, no doubt, aware, that a company has been formed with a large capital for the purpose of starting factories and carrying on the beet-root sugar industry in Ontario. It is in connection with this that the correspondence has taken place from the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. Then we are to understand that the Ontario representations came from the proposed company?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I should be glad if an industry such as this could acquire a good foothold in Canada, but having myself enquired into the experiments made, I came to the conclusion that whilst in Europe, where the beet is cultivated largely by means of child labour and cheap labour, it might be possible to produce the beet-root economically, I doubt if in Canada it can be so produced. I think the manufactory in question, to which the hon. Minister of Finance alluded, published a statement to the farming community, and in that statement asserted that the farmers need not expect a higher price than $5 a ton for the beet, and described the kind of beet that alone was suitable. If that statement was correct, it appears to me you are endeavouring to divert the labour of the farmer into an unprofitable channel. The experiment may have that result. Certainly there is no money in the ordinary farmer raising beets, such as are required for the manufacturing of sugar at $5 a ton. The beet in question is a small plant, not attaining greater weight than from one to two pounds, and I am told that it cannot be grown at that price. The experiments in the Province of Quebec have proved, financially, disastrous to all concerned. The company in question, which is now transferring its operations to Ontario failed in the Province of Quebec, or rather the predecessor of the present company, whose plant I believe the present company has acquired. That company had its headquarters in the County of Berthier, and it is the one I referred to which published the pamphlet.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills); he belongs to that class of political economists who say: "Perish the country rather than a principle." The principle must remain. It is well known that school of political economy is fast disappearing even in England, and I am sorry to say that the depression which is prevailing in the manufacturing districts of England will be a very important ingredient in causing that school to disappear more quickly than it would by ordinary process. I know that my hon. friend is logical. It is a good thing to be logical sometimes, but it is a great fault to be too logical. It is said of our French theorists that they are too logical, and that if they would follow the example of their brothers on the other side of the Channel, and adopt their constitution, which is not always logical but very practical, they would fare better. I think this question is one which must be taken only with a practical view. The hon. member who has just spoken said that his experience in this country has proved that the beet which should be cultivated for the manufacture of sugar cannot be cultivated with profit.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I made no such statement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend said that if the beet was to be sold at $5 a ton, that would not pay the farmer. I may tell my hon. friend that it would be only necessary to sell it at $4.50 per ton to make it a first-class agricultural pursuit.

Mr. DEVLIN. It was the Minister of Finance who said that, during his mission to the West Indies.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am speaking to my hon. friend who preceded me. The Government of Quebec, who are political friends of our hon. friends on the other side, have, as I think very wisely, given a bonus of 50 cents a ton to the farmers for the encouragement of the growth of beet for the production of beet-root sugar. With that bonus, and the price of $4.50 per ton, I am in a position to assert, and the facts are there to show, that it would be one of the best paying articles to be cultivated in this country.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is not the hon. gentleman informed that at West Farnham $4.50 a ton was paid to the farmers for one or two years, and that they gave up the cultivation of the beet in disgust, and said it would not pay at all?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not at all informed of that, and I find that the manager of the Farnham manufactory says he is informed that farmers who would cultivate the beet and get $4.50 per ton would find it very profitable, and that he is sure to get all the beet he requires.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the yield per acre?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot say exactly, but I think it is between 12 and 15 tons per acre. The question has been raised, can this beet be cultivated profitably and in such a way as to give profitable results in our country? My hon. friend says that it may be cultivated in Europe, where the work of children and women can be utilized. I do not see why it cannot be done here. I know the price in our country is a little higher than the price of that kind of labour can be secured for in Europe, but the experiment has been tried and promises to be a success. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) said that the experiment has been left by the farmers of Quebec in disgust and that they are trying a new field of operation in Ontario. My hon. friend only states half the facts. The beet sugar manufactory of Berthier has not succeeded, probably more because of mismanagement than of any difficulty in the way of the cultivation of the beet, though I admit the difficulty is great and that the farmer must be taught the cultivation of that article. But, though the Berthier beet-root sugar manufactory has not been successful, hopes of success are still entertained, and I am in a position to state that the reverse is true in regard to the Missisquoi (Farnham) beet-root sugar manufactory, and I have letters on that subject from those who have been advancing money on it; these are men, who understand what they are doing, capitalists of Europe already engaged in that industry, who say that it is in a fair way to success. The difficulties attending the cultivation were great. Those who were attending to the industry at Farnham knew that, and though last year there was a deficit in the financial operations of the season, still they are satisfied that, speaking of the point of view of the industrial possibility of the enterprise it was a success.

Why should not we have the same advantage in this respect as other countries have had? Where is the man who is acquainted with political economy and who has any acquaintance with the "Wealth of Nations" who would not say that France has succeeded in this matter mainly because of her giving this protection, which began during the first empire? Forty millions of francs were first given as a bonus for the first four manufactories of beet-root sugar in France. That gave an immense impetus to the manufacture in France, and to-day the revenue derived from that industry is one of the largest sources of revenue which the Government of France possesses. Who will say that Germany has not accomplished a great feat, after twelve or fifteen years of experimental sacrifice, in creating the beet-root sugar manufacture? Who will say that Russia has not succeeded in also increasing a great deal the wealth and the agricultural industry of its population by the encouragement of the beet-root cultivation and the creation of the beet-root manufacture? But my hon. friends opposite, who are clamouring that we should imitate our neighbours to the south and should do what the Americans are doing, who contend that they are a wise people in political economy and that we understand nothing about it if we do not go after American rules, should be asked what have our American cousins done in reference to beet-root sugar? They have done exactly the same thing which is proposed here with reference to the encouragement of the cultivation of beet-root and of the manufacture of beet-root sugar and of the manufacture of sugar generally. While last year they adopted a tariff which those hon. gentlemen opposite said we were forced to imitate, when they abolished the duty on raw sugar they gave a bounty of about 2 cents a pound on beet-root sugar manufactured in the United States. As my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has said, this Government does not wish to go further, at all events for the present, than to give a two years' bounty in favour of that new industry. The member for Bothwell asks why, if we give a bounty on beet-root sugar, we should not give a bounty upon barley, or upon cabbage, or upon wheat, or any grain or vegetable? I say we do protect them, because we impose duties on those articles when they come from a foreign country——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you do not give them bounties.

Mr. CHAPLEAU—but do not admit free of duty the products of similar articles. If the farmers of this country seriously engage in the production of beet-root, and thereby ameliorate their condition, who will say this is not a wise thing for the Government to do? My hon. friends opposite, who were always the high-speaking and loud apostles of the agriculturists, should not deny that this is one measure which is asked for by the agriculturists of this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend from Bothwell says "no."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is asked by the manufacturers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It may not be asked by those who have not tried it, but it is asked by those who

have tried it. The experiment which has been tried in the Province of Quebec is not discouraging—far from it. In France the difficulties in that industry lasted more than 20 years; in Germany they lasted more than 12 years; in Russia they lasted 10 years. But after the results were obtained they were found to be beneficial to the country. The Minister of Finance has stated that the Government did not at first want to do more than to give encouragement during one year, but we have extended the time to two years, because the operations of those engaged in that industry require at least two years' protection, and we are giving it. If the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should make a motion to blame the Government for this policy I think he would see the ranks of his followers somewhat thinned off. When he spoke I was sorry not to see the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) in his seat to answer his arguments, because the hon. member for Berthier has studied this question and knows something about it. We went into this matter as an experiment, and I would like very well to see that culture prove a success, as it can be proved to be a success, and very useful to the agricultural class of this country. Then, even if the Government were obliged to make the sacrifice in favour of that industry, I would carry protection that far.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he can reconcile all that he has just said with the statement alleged to have been made by the Minister of Finance to the planters in the West Indies, that the cultivation of the beet-root never had been made a success in Canada.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Minister of Finance said there had been an experiment, that experiment had been a hard one, and, so far, it has not been very successful. Out of three manufactories established in the Province of Quebec, I know of one that, so far, has shown progress in that direction. The manufactory at Coaticook has failed; the manufactory at Berthier has failed, but more from mismanagement than from causes inherent in the culture. The manufactory at Farnham is now in a fair way of success, and if the farmers continue to encourage it, as it is now being encouraged, I think it will prove a success and be followed elsewhere.

Mr. DEVLIN. That does not answer the whole question. The Minister of Finance said positively, if I am not mistaken, that it "never"—that was the word used—never could be a success.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman wants to know he had better ask the Finance Minister.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood the Minister of Finance to say a few minutes ago that he had obtained some information recently on this subject of which he was not in possession some time ago. Probably the information that he has recently obtained has enabled him to arrive at a more accurate conclusion than he had arrived at before. I hold in my hand the report of the experimental farm for 1890, and I find that according to Professor Saunders the yield of beet-roots has varied from 15 tons 400 pounds, to 35 tons 950 pounds per acre. I think if our farmers could raise the sugar beet to the extent of 35 tons per acre, and get $4.50 or $5 for it, it would be a very profitable crop for them. Every one who knows anything about farming knows that there is probably nothing which a farmer, who has not tried it before, is more likely to fail in, than an attempt to raise roots. Roots are a crop which, until recent years, have been very little cultivated in Canada; it is only within the last 10 or 15 years that they have been cultivated to any considerable extent. Every one who has had any practical experience in farming knows that the farmer has to learn how to grow roots before he can grow them successfully. The cultivation of roots is something very different from the cultivation of wheat or pease, or any crop of that kind that the farmers are in the habit of growing when they first break up their land. I believe when they first clear up land, and when the land is broken for the first time, roots are very often grown broadcast upon it. But that, of course, is not at all the system of cultivation that has to be adopted later on. It is no argument whatever against the cultivation of the sugar beet in Canada to say that farmers have failed in growing it; some farmers will fail in growing a certain crop, and other farmers will succeed. The question is, not whether farmers have failed, but whether their experiments have proved that it can or cannot be grown with success, and we understand now that farmers have proved that it can be grown with success. By this report I have in my hand it is proved that the climate and soil of Canada are so well suited for the growth of the sugar beet that some varieties can actually be grown to the extent of over 35 tons per acre. Now, I do think, under these circumstances, that it would be a most unfortunate thing if we took the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite, who, I am sorry to say, are too apt to take a gloomy view of our industries in Canada, and to say that it is of no use to undertake this industry or that industry, because we cannot succeed. I say it would be a most unfortunate thing if we took the views of those hon. gentlemen in reference to this matter. We have the experience of country after country on the continent of Europe who have tried this industry and have found it to be a success, who have grown sugar beets profitably. Not only can we, in all probability, introduce a new industry into this country by giving it a little assistance, but we will be improving the character of our farming. Nothing would more elevate agriculture in this country than the teaching of our farmers the value of root crops. We will not only be able to establish a new manufacturing industry, but we will be benefiting the farmer by inducing him to go in for that kind of agriculture which is, in all probability, the one to which he most requires to have his attention directed. As for the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I am sorry to find that facts, no matter how powerful they may be, no matter how apparent they may be, no matter how striking they may be, do not seem to produce any effect upon my hon. friend's mind. I have found that frequently to be the case with regard to my hon. friend. In respect to the question of free trade, he used to have one little colony to which he always pointed as an example where the free trade idea was fully carried out, and that was New South Wales. What has he got to say now about New South Wales? That colony has found out the fallacy of free trade and other great countries of the world have found it out, and England, as we have just

been informed, is fast following suit. I do not think the people of this country will follow my hon. friend's advice and go in for the old worn-out, decrepit theory of free trade.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) if those figures he gave respecting the production of beet roots referred to the ordinary feeding beets.

Mr. McNEILL. They are figures of the sugar beet, varying from 13 tons 400 pounds to 35 tons 950 pounds per acre. Of course, these are grown on the experimental farm, and my hon. friend knows that we could not expect to get the same results from the same breadth of fields throughout the country generally. But strike an average between the lowest figure and the highest figure, and you will see what an enormously valuable crop this would be, and how very profitable it is likely to be to the farmers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The production on the experimental farm is no criterion for the country to go on. It is well known that that farm has all the resources of the country and the public purse at its back ; so we can form no judgment of the production there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It cost 10 cents each to raise them there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There is another fact that the hon. gentleman overlooks. It is found that in the production of beets for sugar-making a certain size is necessary, each beet being from one to two pounds in weight. Any over that are deficient in saccharine matter. So the quantity is limited to a certain weight, and that is not a great one per acre. If I understood the Secretary of State correctly, he said there was evidence that satisfied him that the industry is a success in this country. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You are right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad I am correct. The Minister of Finance said the experiment has been going on for ten years, and the Secretary of State says it is a success. In the name of common sence, why rob the other farmers of the country to bonus beet-root growers? That is the question this House has to consider, because every dollar given to those growers is taken out of the pockets of farmers conducting other branches of industry. Why should one industry, which has been established long enough to ascertain whether it is a success or not, and which we are told is a success, be bonussed? We are told that the object is only to bonus it for one or two years, and that it is not intended to be permanent. We all know in regard to these protected industries how the thing works. We are asked to bonus them for a year or two, after which they will be able to stand alone. Is there any man in this House who knows a bonussed industry that has been able to stand alone? No one can name such industry. The Secretary of State prefaced his remarks by referring to what he termed the worn-out policy in Britain, and he accused the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) of belonging to the old effete school of political economy that is rapidly losing its prestige, and in fact is going to the wall. Well, if it is, we have had no evidence of it yet. Will the hon. gentleman tell us any free trade country that has ever abandoned it. The hon. gentleman has pointed to some little depression in Britain as evidence that they have been mistaken in regard to free trade. There is some depression in the export trade of Great Britain during the present year. These fluctuations will occur in every country, either protective or free trade, and you have to make calculations for them. But, do you suppose for a moment that Britain is going back on her old free trade policy and about to adopt protection? There is not one man here who will ever see the day when Britain will go back on free trade. Why should she do so? She tried protection long enough, she carried protection to the most extreme length to which it could be carried ; and where did it bring her? It brought her people to starvation, her manufactures to ruin, her shipping was swept from the seas, it kept her down as one of the poor nations of the world. After less than half a century of free trade, what do we find as a result of that policy? She has control of the markets of the world, of the carrying trade of the world, of the shipping trade of the world, and, more than all, she holds the purse of the world. Why, every nation that wants to borrow goes there for the money. That is what free trade has done for England, and anyone who would rise in his place in this year of grace 1891 and tell the intelligent members of this House that Great Britain is going to abandon this policy must take the members for a set of fools.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. She will do it, though.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not in your day or in mine.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They all do it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has Britain done it? In France, Germany, and wherever the beet-root sugar has been tried, the industry has had to be bonussed, because it cannot compete with cane sugar and other sugar products. In Britain when the question came up for consideration some poor shaky souls, who are always timid about the results of free trade, were afraid they were going to be ruined by the production of bonussed beet-root sugar on the continent, and its admission free into Britain. The British Government laughed at them. And what is the result to-day? The British refiners turn their industry into other channels, and the British Government refused to impose any tariff on beet-root sugar, but the people of Britain by their free trade policy got the benefit of that industry. In other words, the people of other continental nations are taxed to give the people of Britain cheap sugar ; the people of Great Britain get the benefit of it, whereas British refiners turn their industry into other channels. So far as regards the beet-root sugar in this country, I join the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in protesting against robbing one class of farmers to bonus another class, because the whole system of protection is to take from one industry and give to another. We have had enough of it, and its results have been found to be disastrous. Those members who had the honour to sit here in 1887 will remember with what a flourish of trumpets the present High Commissioner, who was then Minister of Finance, brought down his scheme for bonusing the production of pig iron. He pointed out that this country was not so prosperous as it should be, and it was simply due to the lack of a higher tariff on iron.

He said what the country wanted was a scientific tariff on iron and he increased the tariff enormously; and we are paying a bonus on the production of pig iron just as it is now proposed to bonus the production for beet-root sugar. The High Commissioner drew a glowing picture of the great results that were to be achieved as soon as this system was put into operation, as soon as we had a scientific tariff on iron, and he declared that the instant we paid this bonus blast furnaces would flourish and be established at Kingston and other places. These statements will be found in the hon. gentleman's Budget speech of 1887, and the members were fools enough to believe him. What is the result? The result is, that we have increased the tax on every man who uses a single pound of iron. The result is, so far as manufactories are concerned, that we have increased the price of the raw material, for there is not a single manufacture carried on in the country into which iron does not enter to a great extent as a raw material. We have made it impossible for our manufacturers to compete in the markets of the world, because when you raise the price of the manufactured products you cut off the manufacturers from competing with less highly-taxed nations in the markets of the world. So we have injured our manufacturers, and we have been injuring producers all over the country in order to stimulate the production of iron in this country. He predicted that within three years, if my memory serves me rightly, there would be twenty thousand additional people engaged in this work, and that those connected with them would amount to 100,000 people, to be added to the population of the country. What has been the sole and total result of that? Why, Sir, in 1888, the very next year, the product was 21,799 tons of pig iron in all Canada. Not one of these blast furnaces which he had predicted had been opened, and not a single pound of pig iron had been produced as a result of this policy. Three years after the imposition of bounties and high tariff in order to stimulate the production of pig iron, would you believe that the quantity had fallen off by 27 tons in a year? That is the result as far as iron is concerned; and you will find that this will be the result in every line in which we adopt this system. It is wrong in principle, and it is found hurtful and disastrous in practice. There is only one correct way, and that is to do the thing honestly, and not to rob one man for the benefit of another. We should give all our people a fair chance in this country of ours, and let them produce the articles that are indigenous to the country. We do not want any industry in this country which has to be bolstered up by robbing the other people of the country in order to sustain it.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. Secretary of State pointing us to the example of France and Germany and Russia.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And to the United States.

Mr. GILLMOR. He asks us: Who will say that they have not succeeded? Who will say that Great Britain is not the queen of nations? Who will say that Great Britain is not ahead of any other nation on the earth? Will the hon. gentleman and the Government of this colony say so, and will they not say also that her free trade principles have produced that greatness? The arguments of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) cannot be met, and the arguments urged by hon. gentlemen opposite are fallacious. Why should any farmer, producing what he chooses, be taxed to aid some other farmer who wants to grow beets to make sugar. My hon. friend the Secretary of State says: The Government ought to give this encouragement to the beet industry. The Government, forsooth! What have they to do with it, except the power by a majority to take from one man and give to another? They do not give anything out of their own income to help the agricultural classes. They do not give anything out of their salaries for this purpose, but they put a law upon the Statute-book that taxes one class of farmers for the benefit of another, and to enable them to carry on an industry which they have been trying to make a success of for twelve years and which has proven a failure. Now, with regard to these farming operations. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) talks about the farmers as if they were infants in the business, and as if they had to be taught to grow beets and everything else. The farmers of Canada have been farming for one hundred years, but how long is it since the Secretary of State and the Minister of Finance have become protectionists? How long is it since the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches became protectionists?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Since 1867 for me.

Mr. GILLMOR. Then, why did you not discover protection long before that? You lead the Government in Quebec for some years before that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not before 1867.

Mr. GILLMOR. Well, you were in politics; you were enlightened at that time; I think, perhaps, you knew pretty nearly as much as you do now, and yet you never discovered protection until the exigencies arose. Now, you come here and you talk about Great Britain going back to protection. What reason have you for saying that?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Because they say so.

Mr. GILLMOR. Who says so?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The English people.

Mr. GILLMOR. What English people?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Their papers say so.

Mr. GILLMOR. Neither political party in England say so; no leading man of position intimates that England will ever go back to the degradation which protection produced in that country; and it was not an intelligent and honest conviction that adopted protection in Canada. It was an effort to hold the majority in Parliament that made you protectionists, and now you want to bolster up the system by bounties, and you try to tell the farmers what they should produce. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and the Secretary of State said that the farmers were to be taught by the experimental farms, but I can tell these hon. gentlemen that if they want to find intelligence in agriculture they have to go to three-fourths of the people of Canada to find it. If they want to find intelligence in matters of trade or science, or anything else, they will find it upon the farms, and it is not in the professions, or in this Parliament, that they will find the intelligence of Canada. The reason the farmers of Canada submitted to protection is because they did not

unite amongst themselves, and because they had not the ear of the Government. If the Minister of Finance had suggested that by this change in the tariff we were going to do an injustice to this industry I would have said nothing about it; but, if it is understood that we are going to work up an industry to produce beets in this country, by bounties, and by protection, I am opposed to it. This idea which has been announced from the other side of the House, that we are going to do everything in this country, and live within ourselves, is the most miserable and retrograde idea that we can possibly imagine. There are no independent nations in the world any more than there are independent men. Show me a man that is not dependent on somebody from the cradle to the grave, or show me an independent nation on the face of the earth. We are all dependent, one upon the other, and the idea of Canada undertaking to produce what all the climates of the world have to send us is simply absurd. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have spoken here about England going back to protection. Why, Sir, I would as soon expect to see England going back to African slavery or going back to the dark ages when there was no liberty of thought or no personal freedom, as to see her going back to protection. England leads the van of the nations of the world because of her free trade principles, and there never was a greater stride made than when she cast off the tattered garments of protection which had brought her well nigh to ruin, and under which her spindles were idle, and thousands and tens of thousands of her ships lay with their sails flapping to the mast. There is not the slightest prospect of England, the greatest nation on the earth under free trade, going back to protection. There are, of course, always a few dissatisfied persons, but their influence is very small and their talk does not count for much. What has protection done for Canada that you should be so proud of it? You touch it very gingerly lately. It has been a failure in Canada, has the National Policy; there is no mistake about it. Where is the prosperity that has grown out of protection? Is it in the manufacturing industries? Where is it? Point to it? Point to the advantages that have come to Canada as a whole from this system? It is a vicious system; it is a system productive of all sorts of political immorality, vice and degradation. It is this system which produces the political evils, immoralities and vices which we see everywhere in this country. These things grow out of that selfish principle which takes from one man and gives to another by law. This principle of protection is contrary to the spirit and genius of free institutions. These protective laws which you have on the Statute-book to-day will look as ridiculous and absurd fifty years hence as the Blue Laws of Connecticut look to-day to those who read them. Look at them! I have a volume in my desk describing them. A man was not allowed to kiss his wife on Sunday; he was not allowed to eat meats or fruits on Sunday; he was not allowed to do this thing and that thing. It does not follow that because a law is on the Statute-book it is right. In my opinion, the whole of these protective laws are wrong, and it only wants a little more honesty and enlightenment on the part of the people of Canada to sweep all these absurd laws from our Statute-book.

I have faith in the great heart and mind, in the honesty and intelligence of Canada. I am a Canadian; I have lived a pretty long life in Canada; I have never been six months out of the country, and I love my native land; but I do not love the system of protection, with all its train of evils and immoralities. The evidence of the folly and wrong of the system is that as soon as you put it on the Statute-book you have to appoint on the same day an army of officials to watch and guard the very laws which the majority ask to be enacted. Nobody wants a protective tariff for himself; everybody wants it for everybody else. Everybody wants to buy where he can buy the cheapest and sell where he can sell the dearest. Everybody wants free trade for himself. So that when you pass these laws and put them on the Statute-book, that does not make them right. There are plenty of laws on the Statute-book which ought not to be there; there are too many laws there taxing one class of industries for the sake of another class. A tariff on trade at all is wrong. Freeedom of trade is the cause of England's prosperity. England was bound and shackled under the worst system of protection that the world ever saw; and under that system she lost the United States, the finest country, take it all in all, that God ever made. England undertook to cripple and injure her colonies while under that system, and she lost them in consequence. I hope the time is not far distant when nations will feel a brotherly interest in each other, because we are all dependent on each other. We talk about independence. What would become of your cotton industries if they could not get the raw cotton from the United States? What would become of your other industries if they could not get raw material from other countries? Learn to do what you can do best, and do that; and with a feeling of the universal brotherhood of mankind, buy those things from other nations which they can produce best. I am astonished that Englishmen should harbour this narrow, pent-up feeling with regard to other nations; I am speaking of your treaty with the United States. It is a great nation; there is no doubt about it. We have been in the race of nationality as long as they, and where are we now? One state has more people and more money than the whole of Canada put together. Let us get rid of this narrow feeling. If I were Prime Minister—of course, I never shall be—I would not go to the United States twice to make a treaty with them. I might go once, because I think it better for nations to throw down these walls of separation, and trade freely; it is better for all. I would throw down the wall on this side of the line, and then Canada would range ahead, as the mother country ranged ahead after she got rid of her tariff walls. Do that, and people will come here and develop your resources, which are to-day lying comparatively undeveloped. No protected country has ever developed its resources by protection. If the United States has devoloped its resources it is because it has forty-four nations lying side by side, with an international trade so enormous that you cannot compute it. That country has been able, with all the advantages which God has given her, to fight against protection without being ruined. But you will never see Great Britain go back to protection. The subject before us to-day is a mat-

ter of very small importance; but how can you justify it morally, to make one man, who is struggling to get a living by a certain kind of farming, take part of his product and give it to another who is trying to make a living by another system? When men can make money by growing beets, let them do it; when they can make money by engaging in the manufacture of sugar from beets, let them do it; and when they cannot, let them try something else. The Canadian people know that protection has not helped them up to this time. It may do so in the future, but I do not believe it ever can or ever will.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) complains that I am very conservative, that I entertain now on the subject of trade exactly the same views that I held when I first came into Parliament. Well, Sir, that is because I believe the views I entertained when I came into Parliament were correct. I entertain now exactly the same views with regard to the various propositions in geometry that I did when I came into Parliament, and it is because they are capable of absolute demonstration. I think the propositions with regard to free trade are equally capable of demonstration. But the hon. gentleman forgets that he has made no progress; that he entertains exactly the same views that he did when he first came into Parliament; that he stands now, as he stood then, on the ground of extreme protection. The hon. gentleman has represented to us the immense quantity of beets which may be grown to the acre—thirty-five tons to the acre, he says. Does the hon. gentleman know that if we can grow thirty-five tons to the acre it will require less than 35,000 acres to grow the beets necessary to produce all the sugar that is consumed in this country, and that 3,500 hands employed in the culture of those beets would produce all the beets from which 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar may be made? Now, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to show how very productive a beet crop may be. He has also shown how very small a fraction of the population of this country can be so employed. But, Sir, to take a more rational statement, taking the average of the continent of Europe, which, I think, is about ten tons to the acre, so that 100,000 acres would grow all the beets and that 10,000 persons would produce all the beets necessary for the production of 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar, and so the hon. gentleman will see that, even according to his own view, this would not very largely stimulate the agricultural industry of the country. In fact, it is but a very small fraction, and, even if prosperous, would produce scarcely a perceptible result in the actual condition of the agricultural population. But the Secretary of State has told us that the free trade school is an effete school of political economists. He says that the English statesmen and economists are all wrong; that they have not properly studied this question; that the views they entertain are fallacious, and that the probability is that the night in which they have lived so many years will soon disappear and light will dawn upon them. In fact, he promised us that the public men of England will, in a few years, again become protectionists. When the hon. gentleman talked about the effete school of political economists he forgets that that school is the one to which he belongs. Protectionism is not a thing of to-day. It did not originate with the hon. gentleman and his colleagues on the Treasury benches. It is much older than they. It existed in what is called the mercantile system for centuries in Europe, and led to nearly all the wars that took place from the mediæval period down to the middle of this century. It was not until free trade was well established in England that she herself was secured from almost continuous warfare. But there is one feature with which the hon. gentleman has not dealt, and that is what the manufacturing bodies on the continent of Europe call the economy of waste. What are you to do with the refuse? On the continent of Europe a large quantity that cannot be converted into sugar is used for feeding stock, but a still larger quantity is converted into alcohol. We have the testimony of distinguished alienists on the continent of Europe that, since the introduction of alcohol manufactured from roots—from the potato and sugar beet—there has been an enormous increase of insanity in all those countries. Not long since a celebrated paper was prepared by the president of one of the asylums in the city of Rome, and he showed that the increase in insanity there was largely due to the abandoning of the use of wine for the use of spirits which had been produced from the beet-root and the potato. In fact, the quantity of methylated spirits in the alcohol produced from the root is very great and most deleterious, and is in a larger degree the cause of insanity in those who use it than almost all other causes put together. So that, when the hon. Minister of Finance proposes specially to grant a bounty for the production of beet-root he is also proposing to encourage in this country the production of alcohol from the refuse, and to what will lead, in a large degree, to insanity among the population. The hon. gentleman is not legislating in the direction public interest requires. The hon. gentleman went to the West Indies, and as the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) pointed out, he told the people there that the production of beet sugar could never be made a success in this country. Does he hold to that opinionstill? Or has new light dawned upon him since he has been to the West Indies. If he is of that opinion still, why does he propose to waste public funds and misdirect public energies by encouraging the production of sugar beet? If he does not believe in it, why should he do this? If he does, why does he not frankly tell us what it is that has given him new light and has led him to change the views he expressed on his West India mission?

Mr. McNEILL. In reply to the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), I wish to say a few words. My hon. friend seems to think that it is a great insult to the farmers of Canada to say that they require to learn something. That is rather a remarkable statement, coming from a gentleman of my hon. friend's breadth and liberality of views. I had always fancied that we all had something to learn, and I should have thought my hon. friend would be the last man to say that he had not something to learn as well as others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I made no complaint on that score.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not referring to my hon. friend, but to the hon. member for Charlotte. The fact is, we have all got to learn, and we established

our experimental farms for the purpose of teaching our farmers a great deal they have yet to learn: and I am glad to know they appreciate what we have done. They appreciate the fact that that farm has been established for the purpose of instructing them in matters concerning which they have more to learn. I find, from this book which I hold in my hand, that we, who have been discussing this matter here, have a great deal to learn about it. I heard the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), I think, say that the sugar beet must not exceed two pounds in weight, but I find here from analyses by the analyst of the experimental farm that one beet root, given at no less a weight than six pounds three and a-half ounces, compares very favourably, in the percentage of sugar juice, with beets which are quoted as of not more than one pound. I find also that one of the very largest in yield was a beet of three pounds eleven ounces, so that I do not think really, when one ventures to make the remark that a certain description of article is better for the farmer to produce than another, and that it would be well that his attention should be directed to that article, one can be considered as having said anything very insulting to his intelligence. I think his intelligence is greater than my hon. friend supposes it is, when he thinks the farmer will be insulted by anything of the kind. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has dealt with the subject. I did not quite catch what fell from him; but this I will say, that my hon. friend is apparently persistently blind—judging by what I did catch of his observations—to the fact to which I referred, namely, that all the civilized countries of the world pursue the policy of protection to-day, with the exception of England.

Mr. MULOCK. A pretty good exception.

Mr. McNEILL. I am coming to that in a moment, and my hon. friend need not interrupt. I seldom trouble the House, and on the last occasion when I did trouble it with a few observations he interpolated a number of remarks in the same way. I have said that all the civilized nations of the world, except England, follow the policy of protection. My hon. friend used to quote the colony of New South Wales as an exception, but that colony has adopted protection, so that he can no longer fall back upon it. That, however, makes no difference to him, and any man who cannot see that there is an enormous reaction against the policy of free trade which has for years past been pursued in England, any man who fails to see that there is such reaction in England, is blind to the signs of the times and unable to see the facts. If any hon. gentleman will take up any newspaper of weight in England he must from time to time see the evidence of that on its pages, whether in letters published in its columns or leading articles. He ought to know that many papers of light and leading in England are now advocating a complete change in the fiscal policy of England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Which are they?

Mr. McNEILL. Many of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Name them.

Mr. McNEILL. I have here a paper which is published for the express purpose of advocating that view. Does not the hon. gentleman recognize the fact that a paper is published for that special purpose as a proof of the reaction which has taken place in England?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman say that it would have been possible a few years ago for such papers to be published in England? Does he not know that the fact of a paper of that kind surviving for several years, as it has, is an evidence of reaction in England on that subject? I have a copy of this paper in my hand.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the paper?

Mr. McNEILL. It is a paper called *Fair Trade*. Here is an organ which is published for the express purpose of advocating that policy which the hon. gentleman says does not exist in England at all.

Mr. DEVLIN. What are the others?

Mr. McNEILL. There is the leading paper in the North of Ireland, the Belfast *Newsletter*, which distinctly advocates a reversal of the existing trade policy of England, and there are many others. You will find that the London *Times*, of which I suppose my hon. friend has heard, only a few weeks ago said it might be possible, that it would be wise, to raise a moderate fence around the empire of preferential duties against the rest of the world.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, no.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad that impresses the mind of my hon. friend at last. He sees that has some effect, and, if he will look over the London *Times* of January or December last he will find that in the columns of that paper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have taken the London *Times* for 20 years and have never found it.

Mr. McNEILL. That has evidently produced some effect upon the mind of the hon. gentleman, because he finds it necessary to contradict it. Anyone who knows the effect of this upon the public mind in England, anyone who knows that that journal stands above any paper in England in public estimation, anyone who can see what the gravity of the situation may be to induce the people of Printing House Square to publish such a statement as that, must know what a tremendous reaction has arisen in England against this policy of so-called free trade.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If there is a tremendous reaction against free trade in England it would be shown when elections take place. Can the hon. gentleman point to any elections which have taken place in England within the last three years where the candidate has been returned on this policy?

Mr. McNEILL. I say there has been evidence given in the elections, and it is proved by the fact that 100 members of the House of Commons are now advocating a policy of imperial reciprocity.

Mr. BOWELL. Sheffield.

Mr. McNEILL. We had the representative of Sheffield here the other day, and he was elected clearly upon that question. I need not give the facts, because they are so well known. We can have theory as far as we like, but when we have facts the theory does not seem to apply. I will make one more remark. When we are told by my hon. friend that we must not tax other farmers for

the benefit of those who grow sugar beets, I say that I am not aware of any particular farmer who has a monopoly of growing sugar beets. Does my hon. friend go so far as to say that any farmer should have a monopoly in this respect? As far as I am aware, anyone who chooses can grow sugar beets. That is one of the shallowest arguments I ever heard. Everyone can grow beet-root who pleases, and when my hon. friend talks about the number of acres to be used for this purpose one would imagine that farmers would place the whole of their acres under sugar beets. They will have their crops in rotation, and it will be only a portion of their land on which they will cultivate sugar beets, and that will be a benefit to the whole of the farmers of the country. There may be some who will not have that article under cultivation, but I venture to say that the number will be comparatively small. I see in this book that it is reported that almost every kind of soil is fitted to raising sugar beets—clay, clay loam, sandy soil and other soils, and I do not see why any suggestion of a monopoly should be made. The difficulty is only the creation of the hon. gentleman's own brain, as the German student was said to have declared that he could evolve the idea of a camel out of his wiser consciousness.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman refers to a shallow argument as having been addressed to the House. If I were as frank as the hon. gentleman says he is, I might be just as uncomplimentary as he is. He says that every farmer can grow the sugar beet. Suppose he does, that would amount to less than 500 acres in each county. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a beet-root sugar establishment would be erected in each county for the manufacture of the beets grown on 500 acres, and that it would be profitable for the farmers to travel over these miles of territory in order to bring their beets to the factory? Surely the hon. gentleman cannot mean that, or he cannot have studied the question. The hon. gentleman says that I am not easily convinced; but I think that observation is rather applicable to him than to me. He still holds to the idea that the people of the United Kingdom are in a ferment on account of what he calls fair trade. He refers to the London *Times*. I have read the London *Times* for 20 years, and I find no such doctrine inculcated there. I would ask the hon. gentleman if such a doctrine is inculcated in the *News*, in the *Telegraph*, in the *Standard*, in the London *Spectator*, in the Newcastle *Times*, in the Liverpool *Post*, in the Manchester *Guardian*, in the Manchester *Times*, in any of the great papers which circulate amongst the people of England, and which reflect and form at the same time the opinion of the people. He produces a little paper which has perhaps a larger circulation among a small clique in this country than it has in the United Kingdom, and he says that this is a proof that the people of England are in favour of fair trade, which may very likely, according to him, be adopted. He may be satisfied with that kind of argument, but the people of this country will not be satisfied with it. He refers to what is done on the continent of Europe. In some of the European countries, where the land is divided up into very small holdings and the people are obliged to engage in a certain kind of agriculture, because they cannot enter into the different kinds of agriculture in which the people of England engage, this may be possible: but the hon. gentleman will find that in England, where the agriculturist is free to engage in whatever description of cultivation he finds most profitable, the thing is very different. The hon. gentleman appeals from a free country, from a country with representative institutions and with a population who have been taught to rely on themselves, to a population under a parental government, an arbitrary and an absolute government. That is the notion which the hon. gentleman has in reference to the institutions of the mother country and that is the confidence which he exhibits in the capacity of the people of the United Kingdom. Now, I tell him that I have a higher opinion of British statesmen, a higher opinion of the capacity of Englishmen, than the hon. gentleman exhibits, and the reason is, that I find so few Englishmen entertaining the views which the hon. gentleman has enunciated. If a large number of them were to adopt the views of the hon. gentleman my confidence in their ability and in their capacity would be, perhaps, less than it is. Sir, I tell him that the greatest people to-day, the people who have accomplished most and have shown by their action that they are capable of accomplishing most, are Englishmen; but it is because they entertain views on the subject of trade, and commerce, and agriculture the very reverse of those which the hon. gentleman has enunciated in this House. The hon. gentleman is an Englishman born out of due time, exhibiting sentiments which prevailed five hundred years ago, and not those of to-day. We sometimes find men born in England who are not Englishmen, and the hon. gentleman is a person of that type.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad, at all events, to find that my hon. friend, in the remarks he has just made, has entirely confirmed the statement I made in reference to him a short time ago. He has gone a step further than he did before, and he has told us now that not only is he not to be convinced by the fact that all the other nations of Europe are adopting policies of protection, but he tells us that if a number of English statesmen were to come round in favour of protection he would not change his views, but he would only hold a lower opinion of their intelligence. The hon. gentleman reminds one of the old story of the juryman who said that he never met eleven men so obstinate in his life as the eleven men who had been sitting on the jury with him, and who would not agree with him, and my hon. friend's argument amounts to that. Now, he tells us that because a certain limited area of land would be sufficient to supply the amount of sugar that we probably would require in Canada, therefore we ought not to go into this industry at all. That is precisely the kind of argument that was adduced in France, in Germany, and elsewhere on the continent of Europe, when this industry was introduced; but that argument was found to be fallacious, because it was found that not only was the growing of sugar beets advantageous for their own market, but the manufacturers could sell their surplus elsewhere. The hon. gentleman, in point of fact, is just where he was when he rose a few minutes ago—with this exception, that he states that although he has read the *Times* carefully he has not seen this most notable article in it. Well, I am very much surprised at my hon. friend, if he

has read the *Times* carefully and has not observed one of the most remarkable articles published in that paper for the last 20 years. It is an article that has attracted the attention of the leading papers of this country, and of many of the leading papers in the mother country; yet my hon. friend tells us that although he has been a careful reader of the *Times* for 20 years he has never seen a word or an article to that effect. I am not surprised that my hon. friend should be just as benighted now as he was 13 years ago, when the National Policy was introduced.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think it would be well if we were to get some information upon the question which I brought to the attention of the Committee a few moments ago. Perhaps there was never a more discouraging remark addressed to those engaged in this industry in Canada than the words which were reported to have been addressed by the Minister of Finance to the planters of the West Indies, when he affirmed that the culture of the sugar beet could never be made a success in Canada. No doubt, when he made that statement, he had good and sound information. But to-day he says it can be made a success. The Minister of Finance, in this matter, I think, has taken a position contradictory to that which he formerly held, and it might be well for him to put himself straight.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has made two assertions that he will have to verify. One is that I stated in the House that the culture of beet-roots can be made a success.

Mr. DEVLIN. I beg your pardon. I said that you stated—at least, it was reported that you stated—to the planters of the West Indies, when you were in that country, that the cultivation of the sugar beet could never be made a success in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I did not touch that part of my hon. friend's statement. I was saying that he had made two statements that he would have to verify before he calls upon me to contradict either of them. He stated a few moments ago that I had declared in this House that the sugar beet business in this country could be made a success. I was not so dogmatic as to make an assertion of that kind. Then he asserted that I had stated in the West Indies that the cultivation of the sugar beet never could be made a success in Canada. My hon. friend will have to get better information than that before he asks me to say what I stated in the West Indies.

Mr. DEVLIN. I shall have to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation as meaning that he did not state, when he was in the West Indies, to the planters there, that the cultivation of this root could never be made a success in Canada.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 163) further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 164) to make further provision in respect to the Weighers of Grain.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Mr. McNEILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 138) to amend chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, Act respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Sir John Thompson.)

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

After Recess.

ORDNANCE LANDS—QUEBEC SKATING CLUB.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 160) to authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain ordnance lands in the city of Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the object of the transfer and the compensation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Quebec Skating Club had their building in close proximity to the fortification walls. It was found that, for the security of the walls, the building should be removed. In addition to that, the building was in a most inconvenient position as regards the new legislative buildings. An arrangement was come to with the Provincial and Federal Governments and the Quebec Skating Club by which the building should be removed from its former site, that site not to be built upon, and the club should have a free site of ordnance lands. The Provincial Government contribute to the cost of the building. The assent of the Imperial authorities was obtained for the use of ordnance lands for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and read the third time and passed.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 119) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company. He said: The nature of the amendment is to stipulate that the route for this railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The resolution for granting aid to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company for the line to the Saskatchewan was unlike the resolutions for like subsidies which were approved by the House on former occasions. On two former occasions there was aid given, one subsidy being to the Regina and Long Lake Company and another to the Calgary and Edmonton Company, both being on like terms. The difference between those resolutions and this resolution is, that those resolutions were preceded by an Order in Council fixing the terms under which the aid should be given, and, when we came to Parliament with the resolutions, we had entered into an agreement, subject to the approval of Parliament, expressing all the terms on which the grant was to be given. The principal features of those agreements—I am now referring to the aid given to the Regina and Long Lake and to the Calgary and Edmonton railways—were that the roads should carry the mails, messengers, officers and supplies of the Government, and that the earnings of the companies by carrying the mails on such lines should go to the credit of the company as against the subsidy payments, and the balance of the subsidy be secured on a portion of their lands.

When the resolution in aid of the Hudson's Bay Railway Company was brought down, as I have said, no such agreement was entered into. The Government had not bound itself, and, therefore, the terms were not as explicit and definite. At the same time, it was the intention, as has been explained to the House, that if Parliament should approve of the measure an agreement of like character would be entered into with regard to this company, and one of the terms which I had omitted to mention before, and which, it almost goes without saying, would be inserted in an agreement of that kind, is, that the route shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The Senate has thought proper to add that as an amendment to the Bill, and as far as the Government is concerned there can be no objection to adopt the clause, because it was one of the stipulations of the agreement, as actually drawn up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It gives the Government certain control, but it does not give Parliament any control over it whatever.

Amendments concurred in.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PUBLIC PROPERTY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 111) authorizing the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments. He said: I want to call the attention of the House to this Bill this evening and carry it to its second reading, if it should please the House to adopt it; but I do not propose to-night to ask the House to complete the passage of the Bill. I explained to the House the object of this measure when I introduced it last session. The ownership of the foreshores of Canada is in a state of uncertainty. The decision arrived at several years ago with regard to the foreshores, and underlying soil of public harbours, declares that that property is vested in the Dominion of Canada. Outside of the limits of public harbours we have no authoritative decision as to where the right of property lies, and that remark applies to the sea coasts of Canada as well as to the lake shores of the country. I need hardly explain to the House, I suppose, that even a decision declaring the ownership of the soil under the public harbours, and the foreshores of the public harbours, to be in the Dominion of Canada, by no means is a definitive decision as regards the boundaries of our property, supposing the right of ownership to end there; because it would be most difficult to ascertain what the actual geographical limits of our public harbours are. That is not only true of the sea coast, but it is more so of the lake shores, where more indefinite indentations are oftentimes called harbours, as, for instance, Toronto harbour, and other harbours like it. Now, we have very important interests involved in this domain—very important, I mean, as regards the people of the country—unimportant as regards the proceeds of its administration. It becomes very important for the people of this country to know in what Government the right of property exists. Persons desiring to acquire portions of the foreshore for the purpose of improvements and facilities for navigation, such as wharves, stores, warehouses, and other structures, are continually making applications for permission to make these improvements. I would remind the House, at the outset, that the passing of a title to property of this description by deed, or license, or lease, to individuals, does not by any means convey to them the right to erect structures upon the foreshore or upon the bottom of the river or harbour. The validity of any erection of that kind depends upon it being convenient or otherwise as regards the public use for navigation. If a structure, even though made upon the soil of a harbour or river granted to an individual impedes navigation, or interferes even with individual convenience, it is a nuisance, and may be abated, and we have statutory powers to provide for the approval of the Government being given to structures of that character, so as to remove the question of the legality of the erection. But apart from that question, which is amply provided for by the legislation that we have on the subject, the question of ownership becomes most important to those who apply for grants for licenses and leases from time to time. A person who applies for permission to erect a wharf, or a warehouse, or to make an esplanade, or any convenience of that kind, knows that he has to acquire a legal title before he can erect the structure or make the improvement, even though that structure or improvement may be of great public importance in itself. If he should get his title from the wrong Government the result, of course, is just as disastrous as if one purchases and endeavours to improve any other piece of property to which he is unable to acquire a title. Down to the decision in Holman *vs.* Green, by which the soil of public harbours and the foreshores of public harbours were declared to be vested in the Dominion of Canada, this kind of property was administered by the Provincial Governments. Leases, patents and licenses were issued, and the right of the Provincial Government was not very strongly contested. When the decision in Holman *vs.* Green was arrived at, and it was publicly understood that that kind of property was actually vested, by the British North America Act, in the Dominion of Canada, the Government was applied to in numerous instances to make grants and licenses for the purpose of erecting these structures, and the question has become a very serious one, and is considerably involved, as to the mode of administering this kind of property. The Dominion of Canada has not the staff of officers or the organization all over the country which would enable them to administer that property effectively and watchfully. The Provincial Governments have their surveyors in every place; they have their registry offices, where all grants, patents and leases are recorded, and in every province—but I speak especially for the provinces with which I am more particularly acquainted—just as much care is exercised with regard to that portion of the public domain as with regard to the Crown Lands of the provinces; and the question presents itself very forcibly whether it were not better that it should be administered in connection with the public lands of the province than administered by the Dominion Government. Now, the scheme upon which this Bill proceeds is that certain concessions shall be made by the Provincial Governments with regard to this kind of property, and that on our side we shall hand over to the Provincial Governments all that property, so far as it is vested in us, subject

to the conditions set forth in this Bill. Opportunities have been given to confer with some of the gentlemen administering the affairs of the provinces with a view to ascertaining the suitability of these conditions, and some little changes were made from the Bill of last year in order to make the measure effective to secure the rights which we have, and effective also as likely to be acceptable to the Provincial Governments. I will invite the attention of the House to the conditions which are embodied in the Bill. I will preface the remarks I have to make on them by the observation, by way of reminder to the House, that we do not propose to surrender any legislative authority or control whatever. It is simply a question whether it is best to have this kind of property administerd by the Provincial Governments, and whether we shall consent to its transfer to the Provincial Governments on terms which we think will protect the public interests of Canada. These conditions may require amendment when they receive the attention of the members of this House who have given thought to the subject; and my object in moving the Bill to a second reading to-night, without being disposed to go beyond that stage, is to call the attention of the House to this subject, and to receive such suggestions as may enable us to make the best Bill we can on the subject. The plan, then, is this: The Governor in Council shall be authorized to transfer in whole or in part the foreshore and bed of every or any stream, river, lake, harbour, bay, open sea, or other territorial waters of Canada, in any of the provinces, to the Provincial Governments, to be dealt with as provincial public lands within the province; and the second section of the Bill provides that every such transfer shall be subject to the limitations contained in the schedule to this Act, as well as to any others that are expressed in such transfer. So that we take power to add to the conditions that are here expressed. But I shall have to move one or two amendments to guard in a more specific way particular rights which might possibly be affected by the transfer, and which are not particularly enumerated in the conditions here set forth, such as rights which have been acquired by the consent of the Dominion Government before the passage of this Bill, and rights which may accrue under agreements which have been made from time to time with the Dominion Government. Subject to those, the conditions which we propose in this Act are that certain lands shall not be considered as being included in any such property so transferred, and the reservation which we propose to the transfer is:

"Any portion of the foreshore or bed of Canadian waters in front of and adjoining any lands held by Her Majesty in the right of Canada, including therein, but not to limit the generality of the expression 'Lands held by Her Majesty in the right of Canada,' Indian ordinance or other Dominion lands: it being understood that where Dominion lands front on a river the lands covered with water in front thereof, excepted from transfer to the province, shall, in the same width as on the bank, extend to mid-channel, and that where Dominion lands front on a harbour, sea, lake or other navigable water the lands excepted as aforesaid shall, in the same width as on the shore, extend indefinitely seaward, or, where there is opposite there Canadian territory, one half the distance across."

So that we do not propose to give up the foreshore in front of any real estate now owned by the Dominion of Canada, whether ordnance lands or public lands of any other description; and one of the advantages of this Bill will be that, by removing all doubts on the subject by consenting to this transfer to the provincial authorities for the purpose of administration, we are likely to obtain the assent of the Provincial Governments to the conditions set forth, so that there will be on our side the quieting of the title by transferring the property to those who have the best machinery for administering it satisfactorily, and on their side the acceptance of the conditions under which the transfer is made. We think that will have the effect of removing doubts which are disquieting with regard to that kind of property, and the removal of doubts will have the effect of avoiding litigation for all time to come. The next portion of the transfer is:

"So much of the foreshore or bed of any Canadian navigable water as has at the time of the passing of this Act erected or constructed thereon, or in connection therewith, any 'public work' within the meaning of 'The Expropriation Act.'"

Within the meaning of the Expropriation Act a public work includes wharves, bridges, piers, booms, and everything of that description ordinarily built in waters of that kind. The second condition is:

"The Government of Canada may at all times, without compensation to the Government of the province, take possession of, erect, construct and maintain any 'public work' within the meaning of 'The Expropriation Act,' upon any lands transferred under the provisions of the foregoing Act, so long as the lands required are vested in the Crown."

So that, although the province obtains the foreshore we can resume possession of it for the purpose of any public work we are carrying on. The third condition is:

"The Provincial Government shall not, except with the consent of the Governor General in Council, grant or otherwise dispose of, to any person or company, any land transferred as aforesaid and covered by Canadian navigable waters which lies within two hundred feet of the outer limits or boundaries of any 'public work in existence at the time of the passing of this Act,' within the meaning of 'The Expropriation Act,' provided that the lands upon which such public work has been erected now front upon or is in whole or part bounded by or forms part of lands covered by navigable water."

So that, if a public wharf has been erected on the foreshore at the time of the passage of this Act, the Provincial Government shall be restrained from giving any grant of any foreshore around it to the extent defined here. The next condition is:

"All patents, leases or other disposition of the foreshore or bed of Canadian waters, as well as all contracts in respect thereof, made by the Government of Canada prior to any transfer under the foregoing Act, in respect to lands other than those referred to in clause one, shall be, so far as the Provincial Government has power so to do, ratified and confirmed."

And then, finally, there is the provision to protect our legislative rights:

"The transfer by the foregoing Act authorized shall not be construed to give to a Provincial Government, or to persons claiming under it, any rights in respect to navigation or to the sea coast and inland fisheries, the rights of all parties in respect to navigation and shipping, and in respect to the fisheries, remaining unaffected thereby."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the subject-matter legislated upon by the Bill now before the House is a very important one, and I am glad the hon. gentleman does not intend to carry the Bill through all its stages to-night. The Bill deals not only with the foreshores in public harbours, but with the foreshores of the different provinces on the sea coast. Until the decision which was given in the case of Holman *vs.* Green, to which the hon.

Minister refers, there was a general consensus of opinion on the part of the members of the bar in the several provinces that the shores in the harbours belonged to the Provincial Governments. But that impression was overthrown by the decision in Holman *vs.* Green, and although that decision has not been generally accepted, I think, as good law, still it is the law of the highest court in this country; and the hon. gentleman, of course, is not only justified in acting upon the fact of its being law and legislating accordingly, but would not be justified in ignoring the decision of the Superior Court. Therefore, so far as any legislation is concerned necessary for determining, once and for all, in what Government the foreshore in the harbours is vested, that legislation would have my concurrence and support, and I should like to see all doubts on that subject set at rest. Those who come from the Maritime Provinces know what very valuable properties these are which heretofore have been disposed of by Provincial Governments under the assumption that they had a perfect right to do so, but which, after the decision of Holman *vs.* Green, were held to be vested in the Dominion Government; and I think any legislation setting at rest all doubts on the subject and vesting these territorial rights in the Provincial Governments would be acceptable to the House and the public generally. Nor do I think the conditions the hon. gentleman has attached to the Bill, in so far as they relate to these grants of foreshores of harbours, could be considered other than prudent, with some possibly trifling exceptions. The general conditions, I think, are fair and reasonable. It is but just that all rights in connection with navigation and fisheries should remain untouched by any transfer. It does not matter whether these foreshores are vested in the Dominion Government or the Provincial Governments, the paramount rights of navigation and shipping must, in any case, be thoroughly protected. The hon. gentleman has sought to do that by one of his conditions, and I do not think any fault can be found in that respect. Nor do I hold, so far as the foreshores of the harbours are concerned, that there could be any reasonable fault found with any of the conditions attached to the transfer which he takes power to make; but with regard to the other territorial rights on which this Bill seeks to give the Government power to make conveyance, I would respectfully suggest whether we are not apt to get into some difficulty, whether it would not be prudent, after all is said and done, to leave the question of conveying from this Dominion Government to the Provincial Governments any supposed rights that may be possessed until there has been a judicial decision on the subject, if judicial decision is required. I speak with some diffidence, my own opinion in the other case, the harbour question, having been altogether wrong. My own opinion has always been that these territorial rights were vested in the several provinces. The hon. gentleman takes power to transfer the soil in the foreshore of the sea coast, all of which was supposed to be vested in the Provincial Governments, but which assumes the title is now in the Government of Canada, to the Local Government; but the transfer is accompanied by the same conditions as are attached to the transfer of the harbour property. In the one case those conditions are reasonable and proper. I doubt whether, in the other case, they may not be found to be onerous and prejudicial to the local interest. Of course, if we start with the proposition that I lay down, that the rights in these foreshores belong to the Local Governments, there can be no necessity for the Bill at all. It is only because the hon. gentleman sees doubts on the matter that he takes this power. But I cannot remember any doubt being raised in court or any case in which such doubts were raised. If they were, that might justify legislation on the subject. If there are no doubts, I would respectfully press on the hon. gentleman whether it is desirable to legislate on the subject at all—whether it would not be better to confine legislation simply to taking power to convey the foreshores in public harbours, which, under the judgment in Green *vs.* Holman, are said to be vested in the Dominion Government. As the hon. gentleman is not going into committee on the Bill to-night I will not argue the question any further than making that suggestion to him, whether it would not be well to limit the scope of the Bill to the foreshores of the public harbours, which have been decided in Holman *vs.* Green to be vested in the Dominion, rightly or wrongly, and leave the other question open, with respect to the other foreshores outside of harbours, until, at least, judicial decision has been given in the same sense as in Holman *vs.* Green. But I cannot for the life of me see how it can be successfully contended that the foreshores outside of the public harbours of the respective provinces are vested in any other than the Queen in her Provincial Government right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is the almost universally received opinion that, before the decision in Holman *vs.* Green, the property of the harbours was vested in the provinces. The decision in that case declares that that property is vested in the Crown, as represented by the Dominion. That may well be contended for, on the assumption that the British North America Act conveyed all the public harbours of Canada to the Dominion; and by that conveyance, as harbours are one of the classes of property mentioned in the schedule of the Act that is expressly vested in the Dominion, under that schedule, by the provisions of the Act, property in the harbours of Canada became the property of the Confederation or was vested in the Crown in connection with the Dominion of Canada. But I do not see, as the hon. member for Queen's says, how that could apply to the foreshores generally. The limit of property no doubt extends a marine league, or for the distance of a cannon shot from the shore, and I do not know upon what theory or principle that portion of Canadian territory that lies beneath the water, and which cannot be vested in the Dominion under the schedule, could, in consequence of anything contained in this decision, be held to be Dominion property; because, if the whole or a portion of the territory that lies under the water along the shore was vested in the Dominion there was no necessity to declare that a harbour should be Dominion property; but by the express declaration of the British North America Act, that the property in the public harbours should be the property of the Dominion, it seems to me to imply that every other portion of the territory of Canada under water is vested in and belongs to the province of which it forms a part. It would be more satis-

factory if a case could be agreed upon between the Dominion and some one or more of the provinces, for the purpose of having this matter judicially determined, rather than undertake to legislate on the subject. It would be more satisfactory, and if it were found that the foreshores do not belong to the provinces, then this legislation would be necessary.

SHIPPING OF LIVE STOCK.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 154) respecting the shipping of live stock. He said: The carriage of live stock in vessels from America to Europe has elicited the attention of the Imperial Government and Parliament, and very severe restrictions have been proposed in the Imperial Parliament, not only for the security of the property conveyed in these ships, but also for the security of the human lives which are at stake; and an endeavour has been made on the part of the Government of Canada to make such regulations for the carriage of live stock as will provide for the prevention of disease, overcrowding and cruelty during the passage, and will, at the same time, meet fully the objections which are entertained to the mode of carrying such stock which exists now in the United States and some of the southern countries of America. A doubt has arisen as to the extent of our powers under the present statute. It has been contended that some of the regulations which are necessary, and which in fact have been adopted in the past, have been *ultra vires* as regards our authority under the Act, inasmuch as the Act only expressly authorizes us to make regulations to prevent the spread of disease among cattle. This measure will go further, and will enable us to make rules and regulations for the security and safety of live stock on such ships, and those regulations will have the force of law. This Act also enables us to appoint inspectors and allow money to be paid to them:

"Out of the fees collected under the provisions of this Act: and any fees collected by an inspector in excess of the amount of the remuneration so determined shall be paid over by him to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. At any port for which no inspector has been appointed under this Act the port warden duly appointed by the Governor in Council shall be *ex officio* the inspector. At any port at which there is no port warden so appointed and for which no inspector has been appointed under the provisions of this Act, the chief officer of Customs at such port shall be *ex officio* the inspector."

We then provide for an annual statement of fees to be collected, and the fee is to be such as the Governor in Council may establish, and no officer of Customs shall grant a clearance until such fee has been paid. The inspector is to issue a certificate, and any violation of the Act is to be a misdemeanour, with this restriction, that no prosecution shall be instituted except with the consent of the Minister. There are provisions as to the completion of the cargo at another port so as to enable the vessel to take in her cargo at one or more points, and that, in that case, another inspection is to take place at the second port. There is a penalty for over-loading of $1,000, and the ship is made liable therefor, and may be seized and detained at any port in Canada until such penalty is paid.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMILLAN. In regard to shipping cattle, there is something this Bill ought to mention. I believe cattle have suffered more on account of what I am going to mention than from any other cause. At the port of Montreal there is no proper yard to take cattle before putting them on ship board. They are taken on to the wharf and have to be confined there by their keepers. My experience is that the cattle receive greater injury before going on board ship after leaving the stock-yards, than during the whole subsequent passage. They receive more abuse and hard treatment before they are taken on the ship than afterwards. I think something ought to be done with respect to that. If the cattle trade is going to increase in the future, as it has done in the past, there should certainly be proper provision for yarding the cattle close by where the vessels lie. At present there is no regulation of any description on this point. The cattle are taken there and confined a few hours on the wharf, until the owners are notified to put them on board. Another fault I have found is in respect to the troughs used on board the ship. Cattle suffer a great deal from want of water while on the vessel. I have found, as a rule, that the hands put the water into troughs made out of rough boards roughly nailed together, and in a great many instances they hold the water only a few minutes. I hold that the Government ought to see that the troughs are made water-tight, so that when the water is put into them they will hold it until the animals have had time to drink it before it is wasted. As a rule, the troughs are made of rough boards and the water runs right out. If it is a middling fair trough, the cattle get a fair share of water, but if not, they suffer a good deal from thirst while on the voyage. I expected, when the Bill was brought down, that something of that kind would be mentioned in it. I have had some conversation with Dr. McEachren, of Montreal, to whom I mentioned this subject, and he said it was one of the great evils that ought to be attended to, as well as the others I have mentioned. Another point requiring attention is the water tanks used on board the ship for the purpose of holding fresh water for the cattle. My experience is that when the box containing fresh water has been emptied and the cattle are put on condensed water they suffer severely, if you give them anything like at all the amount of water they require. I hold that every vessel ought to be compelled to carry a certain quantity of water for every animal that is shipped. If such a provision is not put into the Bill, certainly that point ought not to be overlooked in the regulations. I would like to know how many inspectors are engaged in looking after these vessels. I know there is one at the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and there is another at the Grand Trunk Railway. I think there ought to be an inspector at every vessel to see the cattle shipped on board, as well as an inspector at a railway station where the cattle are taken off. Another thing is with respect to the situation of the cattle on board. Sometimes they are put up on one end of the vessel and their feed is kept on the other end. That is a great inconvenience for the shipper. I think it would be well if some regulation was made to provide against this trouble also. The inspector ought to be there to see that the feed is

put at the same end of the vessel where the cattle are kept. In all these respects the shippers have found considerable inconvenience—that is to say, the want of a proper place to confine the cattle before they are shipped, the lack of proper water-tight troughs for the cattle to drink out of, and the lack of a tank sufficiently large to hold what fresh water the cattle require on board.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subjects to which the hon. gentleman has called our attention ought to receive every consideration in the regulations which are made under this Act. As he mentioned the various points I looked at the Bill, and I think the provisions are sufficient to enable us to make regulations such as he thinks should be made. Under the 3rd section we may make any rules and regulations for the health, security and safe carriage of the live stock, and under section 7 it is the duty of the inspector to see that the arrangements for carrying such live stock are approved of by him. I think, certainly, that the questions of tanks and troughs for the supply of water, and the arrangements of the food, are matters which ought to be very carefully provided for by the regulations and attended to by the inspectors, and the inspectors should be required to see that the regulations are complied with regarding these points. As regards the yarding of cattle in Montreal, and their being cared for at that port, I am afraid it is a matter over which we cannot have very effectual control. We have only power under the provisions of the present Act to make regulations in regard to their health and with regard to their safe carriage: and all other regulations should be provided for either by the municipality or the Provincial Government. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that, with regard to a trade of such immense importance, no effort will be spared on our part to call the attention of the proper authorities to any regulations which ought to be made by them with regard to the safety and the comfort of cattle that go on ship board.

On section 9,

Mr. McMILLAN. The inspector ought to see that the cattle are properly stalled on board. At the present time the regulations require that each animal shall have 2 feet 8 inches space, but I find they are not getting that, on account of there being no inspector present when they are being put on board. A case of this kind came under my son's attention, and it took two or three hours before the cattle were all arranged and tied. There are only two inspectors, I understand, and they are engaged in the yards. One requires to be present when the cattle are put on board, which is the time when their duties can be properly attended to. If they are neglected, then the matter becomes exceedingly troublesome. These regulations, if fixed by Order in Council and thoroughly enforced, would, I believe, confer a great benefit on the cattlemen. Although the cattlemen have very large interests in this business, yet the farmers and those who breed cattle suffer in the end if neglect occurs, and, if great losses occur to dealers, they will, on returning another year to make purchases, offer reduced prices to the farmers, and it is in their interests I speak.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I fail to understand why our Government cannot be as liberal as are the Americans in providing an efficient inspector; they have made an appropriation of $850,000 for the enforcement of a rigid inspection, although the fee we propose to charge under this Bill is not large, and I understand that we have power to increase the amount up to 5 or 10 cents per head for inspection fees. I suppose the veterinary inspection, as it is enforced in Montreal and other ports, will still be continued. This is a special inspection for which provision is now being made, namely, the inspection of the steamship, and the providing of regulations in regard to the loading of cattle and the feeding of cattle on ship-board. That is one of the most necessary inspections of the whole series. The veterinary inspection is merely a formal inspection as our Canadian cattle are free from disease. It is true that occasionally the inspector detects an animal with a lump on its jaw, and an animal with a cancerous jaw is not allowed to be put on board; but the animals do not require a very close inspection in that particular. The inspection really asked for in this Bill is an inspection by a competent person, who will know when cattle have sufficient space, who will understand where they should go, whether there are proper arrangements for their feeding, and whether there is sufficient tank space to carry the water, so that the animals will get cold water, instead of hot water, as heretofore. We have had great trouble on vessels where they have condensed the water. It has also occurred that the water running into the drinking troughs has leaked out before the animals could drink it. If they are not tight, and the water is put in warm, it will leak out before it is cool enough for the animal to drink, and thus cattle sometimes do not receive sufficient water during the voyage. The Government regulations should endeavour to provide that an ample supply of fresh water is provided for cattle on ship-board. The Beaver Line steamers carry a sufficient quantity of fresh water, which is worth much more than condensed water, and they make the trip in 10 days. I willingly pay 10 shillings per head more to that line on account of the fresh water, and I consider it money well invested. As regards space, 2 feet 6 inches is now suggested, and five stockers are now allowed in place of four fat cattle. I contend, however, that the space should be one uniform space, say 2 feet 8 inches between and on decks, and if so, there might be five stockers in the place of four fat cattle averaging 1,000 lbs., and they would fill the space of four fat cattle. In regard to stockers, they will not be so considered if they weigh over 1,100 lbs. I should prefer a different classification. The maximum weight should be 1,100 lbs., and a lot should not average over 1,000 lbs. each, and they should come within the regulations which the cattlemen required and which was laid down at the investigation which was recently held, and printed in blue-book form. The inspection does not intend to interfere with the veterinary inspection which is made. The inspector will look after the loading of the cattle. One inspector will not be sufficient for the work, because I have seen in Montreal 2,000 or 3,000 cattle loaded on the same day when several steamers are leaving port. It is impossible for one man to do the work and do it satisfactorily. It would be well if the Government, after this Bill has passed, would consult with the shippers. I am satisfied they would send a deputation here, and, in con-

sultation with the Government, would devise the best means possible of making the trade a paying investment, and when it is a paying investment it proves remunerative to the farmers who raise the cattle. When a speculator makes money the farmers derive the benefit, as he pays them increased prices when he goes through the country again to purchase cattle.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Serjeant-at-Arms has appointed, with my approval, Lieut. Col. Alfred Hamlyn Todd his deputy for the remainder of the session.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No 165) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The first clause of this Bill has reference to the school lands. It will be recollected that some few years ago, in some sections of the country, we agreed to give alternate townships of land to railway companies in lieu of alternate sections. This is to permit school lands being selected in other portions of the district of equal value to those taken by the railway companies, in order that the lands given to railway companies may be as nearly as possible in one block. Another clause deals with cancelled pre-emptions. The conditions in the old Act required the building of a habitable house and an actual residence therein, but the word "cultivation" was left out, no doubt inadvertently. This is to provide for cultivation as well, which is, as is well known, one of the principal provisions with regard to the occupation of homestead lands. I propose, in section 3, to do away with the three months' residence formerly necessary. Heretofore, the settler was obliged to occupy the homestead with his family six months of each year, and to build a habitable house in the last year and occupy it three months, and that immediately after this occupation he should apply for his patent. In many cases parties have carried out the provisions, but have left their lands, and have not applied for their patent next prior to the three months' residence, and the Dominion Lands Commissioner held that the three months' occupation had to be gone over again. He is supported in that view by the Department of Justice, and this is to correct that inconvenience, for I consider it nothing more. The next clause deals with the five years provision, which compels, amongst other things, the breaking up of five acres the first year, ten acres the second year, and an occupation of six months each year during the three subsequent years. This is to allow the patent to be issued, provided the occupation has been made in three successive years, even if the five or ten acres are not broken. I also propose, and it will be for the House to consider whether the proposition is advisable or not, to do away, after the 1st of January, 1892, with the two-mile radius clause and also to the five years clause. I have always contended that the simpler our land laws are the better, and would do away with a great number of grievances and delays. The obligation to occupy 160 acres for three years, for a period of six months in each year of personal occupation, is a simple, liberal law, and if we can confine ourselves to that we will have very little trouble in working out the land laws in the North-West. By clause 8 I propose that the patent shall be applied for within a period of five years from the date of the homestead entry. There are several other clauses in connection with the lien clauses of the Dominion Lands Act, one of which is to enable the settler who has taken in advance some small amount of $200 or $300 on his homestead to increase the amount to a maximum of $600. In cases where a loan has been made for an amount to a settler on his first settlement, it has been held that no further sum can be advanced. This is to allow a further advance up to the maximum allowed by the Act. Clause 12 also has reference to these clauses; and we will allow some other items to be charged in the account of the settler, such as those for passage and medical attendance. Clause 13 repeals the granting of subsidies in lands to certain railway companies where they affect the clauses of this Act.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not rise to discuss the provisions of this Bill on its first reading, but I desire to suggest to the Minister that between this and the second reading of the Bill he should consider some further changes. As he is dealing with the two-mile radius, he might probably provide, and I know it can be done by Order in Council, that those persons who can now use the two-mile radius might be allowed to do that in the case of cancelled lands. At present, there is an Order in Council preventing that from being done, and as some steps have been taken in regard to liberalizing the provisions in regard to cancelled lands, I think the Minister might go still further, and allow persons who take advantage of the two-mile radius to do so, whether they want to settle on cancelled lands or not. For instance, we have north of Regina at present an Ontario farmer, a man named Miller, and his two sons. They would like to use for the benefit of the two sons the two-miles radius provision, but they cannot do so, because the lands are cancelled; whereas any Englishman, Irishman or Scotchman could come in there and use that provision. I think this suggestion will commend itself to the Minister, and I hope the hon. gentleman will do something to get rid of the grievance that these persons conceive themselves to have. Then there is the question of the 80-acre homestead and the 80-acre pre-emption. An arrangement was made a few years ago that these people might keep their homestead of 80 acres and might get a 160 acre pre-emption, or they might make the homestead 160 acres and take 80 acres for a pre-emption. I think that hardly solves the difficulty, because there is often no opportunity of

taking a pre-emption near the homestead, and in many cases it is of very little advantage if the only possible pre-emption is at a distance from the homestead. I think, as the 80-acre rule has been violated, the Government might allow those who entered originally for an 80 acre homestead and an 80-acre pre-emption to get both for a homestead. When the question was before the House recently—and I do not desire to refer to a previous debate, further than to quote the dictum of the Minister of Justice, with which I agree entirely, he said:

"This Government is the executive of the North-West. There must be an executive somewhere. We do not propose that there shall be an executive Government in the North-West itself, and we have never yet conferred an executive power on any body in that territory."

I agree with that statement, and I think it is a wholesome thing under the present condition of affairs; but that being so, I would fain impress upon the Government the necessity of providing for all those things which an executive there would provide for, and one of those things is that to which I have already called the attention of the Government—that is, to do full justice to the immigration needs of the North-West Territories. It is not enough that the Minister here should have his attention directed to that, because no one here can properly deal with the local needs of the North-West; and I may say that Sir John Macdonald told us that he intended a couple of years ago, in fact when he gave us the advisory board he told us that he intended to place a considerable sum—not a very large sum, but a considerable sum—in the contingencies for this matter, which might give scope for the energy and statesmanship of the North-West Territories in dealing with the question of immigration. Connected more nearly, however, with this Bill, would be a question which has been discussed in the North-West Territories, and that is giving lands for a university. It may be said that it is premature to give lands now for a university. It may be said that by-and-bye we shall have to divide up the Territories into districts or into provinces, and that it will not be convenient to make this grant now, because each of those provinces may require land for a university of its own. But if we gave lands now to endow a university in a central part of the North-West which might be for the whole of the Territories, we should, perhaps, escape from the evil which attends university life and university energy in all the provinces, where we know that it is the curse of our higher education that you have universities competing for students and not students competing for universities. The consequence is, that the curriculum is lower and that men are actually passing in the honours grade who could not possibly, in a university where the curriculum is higher and the examination stiffer, pass for an ordinary degree. I am simply echoing the words of one of the most distinguished professors of the University of Toronto. I think the Government might consider whether they will not set aside lands now for the university of the future, and choose a site which might be central, no matter how the Territories may be divided up, so that we might hope to escape from the depressing influence, from the standpoint of higher education, of having a number of competing universities. We know what the result is in Ontario and in other provinces. I may say in passing—and I think I may be permitted to say it, though it has not a strict bearing on the Bill, but it has on this North-West question, and I want to stop short here of the Minister of the Interior, and allow my remarks to go to the Minister of Finance—I hope the Minister of Finance will consider the petition which has been sent to him on the subject of the grant for our schools. That petition, sent from Moose Jaw and other places, stated the case very strongly against lowering the grant for schools. The other evening, when we were altering a clause in the North-West Territories Act, the question whether we should have the power to deal with irrigation was discussed, and it was decided that a local House should not have that power; and I am not surprised at that decision, because we own none of the public domain. The public domain is entirely under the control of this Government, and therefore I point out to the Government here that the statement of the Minister of Justice being irrefragable, that this Government is the real Government of the North-West Territories, and no power being given to the North-West Council to deal with the question of irrigation, and very properly not, then the responsibility in dealing with any lands in which the water question is concerned rests with this Government rather than with the Territories, and the duty of dealing with that question of irrigation rests with this Government and not with the Government of the North-West Territories. A petition was sent to the Minister of the Interior some time ago from Moose Jaw. An address was sent to myself from Moose Jaw, pointing out that in some of the finest portions of the North-West Territories, in some of the best portions of the Moose Jaw district, the problem of water supply had not been solved; and what they wanted—and it is not an unreasonable request—is that the Government should take the responsibility of finding out the depth at which water can be had, and if the Government will take that responsibility, and find out the depth at which water can be had, they, themselves, will bear the expense of forming companies to dig wells for the benefit of the settlers. I say that when it is found in a country that presents every possible feature of attraction that water cannot be got, then the Government are responsible for showing these settlers at what depth water can be had. Of course, if water can be had at 60, or 80, or 100, or 120 feet, farmers can do that themselves, but where it is a question of going still deeper, their funds give out, and they cannot do it. Now, what they want the Government to do is to ascertain by tests the distance at which water can be found, and they themselves will afterwards work out the matter, so far as it relates to any given section or quarter section. In fact, it would pay the Government well to sink a well at the point where any four sections meet. They would then have 16 quarter sections, the furthest one of them within three-fourths of a mile or so distant, and on the nearest one the well would be almost at the door of the settler. Suppose that the cost of sinking such an artesian well amounted to $1,000; divide that by 16, and you have the amount of lien that the Government would have on each farm, and it is an amount that the farmers would be glad to pay. Now, when I wrote to the Minister of the Interior on the subject of well-digging I got a letter from him, stating that there were four augers, and these were in the hands of the Assembly.

But I need not say that four augers are not enough to deal with this water question in the North-West Territories; it is an agrarian question, and I would, therefore, urge on the Minister to look into this matter. It would be more appropriate when we are in Committee to discuss this question in detail, as bearing on the suggestion that something should be done in the way of well-digging. Therefore, I shall not dwell upon that now. But I have made these requests to the Government, and some of them would involve an expenditure. I may say that nobody can take our population into account, and take into consideration the basis on which the subsidy is given to each province, without seeing that we are entitled to something additional. We have no debt, and if we make a calculation on the basis on which Manitoba came in you will find that we are entitled to something near $400,000, and if that is so, then there will be a large margin still to our credit, after every provision has been made for digging wells. I hope a large sum will be put in the Estimates which will enable the North-West to deal with all these subjects themselves, and that the advantages at Saskatchewan, Alberta and Assiniboia may be pressed on the attention of the immigrating public.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In reference to the remarks made at the commencement of the hon. gentleman's speech regarding cancelled lands and giving an opportunity to parties to take up cancelled lands within a two-mile radius, and also with reference to the 80-acre homesteads, I think both subjects might be dealt with without any further legislation. I think that, with regard to the 80-acre homesteads, a memoranda is now before Council, and it has been engaging my serious consideration during the greater part of the session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENSUS RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. Postmaster General, who is in charge of the census, whether he has any prospect now of bringing down the figures that were spoken of a few days ago any sooner than he expected? If I recollect aright he said at the time there were only one or two returns to be got in, and then the information in the hands of the department would be complete, and that he would put on an increased clerical staff and prepare the figures for the House. It is now nearly two weeks since we spoke about it.

Mr. HAGGART. I think I told the hon. gentleman that there were two or three returns that were not yet in, but that we could make an estimate of what the probable population of those places would be, and I could have an approximate return of the population within two or three days. But I understood it was the feeling of the House that it would, perhaps, be improper to make a return until I could give the exact figures to the House, and on that ground I did not make any return.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman said he would put on an extra clerical force. The hon. gentleman at first expected that the returns would be ready, at all events, three weeks from that time, even without the extra help, and it is now two weeks since he made the promise. Can he give us any estimate to-day when he expects to have them down? I did not understand that it was the feeling of the House—unanimous, at all events—that we should wait until everything is finished; but, of course, as he says he is going to wait until he gets the very last returns, I suppose we shall have to wait too.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman wants an incomplete return I suppose I can get it ready for him in a couple of days.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister knows very well that I did ask for that return, and I still want it.

P. E. I. RAILWAY—DISMISSALS.

Mr. PERRY. I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister of Railways to the fact that the return ordered by the House concerning the dismissal of two officers of the Prince Edward Island Railway has been brought down, but it is not complete. There are no reasons given why those men were dismissed. If the Minister has any more information to give, I want it.

Mr. BOWELL. I gave the hon. gentleman all the information I had. I asked for the correspondence and it was handed to me. These men were informed that their services were no longer required, and they had to go.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The incompleteness of the return consists in the fact that there is no letter, or telegram, or report, apparently, made to the chief engineer on which he bases the dismissal. Now, it is inconceivable that an order should go from Ottawa dismissing employés of the Prince Edward Island Railway from office without some representation having been made to the authorities, and the report, as brought down, does not contain a scrap of information that any report has ever been made, or letter, or telegram, or notice of any kind have been sent to the chief engineer on which he bases that peremptory dismissal. The matter is apparently a small one, but it possesses immense interest in the locality, because the people are anxious to know why these two gentlemen, who possess estimable characters and are known to be excellent workmen, were summarily dismissed. If the hon. member states that the chief superintendent did it of his own mere motion, without communicating with the acting Minister, the matter must rest there; but the reason on its face is very imperfect. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiries and see what is in it.

THE LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to enquire from the Secretary of State the cause of the delay in the distribution of the evidence in the matter of the Langevin Block?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not the matter in charge. I think the evidence has been printed. My department has charge of the distribution of documents outside of the session, not during the session.

Mr. MULOCK. At the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, I applied to the clerk of the Committee. I understand the evidence is not printed up to this moment—at all events, it is not available if it is printed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think it is printed.

Mr. MULOCK. It is no use if it is printed, if we have not got it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is none of my concern. It is the concern of the officers of the Committee and those who have charge of the distribution of parliamentary documents during the session, and I repeat it has nothing to do with my department.

THE MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST.

On the Order,

That Thomas McGreevy, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec West, the witness named in the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections submitted to this House on the 12th day of August instant, do attend in his place in this House, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. member for Quebec West in his place?

No answer being made——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed by the Clerk that a copy of the Order of the House of Thursday last, duly signed by himself, was forwarded by post on Friday last to Hon. Thomas McGreevy at Quebec, when it was learned that he was not at Ottawa, and a telegram communicating the Order was at the same time sent him at Quebec. The manager of the North-Western Telegraph Company at Quebec has informed the Clerk that the telegram was duly delivered to Hon. Thomas McGreevy on Friday last at 2.45 p.m., in the office of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Bowell:

That the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, member for the Electoral District of Quebec West, not having attended this day in his place in this House, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th day of August instant, be taken into the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House; and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means, on the following Resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend Bill (No. 155) intituled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," by striking out sub-sections 7 and 8 of section 1, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:

7. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, sixteen cents per gallon.

8. Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon), twenty-four cents per gallon.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend Bill (No. 116) intituled: "An Act further to amend 'The Inland Revenue Act,'" by striking out in the 41st line of sub-section 177, section 12, the word "eight" and substituting therefor the word "ten."

3. *Resolved*, That the foregoing duties of Customs and Excise shall have effect from and after the 18th day of August, 1891.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Finance please explain any changes he proposes to make?

Mr. FOSTER. I will state briefly what is proposed to be done. There are changes proposed by these resolutions in the items of beer, ale and porter imported, and also in the Excise duty on beer made from other than malt, that is, from sugar, rice or corn. The object of these resolutions is to make the duty on the imported article and also the Excise duty on beer which is made from sugar higher than it had been placed by the preceding resolutions. In Canada, so far, beer has been almost exclusively made from malt, and the Excise duty has been higher upon beer which was made from sugar, rice and corn, that is, other than malt, the object being patent to the Committee. Now that the malt duties have been raised 100 per cent., and the amount to be levied two cents instead of one, it became necessary to raise correspondingly, in fact it has been raised a little more than correspondingly, the amount of Excise duty to be levied upon beer which should be made from sugar, corn or rice, the object being to prevent the manufacture of that kind of beer on equal conditions with malt, so as to prevent the manufacture of beer of poorer quality, and also to preserve, as I have said, the manufacture of beer from malt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When did the hon. gentleman say it was of good quality?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must not interrupt me when I am making an explanation. It has, therefore, been thought proper to raise the Excise tax on beer made from sugar from 4 cents, which it was before, to 10 cents; and that having been resolved upon, it became necessary to place a corresponding duty upon the imported article so as to make it equal, and therefore 6 cents has been added to imported ale, beer and porter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In place of what?

Mr. FOSTER. We had proposed an increase of 3 cents, and we now propose an increase of 6 cents. The way the matter will affect the percentage of duty is this: I find the English imports of ale, beer and porter, at the rate we propose, that is those imported in bottles, will range 30 per cent. on an average. For the imports from the United States, which is beer of a cheaper quality, the duty will range about 40 per cent. on an average of the whole imports, and the average upon both American and British imports will be 33 per cent. As to the ale, beer and porter which is imported in casks, the percentage will be somewhat higher; that upon the British imports will be 40 per cent., and that upon the United States imports will be about 60 per cent. The House must recollect that we have doubled the malt duty, and by that means have caused a very large accretion to the revenue from that industry, and it is only fair that an equivalent protection, and in fact a large protection, in the way of an import duty, should be placed upon the imported article. Judges of this article tell me—and I must appeal in this case to my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to know whether I am right in this conclusion or not—that most excellent beer is made at our Canadian breweries; that it is made from malt, and that it is pure. I have no doubt they can supply the whole demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You will have to ask your colleague about that.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact that we increase the Excise duty upon all ale and beer that is made from other than malt will agree with the strongly expressed conviction of my hon. friend from Bothwell

(Mr. Mills) yesterday, when he deprecated the making of alcohol from beets or potatoes, or anything of that kind. We propose to discourage that.

Mr. CASEY. There are one or two points in this that, perhaps, have escaped the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance. When he doubled the duty upon malt, he certainly did something to discourage the use of malt as a material for making ale and beer, and to that extent he diminished the market afforded to the Canadian farmer for his barley. In fact our farmers have been struck doubly of late, both by the United States legislation and by our own. By the McKinley Bill our market for barley in the States has been cut off, and by the increased duty on malt the consumption of barley for the purpose of making ale and beer is further diminished. Now, looking at this from the hon. gentleman's point of view in his former capacity as an advocate of temperance, that might be a good thing if it led to a diminution in the production of ale and beer: but it appears that the diminished use of barley malt for that purpose is not going to lead to a reduction in the amount of beer produced. It seems that the Government allows now the production of ale and beer from sugar, corn and rice, and while they have restricted the farmers' market by increased taxes upon malt, they are now permitting brewers to use the other materials that are available for the production of a sort of bogus beer. The product of the farmer has been struck in two directions and the product of the brewer has not been struck at all. The brewer whose malt is made dearer is to be allowed to use something else, and he certainly will use these other materials in spite of the increased Excise duty, if they are much cheaper than the malt, and we shall still have an equal quantity of beer produced from inferior materials; we shall decrease the quantity of beer produced from barley, which, as the hon. Minister can learn from his own colleagues, is the best beer. He has a colleague in the Government who is much better qualified to instruct him in the quality of beer than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.) The hon. Minister of Agriculture, who, perhaps, should be more properly Minister of Excise, can give him full information on that point, and may have some special interest in this question of the privilege which is given to brewers to make bogus beer out of these articles which the hon. Minister has named. He says that the increased Excise duty they have put upon this bogus beer renders it necessary still further to increase the duty on imported ale and beer; that is to say, having allowed the use of these bogus materials instead of genuine malt and hops, they have so arranged the tariff as to protect the home manufacture of the bogus beer. I think it is rather a strange proposition, coming especially from a gentleman of the hon. Minister's well-known principles, that we should relax the Excise laws so as to permit the use of inferior materials, and should then protect the inferior beer made from these inferior materials by a 60 per cent. duty. I do not think that such a change in the law can be considered as favourable to anybody, except to the brewer who is allowed to make cheap beer and is protected against foreign competition in doing so. Neither can it be regarded as being favourable to the cause of temperance. The hon. Minister of Finance, if he is not aware himself, may find out by enquiry amongst his colleagues, that in England the materials of which beer may be made lawfully are restricted, and where other ingredients than malt and hops are allowed to be used the percentage allowed is restricted. I do not know what change has been made hitherto in the proposed regulations in this respect, but I should judge that from what the Minister says and from the change he has made in the tariff, it is now allowed, and there is no restriction in force against the use of corn, rice, and sugar in making beer. I protest against this in the name of the farmer whose market for barley is thus injured, and on behalf of those in the country who may be, as the Minister of Finance thinks, foolish enough to use beer, and who will by this means be exposed to the risk of drinking a very inferior article. I would ask the Minister whether any means are to be adopted to distinguish beer made from corn, rice and sugar, from ale and beer made from barley, when it was put on the market? Is it to be marked in any way, or is it to be sold in competition with the genuine article?

Mr. FOSTER. I can scarcely understand what my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) is driving at. He seems to accuse us of acting so as to encourage the making of inferior beer from sugar, whereas no change whatever is made in that direction under the present resolutions. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. They could make such beer if they pleased before these resolutions were introduced, but if they made beer out of sugar, they had to pay 4 cents Excise duty per gallon, as against 3 cents Excise duty per gallon on the beer made from malt. That was the corrective. Instead of acting in the direction of making it easier to make beer from sugar, as my hon. friend incorrectly thinks, this resolution is going in exactly the opposite direction. Now they may make beer from sugar, but if they do, they must pay 10 cents per gallon Excise duty, as against 6 cents per gallon Excise duty upon beer made from malt. The extra duty was put on the beer made from other than malt, in order, in the first place, that the best kind of beer might be made in the country; and in the second place, so far as that is an encouragement to the farmer in the growth of barley, that this encouragement in that respect should not be taken away, but should be increased. The privilege has always existed for them to make beer from sugar, or corn, or rice.

Mr. CASEY. Without restriction?

Mr. FOSTER. Without restriction.

Mr. CASEY. I was not aware that the use of these articles for making beer was unrestrictedly allowed before.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been entirely unrestricted, but the Excise duty has operated with such force that up to this time I doubt, from the reports of the officers, if any beer has been made from sugar or from anything else than malt.

Mr. CASEY. I thought that here, as in England, there were Excise regulations stating what articles might be used along with malt for making beer. But on the other hand, I cannot agree with the hon. Minister that this increased Excise duty is a further restriction on the use of those materials, because while he puts on an increased Excise duty, he puts on at the same time a proportional import duty, and the manufacturer has a much higher pro-

tection against foreign competition than he had before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister has stated what specific duty he proposes. Can he state what the Excise duty on malt would amount to as an *ad valorem* tax on the article produced from it?

Mr. FOSTER. The Excise duty upon malt is now 2 cents per pound. It will depend on the amount of malt that is necessary to produce a gallon of beer. Less than 3 pounds is the average in the country; but suppose you take 3 pounds, the duty would amount to 6 cents on the gallon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What value would the gallon be? I want to get the Excise on an *ad valorem* basis, so as to see what the amount of protection is.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a difference of opinion as to what it costs to make a gallon of beer. If our beer were as strong as the English beer, probably more malt would be taken to make it, so that the Excise duty would be much more in comparison.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, the protection which the home brewer will have will be the difference between the Excise duty and the import duty. What difference exists between the two?

Mr. FOSTER. The measure of protection would be about 6 cents a gallon, if you calculate about 3 pounds of malt to the gallon. The difference between the Excise duty and the import duty on the same quality of beer, would be in bottles 18 cents and in casks 10 cents.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I am sure that in the case of much of the beer imported this amounts to 100 per cent. protection. American lager beer is produced very cheaply, and this amounts to an enormously high duty *ad valorem*. Of course, as the Minister cannot tell us the cost of a gallon of beer, we are left somewhat in the dark.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably about 20 cents a gallon.

Mr. CASEY. It would not be fair to take the cost of the beer entered at the frontier by which to measure the protection. The measure of protection is the cost to the brewer. If his beer costs him 15 cents a gallon or less to make it, he has about 100 per cent. protection. That is the effect of the tariff now proposed, and it is certainly a much greater encouragement than most other manufacturers get. But returning to the question of the materials of which beer should be made, I think it would have been the duty of the Minister, under these circumstances, considering the injury already done to the barley crop by the McKinley Bill, to take away from the brewers entirely this liberty, which he says they have always enjoyed, of using other substances than malt for the manufacture of beer, or at all events to limit the use of those substances to a very small percentage. If he really wants to improve the barley market in Canada, without injury to the cause of public morality, and without increasing the amount of beer consumed in the country, he can do it by providing that malt must be used altogether, or so much malt and only a certain percentage of anything else along with malt, in the manufacture of beer. In that way he can improve the barley market without doing any injury to temperance principles.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend is concerned as to the quality of his beer, we have been very careful in that respect. A man has two sources of material open to him in the manufacture of beer. If he makes it out of malt, he pays about 6 cents Excise duty; but if he chooses to make it out of other articles than malt, he will have to pay 10 cents per gallon. Consequently, the inducement, which has been very strong in the past, seems to be far stronger now, to make beer entirely from malt, and to eschew the use of such things as corn and rice; and that is in the interest of the barley grower.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the inducement is stronger to make the beer out of malt, because the protection is maintained at the same point as before, if it is not higher. But the point I was urging was that the Minister should restrain the use of other materials, and to that extent give protection to our home-grown barley, which will be the means of helping the Canadian farmer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Finance if a rebate is granted upon malt when exported, and to what extent?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure about the article of malt; but the question is not a practical question, because there is none exported. I know that a rebate is not now allowed upon the product of corn made by the distillers and exported.

Mr. McMULLEN. My question was whether a rebate is allowed to malt producers on the malt exported, and what is the rebate?

Mr. FOSTER. I have told the hon. gentleman that I was not sure as to whether there was or not. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue says he thinks the law allows it but that there is no export duty, so that it is not a practical question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might become so. It is very often convenient, and might become convenient in the case of our brewers just now, to turn a great deal of their barley into malt; and it is quite possible it may become, whether it is or not so now, a question of some considerable moment. Unless I am greatly misinformed, barley can be preserved very much better in the shape of malt than in any other way. It is dangerous to keep barley for a long time, but when malted it can be preserved for a long time. The question my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has raised is worthy of consideration. I do not recollect sufficiently, speaking off-hand, to say what the provisions of the Excise are in this respect, but I should think that, within proper restrictions, barley ought to be allowed to be converted into malt, under conditions to prevent frauds on the revenue, and exported free.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look into that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the other question my hon. friend has raised, it is desirable for the Finance Minister to encourage the manufacture of good wholesome beer.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, if we must have it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You intend to encourage that. Well, I think you are giving pretty ample protection, indeed. In the case of the duty on lager beer—I speak, of course, under

correction—I rather fancy that in the case of lager beer, which requires but a very moderate quantity of malt, the cost of production in a large manufactory will be found very small, and that the duty which the hon. gentleman proposes to inflict, and which, I think, is as high as 24 cents per dozen in bottles——

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—will be found to give vastly greater protection than he expects. He estimates that at an average of sixty. I should fancy it would run very much more, perhaps double that. However, I make that observation off-hand and without the data I should like to have. That seems an exorbitant protection, even for so desirable an object as the encouragement of the wholesale manufacture of native beer, and ought to be carefully considered.

Mr. FOSTER. I took my figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns, and, according to the valuation given there, the percentages are as I stated. I may state now to the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that malt may be exported in bond without the payment of any Excise duty; that is, the duty is taken off on the malt being exported. I admit to my hon. friend that this is a desirable protection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very.

Mr. FOSTER. I am impelled to it now more than formerly by the strong representations of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) who argues that, if we are to have beer drunk here, we ought to have it, as far as possible, made from our malt, and thus stimulate the production of barley by our farmers. I am open to his arguments in that respect, and consequently think that the effect of the duty is a strong ground for its maintenance.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister does not for a moment wish to pretend that, under the protection he is giving to the native brewer of lager, he is giving protection to the farmer. He allows the native brewer to use corn, glucose, molasses, rice, almost anything else he chooses instead of malt. The only protection to the farmer would be to compel the brewer to use malt and hops instead of these other articles. If he wants to have a native beer made from good materials, let him provide that only malt shall be used in its manufacture. Then we will undoubtedly increase the market for Canadian barley. But after putting on increased Excise all round, he allows, over and above that, a protection to the brewer of nearly 100 per cent. on his production. That does not at all benefit the farmer. This is a Bill to enable the brewer to charge increased prices for his beer, and the effect is seen in the fact that brewers all round are charging increased prices. The brewer is making very large increased profits out of the change of the law and the farmer is making none. The increased protection is out of proportion to the increase in Excise, as there is more percentage of difference between the Excise and the Customs duty than there was before. It certainly appears as if the brewing element in the Cabinet had got the start of the temperance element and even the agricultural element.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister should adopt the suggestion of an eminent Irish statesman and look to the consumer's interests by providing that every quart bottle shall hold a quart.

Mr. CASEY. Will not the Minister adopt my suggestion by introducing an additional resolution providing that only those materials may be used?

Mr. FOSTER. I have gone a long way to meet the arguments of my hon. friend, and they have essentially helped me in my contest with the hon. member for South Oxford. I will take his suggestion into serious consideration.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. gentleman has gone a long way to help the brewers, I want him to go a little way to help the farmers.

Resolutions reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the Order for third reading of Bill (No. 116) to further amend the Inland Revenue Act be discharged, and Bill be recommitted to Committee of the Whole to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and Order discharged.

SUPPLY—U. S. TREATY WITH CUBA.

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

Mr. BORDEN. Before you leave the Chair, I desire to make an enquiry of the Government, of which I had given notice to the Minister of Finance, relating to the recent trade arrangements which have been concluded between the United States and Spain. The enquiry of which I gave notice to the hon. Minister is as follows:—

Whether, in view of the convention of 1886 existing between Great Britain and Spain, the products of Canada will be admitted to Cuba and Porto Rico at the rate of duties provided by the recent commercial arrangements between the United States and Spain for Cuba and Porto Rico.

My reason for making this enquiry is that many persons who are largely engaged in the export trade of the Maritime Provinces to Cuba and Porto Rico are in doubt whether the recent arrangement between the United States and Spain has any reference to articles exported from Canada to Cuba and Porto Rico. The fact of this uncertainty existing is having a very bad effect on the trade between this country and Cuba, especially in the articles of lumber, fish and potatoes, and I think it is of the utmost consequence that the Government should state, if they are in a position to do so, at once, whether or not in their opinion the most-favoured-nation clause of the Treaty of 1886 between Great Britain and Spain will apply to this treaty, and whether the products of Canada exported to Cuba will be treated there as favourably as the products of the United States under the arrangement to which I have referred. I think it is proper that this information should be asked from the Government. Certainly the Government had ample time to inform themselves in regard to it, and it is impossible for the people to have informed themselves from any other source. It is well known that this commercial arrangement which has been concluded between the United States and Spain has been under consideration since January last. The first correspondence on the subject was a letter addressed by Mr. Blaine to the Spanish Minister in January last. It is well

known that the treaty was concluded so long ago as June, and that it was proclaimed on the 1st of this present month, so that the Government have had ample opportunity to become informed of the facts in reference to which I enquire. The importance of this trade need hardly be referred to. The Minister of Finance and every hon. gentleman from the Maritime Provinces is as well aware of it or better than I am. Since I gave my notice to the Minister, however, I observe that the Board of Trade of the city of Halifax have passed certain resolutions on this matter, and as they are short, and contain the whole question in a nutshell, I will read them to the House :

"Whereas a treaty has just made between the United States and Spain whereby fish, potatoes, lumber and other natural products of the United States are to be admitted free into the Islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, said treaty to come into effect the first day of September next; and

"Whereas a treaty now exists between Spain and Great Britain, expiring July 1st of next year, containing a favoured nation clause, which gives the right for all products of a similar nature to be admitted free from Great Britain and her colonies; and

"Whereas our export of fish to the Spanish West Indies amounts to about 250,000 quintals per annum, besides pickled fish; and

"Whereas the Island of Cuba has of late become our principal market for potatoes which is an article of export of great value to the farmers of this province; and

"Whereas the latest advices from Havana indicate that the Government of the Island of Cuba put a construction on the treaty with Great Britain which prohibits the import of said articles from Canada on the same terms as from the United States under the treaty just concluded; therefore be it

"Resolved, that the Board of Trade, representing the various interests of the province, do most earnestly invite the immediate attention of the Dominion Government to this important matter, praying they will make prompt representations to the Imperial Government and invite their good offices in placing our trade with these Islands on a satisfactory basis whereby our products may be admitted on as favourable terms as similar products from the United States."

I desire to call the attention of the Government especially to these words :

"The latest advices from Havana indicate that the Government of the Island of Cuba put a construction on the treaty with Great Britain which prohibits the import of said articles from Canada on the same terms as from the United States under the treaty just concluded."

If that is the general belief in commercial circles, as I understand it is, the hon. gentleman and the House will see that trade for the present season will be absolutely paralyzed. I am speaking specially of the trade in potatoes, because I represent a constituency from which last year we exported to Cuba from 50,000 to 100,000 barrels, and those gentlemen who are engaged in that trade will not undertake to carry it on unless they have some assurance that the provisions of the new treaty will apply to Canada as well as to the United States. I observe, in reading the papers in connection with the discussion which led up to the recent treaty between the United States and Spain, that language like this occurs. In a communication from the Minister for Spain to Mr. Blaine, he says that the Spanish Government :

"Has decided to respond, as promptly and as fully as its national interests and international engagements permit, to the legislation of the Congress of the United States, as set forth in the note of January 3 above mentioned."

And again the following language is used. He refers to "the desire of both Governments that said arrangement should have a definitive character from the time when Spain shall be free from her international engagements." I think it is clear that the Minister representing the Spanish Government had a very strong notion that the Government of Spain was under certain treaty obligations. More than that, I observe that this treaty is divided into two parts. There is a temporary arrangement which takes force from the 1st September next and continues till July, 1892, which is the date when the convention now existing between Great Britain and Spain comes to a termination. So I think it is fair to infer from these papers that under the Spanish treaty with Great Britain and other countries, they shall be entitled to the benefit of the favoured-nation clause until the treaty expires in July of next year. I will turn now to the treaty itself, dated the 26th April, 1886, between the Governments of Great Britain and Spain, respecting the commercial relations of the two countries. In article I, I find this :

"The Government of Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain will grant to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and to Her Britannic Majesty's Colonies and foreign possessions, most favoured nation treatment in all that concerns commerce, navigation and consular rights and privileges in Spain, and in the Spanish Colonies and foreign possessions, co-extensive in amount of benefit with that accorded to France and Germany under the treaties of the 6th February, 1882, and the 12th July, 1883."

So here the treaties between Spain and France and Germany, respectively, are referred to, and are made a part of the convention of 1886 between Great Britain and Spain. Now, turning to the treaty between Spain and France, article 14 reads as follows :--

"Each of the two high contracting parties engages to accord to the other, immediately and without compensation, every favour and all privileges or reductions in the import and export tariff of duties upon articles, whether mentioned or not in the present treaty, which either has granted or may hereafter grant to a third power."

Again, in the treaty between Spain and Germany, in article 9, we read :

"Each of the two high contracting parties binds itself to grant to the other, in the import or export of goods, whether specified or not in the present treaty, immediately and unconditionally, every favour, privilege, or reduction in import or export duties which one of them has extended or shall hereafter extend to a third power."

Now, it would seem to me, though not a lawyer, nor a very extensive student of constitutional law, very clear that so far as our trade with Cuba and Porto Rico is concerned, until the expiration of this treaty now existing between Great Britain and Spain, we are entitled to the same favours which are being extended until July of next year by Spain to the Government of the United States. I understand it is claimed by the United States that in a case where special concessions are made by two powers in matters of trade and reciprocity, the most-favoured-nation clause does not apply. Well, in answer to that it may be said that in so far as the concessions which are being made by the United States to Spain are concerned, they are not special concessions. This trade arrangement with Spain is being made under the McKinley Tariff Bill, and under that tariff the concessions with respect to the duties on sugar and molasses are made to the world, at any rate at the present moment they exist as towards the whole world. Now, the particular enquiry which I desire to make I have already presented, and I again emphasize the fact that it is more important with respect to the temporary arrangement which has been made. Of

course, anything that may arise after the expiration of the treaty is quite beyond our present enquiry, and we need not be particularly anxious about it at this moment, because there is ample time to make arrangements for the future. I have no doubt, however, that the Government are pressing upon the British Government the importance of extending the Convention of 1886 beyond 1892. In addition to the information I have asked for, I would like to ask the Minister whether Spain has given notice to Great Britain of her intention to terminate the treaty of 1886. I understand by the wording of the treaty that one year's notice must be given. I would also suggest that if there be any correspondence with reference to this matter which can be laid upon the Table of the House, the Government would do well to let us have it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The question which my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) has brought before the House, is one of very considerable importance, especially to the Province of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces generally. Since the announcement of the conclusion of the arrangement made by the United States with Spain, and its publication in the press, a great many representations have been directed to the Government in respect to this matter, from individual persons concerned in the trade with the Spanish Antilles, and from boards of trade, notably from the Halifax Board of Trade, a memorial from which my hon. friend has read. I may say, also, that individual members in the House have pressed the matter upon the attention of the Government, and none more strongly than my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). My hon. friend has so thoroughly laid the chief points in the matter before the House that it is not necessary for me to recapitulate. In fact, if he had simply asked me the question, in order to make my answer intelligent to the House, I should first have read the very sections of the different treaties which the hon. gentleman himself saved me the trouble of reading. In brief, then, to reply to his question, I may say that the convention of 1886 between Great Britain and Spain, in which the Government of Canada took very special interest, through Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, thoroughly safeguarded the interests of Canada and secured for her, amongst the other possessions of Great Britain, the most-favoured-nation treatment in the Spanish Antilles. That convention lasts, as my hon. friend said, till 1892. I believe notice has been given of its termination at that time, and one would be led to suppose that from the wording of the arrangement itself. If, then, that convention of 1886 procured for Canada, as one of the British colonial possessions, the most-favoured-nation treatment during its continuance, I cannot do otherwise than hold that up to the 1st of July, 1892, products similar in kind to those mentioned in the schedules in the Spanish American arrangement, take their place in the markets of the Spanish West India Islands on an equal footing with like products from the United States of America. That is made still stronger by the fact mentioned by my hon. friend, that there are two parts in this arrangement, and that the definitive treaty is expressly stated not to come into force until the international obligations, evidently referring to the convention with Great Britain and the treaties with Germany and France,—until those obligations leave Spain free to carry out, to a larger extent, the arrangements with the United States. With regard to the contention of the United States that my hon. friend has mentioned, namely, that in so much as this is a treaty of reciprocity where something is given for something, and that, therefore, the most-favoured-nation clause would not prevent an arrangement between Spain and the United States, certainly that contention falls to the ground entirely until the 1st of January, 1892, because up to that time Spain is given nothing of advantage in the markets of the United States which is not given to the whole world. The matter was taken up at the earliest possible moment by the Government and is being pressed at home. Of course, what is needed is the authoritative statement of the Spanish Government itself. That is what we are trying, through the British Government, to get, and we do not believe that Spain will do otherwise than carry out her international obligations. The trend of these is very fully pointed out by my hon. friend, and appears in the treaties the sections of which he read to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a very important question of international law with which the hon. gentleman in his capacity of Minister of Finance can hardly be supposed to be acquainted with, but which, probably, the Minister of Justice may have had occasion to consider, that is, the question whether, when two nations enter into a treaty of the nature of a reciprocity treaty such as he has alluded to, that is held to exempt them from the most-favoured-nation clause. Now, I speak with great diffidence, and I speak under correction, but it does occur to my mind that on the occasion of the formation of the German Zollverein a number of years ago, that question did come up, and speaking from memory, and under correction, I rather think that view was held. But I should like, as this is a matter of interest to all of us, and as it may have a very important bearing on future negotiations, to have the views of the Minister of Justice and of any hon. members of the House who have specially looked into the question of constitutional law. The Minister of Justice and the House generally will see that very important issues may come to depend on whether that contention can be maintained or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At the time of the last conference on trade relations with the United States, I mean the conference which took place in the winter of 1887 and 1888, the subject was a very practical one, because there were treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause which might interfere with our negotiations, and we took some pains to ascertain what the view of Her Majesty's Government then was as to that doctrine, and we understood it to be, without any doubt, that the provisions of a reciprocity treaty would not call in the operation of the most favoured-nation clause in those outstanding treaties. I think that that view was very much strengthened by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the very question which has just been raised. On 1st October, 1886, the Supreme Court of the United States, through Mr. Justice Field, rendered a decision, as to a question which had been raised in relation to the treaty with Denmark and the treaty

with the Hawaiian Islands. The judgment is a long one, but I will refer as briefly as I can to the points set forth. The mode in which the question arose was this: As most members of the House are aware, a treaty, without any enactment, forms part of the law of the United States. A merchant doing business in New York in 1882 made importations of sugars and molasses, the produce and manufacture of the Island of St. Croix, which is part of the dominions of the King of Denmark. The goods were regularly entered in the Customs; and it was claimed that those goods should have come in free of duty in consequence of the fact that the treaty with Denmark contained the most-favoured-nation clause, and that subsequently was made the treaty with the King of the Hawaiian Islands to admit all those article free of duty from all those Islands. The decision is summarized as follows:—

"The treaty with the Hawaiian Islands makes no provision for the imposition of any duties on goods, the produce or manufacture of that country, imported into the United States. It stipulates for the exemption from duty of certain goods thus imported, in consideration of and as an equivalent for certain reciprocal concessions on the part of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. There is in such exemption no violation of the stipulations in the treaty with Denmark, and if the exemption is deemed a 'particular favour' in respect of commerce and navigation, within the first article of that treaty, it can only be claimed by Denmark upon like compensation to the United States. It does not appear that Denmark has ever objected to the imposition of duty upon goods from her Dominions imported into the United States, because of the exemption from duty of similar goods imported from the Hawaiian Islands, such exemption being in consideration of reciprocal concessions which she has never proposed to make. Our conclusion is, that the treaty with Denmark does not bind the United States to extend to that country, without compensation, privileges which they have conceded to the Hawaiian Islands in exchange for valuable concessions. On the contrary, the treaty provides that like compensation shall be given for such special favours. When such compensation is made, it will be time to consider whether sugar from her dominions shall be admitted free from duty."

Of course it may be that something may turn on the particular language of the treaties themselves, and I do not mean to put this decision forward as conclusive evidence as to the view of the United States on the broad question; but I think the intimation we have had from Her Majesty's Government in the past and this decision are all that can be had on the subject, unless there is some correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and other powers which we have not obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, as I understand the hon. gentleman, following him as closely as I could, the authority he quoted is tolerably distinct that where a reciprocity treaty is concluded the most-favoured-nation clause does not take effect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the effect of it.

Mr. STAIRS. I should like to say a few words on this subject, on account of its great importance in regard to the trade interests of the Maritime Provinces, more especially those of Nova Scotia. The subject has been well brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), though some time ago I took up the question, upon representations made to me from Nova Scotia, and I brought it to the notice of the Government. The reason why our people are so very much affected by the action of this treaty between Spain and the United States, as regards our trade between Cuba and Porto Rico, is that a considerable proportion of our exports are sent to those two Islands. Both of the articles in which they are most especially interested have been referred to by the hon. member for King's, and they consist of potatoes and fish. I think, from what I have heard of the hon. gentleman's own county, the operation of the treaty, if it should not include the exports from Nova Scotia, will be to seriously hamper the exports from that county to Cuba. The Havana market during the last few years has been a very important market for the export of potatoes from Nova Scotia, and it will be very much to be regretted if the effect of this treaty is to shut out those potatoes from that port. As to the constitutional question, I will not enter into it, but as a layman, I may say that any one reading the treaties, as read by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), would naturally come to the conclusion at which he has arrived, that at least up to July, 1892, Canada is entitled to all the benefits in the Cuban markets to which the United States are entitled. But it seems to me there is another very important question that has to be considered, and it is this: What is going to occur after July, 1892? In pressing on the attention of the Government the importance of the whole question, I want to bring two points clearly before them: First, they must seek as quickly as possible a decision on the question as to the position of our exports up to July, 1892; and, second, they must ascertain what is to be done after that date. It is not for me to dictate, and possibly not even to suggest, to members of the Government how these decisions are to be obtained. I simply ask them to give this important subject their serious consideration, with a view to ascertain if Canada cannot open negotiations, through the Imperial Government, with Spain, with a view to obtaining all the privileges for Canada in Cuba and Porto Rico that will be enjoyed by the people of the United States after July, 1892.

Mr. FRASER. As indicating the feeling prevailing both in Cuba and in Nova Scotia, I desire to read extracts from two letters I have received. One is from a merchant in Havana and the other is from a merchant in Nova Scotia. Following what the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) has said, I declare this question to be one of paramount importance to Nova Scotia. The treaty between the United States and Cuba, if carried into effect, and without any steps being taken on our part with the mother country to arrange with Cuba, will be simply ruinous to many people in Nova Scotia. A merchant in Havana writing, says:

"The principal topic of conversation on 'Change this week has been the reciprocal treaty between Spain and the United States which is to take effect provisionally on September 1st next, and definitely on July 1st, 1892. By the provisions of this treaty American dry fish and potatoes will enter free of duty; this, we are sorry to say, will result in serious prejudice to the provincial products, and we sincerely hope that our friends in Nova Scotia can bring sufficient force to bear upon the home Government that a commercial arrangement may be made which will put the products of Nova Scotia on an equally favourable footing."

That, from a merchant in Cuba, indicates what the effects of this treaty will be upon the products of Nova Scotia in that country. Now, a large merchant in Nova Scotia writes what the effect will be in Nova Scotia so far as the fishermen are concerned, and so far as our exports to Cuba are concerned:

"We wish more especially to call your attention to the fact which you already know, that a treaty has been made

between the United States and Spain which will soon take effect, and will operate against our fish from the provinces, and will drive our fishermen to the United States to fish and obtain prices free of duty. Spanish duty in Cuba is about $1 per quintal."

The first letter indicates what the effect is going to be on our products when sent to Cuba, and the second letter shows, that unless we have this reciprocal trade, what is going to be the effect on the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Following up the remarks made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and others, I sincerely trust that the Government will impress upon the home Government the absolute importance of this matter, so far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, where so great a portion of our trade is to the West India Islands. I can appreciate the difficulty of our having such arrangements made as will enable our people to send their products to these Islands; and further, the difficulty of dealing with Cuba in respect to a treaty there, as we would under general circumstances, in this country or in Great Britain, give effect to that treaty. I am sure that if the Dominion Government urge upon the English Government the absolute necessity of this matter, they can bring such pressure to bear upon the Spanish Government as will enable us to have this treaty. I need scarcely say, that the worst any man in Canada who is opposed to the McKinley tariff can say about its effects upon the farmers of Ontario, is not worse than the effects of this treaty upon the people of Nova Scotia, so far as their trade with the West Indies is concerned.

Mr. McNEILL. I could not very well catch what fell from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in the seat I occupied when he was speaking; but I want to understand whether I had correctly gathered from his remarks, that in his opinion Canada would be enabled to enter into preferential arrangements with the mother country, notwithstanding the existence of treaties having the favoured-nation clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I endeavoured to avoid giving my own opinion about the matter, because it is a subject of great difficulty and would require a good deal of consideration, and a subject upon which we have very little light. All I gave to the House was the statement that we had an opinion from the Imperial Government two years ago—not an official opinion, but an intimation—that the view held by Her Majesty's Government was, that the provisions of a reciprocity treaty would not necessarily invoke the operation of the most-favoured-nation clause in other treaties; and that such, certainly, would be the view of the United States, because a decision to that effect appears to have been given by their Supreme Court. Of course, I want also to guard myself by the observation that a good deal might depend upon the particular language of particular treaties. So far as one can judge about what has been held on the general principle, that seems to be the view of the mother country and of the United States.

Mr. LAURIER. I would say to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that before Great Britain is ready to enter into preferential arrangements with us, the present treaties will have time to expire.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope the wish is not father of the thought, with my hon. friend.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have certainly no objection to entering into a treaty that will improve our position, but the hon. gentleman knows, so far as Great Britain is concerned, that there is no impediment to the export of our products to that country now, by way of taxation; so that we are not likely to suffer on account of any action of Great Britain. I think the doctrine is pretty well settled by the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, which the hon. the Minister of Justice has read, and I believe, as a rule, that it has been recognized in nearly every country in Christendom: That, unless there is something very special in the provisions of a treaty, a reciprocity treaty stipulating for certain special advantages on account of certain concessions made, does not come within the purview of the favoured-nation clause of any treaty. This subject was very fully discussed at various times in the Congress of the United States and also when the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was in operation. The opinion was sometimes expressed there, that the Executive of the United States, having made treaties with other countries in which a special favoured-nation clause was contained, had violated the provisions of these treaties by entering into a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and that if the various nations with which the United States had entered into treaties containing that favoured-nation clause insisted upon it, they could claim to be put upon the same terms as Canada was placed in by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. I think, however, the current opinion amongst the legal men who sat in Congress at that time, was altogether against that view. Certainly, men like Cushing, and Quincy Adams, and Reverdy Johnson, and others who occupied very eminent position as jurists in the United States, held, that the favoured-nation clause did not apply in the case where special arrangements were made by treaty, unless that clause were drawn in such a way as to make it perfectly clear that it was the intention to meet an exceptional case of that sort. I think the same rule has been recognized by the Foreign Office in England, though not uniformly, certainly not in the case of Japan, though I have not looked into the subject for some years.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY BELT—SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to bring to the attention of the House, the grievances of certain settlers in British Columbia, who, in my judgment, and, I believe, in the judgment of the House also, have a very serious ground of complaint against the administration of the Department of the Interior. It is a well-settled rule of common law that all grants of land coming from the Crown, always convey to the grantee, not only the right of surface, but also the right to all the minerals whether on the surface or under the surface. Yet, in certain sections of British Columbia, in the section which has been reserved as part of the subsidy to the railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, in the districts of Cranberry, Cedar, Wellington, Nanoose and Nanaimo, the grants were made by the Crown not only under the authority of common law, but under the statute law of the land as well; because they are not grants by prerogative of the Crown, but grants made under the law, and they do not

convey to the settler the absolute freehold, but are limited to the surface, and reserve to the Crown the rights to the minerals. Letters patent have been placed in my hands issued in 1886 to James Paterson, one of those settlers, in which it is stated that the conveyance is made to James Paterson of the freehold, but with this reservation:

"Saving and reserving nevertheless, unto us and our successors and assigns, all coal, coal oil, ores, mines and minerals whatsoever in, on or under the said lands."

Mr. DEWDNEY. What date did he enter?

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that he entered several years before the Act of 1884, to which I shall allude; my impression is that he entered long before 1887. This settler, along with all others situated as he is, complains that in making this reservation the Government of Canada acted in violation of vested rights. The history of the case is briefly this: These lands I understand have been open to settlement for twenty years and more. They were surveyed, if I am correctly informed, some time between 1860 and 1870, and they have been open to settlement ever since. Now, the people who settled on these lands, settled on the well-known conditions of common law and statute law, which existed in British Columbia as well as in all the other provinces, and they believed that by fulfilling the conditions imposed upon them by the statutes, as to settlement, and as to certain payments, they would obtain the right in the soil—the right of ownership with all that ownership implies, that is to say, not only the right of the surface, but the right to the minerals also, with the exception of the precious metals, gold and silver, which are always reserved to the Crown. In 1884 the Government of the Province of British Columbia entered into an arrangement with the Government of Canada with a view of obtaining help from the Government of Canada towards the construction of a railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, by which the Government of British Columbia transferred to the Government of Canada a block of land on condition of Canada undertaking to pay a subsidy of $750,000 and also the land itself, to any company that would undertake the construction of a railway. This block of land is thus described in the Act:

"Bounded on the south by a straight line drawn from the head of Saanich Inlet to Muir Creek on the Straits of Fuca; on the west, by a straight line drawn from Muir Creek aforesaid to Crown Mountain; on the north, by a line drawn from Crown Mountain to Seymour Narrows; and on the east by the coast lines of Vancouver Island to the point of commencement; and including all coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, mines, minerals, and substances whatsoever thereupon, therein and thereunder."

To this were made the following reservations and exceptions:—

"There is excepted out of the tract of land granted by the preceding section, all that portion thereof lying to the northward of a line running east and west halfway between the mouth of the Courtenay River (Comox District) and Seymour Narrows."

That is to say, out of the block so given to Canada a certain portion lying north of a certain point is reserved to the Government of British Columbia. Then, there is this further clause:

"Provided always, that the Government of Canada shall be entitled out of such excepted tract to lands equal in extent to those alienated up to the date of this Act by Crown grant, pre-emption, or otherwise within the limits of the grant mentioned in section 3 of this Act.

"The grant mentioned in section 3 of this Act shall not include any lands now held under Crown grant, lease, agreement for sale, or other alienation by the Crown, nor shall it include Indian reserves or settlements, nor naval or military reserves."

So that here it is plainly stated that in the portion which was reserved to the Government of British Columbia, the Government of Canada should be compensated for any land which should be found to have been alienated by grants from the Crown in the different ways here mentioned. The words are as broad as they can be. Now, there cannot be, in my estimation, any doubt that under a statute opening lands for settlement——

Mr. DEWDNEY. Is that 1883?

Mr. LAURIER. That is 1884. The moment a settler goes on his land, makes his entry, or squats with the intention of becoming a settler within the meaning of the Act, he becomes the owner from the moment of his entry, not from the time the letters patent are granted to him. The letters patent are only an evidence of his right; but his right does not originate with the letters patent: his right to the soil commences and takes effect from the moment he commences to operate and conform to the provisions of the Act. If this construction of the Act is right, all the lands which at that time under that Act were alienated by the Crown, that is to say, had been pre-empted or settled upon within the meaning and intention of the Act, were withheld from Canada, did not belong to Canada, but belonged to the settler. Now, the question might arise whether the letters patent, when they were issued, should have been issued by the Government of British Columbia or by the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada has assumed that the right or the duty of issuing the patents belonged to the Government of Canada, and so it has commenced to issue these patents. I should say, however, that the lands which have been granted to Canada have been also granted by Canada to the company which has undertaken and fulfilled, I believe, the construction of a railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo. But what the settlers now complain of, is that those patents which are given to them reserve to the Crown the coal and other minerals. This is a very important matter to them, because, as I understand, valuable deposits of coal have been found upon those lands, and therefore it becomes all the more important to them that the faith of the Crown, if it was pledged to them at the time of settlement, should be kept. Now, the question which I submit is this. My contention, or at all events, the contention of those people, is that when they settled upon those lands, they were not encumbered by any restrictions, and they settled with the conviction that by conforming to the law of the statutes, they would become owners and proprietors, not only of the surface, but of all the minerals found beneath the surface, with the exception of gold and silver, but including coal. Coal has been found upon those lands, but it is reserved from them and held by the Crown. What is the reason? As far as I can see, the reason is that in the Act which was passed by the Parliament of Canada in the session of 1884, after the Act of British Columbia to which I have alluded had come into effect, the following sections are to be found. Sub-section 1 of section 7 says:

"The lands to be so conveyed shall, except as to coal and other minerals, and also except as to timber lands as hereinafter mentioned, be open for four years from the nineteenth day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-three, to actual settlers for agricultural purposes."

Then sub-section 2 says:

"Every *bonâ fide* squatter who has continuously occupied and improved any of the lands within the tract of land to be acquired by the company from the Dominion Government for a period of one year prior to the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-three, shall be entitled to a grant of the freehold of the surface rights of the said squatted land, to the extent of one hundred and sixty acres, at the rate of one dollar per acre."

Now, I presume it is upon these two clauses that the Government acted when they refused to make the grant of the minerals as well as the surface when issuing the patent. But it seems to me that this hard construction, if it be taken, should be strictly maintained within the terms of the statute. It might apply, perhaps, to those settlers whose possession of the land did not extend to a date prior to the 1st of January, 1883, but cannot be held to apply to all those settlers who had settled upon the land before that time. In the case to which I referred, the case of James Paterson, I am just informed by a note received from himself that he settled upon his tract of land upon the 29th of January, 1878, and therefore would not come within the two clauses, sub-section one and sub-section two of section seven, but would be entitled to his patent without any abridgement whatever. Moreover, whatever may be the construction put upon these two clauses, section five seems to defeat them in so far as they may interfere with the rights of citizens. Sub-section five reads as follows:—

"The existing rights, if any, of any persons or corporations in any of the lands so to be acquired by a company shall not be affected by this Act."

The language is just as broad and clear as it can be, so that if we are to take these words, emphatic as they are, it is clear that the settlers who had settled upon their lands previous to the date mentioned in the statute, could not be prejudiced, as regards any of the rights they were entitled to, when the Act was passed, and which rights they had reason to expect would not be interfered with. It may very well be conceived that since valuable deposits of coal were found in that region, these settlers, who were thereafter to be deprived of what they had reason to believe would be a source of wealth to them, made serious complaints to the Government. They sent petition after petition, as I am given to understand, and I am informed also that about 1884 or 1885, they sent a petition direct to Lord Lansdowne, then Governor General, and he referred them to the Department of the Interior, from which they never received any satisfaction. However, some time in 1886 or 1887, the impression got abroad through the district that an Order in Council had been passed empowering a commission to go to British Columbia and enquire into their rights. In 1890, I brought this question to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. I made the following motion:—

"1. Copies of all petitions addressed His Excellency the Governor General by settlers in the Districts of Cranberry, Cedar, Wellington, Nanoose and Nanaimo, B.C., asking the privilege of obtaining the lands on which they had squatted on the Island Railway Reserve on ordinary terms allowed to settlers, viz., that their grant should include surface and minerals.

"2. For copies of all Orders in Council passed to authorize a commission to enquire into the claims of said settlers."

I was then told by the hon. Minister of the Interior that no such order had ever been passed nor had any such petition been received. I expressed at that time my astonishment at the statement, and he promised to look further into the matter. He did so, and a few days afterwards told me there had been a petition sent in 1882 or 1884 on the matter, and that petition had been brought to the House in 1886. The motion which I have read was made on the 29th of January, and the question came up again on the 6th of February, upon a question made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), who enquired from the Government:

"Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause an investigation to be made into the alleged grievances of certain squatters on the railway lands on Vancouver Island, who claim that they have been denied the rights guaranteed them under sub-section two of section seven of the Act passed by the Parliament of Canada intituled: An Act respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, &c."

To this question the hon. Minister of the Interior made the following reply:—

"In the transfer to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company the rights of the squatters under the Act 47 Vic., cap. 6, have been reserved and protected, and their remedy (if any) seems to be against the company. An officer of the Department of the Interior will, however, be sent at an early day, to investigate the alleged grievances, with a view of ascertaining the rights of the squatters under the said Act and the patent of the company."

Now, nothing could be more binding than the engagement the hon. gentleman then gave to the House, upon a direct enquiry by the hon. member for Vancouver, whose constituents these settlers are. In my judgment, these settlers are entitled to the minerals, yet it may be said that the question is not free from doubt, and certainly the promise then made by the hon. Minister was one which commended itself to the judgment of the House. This promise was indicated to the settlers, who expected its fulfilment. At the opening of the session I moved for the report of the officer who, I had reason to suppose, had gone to British Columbia and investigated those claims; but the hon. gentleman told me that no such investigation had taken place, that he had looked into the matter, and for reasons to which I shall presently allude he did not think fit and proper to investigate the claims and redeem the promise he had made to the House. Now, what were the reasons then given by the hon. gentleman? He stated that he had gone himself to British Columbia, and that he had ascertained that the question to which his attention had been called and which he had promised to investigate, was then before the courts. I asked him if he alluded to the case of Hogan, and he said he did. I suggested that I thought that he was under a misapprehension, as I had reason to believe that the case of Hogan did not at all involve the question as to whom belonged the minerals—as to whether they belong to the company or the Government of Canada or the settlers, but that it was altogether a dispute between settler and settler, and that, if such were the case, the hon. gentleman had acted certainly upon a very strange misconception of the facts—a misconception of fact which could not excuse him for not having redeemed the promise he made the settlers. The hon. gentleman then answered:

"All I can say is that I acted in accordance with my judgment at the time, and I thought I was acting in the interests of the settlers when I refused to make an investigation which might prejudice their case before the courts."

Since then I have got the case of Hogan to which the hon. gentleman alluded, and I find that if the hon. gentleman acted upon the best of his judgment I do not believe he did himself justice, for he gave the question no serious consideration at all. I cannot see that he gave it even superficial attention, for if he had at all looked into that case, he would have found that there is in it no question of the right to the minerals. On the contrary, it is simply this: Hogan sued the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to compel them to give him a deed of sale for a certain plot of land, and specially stated that the only rights he claimed were the rights of surface and that he did not at all ask for the minerals. The company answers him that he is not entitled to the plot of land; the ground of its contention is that he settled upon land which has never been opened to settlement, that he settled upon a town plot and not upon land set apart for agricultural purposes; and now, in order to show how completely the question of coal and minerals is excluded from the consideration of the matter, I will read from the declaration of Hogan himself:

"On the 10th December, 1887, the plaintiff by a notice in writing of that date signed by him and addressed to, and on the 15th December, 1887, duly, served on the defendants, notified the defendants of all the facts and premises in the preceding paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 mentioned and applied for the said parcel of land in said paragraphs 12 and 13 mentioned, and asked to be allowed to acquire the same from the defendants, and the plaintiff, in and by said notice, also notified the defendants, as was the fact, that he was ready and willing, and he hereby offered to pay the defendants the sum of $160 for the said parcel of land, and applied to be received and recognized by the defendants as the purchaser of said parcel of land and as the person entitled to grant thereof under the said enactments and provisions, saving, excepting and reserving to the defendants all coal and other minerals in or under the said parcel of land."

And in his conclusion, he asks this:

"That it may be declared that the plaintiff is entitled to acquire and purchase from the defendants the said parcel or tract of land at the price or sum of $160, excepting and reserving thereout and in respect thereof all coal and other minerals."

So in this case the minerals are especially excluded. Hogan himself declares that he has no intention of acquiring the minerals; and under such circumstances how was it possible for the hon. gentleman to prevent the investigation from going on, because he said this question of the minerals was in court? The hon. gentleman has not given even the slightest and the most superficial attention to the matter. That is clear, because, if he had, he would have convinced himself that the case of Hogan had no reference at all to the cases of the other settlers as to whom the question whether the minerals belonged to the Crown, the company or the settlers was involved. Under such circumstances, I submit that the hon. gentleman is absolutely without any excuse. There is no reason why these men were delayed as to the investigation of their rights by the step which the Government took. When they applied to the Government, they were told that their claims would be investigated. This was probably on the suggestion of some of the supporters of the Government in this House. Then the promise goes out among their friends in the country, and they expect, but the expectation is not fulfilled. If anything should be considered sacred, I think it should be the word of the Crown pledged to the people; but the hon. gentleman, acting here as a Minister of the Crown and as Minister of the Interior, and having to deal with important interests connected with these people, after having made a solemn promise to them, refuses to carry out that promise on grounds which did not exist. I say it was beyond the duty of the hon. gentleman to refuse to carry out the pledges he had made not only to these settlers but to the Parliament of Canada as well. I think everyone will agree with me that, if we hope to have this country settled, every settler upon our lands, either from abroad or from within the country, must know that his rights will be protected and that everything which has been promised to him shall be faithfully and rigidly carried out. Some few weeks ago only, the hon. member for Assiniboia brought to the attention of the House the case of certain settlers in British Columbia and the North-West who had settled on their homesteads on the assumption that they had the right which existed by statute at that time to obtain a second homestead. The law has been subsequently repealed, but the sense of the House was overwhelming that faith ought to be kept with those settlers, and that, since they were entitled to a second homestead and pre-emption when they settled on the land in the North-West, the word of the Crown should be kept with them, and that they should be given a second homestead. I ask for the same privileges for these settlers; I ask that every right they have had, that all they expected would accrue to them, when they settled on those lands, shall be religiously observed with them, and that the faith of the Crown which was promised to investigate their grievances shall be religiously kept, and I say that the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his department, after having made the promises which were made and not fulfilled, is without any excuse whatever. Therefore, I move that all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following substituted:—

The letters patent issued under the authority of the Department of the Interior to settlers on lands forming part of the railway reserves in the districts of Cranberry, Cedar, Wellington, Nanoose, Nanaimo, British Columbia, convey to said settlers the right of surface only, all minerals including coal and coal oil being reserved to the Crown.

2. That some of the said settlers have often represented to the Government by petitions and otherwise that such exclusion of minerals from their letters patent, was contrary to law and to their vested rights.

3. That last year, the Minister of the Interior, on the floor of Parliament, promised that an officer of his department would, at an early day, proceed to British Columbia to investigate the claims of the said settlers.

4. That the Minister of the Interior, without any cause whatever, has failed to have the said investigation made and has thus committed a breach of faith with Parliament and a gross injustice to the settlers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. the leader of the Opposition on his having at last taken some little interest in British Columbia. I hope this will be the precursor of many actions that he will take in that direction, and that we will see more attention in future given by the leaders of the Opposition to that country than we have in the past. The hon. gentleman has commenced by giving the history of the railway belt in British Columbia known as the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway belt. As early as 1875, a reservation was made of that railway belt by the Government of British Columbia for the

purpose of securing, as they thought they had a right to do, the construction of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They made this reservation in order that there might be no excuse on the part of the Government of the Dominion, on their application being made to construct that piece of railway. However, the Government of Sir John Macdonald, as well as the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, refused to make that piece of road a part of the main line; but, from 1875, the whole of that tract of land now known as the Nanaimo and Esquimalt railway belt, was exempt from settlement, purchase and preemption, and it was not until 1883 that an arrangement was made by which this land was reserved especially for the construction of the piece of road from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, and in 1884 the legislation took place by British Columbia and in this House confirming the arrangement, and an Act was passed with several conditions attached to it. One condition was that any parties who had settled on the reservation prior to the 1st of January, 1883, would be entitled to the surface rights of 160 acres, at $1 an acre. It was also agreed that any parties would be entitled to settle on the land four years subsequently to the 19th of December, 1883, and would be allowed to obtain their land, 160 acres, at $1. Now, there was no difficulty with regard to these two classes of settlers, they were allowed to settle under certain conditions, among which was one that the right of way should be reserved for the railway, the coal and other minerals described in the Act were to be reserved from the patent, and any timber required for railway purposes were also to be reserved. Now, with regard to these settlers, there can be no difficulty in my mind, nor with regard to some others who have settled there previous to 1883; and Mr. Paterson appears to be one of those who settled in 1878, according to the information of the hon. member. He settled on land at the time when we had no interest whatever in it, and I should presume is entitled to his patent under the conditions under which the Local Government gave their patents in those days. They varied at different periods, and whether they carried minerals or not, I am not prepared to say; or whether they took it up at a time when 5 cents a ton was demanded on all coal mines that were worked, I am not sure. But if this gentleman has received his patent for lands he took up in 1878, and he has a grievance, the grievance is not against the Dominion Government, but it is against the Local Government, and if he wants a remedy he must go there for it, it is no use for him to come here. And there may be others in the same position. Now, it was not until the hon. gentleman made his motion here to-day that I gathered from him what were the grievances from which these settlers suffered. It appears now that they complained that they do not get the minerals in their patents. He did not say that when he asked last year for information in regard to it.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, I did.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He never said that was a special grievance.

Mr. LAURIER. The very terms of the motion which I made included minerals.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Then I had forgotten it. However, I do not see what right any of those settlers have on the land subsequent to 1882, or, at any rate, from 1875 up to 1882. They are squatters, and have no rights whatever, and I do not see that they are entitled to the minerals at all. I hold in my hand the patent which was issued by the Dominion Government at a time when we handled the property. On the completion of the railway we were compelled by the Act to hand the land over to the railway company, and we subsequently did so. Now, the patent we issued in accordance with the Act is to this effect:

"To have and to hold the said parcel or tract of land unto the said ——— and assigns, for ever; saving and reserving nevertheless unto us, our successors and assigns, the free uses, passage and enjoyment of, in, over and upon all navigable waters that now are, or may be hereafter found, on, or under, or flowing through, or upon any part of the said parcel or tract of land; and saving and reserving also the right of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to cut timber for railway purposes on said lands, and the rights of way for their railway through said land, and the right to take such parts of the said lands for the stations and workshops of the said company as may be required by them for these purposes, without paying compensation therefor; and saving and reserving nevertheless unto our successors and assigns, all coal, coal oil, ores, mines and minerals whatsoever, in, on, or under the said lands."

Now, that was the understanding upon which the land was transferred by the Dominion to the railway company. When the land was transferred to them we were compelled to give them a title similar to that, and I have a copy in my hand of the title which has since been given by the railway company, and it corresponds exactly with the title given by the Dominion Government when they handled that property. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me, see where any hardship has been done to any settlers. They went on that land with their eyes open, they knew very well what the conditions were, and if any of them had rights prior to any negotiations with regard to this property, of course, they are entitled to their patent, and to all the conditions mentioned in the patents given by the Local Government, and if they have not got their patent, it is their own fault, for they are perfectly able to get it if they wish. It is a question of law, it is a question for the courts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you assumed to issue the patent.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Only a few names were given to us by the Provincial Government, and it is only to those that we issued patents. Now, with reference to the personal attack that has been made on me in reference to the enquiry that was made last year. As I told the hon. gentleman early in the session, I stated that I had made the promise to the House that an investigation would be made, and that after the House adjourned I submitted the matter to my colleagues and stated how I proposed to make the investigation, which was through my deputy, who had already departed and got as far as Winnipeg, and I proposed to associate with him Mr. Aikman, who had been our land commissioner up to a very late date, but who had left us and joined an old firm with whom he had previously been a partner. Mr. Aikman knew the whole of the transactions with regard to our lands in British Columbia, and I thought he would be available. Upon communication with him I found that his charges were rather exorbitant, and after submitting them to my colleagues, we concluded that the claims were not of such a character as would justify us in making the expenditure in-

volved, and that as I was going to British Columbia, I would make the enquiries myself. I then telegraphed to Mr. Burgess not to proceed, and I went there myself, and, as I said before, I found these two or three cases in litigation in regard to the squatters on that belt. It happens that Mr. Hogan was not claiming the minerals, and the hon. gentleman says that is the only excuse I have for not enquiring into the matter. But Mr. Hogan did not care about the minerals, because he had jumped a town property which was far more valuable to him than a coal property. However, at that time, I was not aware that the grievance was that the claimants were clamouring for their minerals. If I had understood the hon. gentleman to make that statement, I would certainly have told him then, as I tell him now, that he had no grievance in that respect whatever. If I had understood that this was the claim, I would have told him frankly that it was not a matter for investigation, because the patent would not give them the minerals on the railway reservation. British Columbia is not the only country where its minerals are reserved. We are reserving them in the North-West Territories. Why should a holder of land in the railway reservation of Vancouver Island be entitled to the minerals any more than a settler in any other part of the country? In Ontario the minerals in the Crown lands are reserved. No very great hardship has, therefore, been suffered, nor do I think that the motion should be adopted.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MULOCK. The amendment placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, proposes to censure the Minister of the Interior for not having carried out the promises he made on the floor of the House in February, 1890, for an investigation into the claims of certain settlers in British Columbia. The Minister has urged to-day, and on former occasions, several reasons why he has not taken the course he promised, and which at the time, by virtue of his promise, he thought he should have taken. In order properly to understand these various defences of the Minister it may be instructive to briefly consider the history of the case. I understand the leading facts to be as follows:—From 1870 onwards, for a period of some eight years, various settlers took possession of and pre-empted lands in the railway belt in the Island of Vancouver. Subject to whatever rights those settlers had acquired, they were not trespassers—and I presume the bulk of them were legally in possession—but whatever may be the merits of that question, subject to whatever rights they possessed, a transfer of the lands in the railway belt was in due course made to the Dominion. Some of those settlers obtained patents and some, perhaps, did not obtain patents; however that may be, the legislation on the question, the forum for the settlement of this question was transferred to the Dominion. The settlers began as early as 1880 to make application to the Dominion Government for an investigation of their claims. We find their applications for investigation taking various forms. We remember a visit made to British Columbia by a distinguished Governor General of Canada, and it is said, and not controverted, that on that occasion and on the occasion of a subsequent visit, those settlers approached the Governor General, as it was their right, and they orally made known to him some of the grievances arising out of this conflict. On his return to Ottawa, it is reasonable to assume that His Excellency communicated the tenor of those grievances to his constitutional advisers. Subsequently, and perhaps concurrently with those visits, various communications in different forms passed from the settlers to the Government here. Petitions and correspondence were transmitted from time to time, the last of them having ceased to come about 1887. Those various communications were interrupted for a time by reason, no doubt, of the disturbances of the North-West, when that country was in a chronic state of rebellion from unredressed grievances, and ultimately broke out into open rebellion. They thought, no doubt, they would wait and see the effect of the applications made by their fellow-citizens in the North-West. However that may be, their applications were, until within a year from now or thereabouts, pigeon-holed and stowed away in the secret archives and places of record in Ottawa. No, not entirely so. The late Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior, I understand, undertook to look into these claims, and on one of his visits to British Columbia he gave audience to some of the settlers. He came back, and probably but for his untimely death he would have investigated these questions, and we would not to-night have been discussing them. The consideration of the claims of the settlers was interrupted by the untimely death of Mr. White, and in due time the office and the responsibilities of the office devolved upon the present incumbent. It was unreasonable to hold him responsible for not having attended to these claims at an early date, because, coming new to the office, it was only fair to allow him a reasonable time to familiarize himself with unfinished business. But there is one date when we can fairly claim his responsibility began, and that date is at all events not later than January, 1890. In that month the present leader of the Opposition called the attention of the Minister pointedly to the grievances in question, and moved a motion on 29th January asking for the papers in connection with the appropriation for the various applications of the settlers. That motion made by the leader of the Opposition was accompanied by explanatory remarks making it quite clear that an investigation was desired, and a few days afterwards, the hon. gentleman who specially represents the settlers in question called the attention of the Minister to the matter by a question, and in reply to that question, the Minister of the Interior on the 6th day of February, 1890, promised the House that he would at an early day investigate these claims. His words on that occasion as given on page 274 of the *Hansard* of 1890 were as follows:—

"An officer of the Department of the Interior will, however, be sent, at an early day, to investigate the alleged grievances, with a view to ascertaining the rights of the squatters under the said Act and the patent of the company."

Here was a statement made on the floor of this House by a responsible Minister of the Crown, 18 months ago, promising in the name of the Crown that at an early date the claims of these settlers would be investigated. It is to be borne in mind that these petitioners are simply asking for an investi-

gation now, and not for an actual adjudication. They are asking first of all that the Dominion of Canada should investigate their claims, and here we have a solemn pledge given to Parliament in the name of the Crown, that these claims would be investigated. It is now the 18th August, 1891, and these claims not having been investigated, Parliament has a duty to perform in asking the Administration why that pledge has not been kept. The Minister of the Interior assigns various reasons to-day for not having investigated these claims, and he certainly must have felt his defence very desperate when he advanced the reasons he did, to an assembly such as this, for the non-action that he has been guilty of. In February, 1890, he stated, as recorded in *Hansard*, that the claims of the settlers were not against Canada at all, but against the railway company; and he used these words:

"In the transfer to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, the rights of the squatters under the Act 47 Vic., cap. 6, have been reserved and protected, and their remedy (if any) seems to be against the company."

In 1890, when he had been a year and a-half in office, the Minister of the Interior told us that the claims of these persons, if any, were against the railway company; but what have we heard him tell us to-day? He told us that there was no use in their coming to the Parliament of Canada or to the Department of the Interior for redress, because their claims, if any, were against the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Excuse me, I did not say anything of the kind. I said it was dependent on the class of squatters; some might have their claims against the Local Government, and others might come probably against the Dominion or against the company.

Mr. MULOCK. He turns some of them away with a deaf ear to British Columbia, and others of a certain class, he says may come here to establish their claims. If some of these settlers have no right to come to the Dominion, what did he mean by making the promise that he would investigate? Again, Sir, the Minister of the Interior told us to-day that this was a question of law, that he had made a great discovery of late, and that it was idle to go to British Columbia to investigate these claims, because they were questions of law, and, therefore, I suppose should be investigated in a legal tribunal. If that is the case why did the Minister send Mr. Burgess, one of his officers, a short time ago with instructions to investigate. The Minister himself undertook the task, but he subsequently changed his plans when on his way to where these settlers were. He has made this discovery to-day in order to get out of the difficulty—I will not say that—but it perhaps occurred to him as a *bonâ fide* defence, and it shows what an immature defence he has in regard to the case in point. Again, he told us to-day that when on his way to British Columbia when he intended to investigate these claims, he suddenly changed his plans because he had heard that a test case was in litigation, and, therefore, it would be advisable to postpone action on his part until the litigation in question determined the right of the party, and in reply to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, he stated that he referred to the Hogan case. The Hogan case, the Minister says, is a test case applicable to the settlers and being under litigation he proposes to do nothing until the determination of this case. Had the Minister taken the trouble to send down to the Supreme Court, within a hundred yards of where we are sitting, to get the record of the case, instead of accepting some hearsay statement that there was such a suit pending, he would have seen plainly set down there the reasons why this case has nothing to do with the question in issue. At page 6 of the case, which I hold in my hand, there is one excellent reason given, and on another page there is another excellent reason to show that the case in question is in no way applicable to the issues raised by the squatters.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That book was not printed in 1890.

Mr. MULOCK. But it was published when the hon. gentleman, on the 18th June, 1891, made the statement to the House. The writ was issued on the 21st March, 1888, and it was a pending suit when he went to British Columbia. Instead of taking some hearsay statement about such a case, when he was right at the court in British Columbia where the writ was issued, and where the pleadings were, why did he not ask to see the case and to see how it applied? He could have gone to the court in British Columbia, if he was delicate about going to the Supreme Court here, and he could have found out all about this case. He could have found out that it had nothing whatever to do with this question under discussion, for the Hogan case expressly declares that it did not bring into litigation mineral rights at all. Paragraph 14 of the plaintiff's claim states that this litigation "has regard to the land, saving, excepting and reserving to the defendants"—that is the company—"the coal and other minerals in or under the said land and the right to cut timber," and so on. The plaintiff's case, on the very face of it, expressly declares that it is not of that class of cases which is in question here, namely, that of the *bonâ fide* settler seeking possession of agricultural lands; and, moreover, I understand that this case had to do with another class of property not at all like the property of the settlers, namely, town plots that were not liable to settlement. For two excellent reasons, therefore, the case in question was in no way applicable. The great defence which the Minister reserved for the last, was, that he did not know what the settlers wanted, that he could not make out from the communications to the department what their grievances were. He now says that he did not know what their grievances were, and yet, eighteen months ago he made a solemn promise to Parliament to investigate them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he could not make out exactly what was wanted.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said I could not make out from the leader of the Opposition what the grievances were.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman does not know yet what the grievances are after 15 years of correspondence coming to the department, and of complaints to officer after officer; and he turns a deaf ear to these people and says to them: Go anywhere but to me; go to the railway company; go

to the courts; go to British Columbia, but do not trouble me. That is the defence of the Minister of the Interior. Under the circumstances I would be inclined, perhaps, to bear with him a little; but when we consider the experience of this country within the last few years, when we consider that rightly or wrongly the recent troubles in the North-West were largely attributed to the present Minister of the Interior;—I do not say they were due to him, but I say that inasmuch as public opinion has more generally attributed them to him than to anyone else, a responsibility rested upon him to be on the alert to prevent similar troubles anywhere else. He knew well how people would be provoked, and what dangers would be incurred by neglect of duty on his part: and yet with full knowledge of the grievances, after having made a pledge to these people on the floor of Parliament, and after eighteen months of negligence and dilatoriness, he comes down here and says to them: I have decided to turn you away from the doors of Parliament, and have nothing to do with you; you may have grievances, but I decline to investigate them: you may seek for redress if you like, but you will not get it at my hands. If the hon. gentleman could have said that with any propriety at all, it would have been at the time the applications were first brought to his notice in 1890, when he was asked what he was going to do. But he had no right to make a promise on behalf of the Crown to these people, and fail to keep that promise. Every possible excuse that can be advanced to-day for not making this investigation existed in February, 1890; and if it is a good defence to-day to say that reasons exist for not investigating, the same reasons existed then, and the promise should never have been given. Therefore, apart altogether from the dilatoriness, from the absolute non-performance of duty, I feel that perhaps a more serious offence exists to-day in the failure of the Minister to uphold the honour of the Crown. For these reasons I think Parliament will not be doing its duty unless it accepts the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have very great faith in the generosity of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I am sure that he has been led to give this case his support and the support of his party from the goodness of his heart, and not from the facts of the case itself or its merits. If the hon. gentleman's sense of justice in any degree equals his generosity, I am sure that when he comes to understand this case as it actually is, he will withdraw his motion or vote against it. Now, the hon. gentleman has challenged a vote of this House; and I presume he does not mean and does not expect a party vote, because it is not a party question. It is a question, it is true, of the administration of the public domain; but it is a question relating to the rights of persons claiming to be settlers in a distant portion of this country; and I presume that it would be his wish that the House in pronouncing judgment on the treatment of the rights of those persons, should be guided by something more than mere party spirit. Let me call the attention of the House to what the facts are in this case; because I could not imagine a member of this House presenting for the vote of the House a weaker case. I could not imagine the Government possessing a stronger case than it does on this occasion; and if we have not a case on the merits, we do not claim any member's vote in this House to-night. Now, Sir, it is alleged that a class of persons who settle on a certain tract of land comprising several townships in British Columbia between Nanaimo and Victoria are entitled to the sympathy of this House, and are entitled to the judgment of this House against the Minister of the Interior. They are represented in this city by a person whose name was mentioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition—a Mr. Paterson—whose case was put forward to the House to-night as a sample case, and one which we might fairly treat as a sample case; because, so far as I know, it does not present any of the extreme features which are alleged in regard to some of these cases, which are, perhaps, a little weaker or a little stronger than that of Mr. Paterson. But what is the contention of the hon. leader of the Opposition as regards Mr. Paterson and all persons of that class? It is that this person went upon these lands in British Columbia as a settler; and I will take his case, not because I lay any particular stress on its strength or weakness, but assuming, as the hon. gentleman himself did, that the features of that case fairly represent the others. Now, in 1878, this man went upon these lands, and from that fact the hon. leader of the Opposition says all his rights spring. Now, let us remember that British Columbia had a clearly-defined Crown lands policy as all the other provinces had. The Acts relating to the settlement of public lands in British Columbia at that time, and for many years before, provided that when a person entered upon the public lands for the purpose of settlement, he had to perform, as our settlers have, certain duties running over a space of two years; and at the end of the two years he would, under ordinary circumstances, be entitled to a patent for his land. But the first weak spot in his case—and it is so weak a spot that it is absolutely fatal to the case presented to the House this afternoon—is that neither Mr. Paterson nor any other of these persons went on the public lands of British Columbia, which were open for settlement at all, but they went on lands which three years before, by a solemn Act of the Provincial Legislature, had been reserved from settlement; and no matter how long they had stayed there, they were trespassers and squatters and entitled to no grace under any circumstances whatever except for the Dominion Act of 1884. The solemn judgment of one of the judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, afterwards affirmed by the full bench, designates what they were. They were not settlers upon public lands, but they were persons who were:

"Endeavouring to acquire the lands of the Crown without its assent, and even in direct opposition to the desire of the Crown to retain particular parcels of land for public uses."

In the year 1875, be it remembered, the British Columbia Government, being desirous of aiding and securing the construction of a line of railway between Nanaimo and Victoria, set apart this railway belt, twenty miles in width, and declared that it should not be open for settlement, although all the other public lands of the province were. And in spite of and in violation of that Act of 1875, and in defiance of the law, this man went on these lands, three years afterwards; and the leader of the Opposition uses, in relation to him, the language

that we have violated the vested right which he acquired in 1878, that he settled under the impression that he was to get the minerals as well as the surface rights, although the law of his province said he should get neither, and that we have violated justice in his case. Now, there is the first point, that by the law of his province he was a trespasser and not a homesteader, that he was not entitled to the minerals, not entitled to the surface rights, and that he required no right to a foot of the land, under any circumstances, before the statute of this Parliament was passed in 1884, to which I will call attention in a few moments. The second point is this: This man and the class of persons he represents have got patents for their lands from the Dominion Government, but the hon. leader of the Opposition claims that they are deeply wronged, because they have not received patents of the minerals—because their patents give them the right to the lands but reserve the minerals. That of itself would be no very great wrong, no very great injury in the hon. gentleman's own province, where, if I am not much mistaken, the settler on public lands receives a patent for his land after he has paid cash for it and done his homestead duties, every inch of mineral rights, including the coals which are under the soil, being reserved. In my own province the law is the same; in the North-West Territories it is the same; and all over British Columbia grants have been given from time to time to homesteaders and to purchasers of public lands, reserving the minerals, although in some cases and at times statutes have been enforced giving rights to the minerals, including the coal. So that the second point is that, by the law of his own province, he had nothing to complain of, even if he had been a settler and a homesteader, as to these coal lands being reserved. That state of things continued down to the year 1884. All that time the law of the Province of British Columbia, which the hon. the leader of the Opposition supposes gave Paterson a vested right to minerals as well as to surface land, stared him in the face, declaring he should get neither, declaring that he was a trespasser and a squatter there. But in 1884, what was known as the Settlement Act was passed, by which British Columbia, on the one side, and the Dominion of Canada, on the other, made a bargain with regard to the construction of this very railway. The purpose for which the land had been set apart in 1875 was about to be accomplished by the Dominion Government at last. The Dominion Government were to undertake to secure by a company the construction of that line of railway, and in order to enable it to do so that belt of land was to be put in their possession for the purpose of being transferred to a company. Down to that moment, as I have said, this man had no rights on the land and could get none, nor had this Government anything to do with the land. But by the Settlement Act of 1884, it was recognized that when this land was, at last, to be applied for the purpose for which it had been nearly ten years set aside, there should be some recognition as to the position of the people who were located upon it. What was to be done with that land? It was, by the terms of that Act of 1884, transferred to the Government of Canada. For what purpose? For three distinct purposes. In the first place, all excepting the lands, which I will mention in a moment, were to be transferred to the company

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

which should build the road, and as soon as it should build the road; and the company in relation to that whole belt were to have every ounce of minerals, including not only the coals, which have been reserved here, but the minerals, and clays, and metals of every kind. This grant was to be made of the whole belt of country so soon as a company should build this railway, but the company were to take it subject to these provisions in favour of the settlers, which were the very first provisions that recognized any rights in settlers at all. Now, it is from the Act of 1884, and from no other Act whatever, that they can derive any right or any title or expect any consideration or any patent? Here is the third section of the Act:

"The Governor in Council may grant to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company mentioned in the said agreement and incorporated by the Act of the Legislature of British Columbia a grant of money and all that tract of land, including the coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marbles, slate, mines, minerals, and substances whatsoever."

And yet we are to be censured to-night because we have not given to Paterson that which the Statute of Canada said, in 1884, should go to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. Now, then, I have said that there were two classes of provisions in favour of the persons who were on the soil then. The laws of their own province had given them no rights whatever, but there was here a provision in favour of two classes. There were those persons like Paterson who had squatted upon the land, in the attempt, as the Supreme Court said, to wrest public lands from the Crown which had been solemnly dedicated to other purposes; and these were to receive—what? Why, the grant to the railway company was to be made of these lands, subject to this condition that:

"Every *bonâ fide* squatter who has continuously occupied and improved any of the lands within the tract of land to be acquired by the company from the Dominion Government, for a period of one year, prior to the 1st of January, 1883, should be entitled to a grant of the freehold of the surface rights of the said squatted land to the extent of 160 acres at the rate of one dollar per acre."

Now, there is the first provision in favour of those persons, who, in 1884, were squatted on the land. If they had been in possession for a year prior to the 1st of January, 1883, they were to receive a grant of the surface land, and a grant of the surface land has been issued to them; and the leader of the Opposition has read that Act to the House this afternoon, and asks that the Government should be censured because, in addition to the surface land, we did not give this man likewise, and take from the company, the minerals which, under the third section of the same Act, the company, and the company alone, were entitled to:

"The company shall, at all times, sell coals gotten from the lands that may be acquired by them from the Dominion Government to any Canadian railway having the terminus of its railway on the seaboard of British Columbia, &c. All lands acquired by the said company from the Dominion Government under this Act, containing belts of timber fit for milling purposes, shall be sold at a price hereafter to be fixed by the Dominion Government or by the said company."

And the leader of the Opposition lays stress on this sub-section:

"The existing rights, if any, of any person or corporation in any of the lands so to be acquired by the company, shall not be affected by this Act."

Not referring to the squatters, because, by the law

of British Columbia, they have no rights; but that clause was inserted because, out of that reserved belt, certain township sites had been sold and purchasers had acquired rights under the British Columbia Government which needed to be preserved. So much for that. These were precisely the rights which, as a squatter, Paterson and all the persons of that class were entitled to, and these were precisely the rights we conveyed to them. We had no power to convey anything more, because the statute took everything else and gave it to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. But let me ask, if this man had had rights, as the leader of the Opposition supposed were reserved to him under that sub-section in reference to existing rights, how was it that, when the Public Lands Act of British Columbia entitled a homesteader to his patent within two years' time, he had not got his patent in 1880, two years after he went on the lands, but that four years afterwards, when this Act was passed, he had to get his patent from us under the provisions of that very section which says he was to get only the surface lands? I ask how, if he was entitled to anything more, either as a settler in British Columbia, or under the Act which we passed, he accepted that patent from us and took his lands with the reservation of the coal, and that he now puts his complaint into the hands of the leader of the Opposition and says he must get something more? There is another point which the hon. the leader of the Opposition entirely lost sight of. This man has not only got what he was entitled to under the Act, but it is absolutely out of the power of the Minister of the Interior or the Dominion Government at this moment, and it was last year when the investigation was promised to be held, to give him anything further. What he wants further is a grant of the minerals, and, as I have shown to the House, the minerals have been absolutely transferred to the company by that Act and by an Order in Council which was passed under it in the year 1887. Now, then, what are his rights? Supposing he were a settler on public lands instead of a person, in the language of the court which I will quote again, who was a trespasser trying to deprive the Government of public lands which had been set apart for a specific purpose, what redress has he? If he has any rights, as the leader of the Opposition supposes, arising from his settlement in the year 1878, he has his full claim against the British Columbia Government in relation to the minerals. We have done nothing whatever to divest him of those rights. If, on the other hand, he claims that, under any interpretation whatever of the Settlement Act of 1884 we have been too strict with him, that he was entitled to anything more, that he had any rights against us that were reserved by the sub-section I have just read, that under any pretext, no matter how ingenious, he could be entitled to these minerals, he has a right of action either against this Government or against the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company which has acquired the right and title to these lands, or the Provincial Government, and yet he has not up to this moment endeavoured to assert his rights in the courts. He has simply alleged, in a petition addressed to the Minister of the Interior, that he ought to get the coal lands in that belt on the ground that the settlers on other public lands in British Columbia got the coal with their surface lands, forgetting that he settled on a tract of land which was not only not open to settlement but where the surface rights as well as the coal were reserved and in regard to which it was a pure matter of grace that he was to receive any patent even of the surface rights. So that every right he has is preserved intact, and he has full redress in the courts of the country against the British Columbia Government, against this Government or against the company, and we submit ourselves, as they submit themselves, to the judgment of any court to which he may choose to appeal. I have said, however, that there were two classes of settlers who were considered as a matter of grace in the passage of the Settlement Act of 1884. I have mentioned the squatters as one set, but it illustrates my argument about their having no right to settle on these lands when I mention that, for the first time since 1875, three years before this man went into possession, the Settlement Act of 1884 threw open these lands for settlement, and for four years during which the railway was supposed to be in course of construction, settlers were allowed to go on these lands and pre-empt them. But even in relation to those settlers, of whom this man is not one, because his rights date back before the Settlement Act of 1884, and when he was a trespasser, mark the provisions which guarded the pre-emptions. All the minerals are reserved in favour of the company, even in regard to those *bonâ fide* settlers who came in under the provisions of the Act of 1884, who were to pay their money and perform their settlement duties and who were in every respect superior to the squatters who attempted to wrest these lands from the parties to whom they were destined by the Government. The provision in regard to them is that the lands to be so conveyed should, except again as to coal and other minerals and also except as to timber lands, "be open for four years from the 19th December, 1883, to actual settlers for agricultural purposes at the rate of $1 an acre to the extent of 160 acres to each such actual settler, and in any such grant the right to cut timber for railway purposes and rights of way for the railway and stations and workshops shall be reserved, and until the railway from Esquimalt and Nanaimo shall have been completed, the Government of British Columbia shall be the agent of the Government of Canada for administering for the purposes of settlement the lands in this sub-section mentioned." So there were just two classes of persons whose rights—I shall not speak of them as rights, but whose position there, notwithstanding that it had no sanction of law, was guarded. The squatter, who had gone in when the lands were not open to settlement, was to receive the surface rights which Paterson has got. The agricultural settler, who went in during the four years the railway was under construction and who had to pay for his land, was to get the surface rights, but it was provided in regard to that, which was the most favoured class, that the company was to be entitled to the minerals. Now, we come to this point, which is the only point, after all, upon which the leader of the Opposition could have felt any confidence in addressing the House, that is that last session, when this matter was urged upon the House the Minister of the Interior promised that before another session he should investigate the claims of those settlers, and perhaps he went so far—my memory is not exact on the subject—

as to promise that they should be investigated upon the spot. What took place in the meantime? The Minister of the Interior went to the place and he found that a lawsuit was before the courts, involving, to some extent, the very rights which he had gone there to investigate. Now, with what great confidence the House was assured this afternoon that that lawsuit had nothing whatever to do with it; with what confidence the House was told a quarter of an hour ago by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that if the Minister of the Interior had only opened the printed case, he would have seen that it had nothing to do with it; but those who will take the trouble to read the case will find that the suit involved the questions arising in regard to the very class of cases which the Minister of the Interior is to be censured for not having investigated. This lawsuit had nothing to do with it? Let me tell the House that the lawsuit was carried on by three of these settlers, and that these settlers were three of the petitioners in the Department of the Interior who had pressed their claims for improvements, or for patents, on the Minister of the Interior, and that to-day, on the fyles of the Department of the Interior, appears the opinion of the Department of Justice upon those very claims of three of the settlers, and the decision of the Minister of the Interior upon that opinion, the opinion being given in the line which was taken by the judgment of the Supreme Court of British Columbia subsequently. That case is now before the Supreme Court of Canada on appeal. It is true it has gone off on other grounds; it is true the Supreme Court of British Columbia has decided that these persons claimed some of the town sites in the railway belt, which, under the circumstances, even under the Act of 1884, says the Supreme Court, were not open to pre-emption; and it is equally true that in the suit the plaintiffs did not claim the minerals, but claimed the surface rights. But what was the claim in relation to the surface rights? Why, it was this: That the Dominion Government had no right to make this transfer to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company at all; and if that contention had been established, the claims which were made in relation to this property would be still for us to administer. If they had succeeded in that contention, the transfer of all the minerals to the company would have been invalid and inoperative, and the leader of the Opposition would have been right in attempting to hold the Minister of the Interior responsible for not giving the minerals to the party who might be entitled to them, although he would still hold that the company was entitled to them. Again, it was contended that the right of pre-emption of a settler in relation to any lands upon that railway belt, was not affected and not limited by the Settlement Act of 1884, and that the settler there had all the rights of a settler on public lands in British Columbia; and if that contention had been sustained in Hogan's case, although it would only have resulted in the obtaining of a surface right by Hogan, it would have resulted, by all logical consequence, in a patent for the minerals on the same principle. Therefore, while it is true that that case did not raise a claim to the minerals, and was not decided upon the question now before the House—a claim being set up which the court disposed of on other grounds much more easily than if they had come to that—the claim covered the particular ground which is available for the settlers to take, and the claimants are three of the claimants in the department whose cases the Minister has promised to investigate, and the House is asked to censure the Minister because when he went there last year, finding these cases before the court, three of the cases which he had promised to investigate, he did not set up a rival tribunal, and sit in solemn judgment on the decision of the Supreme Court. There is only one chance to develop a weaker feature than those I have mentioned in the case of the leader of the Opposition, and that is that the Minister of the Interior is to be censured to-night for not having granted the coal in the areas attempted to be pre-empted by these men, when that coal, as well as all the other lands in the belt, passed out of the hands of the Dominion Government, every vestige of it, every foot of land, every pound of minerals, gravel and clay, even, twelve months before the Minister of the Interior took office. Now, just two points more in the observations which have been made against us. One is that we have, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) interjected, undertaken to issue patents for these lands, and we are, therefore, responsible for the way in which the patents were issued. Now, let us see how that came about. I have told the House that under the Settlement Act of 1884, for the first time these lands were thrown open for public settlement, they were to be open for four years, and the persons who during that four years complied with the provisions of the Act, were entitled to receive patents from the Dominion Government. Those persons received their patents. When the railway was completed and before the lapse of the four years, namely, in 1887, a transfer of all the rights was made to the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway Company, and all power on our part to give redress, to give them anything more than they had got by their patents, passed out of our hands; as I have stated, they passed out of our hands more than a year before the Minister of the Interior took office. Now, there is one other point which has been, and will be, pressed upon us, and it is this: Why did the Minister of the Interior promise to investigate? Now, before I come to answer that question, I agree that there is no use in our investigating at all, and we cannot renew our promise to investigate, because, as I have said, the property and the rights have completely passed out of our hands. If these people are entitled to minerals, we cannot grant them, because we have granted them to others, who, the Statute said, were entitled to them. If they were not entitled to receive them, notwithstanding our reading of the Act—and our reading has not been challenged from 1887, when we made this transfer, down to 1891—either these settlers can get their patents from the company to whom the transfer has been improperly made, or they can get their damages from the Provincial Government, or they can get damages against the Crown in right of the Dominion of Canada, by proceedings in the Exchequer Court. But to give them the minerals is a thing we cannot possible do. Now, when this matter came before the House last session, I, for my part, did not understand that the complaint that was to be presented to the House was that we did not include coal lands in the patents, because I do

not suppose they would make that complaint in the very teeth of the Act which stated that the coal lands should be kept out of the patents; but I understood that the grievance of these settlers was that the transfer having been made to the railway company, the persons who had come to settle during the four years of railway construction, not having received, all of them, their patents from the Dominion Government before the transfer was made, because their rights had not been completed, their patents had not been given, and that a number of them had received deeds from the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway Company, covering the areas to which they were entitled, in which certain reservations are made which those persons considered severe. We had not then received a copy of the conveyance which had been made by the company, and I understood the intention of the Minister of the Interior to be to go there to examine the deeds which those persons had received, to see whether they were more onerous than the terms of the Act contemplated. We have since received a copy of those deeds, and we find that just in the language of the Act they reserve the minerals, and they reserve also the right of the company to go upon the land to take the minerals, which right is involved in the reservation of the minerals, and the right to use the lands for the necessary purpose of searching for and taking away minerals, with the stipulation, however, that the owners shall be compensated for any damage done to the property by the exercise of the rights so reserved. Having that information in our possession now, I am not able to form the opinion that those persons are aggrieved, even those who had received deeds from the company; but if they have been they have their redress, and it is a redress which the Government of Canada would probably aid them in securing against the company, because the company are not entitled to insert in their deeds any more onerous conditions than are specified in that Act. It was entirely in relation to the supposed exaction of further conditions by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company that enquiry was promised by the Minister of the Interior, but when the complaint was developed in the House this afternoon, it was apparent that the grievances were not on that score, but the grievance put forward was that we did not convey to Mr. Paterson and his associates things which the law did not give us to convey to them, but to transfer to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Company. Therefore, we distinctly rest our case as against the attack made on the Government on the fact that these were not public lands open for settlement until the Settlement Act of 1884; that they had been reserved for other specific purposes three years before Mr. Paterson went on them; that even according to the laws of British Columbia the Government of the province might with perfect propriety have reserved the minerals from the grant; that his rights began under the Settlement Act of 1884, which declared he was entitled to surface rights only; that he got those surface rights and nothing less; that we have conveyed away, in accordance with the terms of the Act, the coal and other minerals, and it is impossible to give them now; that as regards the promise of the Minister to hold an investigation, that promise was made in relation to other particulars and other complaints, and even if he had made a most laborious investigation into the particular complaint alleged this afternoon, it is utterly impossible as a matter of law to have given any redress, because the redress which they claim was not only one to which they were not entitled, but one which it was out of the power of the Government to give, those lands and those minerals being no longer in the posession of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice has said this is not a party question, that it is a question of personal rights, and it should be determined by the facts of the case. The hon. gentleman also informed his supporters that unless they entirely agreed with his views as regards the merits of the case, he did not ask their support. I am quite ready to accept the challenge which the hon. gentleman has thrown out, and to say that if there is not a case clear and cogent against the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued, then we do not ask this House to support the amendment now before it. It is important to consider the history of this case, and the law as applicable to it, in order that the House may thoroughly understand its merits, for I assume that no hon. gentleman either on that side of the House or on this is disposed to do to settlers who go into a province any wrong or any injustice, and it is infinitely better if the Minister has made a mistake that censure should fall on the Minister rather than that a settler who had laboured many years on the land with the faith of the Crown pledged to him that he would become, on certain conditions, owner of the property, should be deprived of rights which he supposed by that promise were secured to him. Before I proceed to read the law in British Columbia on the subject to which the Minister of Justice has with so much confidence, but in my opinion without any justification for that confidence, appealed, I wish to call attention to the case to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which he says was on all fours with this one, and to the extract from the opinion which he read from the judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, which if he had read a little further would have made it perfectly clear that the learned judge did not support the proposition which he was enunciating and which he quoted it to uphold. Let me read an extract from the pleadings in the case. One of the propositions is this:

"The lands mentioned in paragraph 13 of the plaintiff's statement of claims include several lots sold and conveyed to various purchasers by the Crown, long prior to the passage of the Settlement Act aforesaid."

The point there was this: Whether the party who had settled on those lands should take up a lot that lay within a town site and had a right to it as though it was ordinary agricultural land. That was the issue, and the only issue submitted to the court by this case. Another extract which I will read is a very brief one. It is as follows:—

"The main contention on behalf of the plaintiff"——

This is part of the judgment—

—"was that the town site recited, either had no existence or was improperly stated in the Order in Council establishing it."

This shows that there the issue was not whether a settler could acquire rights under the land laws of British Columbia to property by settlement within this particular district, but it was whether he could acquire the right of an agriculturist to land that was set apart as a town site. The statement of the

judge from which the Minister of Justice made a brief extract, was this :

" The plaintiff has never been a settler on land for agricultural purposes within the meaning of the law, but has been a trespasser off and on for about eight years past on a town site."

So hon. gentlemen will see that the case is as foreign to the issue presented in the case of Mr. Paterson and others who are similarly situated as any case can well be. The question at issue was, whether, under the laws of British Columbia permitting the pre-emption of land for agricultural purposes, Mr. Hogan was enabled to go on the land which came within the town site referred to. Let me call the attention of the House to the provision of the Act of 1875, the Act of British Columbia, which the Minister of Justice alleged put it out of the power of Mr. Paterson and others, three years later, to settle within this railway belt. I will undertake to show in the most clear manner that the laws of British Columbia did give the parties the right to take up, to pre-empt lands, and acquire the right to purchase at $1 per acre within this settlement belt, and when the British Columbia Government conveyed to the Government of Canada that district for railway purposes, it expressly reserved the rights of those who had settled on the land within that particular district, and it gave the Government of Canada the right to acquire land elsewhere in place of the land so settled on. What are the provisions of the law of British Columbia in 1875? Let me read section 60 which refers to the railway reservation. It reads as follows :—

" The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall at any time by notice signed by the chief commissioner of lands and works and published in the British Columbia *Gazette* reserve any lands not lawfully held by record, pre-emption, purchase, lease or Crown grants for the purpose of conveying the same to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefit of the Indians or for railway purposes mentioned in article 2 of the terms of union or for such other purposes as may be deemed advisable."

What did it do? Did it withdraw this land in British Columbia from actual settlement? No; but it reserved to the British Columbia Government the right by Order in Council on the part of the Lieutenant Governor, published in the British Columbia *Gazette*, to set apart lands for the purposes mentioned. Had those lands been so set apart under that Act at the time the settlement took place? Not at all. There is not a scintilla of evidence before this House for the purpose of showing that those lands had been so set apart or reserved. On the contrary, the the British Columbia Government permitted those persons to go upon those lands, and the commissioner entered their names as persons who had pre-empted those lands, and had acquired the right of settlement under the law of British Columbia. What does that law say?

Mr. HAGGART. That is prior to the date of the passing of the Act; not afterwards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am reading here the Act of 1875 which the Minister of Justice said made it impossible that those parties could acquire rights of settlement within the railway belt.

Mr. MARA. I would like to put the hon. gentleman right. The Government of which he was a member in the first place asked the reservation of those lands, and in the second place asked for the actual conveyance of those lands in 1873. That was by the Government of which you were a member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman refers to negotiations that were never consummated. The hon. gentleman refers to negotiations that did not result in the transfer of this property, for the hon. gentleman will see by the Act of 1884 that the transfer then took place.

Mr. MARA. The reservation was made and was not taken off.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman can make his speech when I have done. If the hon. gentleman chooses to take sides against the settlers of British Columbia he is welcome to do so.

Mr. MARA. I thought the hon. gentleman would not like to make a statement that was incorrect, and I wanted to set him right, but he does not wish me to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot interrupt the speaker.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not propose to be interrupted by the hon. gentleman. Now, section 26 of the Act reads as follows :—

" Any person desiring to pre-empt land as aforesaid shall apply in writing to the commissioner for leave to pre-empt such land, which application shall be in duplicate, and in such application he shall apply for the land as surveyed according to the rules from time to time to be made in that behalf, by the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works."

Now, we say that Mr. Paterson did that, and we say that 200 other parties did that in the districts referred to, and we say that it was open to the Minister of the Interior to appoint a commissioner for the purpose of enquiring into these facts, and to ascertain whether the facts are not as we represent them. I have something more to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to with regard to this, as he does not seem to be aware of the legislation that has taken place in his own province. I refer to the Act of 1884. Under that statute it is provided that certain districts shall be set apart for railway purposes by section 3 of the Act, which reads as follows :—

" There is hereby granted to the Dominion Government, for the purpose of constructing, and to aid in the construction of a railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, and in trust to be expropriated as they may deem advisable (but save as is hereinafter excepted) all that piece or parcel of land situate in Vancouver Island, described as follows:—Bounded on the south by a straight line drawn from the head of Saanich Inlet to Muir Creek on the Straits of Fuca; on the west by a straight line drawn from Muir Creek aforesaid to Crown Mountains; on the north, by a straight line drawn from Crown Mountains to Seymour Narrows; and on the east by the coast line of Vancouver Island to the point of commencement; and including all coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, micas, minerals and substances whatsoever thereupon, therein and thereunder."

Then, under section 4, there is the following provision :—

" There is excepted out of the tract of land granted by the preceding section, all that portion thereof lying to the northward of a line running east and west, half way between the mouth of the Courtenay River (Comox District) and Seymour Narrows."

But that is not all. Section 5 provides as follows :—

" Provided always that the Government of Canada shall be entitled out of such excepted tract to lands equal in extent to those alienated up to the date of this Act by Crown grant, pre-emption, or otherwise, within the limits of the grant mentioned in section 3 of this Act."

Now, Sir, these lands lie within the limit, and if there were lands upon which any settler had acquired the right of pre-emption to these lands, it was open to the Government of Canada to seek an equal area of land elsewhere. If the facts are as we state them the Government of Canada had no interest in these lands, the Government of Canada had no right to them; they were lands that were pre-empted, and so did not pass to Canada, and it was the business of the Government of Canada to ascertain what was the area of these lands, and to claim from the British Columbia Government an area of other lands equal to these in extent. It was their business to appoint a commission or an agent to enquire into all these facts, to ascertain what was the extent of the territory that could not pass to them under the provisions of this law; and then it was their business to leave these parties to be dealt with by the Government of British Columbia, receiving the patents from the Government of British Columbia, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 1875, which Act gave them the right to the minerals as well as to the surface. There can be no doubt whatever with regard to that But if the Government of Canada choose to regard these lands that are pre-empted as part of their grant, they must give them in accordance with the conditions of the pre-emption. What has the Government of Canada done in undertaking to deal with these lands in this way? Why, they have put it out of their own power to claim from British Columbia lands of equal area in which the minerals are found, and so they have undertaken by an illegal act, an unjust act, an act of violence, to take from these persons, rights which were secured to them under the Act of 1875, and reaffirmed to them by the Act which I have just read. There can be no doubt whatever with regard to those rights. How was the Minister of the Interior to ascertain the area or extent of lands within the area marked that did not pass to the Government of Canada? He had to look and see what lands were actually granted; he had to look and see the extent of the lands embraced within the area that was absolutely excepted without reference to settlement at all: and then he had to look to the extent of lands that were pre-empted under the law of British Columbia, and for which patents had not yet issued. It was necessary to ascertain these facts in order that he might know what area of lands he might claim elsewhere outside of this belt, in compensation for the lands which could not pass to him, in consequence of the lien that was upon them. Now, Sir, the provision is perfectly clear. Here are 200 families settled before the Act of 1884. They settled under the provisions of this Act of 1875, and they were authorized so to settle. It is not a fact that these lands were set apart for railway purposes, and that settlers were excluded from 1875 upwards. I say that they were not so excluded; I say they were entitled to settle, I say that the provisions made for entering their names in the various land offices of British Columbia were acted upon, and Mr. Paterson's name and other names were entered upon these books in 1878, six years before the Government of Canada acquired a title to any of these lands in that district; and therefore these parties had prior rights. There is no doubt, in my opinion, that they have rights which may be enforced in a court; but for the purpose of perpetuating the blunders of a Minister, or excusing the indifference or carelessness of a Minister, is this House going to send 200 settlers in British Columbia, who have had to struggle to improve their lands, and to make for themselves a livelihood, first to the courts of British Columbia and then to the Supreme Court of Canada, for the purpose of vindicating those rights, which it is the business of this House to see are vindicated here against the misconduct of any Minister, whether that misconduct arises from the undue influence of a railway corporation or whether it arises from the indifference of a Minister to the discharge of the duties of his office? Sir, it is perfectly clear that when the hon. Minister promised my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that he would enquire into this matter, he felt then that it was his duty to appoint a commission or an agent to investigate the facts, and to redress the wrongs of which these people complained. The hon. Minister of Justice says that this man accepted a surface patent. Why, the Government forced a surface patent upon him. He protested against it; he has petitioned against it; he has addressed the House against it; and we are speaking here on his behalf as a protest against the issue of a patent for a less amount of property than he was entitled to under the terms and conditions under which he settled. I say it is not a fact that he had not a right to go upon those lands. I say that his right to go upon them was recognized by the laws of British Columbia; and his right to acquire a patent is a right under the common law, which gives him a right to all minerals except the precious metals. That is the extent of his right, and he ought not to be content with anything less; he would not have the spirit of a British freeman if he were disposed to accept anything less. Now, Sir, it is clear that Mr. Paterson and the other settlers are entitled to the minerals, and this House ought not to take sides with a great railway corporation against them which through its influence has induced the Administration not only to part with what belonged to the Government, but with what belonged to the actual settlers who had gone upon those lands. I would like to know how it was possible for the hon. Minister of the Interior to discharge his duties otherwise than by an enquiry into the facts. How was he to know whether the provisions of that Act were observed unless he knew what settlers were there previous to 1884? The confirmation took place in 1884, and all the persons who had settled there prior to that time were entitled to patents from the Crown in the ordinary way; and in my opinion, whatever it may be worth, those parties were entitled to their patents, not from the Government here, but from the Government of British Columbia; for when a party had acquired a right, the intention of that Statute was to give the Government of Canada compensation by allowing them to obtain lands elsewhere, because it says:

"The grant mentioned in section 3 of this Act shall not include any land now held under Crown grant, lease, agreement for sale, or other alienation by the Crown."

And so on; and the object was perfectly clear in proposing to give the Government of Canada mineral lands elsewhere, to treat those lands as lands that had not passed and were not intended to pass to the Government of Canada for this railway reservation; so that hon. gentlemen will see, by an ex-

amination of these sections, that but a portion of the land within the limitary lines laid down in the statute, passed to the Government of Canada, that a certain district did not pass, that lands that had already been granted were not intended to pass, and that all lands settled upon prior to this agreement were lands not intended to pass but were lands pre-empted, with which the Government of Canada ought not to have undertaken to deal; and I say again, it was impossible that the Minister of the Interior could know what lands had passed to the Government of Canada without an examination by a commissioner or otherwise to ascertain the facts, and to see that no attempt was made to give to the railway corporations lands to which other parties had acquired the right. Now, the hon. gentleman undertook to make the provisions of this law retrospective. He reads the Act of 1884 as if it not only conveyed to the Government of Canada the lands of British Columbia which the Government of British Columbia were then free to convey, but that it was retrospective in its character and put an end to the rights of all parties who had not already acquired a conveyance or a patent from the Crown. Now, I do not admit that. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Paterson and those associated with him were claiming the minerals because other parties elsewhere had got minerals. No, Mr. Speaker, the claim is not put forward on any such ground. The claim is put forward on this ground, that it was their right. They went upon those lands under the law of British Columbia, as it was made in 1875. They went there with the assurance that they would receive a patent in the ordinary form. There were no minerals reserved when the settlements upon those lands were made. There was a provision for the publication of a proclamation in the *Gazette* should any lands be reserved; but that provision was not operative until the proclamation appeared, and no such proclamation was issued until the arrangement was made between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia on the subject. The hon. gentleman says that those lands were first opened to settlement in 1884. I say that is not the case. That is a question of fact, which, if there was any doubt upon it, ought to have been investigated; but I find that the Government of British Columbia opened books and permitted entries, and parties who settled in this district did make entries, and the lands were recognized as open to settlement in the way described in section 26 of that Act, which was not put an end to under section 60. I say, then, that every one of these two hundred settlers who went into that country, some of whom have been there for twenty years, went there under the law as it then stood, which gave them the assurance that upon the performance of certain conditions, such as continued residence on the property for a certain period and the payment of one dollar an acre, they would acquire a title to the property—not simply a title to the surface, but a title to the lands, embracing all the minerals contained in those lands other than the precious metals. So that it is perfectly clear that the case referred to by the hon. Minister of Justice has no bearing upon this case. The case quoted by the hon. Minister of Justice was a case in which the only question at issue was whether the lands were open to settlement as agricultural lands, or whether they were a portion of a town site. Now, let me call the attention of the House to this fact, that that question would have been of no importance whatever if the agricultural lands had not been open for settlement. If Mr. Hogan had succeeded in showing that those lands were outside of the town site, they might then have been in the position of these lands.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The pretension of Hogan and all that class of people was based on the Act of 1884.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That does not make the slightest difference, because the point is not that Mr. Hogan was there prior to 1884. If this had not been a town site then the question would not have been a question of any consequence, as it is set out in the pleading. But it is because those parties had rights, it is because these lands were open for settlement on certain conditions——

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Hogan states the contrary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—it is because that is the case that the Government of Canada, when they found that the minerals in these lands were conveyed, should either have issued a patent for the minerals to all those settlers, or have refused to touch these lands, and have asked that the complement of lands represented by them should be taken elsewhere. That they have not done, and I say that the action of the Government in undertaking to deal with these lands in this way, without any investigation into the rights of those parties and without looking at the law, as it stood, under which these rights were acquired, is open to censure, and the resolution of my hon. friend should be supported.

Mr. MARA. When I interrupted the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I thought he would rather be corrected than mislead the House; but when he taunted the British Columbia members with not knowing the legislation of their own province, and continued his misstatement, I can come to no other conclusion than that he wished to deliberately mislead the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is out of order. He says my hon. friend wished to mislead the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid my hon. friend must withdraw the expression that the hon. gentleman deliberately intended to mislead the House.

Mr. MARA. Then I will withdraw the expression that he deliberately intended to mislead the House, but I will say that when he was corrected and the opportunity afforded him of placing himself right he deliberately refused to do so, and repeated the statement which, at the time, I informed him was not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you do not know.

Mr. MARA. I think I will prove to the hon. gentleman in a few moments, if he is a fair-minded man, that he is wrong. I was surprised this afternoon when the hon. leader of the Opposition presented his case to the House, but I felt that he had been misinformed, that a wrong brief had been placed in his hands; but certainly the hon. member for Bothwell can plead no such excuse. In 1873, Mr.

Marcus Smith, who was then engineer in charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway, declared Esquimalt the terminus of that railway. At the same time the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie was leader asked that a reserve of twenty miles in width should be placed upon the projected line of railway between Seymour Narrows and Esquimalt. That was done. Shortly after that the Mackenzie Government asked for a conveyance, which was refused. I will now read a memo. of the Executive Council of British Columbia, showing that they fully understood at that time that a complete reserve was placed upon the land between Esquimalt and Seymour Narrows. In a memo. dated 18th September, 1883, the hon. Commissioner of Lands and Works reported :

"On a memorandum dated 18th September, 1873, from the Honourable Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works reporting that the Order in Council of the 30th June, 1873, reserving Crown lands of the east coast of Vancouver Island is seriously retarding the settlement of that portion of the province and recommending that in view of the fact that the despatch from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor to the Secretary of State transmitting the minute of this Executive Council, dated 25th July, 1873, upon the subject of this reservation has not as yet been replied to and as the matter requires immediate settlement, that the Dominion Government be respectfully urged to at once define by survey the land they propose claiming on the east coast of Vancouver Island, and that they appoint also a competent person in the province to dispose of said lands on such terms as will admit of settlement and the Honourable Amor DeCosmos as special delegate about to proceed to Ottawa, be authorized to confer with the Dominion Government upon the subject.

(Certified) "W. J. ARMSTRONG,
"*Clerk Executive Council.*"

That was the position in 1873. I will now show to the House, and particularly to the hon. member for Bothwell, the position of affairs in 1880. In that year the Hon. Mr. Walker, Premier of the province, was sent to Ottawa with respect to the railway, dock and other matters. In his report to the Province of British Columbia, made on his return, he said as follows :—

"Figures showing the advantages of the line (if constructed) were produced ; much stress was laid on the facts that the surveys had been made, that valuable lands on the Island had, as far back as 1875, been ceded by Statute to the Dominion at its special request and solely for Canadian Pacific Railway purposes ; that up to the present moment these lands have been retained and the policy of retaining them in aid of the same railway been reaffirmed by the present Dominion Government. A well-drawn document on the same subject from the Victoria Chamber of Commerce was also referred to, and I can safely state that no favourable circumstance or argument which an intimate knowledge of the case could suggest was omitted on the occasion."

Now, I have given you the views of the Provincial Government in 1873 and in 1880, and by these two documents you will see that the Provincial Government religiously kept that land intact and at the request of the Dominion Government. The Provincial Government had then and some time previously been fighting the Dominion Government on account of its non-fulfilment of its railway promises, and they were particularly careful that by no act of theirs should the agreement be violated or the Dominion Government given any grounds to charge them with a breach of contract. Therefore, from 1873, when, as the Premier of the province said, a tract of land was ceded to the Government, up to 1880, not a single settler could record his claim upon those lands. How, then, can the hon. member for Bothwell say that the land was open to settlement, and that all a settler had to do was to record under the Land Act of 1875, secure his title, and be entitled to the coal and other minerals, as he would be if he were an ordinary pre-empter under the Act of 1875? The next point I will discuss is what is called the Settlement Act of 1884. The hon. Minister of Justice quoted altogether from Dominion Statutes and Dominion Orders in Council. I will now quote from British Columbia Statutes and Orders in Council to show that the utmost harmony existed between the two Governments, that the same ideas dictated both Bills, so that there was no conflict. Clause 23 of the Settlement Act of 1884 states :

"The company shall be governed by sub-section *f* of the hereinbefore cited agreement, and each *bonâ fide* settler who has continually occupied and improved any lands within the tract of land to be acquired by the company from the Dominion Government, for a period of one year prior to the 1st of January, 1883, shall be entitled to a grant of the freehold of the surface rights over said squatted land to the extent of 160 acres to each squatter at the rate of $1 an acre."

So that the British Columbia Government distinctly shows that these men were not in a position to record, either by pre-emption or purchase, but that they were simply squatters, and I may say further, that I was a member of the Local Legislature from the time of the first reserve placed upon the land until the Act of 1884 was passed ; and, in this Bill, squatters' claims and rights received every consideration, this clause having been purposely framed to protect them, so that any man who had been a *bonâ fide* squatter on the land for one year prior to that date could get, not the coal, but the surface rights only, upon the payment of $1 an acre. Now, after the very able defence of the Minister of Justice, it would certainly be out of place for me to attempt to argue this point any further. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I will not say intentionally misled the House—but he certainly has not paid that attention to the Statutes and to the Orders in Council which would enable him to speak authoritatively on this subject. There is one point that I do not wish to have misunderstood ; that is in regard to the pre-emptions as provided for in the Lands Act of 1875. If he would look into the Statutes and Orders in Council he would find that there were three or four reserves made, that the line was changed several times. First, there was a reserve on the Fraser River route, afterwards on the Bute Inlet route ; but, when the Land Act of 1875 was framed it was intended that the Provincial Government should make good to the Dominion Government all lands within the 20-mile belt that had been alienated prior to the first reserve that was placed upon the land, and, if the hon. gentleman had looked into the question closely and had wished to deal fairly with the House, he would have explained that point to the House.

Mr. GORDON. I shall not detain the House very long after the very able manner in which this question has been dealt with. However, I cannot forbear making some allusions to the changes which have occurred in their love for the poor settlers of hon. gentlemen opposite within the very short period of my political life. On the 28th March, 1884, the late member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer) moved the six months' hoist to what is commonly known as the Settlement Bill, and on that occasion I urged a division of the House against the Government. In that Bill were comprised all the iniquities of which these people complain. It was pointed out to

hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, particularly by my hon. friend from New Westminster, who was a man of very large experience, and, aiding him in my humble way to the best of my ability, I pointed out to hon. gentlemen who are now so sympathetic with the poor settlers in the Vancouver district, that there were 126 squatters on that belt at that time who had been unable to get their pre-emption records. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to that fact. He assumes that everyone who had settled on that belt from 1873 up to 1884, by virtue of their squatting upon the land, were permitted to record their names and secure their pre-emption records. That is not the fact. There was not a settler who had squatted upon the land reserved by the Local Government from the Seymour Narrows to Esquimalt who was allowed to enter his name or obtain his pre-emption record. Perhaps the Minister of Justice was a little harsh on some of the settlers when he assumed that they went in there with a view of taking the land away from the Crown.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Local Government of British Columbia exercised the power given them by the Act of 1875 and reserved this land specially by proclamation?

Mr. GORDON. In 1873 the Government of Sir John Macdonald made application to the Local Government to declare a reservation for the Canadian Pacific Railway from Seymour Narrows to Esquimalt. That reservation was proclaimed by the Provincial Government and that remained until 1883. In the first instance, it reserved a twenty-mile belt following the sinuosities of the coast of Vancouver Island on the east coast from Esquimalt to Seymour Narrows. In 1883 that reservation was changed and the boundaries were rearranged, but were re-reserved in the same proclamation. The land was never open for five minutes from 1873 down to the period at which it was opened by the Act of 1884. During all that period there was not a solitary squatter who was able to go to one of our land commissioners and secure his pre-emption record or even the entry of his name. The commissioners would take the slip of paper upon which his application was written and put it on fyle, so that, when the lands were dealt with according to the laws of the province for the time being, it was supposed that he would get the first opportunity of purchasing that land. At the time the Settlement Act was being passed, I felt assured that a great many of these settlers would feel it a hardship in this way—and it is this point to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice—that instead of going on this land with a view of grabbing it away from the Crown, they were induced by local representatives to go there with the assurance that they had better settle there than go into Washington Territory, that they had better take their chances, and when the land came into the market they would have the first opportunity of purchasing the land upon which they might settle. In this way many of them were led to believe that they would obtain the mineral rights as well as the surface rights, and many were thus induced to settle on lands that otherwise would have been left unsettled, but that was not through any action of the Government. So strongly did I feel that these people had been harshly dealt with that I appealed to both sides of this House, not only in the interest of the settlers, but on the ground of the immense magnitude of the interests which were being given away to a company composed mostly of foreigners, who would thus become possessed of lands and minerals of such great value. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not quite so sympathetic then as they are now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We were not quite so numerous, but we were quite as sympathetic.

Mr. GORDON. There were some of those gentlemen who voted against the Government on that occasion, and I have a list of them here. Amongst those who voted with Mr. Homer and myself and others on this side against the Government were Mr. Allison, who is present here again, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Fairbank, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Gillmor, Mr. Irvine, Mr. Jackson, Mr. King, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Landerkin, Mr. Lister, Mr. McCraney, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Somerville (Brant), Mr. Springer, Mr. Wheeler, and Mr. McIsaac. Those gentlemen voted with us, but the leaders of that party including the present leader of the Opposition voted the other way.

Mr. LAURIER. I voted with the Government and I voted wrong.

Mr. GORDON. Also including the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blake, who voted to give away the rights of these people, and that also included the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), Mr. Mills (Bothwell), Mr. Mulock, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Paterson (Brant), Mr. Trow, Mr. Watson, Mr. Cameron (Huron), Mr. Armstrong, and some twenty others. They were all at that time willing to sacrifice the people who had settled on that land and to give all the coal away which people who were acquainted with its value prized so highly. Now, this sudden sympathy can have only one object in view, and I am in very grave doubt as to whether the settlers on those lands can see anything in this resolution that will give them anything to hope for.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville.) Or to vote for.

Mr. GORDON. If the leader of the Opposition had brought in a Bill to expropriate these minerals from the railway company with a view of handing them over to the settlers, he would have had my support.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a good hint.

Mr. GORDON. I promised him that last session. But he, as a legal gentleman of high standing, would rather take the political position and bring in a resolution with a hope of getting my support because my people may feel that he is in sympathy with them. However, I do not feel inclined to accept his warm embrace. If I could see the whole Opposition regret the step they took on the 28th of March, and take some measures to remedy the whole defect, then I could join with him heartily, and I believe every gentleman on this side of the House would join with him in redeeming Canada from one of the greatest monopolies that has ever cursed the country. I cannot forbear from referring to some remarks of the leader of the Opposition with regard to those lands that were

alienated. He certainly wished to convey to the House that the lands that were given north of the line drawn east and west, half way between Courtney River and Seymour Narrows, were in lieu of those squatted lands, which is not the case ; they were in lieu of lands alienated by pre-emption and recorded prior to 1873. They were granted in 1887, I think, to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, and perhaps included a little more than the alienated lands. But if the hon. gentleman wishes to attack the grants to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, I think there is every opportunity to do so, because every one of its provisions and conditions are based upon the conditions of the Settlement Act, which provides that "nevertheless," "nevertheless," and "nevertheless," through all the conditions of the Act, if I have read it right. If the hon. gentleman wishes to attack that grant, not only with a view to remedy any of the evils that the settlers may have felt, but also to remove from that part of the Dominion of Canada a huge monopoly that was never contemplated by those who voted to implement that bargain, I certainly will assist all I can. In the present instance I can only disagree with the tenor of his resolution, because it affords no remedy to the settlers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand the facts to be as they are represented by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), who has just resumed his seat, has expressed, what we should all be surprised if he did not feel, a warm sympathy for the squatters or settlers on those lands about whom we are talking to-night. The hon. gentleman represents those people in this House, and it is therefore to be expected that they would, to some extent, have his sympathy. If I understand him aright, he is in full sympathy with the object my hon. friend seeks to attain, only he does not think the hon. gentleman has taken the right way to do it. Therefore, there is no need of argument to convince him that we are right in the position we take in this House ; he is satisfied that we are right now.

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes ; the only exception he takes is about the mode of procedure we have adopted to gain that right ; it is not to the right itself. If you bring in a Bill, he says, to obtain for the people what they are seeking, you will have my support. I can tell him that if he supports my hon. friend in his motion before the House he will attain what he is seeking, and his friends will attain what they desire, and the right of the settler will be ultimately secured to him beyond any peradventure. That will be the political and legal result of this vote, because it will be an expression of opinion on the part of the House that the rights of these gentlemen must be secured to them, and it will then become the duty of the Government to take proper, legal and constitutional means of carrying it into effect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what we are doing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is assuming just that which is in dispute. The Postmaster General laughs very heartily, it seems to me he does not understand the points we have been discussing for the last two hours. Now, let us see what the facts are. There can be no dispute, I take it, about the law, and if we can agree upon the facts we can come to a conclusion. I understand that in 1875 an Act was passed by the British Columbia Government giving certain rights of pre-emption to those who chose to exercise them. In that law it is provided, in the 60th section :

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, at any time, by notice, signed by the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, and published in the British Columbia *Gazette*, reserve any lands not lawfully held by record, pre-emption, purchase, lease or Crown grant, for the purpose of conveying the same to the Dominion Government."

Now, I asked the hon. gentleman a question upon the crucial point in dispute. I asked him whether he was able to inform the House that the Lieutenant Governor in Council had reserved those lands by a notice under that regulation.

Mr. GORDON. Yes ; certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not answer me that they had, but he answered me that two years before the Act passed at all a proclamation had been issued by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Why, the hon. gentleman surely must know that a proclamation issued two years previously can have no effect to repeal or abrogate a statute passed in 1875. The rights which these people claim are guaranteed to them by statute passed in 1875, and no proclamation issued, and no private agreement come to between the Government of British Columbia and the company, could have any effect in abrogating or derogating from that statutory enactment of 1875. If the hon. gentleman can show me that previously to the parties, whose rights are in question here, having pre-empted the lands they seek to hold, a notice was issued by the Lieutenant Governor under that section, then he will go very far to maintain the argument he has addressed to the House. But if he cannot show me that such a notice has been issued under that section it is no use for him to quote a proclamation issued by the Lieutenant Governor of the province one, two or three years previously, because they have no legal weight.

Mr. GORDON. The Provincial Government notified every land commissioner within that reservation. Notwithstanding that Act, he knew the records were to be issued.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may be right in that ; I am not going to contradict him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reservation was made under that Act too.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A private notice given by the Governor of British Columbia would have no effect upon the rights which a settler acquires under the pre-emption clauses of this Act. The fact is, that under that law, sections 26 and 27, certain properties may be pre-empted by individuals. The facts are, as I understand them, that these individuals have exercised those rights and pre-empted them.

Mr. MARA. No. Will the hon. gentleman refer to chapter 13, page 63.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The sections to which I am referring are sections 26 and 27, which give applicants the right top re-empt, and section 60, which enables the Lieutenant Governor, in a particular way, to reserve those lands from pre-emption.

Mr. MARA. I do not think the hon. gentleman understood me. If he will refer to chapter 13 he will find it is an Act to authorize the grant of certain lands to the Government of Canada for railway purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is at liberty to read any section that is pertinent to the argument.

Mr. MARA. This statute conveys to the Dominion Government the lands which the hon. gentleman is now seeking to lead the House to believe are open to pre-emption. The Act states:

"Whereas it is expedient to provide for the grant of public lands to the Dominion Government required for a railway between the town of Nanaimo and Esquimalt harbour——"

And it proceeds:

"From and after the passing of this Act there shall be and there is hereby granted to the Dominion Government for the purpose of constructing and to aid in the construction of a railway between the town of Nanaimo and Esquimalt harbour in trust to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway before mentioned (not to exceed 20 miles on each side of said line) as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion from the public lands of the North-West Territory and the Province of Manitoba, as provided in the Order in Council section II, admitting the Province of British Columbia into Confederation; such grant should be subject otherwise to all the conditions contained in the said second section of terms of union."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman state to this House that this Act is acted upon by both Governments, and the matter was completed under it?

Mr. MARA. I have read extracts that it was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman read extracts from some proclamation in 1873.

Mr. MARA. I read extracts from an address by the Premier of the province to the Local Legislature of 1880, stating that the compact was made in 1885 and had remained intact.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman would answer my question categorically, and if his answer in the affirmative was correct, it would go far to clear the argument from a good deal of misunderstanding. But I will show that the hon. gentleman is wrong. He has stated that the negotiations between the Dominion Government and the Government of British Columbia, which that Act was to enable the British Columbia Government to carry out, were not completed; and in 1884, if he will turn to the British Columbia statutes, he will find in the Act 47 Vic., chap. 14, provision is made for granting those very lands from the British Columbia Government to the Dominion Government. If those lands had been conveyed, as he asks the House to believe they were by the Act of 1875, the legislation in 1884 would have been a perfect farce and there would have been no occasion for it. I call attention to section 3 of the Act of 1884. It provides for the granting of lands to the Dominion Government to aid in the construction of a railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo. It subsequently gives a description of the land, and contains this provision:

"Provided always that the Government of Canada shall be entitled, out of such excepted tracts, to lands equal in extent to those alienated up to the date of this Act by Crown grants, pre-emption or otherwise, within the limits of the grants mentioned in section 3 of this Act."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. MARA. You said you wanted me to reply categorically.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to show the hon. gentleman that it is not possible that the Act of 1875 could have been operative to convey title to the property, because the Act of 1884 conveyed the same property, subject to certain provisions. What are those provisions? One is that the Government of Canada shall be entitled to occupy those lands and grant portions of them as pre-emptions. British Columbia had allowed certain lands to be pre-empted.

Mr. GORDON. No. That is the point of the mistake.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a matter of construction.

Mr. MARA. It is a matter of fact.

Mr. GORDON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me a few words. That one point in regard to pre-emption is the whole cause of the mistake made by hon. gentlemen opposite in this discussion. From 1873 to the opening of the lands by the Act of 1884 no record was issued. The Act transferring that land to the Government of Canada in 1875 occurred in this way: The Dominion Government of that day introduced a Bill in Parliament to authorize the construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. That Bill was defeated in the Senate. Then followed a long correspondence and negotiations between the Local Government and the Imperial Government, through Lord Carnarvon, and that Act remained as it was pending those negotiations. The sum of $750,000 was offered by the Government of that day because they had failed to keep faith with the province; they offered it through the member for West Ontario, when he visited British Columbia. British Columbia rejected that proposition, and that Act of 1875 remained on the Statute-book. Those lands were all reserved; not a record was issued. The records to which the hon. gentleman has referred are those records which were issued in 1872-73 up to the date of the proclamation. But no records had been issued for eleven years, and they were then issued in conformity with the law at the time the records were made; but, I repeat, that not a single record was granted in the railway belt from 1873 to 1884.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has made a very lengthy attempt to explain the painful position which he occupies here. It is this: that he is engaged in bolstering up an attempt on the part of the Government to deprive some of his constituents of their legal rights. The hon. gentleman, and I say it with proper respect, has evaded the point in the argument, which is conclusively against him, and he has attempted to assume in his argument that section 60 operated in itself as a reservation of the lands. Section 60 does not reserve a foot of land. It merely confers a power on the Lieutenant Governor to exempt certain lands, when he has published a proclamation in the manner prescribed by the section. There is no evidence before the House, it has not been established by any hon. member who has spoken against the amendment, that any proclamation under section 60 has yet been issued. So that, what do we find? If I am right in that, and I do not think a lawyer in the House would challenge the correct-

ness of that interpretation, we find the hon. gentleman here construing a statute, two sections of which give the persons desiring to pre-empt lands the right to do so, and one section of which gives the Lieutenant Governor power to reserve the lands; and we find before us as evidence the statement of my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Laurier) that this person named Paterson did make the necessary entry to pre-empt his lands.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But I say, yes. I say we have the evidence from the lips of the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are not in a position to contradict that.

Mr. GORDON. I am in a position to say that it is not a fact. I am in a position to say that the records were received in 1884. The certificate of purchase and the certificates of record were sent together to the department.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Paterson told me again at six o'clock to-day that he made his entry on the 29th January, 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have that statement made here, and the House is bound to come to a conclusion on this important matter upon the facts as they appear to the House, and upon the law as it stands here. No amount of twisting on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite and no amount of reference to statutes which never were in operation or in force will avail them in this controversy. I was about to show, before I was interrupted, that by the Act of 1884 these lands were granted to the Dominion Government with that proviso, and the proviso gives to the Government of Canada the power to accept other lands in lieu of those which have been alienated by pre-emption. If this land, therefore, was alienated by pre-emption, the duty of the Government of Canada, as has been so well pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), was to have sent an agent there to have ascertained what lands were alienated by any of the means prescribed in that provision, by pre-emption or otherwise, and to have accepted other lands in lieu of them. The Government failed in their duty when they did not ascertain that. They took a grant of all these lands and they have given a patent to this gentleman, but they have given a patent exempting from it the right to the minerals. I want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite how that can be justified on the statement of facts and law as we have it here; how can they refuse to give that man a patent conveying to him all the rights which he would be entitled to, as one possessing a pre-empted right under the 26th and 27th sections of the Act. I say no valid argument can be adduced, unless you show that the facts stated here are wrong. There is no argument can be advanced here to take away from these men the legal rights which they acquired; after they made their entry and pre-empted these lands they possessed the right which follows, to get a patent conveying the lands themselves and the minerals. Not only that, but hon. gentlemen will see that their arguments, and their references to proclamations in 1873, and to negotiations which were uncompleted and were never carried out, ought to have no more effect upon these acts, and upon the legal and equitable aspect of the case, than a passing breeze of wind. What have negotiations which never were carried out between the two Governments, and proclamations of the Lieutenant Governor got to do with the legality of the rights of parties under the Act? It is only a lumbering of the case to bring these things in. You have got to look at the statute of 1875, the succeeding statute of 1884, and the one prominent fact that the man made his pre-emption entry; and looking at these two statutes, coupled with the fact that the pre-emption was made, there can be no legal doubt of this man's legal right, and that the Government are in fault in refusing to recognize that right to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to say just a few words in reply to the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He claims that these gentlemen made an entry under the Act of 1875, and that under the Act of 1875 they were entitled to all the rights of pre-emption which were provided for by that Act. He claims under the clause of that Act, which said that certain rights should be set aside by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, that unless that proclamation took effect the Act would have no force. We find that subsequently, by the Act quoted by the hon. gentleman here, they have passed an Act of Parliament transferring these lands which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) says ought to be transferred by an Order in Council, or set aside by an Order in Council. But, further than that, we have the judgment of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, which says that these lands were set aside and reserved. The statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) never struck those parties who have been prosecuting claims before the courts in British Columbia. The law as laid down by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has never struck any lawyer in British Columbia; for, in making the factum of their case to be submitted to the courts in British Columbia and to the Supreme Court they said that the law is the very opposite of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) states. I shall just read from the factum of the case of Hogan *vs.* the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, a short paragraph, in which the plaintiff states:

"It would appear from the passing of the Act of 1875 down to the passing of the Settlement Act in December, 1883, a large tract of country was withdrawn from settlement, purchase or pre-emption, during that period, and remained a wilderness."

If the law was as stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), how is it that it never occurred to the plaintiff's attorney in the case, when he was urging his claim before the courts in British Columbia or before the Supreme Court? The case made out by hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be an absurd one, even taking the facts as stated by the hon. gentlemen themselves. Suppose that person was entitled under his pre-emption to the coal and minerals, and to everything which a deed in fee-simple would give him, what power had the Minister of the Interior to give any such deed as that? The land was conveyed to the Dominion Government in trust. They were only acting as trustees, and one of the conditions of that trust was that in conveying the land to any squatter or settler there should be exempted the coal, the minerals, the gravel, and everything else. The amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) declares that it was the duty of the Minister of the Interior, and the duty of the Government, to do this, even long after the lands had passed out of

the hands of the Government, and passed into the hands of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. Suppose we were in possession of these lands, as we were in 1884, and suppose we had all the rights and privileges which the conveyance of British Columbia gave us under that Act: what power had we then under that Act to make the conveyance which the leader of the Opposition proposes, and which the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies), a distinguished lawyer, and which the hon. gentleman over there who poses as such, state that we have the power to do? No such power was ever vested in the Dominion of Canada, and the Minister of the Interior had not the power. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says: Oh, but it was the duty of the Government, before taking the conveyance, before the statute was passed, before entering into our duties as trustees, to send our commissioners and to enquire into what rights every squatter had in that section of the country, and upon what terms he had entered on the lands, and to see that the conditions were fulfilled in every particular. We had no business to do anything of the kind at the time. The hon. member (Mr. Mills) was a supporter of the Bill as introduced into the House in 1884. He did not make it a condition, before the passage of the Bill or before voting for it, that a commission should be employed to go up there and enquire whether the squatters came into possession of the lands under certain regulations or rules of the Provincial Government. No; he was perfectly content with the provisions that the Bill made with regard to the squatters, and with what the British Columbia Government gave to us as trustees to convey to the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway. We were simply acting as trustees. We had not even the full powers of trustees; and if the hon. gentleman will read the Act he will find what our powers in the matter were; and he will find that the Minister of the Interior, before he could even issue a patent for any of the lands, had to issue it at the direction of his attorney, the Government of British Columbia. I have been in this House many and many a year, but I never before heard of a great party of this country moving a motion of want of confidence in the Government for carrying out to the full extent the provisions of a statute which a majority of the hon. gentlemen themselves voted for. They must be hard up for material against the Government when they have to make such propositions as this without the foundation of a case. The hon. member for Queen's accused me of being out of the House for a couple of hours and not understanding the question. What an exhibition he made of himself, in getting up and trying to explain his leader out of a very difficult position. He could not explain him; there is no explanation possible; and the result is a vote of want of confidence because my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior made a promise to go to British Columbia after the session and enquire into the complaints. My hon. friend has stated that he faithfully kept his promise. He first of all sent his deputy out, and he explained whom he was going to associate with him; and when he was part of the way out he telegraphed that he would go out there himself and make the enquiries; and he proceeded over to Esquimalt. There was another statement made by the hon. gentleman here as to the fault found with the hon. Minister of the Interior in regard to the non-issue of those patents. The statement was never made in this House that those people only got their patents for agricultural lands, and that certain reservations of minerals were made. I was in the House and I listened to him, and I thought they had just claims to some agricultural lands; they had performed the duties of settlement, and they were withheld from them for some reason or other. But, when we enquired into the matter we found the contrary. Fault is found with my hon. friend that he did not set up a court of enquiry to investigate these matters. When the cases were before the courts for judgment he was to hold another court and find whether the particulars being adduced before that court were correct or not. My hon. friend fulfilled in every particular the obligation he made to this House; and I have never heard a more unfounded and more useless proposition than the hon. leader of the Opposition has made in this House this evening, in moving a motion of want of confidence in the Government for something which he alleges they did not do, but which the facts of the case show they did do.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Hargraft,
Allison,	Harwood,
Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	King,
Bain,	Landerkin,
Barron,	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Borden,	Lister,
Bourassa,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McMillan,
Brown (Monck),	McMullen,
Cameron (Huron),	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Carroll,	Mousseau,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mulock,
Casey,	Murray,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Préfontaine,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Savard,
Flint,	Scriver,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Simard,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
German,	Tarte,
Gibson,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Traux,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Watson.—81.
Guay,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Baker,	Léger,
Bergeron,	Lépine,
Bergin,	Lippé,
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Burnham,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Carignan,	Macdowall,
Carpenter,	Mackintosh,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAllister,
Cleveland,	McDonald (Victoria),
Coatsworth,	McDougall (Cape Breton),

Cochrane,	McKeen,
Cockburn,	McLennan,
Corbould,	McNeill,
Costigan,	Madill,
Craig,	Mara,
Curran,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Montague,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Pope,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Roome,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Temple,
Henderson,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Tupper,
Ingram,	Tyrwhitt,
Jamieson,	Wallace,
Joncas,	Weldon,
Kaulbach,	White (Cardwell),
Kenny,	White (Shelburne),
Kirkpatrick,	Wilmot,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville),
LaRivière,	Wood (Westmoreland).—100.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Ives,	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Corby,	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. McKay.	Mr. Bowman,
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Choquette.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway, including the Eastern Extension and Cape Breton Railways..... $3,700,000

Mr. BOWELL. This deficit was fully discussed when the Supplementary Estimates for 1890-91 were before the House. The amount asked for the current year is the same as was spent in the management last year, and there is no reason to believe that the income of the road will be any larger. The other night I gave as full explanations as are at my disposal. The deficit arises from various causes:—loss of traffic, greater expense in working and deprivation by the Short Line of a large amount of income.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact income for the year which expired on the 30th of June last past and the exact expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. Earnings for 1890-91, $2,977,395.38; working expenses, $3,662,341.94. Deficit for the year ending 30th June, 1891, $684,946.56.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the present deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, wholly apart from the sum charged to capital account, is close on to $700,000. That is a very serious state of affairs, and the largest deficit we have ever had to face.

Mr. BOWELL. The largest deficit was in 1878-79, and that was when there was only 714 miles in operation. The deficit then was $716,083.53.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I recollect the circumstance under which that occurred, and I think also in that was included about $200,000 which had been distributed over three years for the change from iron to steel rails, so that this year's deficit is considerably the largest we have ever had, and it does not include very heavy improvements chargeable to capital.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is correct, as far as I am informed. That was the year when the road was steel-railed instead of iron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the expenditure on capital account last year?

Mr. BOWELL. I will make a note of it and get the information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman intimated that he would be in a position to state the arrangement made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway at St. John before this passed.

Mr. BOWELL. The following is the agreement:—

"ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT made this day of in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty.

"BETWEEN Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented herein by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada, hereinafter called the Minister, of the first part, and the New Brunswick Railway Company, hereinafter called the company, of the second part:

"WHEREAS the company has applied for permission to have its freight business done on the premises of the Intercolonial Railway at St. John station, by the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, and whereas the Minister is willing to grant such permission upon certain terms and conditions herein contained:

"Now, therefore, this agreement witnesseth that the said Minister hereby agrees that the company shall have its freight business done in and about the station and premises of the Intercolonial Railway at St. John, including the waybilling of freight, the whole to be done by the employés of the Intercolonial Railway and under the charge and supervision of the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, these rights being, however, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter contained.

"And the said company hereby agrees and assents to the foregoing, and accepts the terms and conditions following, and in consideration of the permission granted hereby binds itself and successors to do and perform all acts, matters and things on the part of the said company to be done and performed in accordance with this agreement and with the said terms and conditions, which are as follows, that is to say:—

"1. This agreement shall remain in force until the day of

"2. It is understood and agreed that the permission and privilege herein granted to the company are intended only for the business of the company and shall not include or be used by the company to cover the business of any other railway or railway company, nor shall the company transfer its provision or privileges, or any portion of them, to any other railway company or to any person or persons whomsoever.

"3. Whenever the words 'St. John' or 'St. John station' occurs in this agreement, they should be understood to mean the Intercolonial Railway Station now established at St. John and the freight buildings, yards and tracks from Wall street to Mill street, as they now exist.

"4. It is understood and agreed that the permission and privileges granted apply only to St. John station as it now exists.

"5. The business of the company shall be done by the employés of the Intercolonial Railway, in conjunction with the business of the Intercolonial Railway, but the business of the one party is not to have precedence over the business of the other party.

"6. Should any of the buildings or tracks of the Intercolonial Railway at St. John be at any time destroyed or rendered unserviceable either by fire, flood or otherwise, the company shall have no claim against Her Majesty for damage on account of loss of accommodation, but they shall have a share of such temporary accommodation as is provided by the Intercolonial Railway on its own property for its own use.

"7. Her Majesty shall not be liable for any loss or damage to any freight received for or from the company, arising from any cause whatsoever, and if any such claim is, after due enquiry, established against Her Majesty and paid, the company shall, within ten days after receiving notice of the amount so paid, repay the same to Her Majesty.

"8. The Minister shall furnish standing room for freight cars on the siding at St. John, also storage for freight at this place, to the extent to which he can do so without prejudice to the operations of the Intercolonial Railway.

"9. The company shall pay the following rates and charges for the use of the station at St. John and for the services of the employés of the Intercolonial Railway, allowance for deterioration, wear and tear of tracks, sidings and yard from Wall street to Mill street station house, offices, freight sheds, also of furniture and fittings and freight trucks per month, $. Proportion of wages of the undermentioned persons shall be paid by the company thus:—Station-master, one-half; telegraph operator, in day time, one-half; if the night operator is used by or for the business of the company, one-half; freight clerk, in proportion to the total tonnages inwards and outwards monthly by each road. Cost of shunting and wages of shunters and switchmen in proportion to the number of cars and engines arriving and departing by each road. Carting of freight, actual cost: fuel, oil, wicks, lamp chimneys, and other small stores for use of station and yard, one-half. All stationery, forms and tickets required for the company's business to be supplied by the company.

"10. All rates and charges shall be made up monthly, and the company agrees to pay promptly to the Intercolonial Railway each month the total amount chargeable against it for the month immediately preceding.

"11. The company agrees to give the necessary facilities, including access to books and papers, to the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway, to enable him to ascertain and verify the charges under this agreement.

"12. The company agrees that in case it should make default in carrying out any of the terms and conditions of this agreement, either wholly or in part, this agreement shall forthwith be and become entirely null and void: this termination shall not relieve the company from the payment of any sum or sums of money then due to the Intercolonial Railway, and the company shall be liable for the same, and for any loss or damage caused to Her Majesty by reason of such default.

"In witness whereof, the president and secretary of the New Brunswick Railway Company duly authorized by resolution of board of directors which is hereto annexed, have hereto set their hands and affixed the seal of the said company the day and year first above written, and these presents have been signed and sealed by the said Minister, and countersigned by the Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals of Canada, on behalf of Her Majesty."

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Railways was asked to lay on the Table information in reference to rates and other matters on the Intercolonial Railway. I sent him a note in which I mentioned, amongst other things, information as to rates, as to freight carried below cost, free passes, &c.

Mr. BOWELL. I have here a full statement of all the tariffs, and, as the hon. gentleman has plenty of time, he might study them for himself.

Mr. MULOCK. One would not be able to decide what has been carried below cost from that statement. That, I presume, can only be furnished by the Railway Department itself.

Mr. BOWELL. As I understand, the only articles which may be considered to be carried at or below cost are coal and grain. It depends altogether on the proportion of the expenditure according to the period of the year at which the freight is carried. In the summer or autumn, when no difficulties present themselves, coal can be carried at what might be considered a fair rate. Only this afternoon a railway manager told me that the rate would pay expenses, and probably a little more; but if coal were carried on the Intercolonial Railway at a period when two engines are required to draw it and a snow plough to precede it, it would probably be under the cost. The policy has been to develop that particular trade to as great an extent as possible, in order to encourage those industries, and in the hope that the return freight would more than compensate for any small loss that might accrue in carrying coal to market.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood that a part of the deficit had occurred from the fact that coal was carried below cost.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that was the statement made by myself. I made enquiry into the rates on other roads, and I have been led to the conclusion I have given; although in the past it is believed that part of the deficit has arisen from the carrying of coal in the way I have mentioned, unless you allow for return freights, though I have no satisfactory information to establish that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I not understand that the rate charged was $\frac{7}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That must be below cost if you estimate anything for wear and tear of the rolling stock and those other expenses which are usually computed by railway companies. That is only a little above half a farthing per ton per mile, and I have always understood from railway managers that it was impossible to carry coal or any other freight at such a rate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The report of the Railway Department and the report of the Chief Superintendent last year explicitly stated that the deficit was to be attributed to that fact. That is the official statement, and I have never heard that seriously questioned, although it was attempted to be argued that there were incidental advantages and indirect benefits which the country derived from carrying the coal at a loss. The fact that this was one of the chief causes of the deficit was, however, never disputed. This year we have the striking fact before us that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway will amount to about $700,000, and it therefore behoves us to look into the matter and see if any leak can be stopped. In the report for 1889-90 I find it stated that the deficit for that year amounted to $553,392. When we analyze that, it is stated that, although there was an appreciable increase of $44,566 in the freight traffic, there was a decrease of $12,376 in the passenger traffic, which is said by Mr. Pottinger to be attributable to the number of through passengers who take the Short Line road through St. John instead of through Lévis and Quebec, as heretofore; but, as a matter of fact, I find that the earnings for the year were $32,716 larger than those in the previous year, so the question arises, what caused the deficit? The deficit will be found in the addition to the working expenses, and I think the House is entitled to some explanation on that point. The working expenses were increased during last year by no less than $327,544. That is a most serious state of affairs, and I think requires clear and extended explanations before this item is passed. I find by the Public Accounts of 1889-90 that the working expenses amounted to $3,481,472, as compared with those for the previous year of $3,153,928, being an increase for the year of $327,544. The Committee would naturally expect some detailed explanation of how that came about,

of how it is that the expenses were so much larger last year than they were the year before. With regard to the balance of the deficit, it is contended, I know not with what truth, I am not in a position to know, that a large part of the loss connected with the Intercolonial Railway occurs in the stores account kept at Moncton. It is charged, and alleged, and believed, that two prices are paid for articles required for the Intercolonial Railway. I do not want to make a statement stronger than that which I am making, but it has been charged for years, and it is so charged in the public press, that an investigation into that stores account, if it were properly conducted, would reveal a state of facts of a not very palatable kind. We find that the stores which are alleged to have been on hand at the end of the year, including fuel, amounted to $339,882; iron and steel rails and fastenings, $275,049; old materials for sale, $92,110, or a total of $707,042. That may be correct. That is the statement which Mr. Pottinger furnishes to the department here, but whether it be correct or not will not be ascertained until a thorough investigation is made; and I submit to the Government that, in view of the fact that it has been persistently charged by the public press and by leading and responsible public men in the Maritime Provinces that there are tremendous leaks in that branch of the department at Moncton, it is eminently desirable that at an early day a thorough investigation should take place—first, to ascertain whether the stores alleged to be on hand are really and actually there; and, secondly, to ascertain whether it is true, as is charged, that two prices, or very much larger prices than should be paid, are being paid for many of the staple articles required in that stores department. It is, of course, out of the question that an outsider could know the facts in such a way as to be able to make a charge on his responsibility from his place in the House. I can only repeat what I have read, what I hear, and I hear it from men in Moncton, who make no secret of charging it publicly, and I mention it here in order that the Government may, if they deem fit, make this investigation at an early date. It is well known that some years ago, in the matter of oil purchased for that road, it was charged, and proved, that excessive prices were paid, prices beyond anything that ought to have been paid, for the oil used on that road—that some men made a fortune out of it; it was charged that there was an oil ring, a political ring; that the moneys were appropriated for political purposes, and that enormous profits on the oil, amounting to thousands and tens of thousands of dollars, were made by an oil ring in St. John; and the profits were applied for political purposes. I do not know whether it was so; I heard it stated, and I heard the names given, and I heard the prices quoted, on a public platform, by one of the leading citizens of New Brunswick, not long ago. He stated the prices that were being paid; he stated the names of the parties who had the contract. He is a gentleman in whose statements, I think, my hon. friends opposite are disposed, at times, to place a great deal of faith. In view of these facts, in view of the deficit which happened last year, and which we have to face, it appears, in an increased form this year, I think it will be the duty of the Government to make this investigation.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask the acting Minister of Railways whether the expenditure on capital account for the year ending the 30th of June, 1891, was larger than for the year 1890?

Mr. BOWELL. The manager says he will give me that statement to-morrow; he cannot answer definitely, but he thinks it is a little larger. In reference to the observations made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), it is the old story, about deficits, and leaks, and bad oil, and large prices, that I have heard here for the last five or six years. How far it is correct, I am neither going to affirm nor deny. This much I do say, however, that in the contracts which have been entered into for the oil required on the road since I have been in charge of the department, they have been given to the lowest tenderers, and the quality of oil selected was that which was reported by those who ought to know as being the best for the uses for which it is required. The hon. gentleman has not made direct charges against the management at Moncton, nor has he charged any clerk or officer whose duty it has been to take stock with having deliberately made a false return, but the hon. gentlemen has made his charges inferentially. I can say that if, in taking stock, the facts are as have been indicated by the hon. gentleman, then the returns must have been false, and the officer who made it ought to be severely punished, if such be proved: and I should deem it my duty, if I remained in charge of the department, to make a thorough and full investigation into that charge which has been indirectly made. I understand the hon. gentlemen only repeats what he has seen in the newspapers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And heard from leading citizens.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not disposed to give much weight to statements made on the stump, or at public meetings, when opposition politicians are discussing the management of a Government road. Perhaps we are all prone to draw little too long a bow upon questions of this kind; but leaks there may be. I know that during the very short time I have been at the head of the department I have deemed it my duty, even on the railways in Prince Edward Island, to take measures compelling those who have granted passes contrary to the distinct and positive order of the manager from headquarters to pay the passes themselves. I think that is the most effective way to put a stop to an abuse which I believe has existed in the past to a much greater extent than should have been allowed, in the interest of the road. I have given positive instructions to the manager to charge the amount of the pass to the party who had issued it, and he was compelled to pay for it. There may be many other leaks to stop which will require full investigation. I can promise the hon. gentleman, on the part of the Government that in view of the large deficits in the past, and in the prospective deficit for next year, a rigid and thorough investigation will be made, with a view to stop all possible leaks. The hon. gentleman referred to the great expenditure last year over that of the year previous, and he pointed out, as a strong point, that although the earnings as published in the blue-book were larger than they were the year before, yet the deficit was

much larger than it had been before. Now, I am informed that it was necessary, in order to keep pace with the times and requirements of traffic, to place an extra special train upon the route to make connection with the Short Line from St. John to Halifax. That alone has necessitated an expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway of not less than $190,000. Then, in order to compete with the Short Line faster trains had to be placed upon the Intercolonial Railway proper, that is, from St. John or from Moncton to Quebec. It is scarcely necessary for me to inform the House, or anyone who has given this matter the slightest study, that the faster the train the more expensive it is, the greater the wear and tear of the rolling stock. I am not in a position to give the amount of that expenditure, nor am I in a position to say whether an accurate statement of additional expenditure could be given. Those, I think, are the reasons which have led to the large expenditure and to the falling off to a certain extent of the traffic which would naturally arise from competition between the two roads. I repeat that the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is one that not only should receive attention, but should be put in force during the coming year, so as to see if it is not possible to reduce expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was an extra express put on the Intercolonial in consequence of the opening of the Short Line?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; to connect with the Short Line at St. John, N.B., which involved an additional expenditure of $190,000 per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without any return?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where does the express run?

Mr. BOWELL. Between Halifax and St. John.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not express any disapproval of the means taken to make the Intercolonial road an effective rival to the Short Line, and as to the management and the present running of the road from Rivière du Loup to Moncton I have no criticism to pass. I am of the opinion that the road is doing fairly well, that the management is fairly good and the passengers are fairly accommodated.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to say that the Quebec express was not a success. I think during only three days last winter that express was one time at Truro. At least, that is what I am informed by railway men. What is the average price paid for coal by the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. BOWELL. The average price is about $2.20 per ton. A contract was entered into a few days ago at $2.20 for most of the coal, and some was a little less.

Mr. KING. Is it a fact that we have a night and day train between St. John and Halifax?

Mr. BOWELL. The manager tells me there is an extra train both ways between Halifax and St. John.

Mr. KING. Is there a night train, a day train and a train connected with the express?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What price is being paid for the coal oil consumed on the road, and with whom is the contract let? I understand some pains were taken with respect to coal oil?

Mr. BOWELL. I said that the lowest tender was accepted, and that the usual mode was adopted of advertising for tenders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who supplies it now, and at what price?

Mr. BOWELL. The manager says there is a good deal of pains taken, particularly as regards the quality of the oil. All oil, before being accepted, is sent to Montreal for analysis. As to quality, I have not the tenders now; but if the hon. gentleman would like them before the item is finally passed I will see they are brought down, when he will learn exactly to whom the tenders were awarded and the prices paid and the quality of the oil. There has been a good deal of pressure brought to bear to compel the acting Minister to take a course he did not think it was in the interests of the road he should take in regard to this very question of oil. Having a distinct recollection of the numerous debates and complaints made of this question I was determined not to take any oil, except that which was reported by the analyst to be the best and the cheapest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of coal was conveyed last year from Springhill collieries?

Mr. BOWELL. I can give the hon. gentleman quantities transported over the Intercolonial from four points.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know the general quantity, but what proportion is carried from Springhill?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that nearly the whole of the coal coming over the Intercolonial is from the Springhill mines. The manager thinks there is not 5,000 tons from any other colliery. The total amount carried in 1890 was 145,800 tons; 1889, 126,316 tons; 1888, 184,662 tons; 1887, 198,643.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is carried from Springhill until it reaches the Grand Trunk—how many miles?

Mr. DICKEY. 557 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Minister statements of all coal carried from all points?

Mr. BOWELL. No; but I can get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the Minister what is the general rule of the department in connection with printing, and the more extensive lines of advertising. Are they subject to tender and contract, or are they given out at the discretion of the manager or Minister?

Mr. BOWELL. The printing of forms, and other printing required for the road, is given out at prices that are arranged, I am informed by the Queen's Printer. I do not know that there is any particular rule in reference to advertising.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is chiefly in Moncton. The Moncton *Times* is kept up by it.

Mr. FLINT. I can understand that the advertising would be a difficult thing to give out by tender.

Mr. BOWELL. When an advertisement of a time-table is given to any newspaper, it is given to it at a price arranged or indicated by the department, so that if it is a weekly paper, not on the line of the road, it does not get as much as a city paper.

Mr. FRASER. Do I understand the Minister to say that the prices as charged by the Halifax papers, are fixed by the department?

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I am informed.

Mr. FRASER. Then I would like to know how is it that the department has made the prices about twice what they used to be?

Mr. BOWELL. That I cannot tell. If the hon. gentleman gives the journal to which he refers, having a little knowledge of printing, I might be able to give him an answer. We know that the space in one paper is sometimes worth five times as much as a similar space in another.

Mr. FRASER. I will give the hon. gentleman the two journals which I refer to, and I do not think there is much difference between them. I speak of the Halifax *Herald* and the Halifax *Chronicle*, and I make the statement that the price is nearly twice as much at present for the advertisements in the *Chronicle* as it was during the former Government. I am glad the prices are made by the department, because that exonerates the paper from charging so much.

Mr. CURRAN. I understand that the oil contracts entered into this year will be brought down, but at the same time on account of the feeling that exists in regard to these supplies among the trade —and there is a good deal of feeling—I would like to know if it would be possible to bring down a comparative statement as to the qualities of the oils. I believe that each tenderer was obliged to send in a specimen of the particular brand which he intended supplying, and that all these different samples were tested by the analyst at McGill College. Am I to understand that not only the contracts entered into will be brought down, but that there will be also a comparative statement as to the quality of the samples?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; there is no objection to bring it all down. I think the suggestion made by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) is a good one, as it will enable the Committee the better to judge of the manner in which the contracts have been awarded. I will bring down all the information that we have, and a full report as to the test of the different oils which were submitted to the analyst of McGill College.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister says that a contract has been entered into recently with regard to coal. Does he consider the price at which he has contracted, namely, $2.20 per ton, a low price for coal? Is that lower than we have been getting it for in the past?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to answer the question personally as to what I might consider a fair price, but it is the same price as was paid for the same qualities of coal last year, and I believe that is a little lower than the ordinary market price, because the tenders are given for quantities ranging from 25,000 to 100,000 tons to each of these collieries. The last contract that was made was for $2.20 per ton. The manager tells me, however, that one of the tenders was for $1.75, where it is supplied to the road from a colliery very close by.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that we paid $1.90 per ton during the year 1889, and $2.10 per ton was the largest figure which we paid for coal. The Black Diamond Coal Company of Westville supplied 15,413 tons at $1.90 per ton.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is correct in his reference to the Black Diamond; but I am informed it would not be in the interest of the country if we took much of that coal. It is of an inferior quality to the other coal of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that you also got coal at $2.10 per ton. What quality was it?

Mr. BOWELL. The manager tells me that the year previous some of the coal was furnished by tender at $2.10 and $2.15 per ton, and the coal from the Black Diamond mine was $1.75, being of an inferior quality and, from what I can learn, dear at that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Intercolonial Coal Company supplied 19,000 tons at $2.15 per ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose these were the charges at the mouth of the pit practically?

Mr. BOWELL. That is what we paid delivered at the junction of the road; that is, between the mine and where it was delivered on the track.

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. gentleman explain the difference in the price between this year and last year? Is the price of coal going up?

Mr. BOWELL. The only way I can explain it is that the coal companies combined; you may say it is a combination if you like, and I think it is. I noticed in looking over the tenders when submitted to me by the manager, that nearly all the coal companies tendered alike, or with a very, very slight difference, and those were selected which would be delivered at the nearest point where they were required, consistent with the quality of the coal.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I certainly think, in the interest of the people of this country, who are losing about $700,000 a year on the operation of a railway that is largely operated in the interest of the coal companies, it is high time that the Minister raised the freight charges on coal. He carries it at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. I think it would be prudent to raise it to four-tenths of a cent.

Mr. FLINT. I was speaking on the subject of printing. It appears that the rates are fixed by the department. Whether they are reasonable or not, not being a practical printer, I do not know; but it seems to me that payments to the Moncton *Times*, the Halifax *Herald*, the Yarmouth *Times* and the St. John *Sun*, amounting to about $40,000 a year for printing, practically without competition, might afford an opportunity for a very considerable saving. It seems to be a huge sum for the printing of these forms, and it seems to me that a saving of many thousands of dollars might be effected by having the work done by contract in the different printing offices of the country. The Moncton *Times* draws over $10,000 per annum; the Halifax *Herald* draws about an equal amount; the Yarmouth

Times, which is at quite a distance from the Intercolonial Railway, though no doubt capable of doing good work, but not better than other printing offices in the same vicinity, gets about $4,500; and the St. John *Sun* gets about $13,000. I think there is ground here for grave suspicion of political partizanship and favouritism in the management of the railway. Serious complaints have been made in Parliament from time to time with regard to the payments for advertising in the various journals of the country, and there is a widespread belief that the opinions of these journals are to a great degree biassed by the fact that they receive large sums for advertising from the Government of the Dominion; but very few people are aware that these four or five Conservative journals, in addition to the large sums they receive for advertising, are paid for printing receipts, vouchers, tickets and things of this kind, sums amounting to $40,000 odd per annum. As a matter of public policy, I think it is not wise that public opinion should be biassed by these means; but also on the ground of the strictest economy on the Intercolonial Railway, every work of this kind should be given out by tender and contract.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask, as the advertising rates are prepared by the department, what is the rule followed and who prepares them? Is it after consultation with various printers?

Mr. BOWELL. I fancy not. The rule, so far as I can understand it, is—and I may as well be frank with the Committee, I have not looked into this question minutely, not having had time to look into the details of the department—that they just say to a paper in which they desire to advertise: If you like to advertise this for twelve months, subject to the changes to be made in the time-table, we will pay you so much. I am not going to quarrel with the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint); but affirm that this habit of attacking the newspapers, and saying that their opinions are moulded by any little favours which they may get from the Government, is unworthy of anyone who has any knowledge of a party newspaper. Does anybody suppose for a moment that if there were a change of Government, and the patronage now given to the Halifax *Herald* were given to the Halifax *Chronicle*, that that would change its political opinions or bias it to support the party that succeeded to power? I have a sufficiently good opinion of those connected with the press to believe their expressed opinions to be their honest convictions as to what they think is right in the policy they pursue; and I believe they would pursue the same course if they received $1,000 a year as they are pursuing to-day; and I believe that if they did not get ten cents, they would support the Government with the same vigour that they would if they received $10,000. Whether this patronage should be given to all the newspapers that support the Government or whether it should be distributed among those that do not support the Government is a matter of opinion; but we all know that hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side of the House, did not pursue this policy. As long as this work is required, and as long as it can be done as cheaply by friends as by foes, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman, if he were on this side of the House, would be one of the first to pursue that policy. In reference to the amount paid, I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no more printing done than is absolutely required to carry on the affairs of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is more money paid.

Mr. BOWELL. No, there is not. The prices I understand have been arranged by those who were supposed to be capable of judging what was a fairly remunerative price to be paid for that kind of work. I admit that advertising, if sent broadcast over the country, might be abused; but I will venture the statement that there is not a railway on the continent of America which pays less, according to its mileage, for the printing of forms and advertising than does the Intercolonial Railway. If you look at the Canadian Pacific Railway you will find that they have a whole staff devoted exclusively to this special work. The head of the staff is paid a very large sum, and he has a very large number of clerks under him. If we desire to make any road popular and known, there is no better plan than by judicious expenditure in advertising.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you should advertise in all the papers.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to do that.

Mr. DICKEY. I should like to say a word with regard to this rate of three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile on coal. I do not think it is quite realized always that a particular class of freight should not be made to defray the whole expenditure of running a road. There is a large proportion, about one-third of the expenses of the road, which is permanent and not increased by carrying an additional amount of freight. So that what should be charged against classes of freight like this would only be about two-thirds the expenditure. I do not believe the public generally knows how cheaply freight is carried on this continent, but fortunately we have available the reports of the Inter-State Commerce Commission of the United States, which deal thoroughly with the whole railway traffic of the United States, giving the cost of carriage upon every road there; and the average cost of carrying on all the roads in the United States of every class of freight is only six-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, and deducting one-third, that makes the actual cost of carriage four-tenths of a cent. It must be remembered that freight such as coal is the very cheapest class, as cheap as grain or any other very cheap freight. It is entered No. 10 on the classification of Canadian railways, and, therefore, the cost will be much less than the average freight. Take some American roads with a mileage like the Intercolonial Railway; take, for instance, the Pennsylvania system, which is reputed to be the best managed in the States, and runs the fastest trains, and gives the best service, the cost of every class of freight on that road is only four-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. That includes very much more expensive freight than coal, and that is a total cost, including the general expenses of freight; and if that is reduced by taking off one-third for the fixed expenses of the road, it is brought considerably below three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile on this coal traffic.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is not that company carrying its own coal?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not prepared to say whether it carries its own coal, but even if it did the coal it carries would be a very small proportion of the freight of the road which this gives, and would not at all affect the percentage, so small would be the amount of coal. On the Philadelphia and Reading division of the Pennsylvania railroad the whole of the freight only costs three-and-a-half-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. On the Chicago and Grand Trunk, which is a very parallel case, under the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, it only costs four-tenths of a cent per ton per mile to carry their freight, including every class of freight: and if you take a low class of freight like this it would make, of course, a very great difference in the comparison. Take the particular classes of freight. Grain is a similar class to coal. What are the grain rates in the United States? Grain has been carried from Chicago to New York by their road for the last five years at two-and-a-half-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, and grain needs to be carried in covered cars, and requires better classes of rolling stock and is more expensive to handle than coal. During the present summer the rate on grain from Chicago to New York is two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, or 33 per cent. less than the rate under consideration. Of course, this is a rate adopted by all the lines that run from New York to Chicago, and, I presume, is a paying rate, probably not a directly paying rate, but a rate that pays in some way indirectly. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries flour from St. Paul, Minnesota, to Boston, for thirty-eight hundredths of a cent per ton per mile, and I believe, though I am speaking without actual knowledge, that in the passage of that freight from St. Paul to Boston it passes over roads on which the Canadian Pacific Railway have to pay mileage on their cars, and if that is the case it brings that down as low as the actual rate on the Intercolonial Railway, but it is 1,561 miles, instead of 557 miles that the coal is carried. From St. Paul to Boston the rate is thirty-eight hundredths of a cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the rate for barley?

Mr. DICKEY. Thirty cents per hundred. That is a new rate, dating from the middle of July. Coming to the particular article of coal, you will find that the rates are all very low everywhere. In the United States it is difficult to get information about coal, because in many cases the mines are owned by the railway companies, and it is a mere question of book-keeping whether they charge the cost of carrying the coal to the railway or mine account. Therefore it is difficult to be assured you are getting the expenses of railway transport; but it is fair to say that in making up the accounts it is not at all likely they would put it below the cost. They would try and get a fair average between the mine and the railway. From Buffalo to Chicago the rate on coal is $1.50, and that distance is 539 miles. That is less than three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. Another fair estimate is this: The Grand Trunk Railway gets its coal from the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière Junction, and carries it to Montreal, and the Grand Trunk Railway operating department has an account with its fuel department, and it charges the fuel department with the expenses of conveying that coal. It is fair to assume that the traffic department will charge the fuel department with the actual cost of carrying the coal. As a matter of fact, they charge less than three-tenths of a cer t per ton per mile. This very coal comes by the Intercolonial Railway to the Chaudière, where it is taken in charge, and is hauled at less than three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the Grand Trunk charge for coal not for their own use?

Mr. DICKEY. Nearly half a cent per ton.

Mr. BOWELL. Five-tenths of a cent.

Mr. DICKEY. That, of course, is for a short haul; and there are other considerations which enter into that matter. The Grand Trunk charge their fuel department one-fourth of a cent per ton per mile, but they have to pay car mileage of three-fourths of a cent per car, which, on a 20-ton car, brings the rate up to nearly three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries this coal from Springhill to Montreal at a cheaper rate than the Intercolonial Railway does.

Mr. MULOCK. Then our loss cannot arise from the coal traffic?

Mr. DICKEY. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries for the same price as the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Tunk do from the Springhill Mines to Montreal. The Intercolonial Railway makes the Canadian Pacific Railway pay from Springhill to St. John a local rate, and therefore the rate on the line between St. John and Montreal is so much less. The cost per ton from Springhill to Montreal is $2.49. Of course, I am not speaking from personal knowledge, but after very careful enquiry. Out of that amount the Canadian Pacific Railway have to pay $1.12 to the Intercolonial Railway from Springhill to St. John; therefore, they only get $1.37 from St. John to Montreal, or only twenty-eight hundredths of a cent for themselves, and that is less than three-tenths of a cent.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that a paying rate?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not say it is a paying rate. It may be a competitive rate, but it is so. Another argument is this: The Inter-State Commerce Commission fixes the rates of certain classes of freight, and in Iowa they have fixed the rate on slack coal, which is the very cheapest class of coal, at $1.34 for 400 miles. It will be seen that the Intercolonial Railway rate would be $1.20, so that the difference is only 14 cents, and that is a rate which all roads are obliged to adopt, and of course is a paying rate. The coal rates on the Intercolonial Railway must be considered as a whole. If the through :e is dealt with the local rates must be dealt with. I think the Minister will admit that the local rates on coal in Nova Scotia are abnormally high, that they are far in excess of what should be paid on a business basis. The people living in my own town pay 70 cents a ton freight on coal from the Springhill mines, a distance of between 17 and 19 miles. That is only an instance of the abnormally high local rates on coal on the Intercolonial Railway, and to a certain extent the local consumers are made to make up something upon any possible deficiency in the cheap rate given on the long haul. One element in favour of this coal business is that it is a steady, regular, reliable business. There is a certain amount of coal always ready to be removed, and no loss is created by plant

lying idle or by any uncertainty in regard to the business. It is that kind of busines which a railway desires and will make concessions to develop. I think the proportion of coal carried from Springhill to Quebec, as compared with the total amount of coal moved by the road, is about 1 to 5, and the other five tons are carried at a very paying rate, though the one ton may be carried at cost. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) asked me how I accounted for this deficit if there was no loss on the coal. I am not prepared to say that this coal rate is a paying rate, taking the total charges of the Intercolonial Railway as they are. I should say it is not; but I think a careful reading of the reports of the officers will show internal evidence of other facts which are quite as open to blame for this deficit as the coal traffic. In the last year, for instance, we have nearly $200,000 accounted for by the opening of the Short Line, and there are other items in addition to that. As a member interested to some extent in this coal traffic, I must protest against putting on its shoulders the whole or any considerable portion of the loss caused by the running of the road. I believe the causes of the loss on the Intercolonial Railway are not so easily traceable as that you can put your finger on one class of traffic and say the loss is all caused by that. I believe the causes lie deeper than that, and require a good deal of enquiry to get at them and apportion the responsibility as it should be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to revert again to the observations made by the acting Minister of Railways with reference to the cost of printing. His attention was called to the fact that four papers received $37,500. Now, I think that a fair test of the management of the road in this particular would be to compare it with similar expenditure by, say, the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I think the Minister should have submitted to the Committee a statement showing what the expenses of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are, or any other railway company that has a large mileage in Canada, for printing, in the same way that the Intercolonial Railway has incurred an expenditure for this purpose. Here are $10,000 paid to the Halifax *Herald*, $10,000 to the Moncton *Times*, $4,500 to a paper in Yarmouth, and $13,000 to the St. John *Sun*. Now, since the Government have established a Printing Bureau here I know no reason why that work should not be done at the Bureau. If the Government are to have a printing establishment, and then give out the printing to be done by newspapers all over the country at enormous prices, the printing establishment is useless, it is a censure upon the institution which they themselves have called into existence. But surely there must be a great deal of printing done that is not of this character. The hon. gentleman pronounced a eulogy on the wisdom of advertising in newspapers. I do not think it is necessary that the Intercolonial Railway should do any more in that respect than the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not find the Grand Trunk Railway Company paying enormous sums for the publication of time-tables in newspapers. I think in most cases these time-tables are published by the newspapers gratuitously for the information of their subscribers. But what we object to, and what the hon. gentlemen really defend, is that by these expenditures we are assisting in maintaining the Government. Now, this is not a satisfactory state of things. It seems to me there is great room for reform in this particular, and it would be very well for the Government to investigate this matter and to ascertain what is the expenditure for printing made by the ordinary railway companies of the country. This road should be run, not as a political institution, but it should be run on business principles, and certainly it is not run on business principles when these enormous prices are being paid for the maintenance of newspapers rather than for purposes of the railway, and, therefore, in the interest of the public. I think we require much more information on this subject than we possess; and in submitting these estimates to Parliament, especially when you are submitting estimates for a railway in the management of which there is a deficit of three-quarters of a million dollars a year, we ought to possess all the information we can get on the subject, in order that a reform may be had. Certainly, a reform is greatly needed, and we are not likely to get it by discussing these estimates at one o'clock in the morning, with the amount of information we possess.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see on page C—311 of the Auditor General's Report, "D. Pottinger, Manager, Halifax Club dues, $30; Rideau Club dues, $25." I would like to know how it is that we have to pay these club bills for men in charge of this railway.

Mr. BOWELL. I made enquiry into the facts when it was brought up in the Public Accounts Committee by the member for South Oxford, and I find it to be the practice on other roads. I find that the Grand Trunk Railway Company pays the club fees of its manager and assistant manager; the Canadian Pacific Railway does the same, except in the towns where they live. It is done on the principle, I presume, that the managers of railways, when they visit distant places, have to visit the clubs, and it is looked upon as part of their expenditure. As to the propriety of continuing a charge of that kind, I am not prepared to give an opinion just now. My own views are probably in accord with those of the hon. gentleman who called the attention of the Committee to it—that is, that the travelling expenses of officials should be paid by the railway companies, the same as other expenses. But as that has been the established practice in Canada and the United States, it has been adopted for some time on the Intercolonial Railway, and it will be a question as to whether it should be continued.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we remember that in the earnings of the Grand Trunk they save about $1,200 a year per mile, after paying all their running expenses, and the Canadian Pacific Railway are saving even more than that, and when we consider that we are losing $557 per mile per year in operating the Intercolonial Railway, I think it is necessary that we should strike out items of this kind and have them cut off, until, at least, the road is paying running expenses. I do not think we should try to be as extravagant as the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, with regard to the coal question, which my hon. friend referred to a few minutes ago; he must

know, if he is well posted with regard to the coal question in the United States, that the Pennsylvania Railway, which is one of the principal railways of that country operating in coal, is one of the largest stockholders in a coal combination that has been formed in the United States. It is well known that they control about 200,000 acres of coal fields in the United States, out of a gross amount of, perhaps, 400,000 acres. Now, in order to keep up the price of coal at the pit, the Pennsylvania Railway carries coal at virtually less than cost, because that is a matter of little importance to it, but it is of vital importance that the price should be kept up at the pit, because other companies have got to carry it at the same price in order to get a traffic. The result is, that they carry coal at less than cost, but they make up for it by the increased price at which they sell coal at the pit. My hon. friend should know that is the reason why coal is moved so cheaply on that particular line.

Mr. McGREGOR. The Baltimore and Ohio Railway, which runs through a portion of the State of Ohio, charges half a cent per mile for outsiders. They have a very large coal territory of their own, and they carry their own coal a little cheaper. Speaking about the rates from the great west to the great east, we find that the rate is somewhat lower going east; but we must remember that these cars are loaded going west again, whereas in carrying coal from the Maritime Provinces to Quebec the cars are only used for that purpose, or very largely used for that purpose, so that it becomes pretty costly when you have a double haul for the cars that are going back empty, because they are not so well fitted for carrying merchandise after being loaded with coal. So far as I know, half a cent is a very low rate for coal on any of the ordinary roads.

Mr. TUPPER. I understand there is no question but that the rate is a low one. I have spoken to railway men on the subject, and their view of the question is this: What can the coal be hauled for? What rate can it afford to pay? If the road can get half a cent per ton that should be charged; if the road can get more than that rate it should be charged. The point is, as to what rate would stop the traffic. Then the question arises: Is it in the interests of the road that the traffic should cease: that the coal should not come up to Quebec by the Intercolonial? That question, of course, concerns the people of Quebec. It also concerns the interests of the road itself. Would it pay the road to abandon the business, not merely as regards carrying the coal, but the other business that flows from it, and thus decrease the output of a large colliery like Springhill? I am told by railway men that if they had a large colliery along their line they would strain every nerve to carry the coal at the lowest possible rate, and secure, not only the business, but the indirect advantages which arise from the prosperous condition of a large coal mine. This is a subject well worthy of consideration, not only as regards what the road gains or loses, but whether a higher rate would stop the traffic, and whether it would prove advantageous to the road to cease handling the business.

Mr. McGREGOR. You can pay more for a gold dollar that it is worth. It might be better to do less business on the Intercolonial Railway than to carry coal at a loss. The acting Minister has said that "the combine" had increased the prices at Quebec. If the "combines" were properly taken in hand they could not do it.

Mr. KING. We have it on the authority of the chief engineer that coal carried at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile is carried at a loss. The hon. member for Cumberland has told us that the rate is $1.12 per ton from Springhill to St. John. I understood the lowest rate to St. John was $1.50, a distance of 160 miles. I fail to understand why the rate should be one cent per mile to St. John and three-tenths of a cent to Quebec. There is an item in the Auditor General's Report to which I wish to call attention. It is an item of 16,400 feet of pine plank, at $60 per thousand. I do not think there is any pine plank of that value manufactured in the city of St. John, and that a fair price is $40 per thousand. At another page of the Auditor General's Report there is an item of 600 gates, at $2.45 each, amounting to $1,478. I do not think that is an excessive price to be paid for the description of railway gate required; but the plans and specifications which were supplied gave no one a chance to tender at a fair paying price. I know a person who noticed the advertisement, and asked to be shown the plans and specifications. The lumber called for in the specification was to be of first quality clear pine, free of knots. In fact, it was to be of that class for which 6 cents per superficial foot was charged. Taking the quantity at 40 feet, the cost for lumber alone for each gate would be $2.40. The price paid for each gate was $2.45. The difficulty was that the specifications were not properly made out, or the gates could have been furnished at a lower rate, because there was no necessity for using first quality of clear pine when the gates are, no doubt, made of merchantable pine lumber worth, at the outside, $12 per thousand. No doubt, if the gates were examined to-day, it would be found that they were of good merchantable pine lumber, and nothing more is required.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are not all Government specifications drawn in the same way?

Mr. KING. If they are, it is time they were changed.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to give the information asked by the hon. gentleman, either as to the gates or the lumber. The pine plank is charged 6 cents per foot. May it not have occurred that plank was required for some specific purpose? If it were the ordinary inch plank, I think the hon. gentleman's criticism would be quite correct; but it is possible that it might be of a special quality, and of that thickness I referred to, and the charges may be for surface, in which case it certainly would not be too high.

Mr. KING. I think I am perfectly safe in saying the hon. gentleman's explanation does not apply, because five-sixths of all the lumber manufactured in New Brunswick is composed of deals, and I never heard of an invoice for lumber being made out in any other way than by the superficial foot, board measure.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Minister of Marine will make use of the same arguments he has made here to-night, when I ask again that a maximum rate should be fixed for the carrying of coal on the railways of the North-West. I have asked in this

House that a maximum rate should be fixed at two and a-half cents per ton per mile in the North-West, and the Government have refused to accede to that, which is comparatively a very high rate. I would like to ask the Minister what is the distance between the Springhill Coal Mines and the Londonderry Iron Works, and at what rate per ton per mile is the coal carried between the Springhill Mines and the Londonderry Iron Works, and the rate per ton per mile at which iron is carried over the Intercolonial Railway from the Londonderry Mines to Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. The distance is about 40 miles, and the manager, although not sure, thinks that the rate for coal is about 25 cents per ton.

Mr. WATSON. What is the rate per ton per mile for iron over the Intercolonial Railway from the Londonderry Iron Works to Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that, as far as recollection will serve, it is a half a cent per ton per mile.

Mr. WATSON. Is that supposed to be a paying rate? Does the Minister think that any loss is caused by carrying iron at a half cent rate?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that this rate will pay expenses, and leave a small profit. I suppose that during the winter when they had a great deal of trouble on the road there would be a loss.

Mr. WATSON. This is a question that the House should carefully consider as to whether it is desirable that these infant industries, which we try to encourage at a vast annual expense to the country, is the best system for the country to adopt. We are told that the Londonderry Iron Works would close up if it were not for those low rates on iron, and that the Springhill Mines would close but for the low rates on coal. We are also giving a bounty for the encouragement of the iron industry in Nova Scotia, and taking it all through, it appears to me to be an expensive luxury. We are simply killing off any revenue we might derive by importing iron and coal, and we are encouraging these industries at a heavy annual loss to the whole country. I do hope that the House will consider this matter in future. They should also consider that while we carry the iron at this low rate of half a cent per ton per mile, and while we carry coal on the Intercolonial Railway at three-tenths of a cent per mile, we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to charge a cent and a-half per ton per mile for carrying coal from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, a distance of over 400 miles, and where the freight of the coal is actually more from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, than the actual cost of Pennsylvania coal laid down in Port Arthur. While the Government is operating railways in the east in the interest of manufacturers, or consumers as it may be, at a heavy loss to the country they should at least see that in the west we should have at least fair rates on our coal. These rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west are exorbitant as compared with the rates on the Intercolonial Railway and they are exorbitant because that railway corporation has a monopoly. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway were carrying flour from Minneapolis to Boston for thirty cents per hundred, and if he looks at the rates he will find that the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Boston, are much greater than from Minneapolis to Boston, because the Canadian Pacific Railway have a monopoly in the Canadian North-West. Because Minneapolis is the competing point, the rates are much lower than from Winnipeg to Boston, although the distance is about the same. When these freight rates come up for discussion, it will be interesting to have a comparison made in order to show how the people of the North-West suffer from monoply.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the Minister what is the rate on flour per ton per mile, as compared with the rate on coal?

Mr. BOWELL. The rate is three-and-a-half tenths of a cent on flour, and three-tenths of a cent on coal, so that it is one-half-tenth of a cent dearer on flour than on coal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that the recent cut on the rate on flour to St. John does not apply to Halifax. Is that correct? The rates were always the same before.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the Canadian Pacific Railway has made a cut of forty cents to St. John for flour, and the Intercolonial Railway has made no change in its rate. Whether they will do so or not, is a question for consideration.

Mr. KENNY. It has come out in evidence then, that we, as the owners of the Intercolonial Railway, are carrying flour at the same rate at which we are carrying coal, and I find no fault with that.

An hon. MEMBER. The rate on flour is one-half-tenth of a cent higher than on coal.

Mr. KENNY. The difference is hardly appreciable. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has just called the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that within the last few days the Canadian Pacific Railway has lowered its rate on flour. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all the flour trade in the west initiated with these companies, had an understanding that flour would be carried to the largest competitive points in the Maritime Provinces—I mean the city of St. John and the city of Halifax—at the same rate. Now, it seems—common rumour has it, at all events—that the Canadian Pacific Railway has departed from that plan, and is carrying flour to St. John lower than to Halifax and less than three-and-a-half-tenths of a cent per ton per mile; so that Canadian flour is being carried by these Canadian roads at as low a rate as coal. For my part, I do not find fault with this low rate on flour. When we refer to the low rates on coal from Springhill and on iron from Londonderry, we must remember that we are the owners of this Intercolonial Railway, that we have to sustain and keep it in working order, and that if to-morrow we could by means of the Intercolonial Railway help in the development of a colliery that would put out every year 1,000,000 tons of coal, remembering that every person who came to that colliery or left it, and all the people employed in it, must be transported over that railway, the indirect advantages we should derive from that colliery would warrant us in carrying the raw product at a very low rate. Reference has frequently been made to the great tax that this Intercolonial Railway is to the Dominion of Canada, and

we would all desire to see less difference between expenditure and income; but we must remember that the loss is not due entirely to the low rate at which coal has been carried, because to-night we have the information that we are actually carrying flour at the same rate. When travelling over the Intercolonial Railway lately, I was informed that during the last four years we have spent for steel rails something like $900,000, which has been charged to income, and which would amount to something like $200,000 a year. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Railways if that is correct?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's statement is quite correct. The road within the last two years has been almost wholly re-railed with steel rails, weighing 67 lbs. instead of 56 lbs., so that trains may run more rapidly and safely over the road. This has all been charged to income.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With reference to the rate on flour, I am quite satisfied that the rate received by the Intercolonial is just as much per mile as that received by the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific, and I believe that the rate charged by the Canadian Pacific on flour is a paying rate—or at least a rate on which there is no loss. Then, as to the coal rate, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) stated that only one ton out of five was carried to Quebec. I suppose there is a little loss on that; but the local rates, which he admitted were very high, would make up any loss on the through rates. So that I am forced to this conclusion: That the loss on the Intercolonial Railway is not due to the rates at which it carries coal and flour, and that we must look for the cause of the loss in some other direction. Now, from my knowledge of the Intercolonial Railway—and I have had considerable to do with it—I do not believe there is a better paying road in this Dominion than that portion of the Intercolonial Railway running from St. John to Halifax. There is a very large traffic over it, and why the Intercolonial Railway should not pay its running expenses by three-quarters of a million dollars a year, without taking interest into account, is to me unaccountable. I believe, as the hon. member for Queen's has suggested, that it is the bounden duty of the Government to issue a Royal Commission to make a thorough investigation into the cause of this great loss. The acting Minister has stated that owing to the Short Line they had to put on a new express train, which cost the country $200,000 a year. Now, is there any necessity for that extra train? Why could they not arrange the other trains to start a little sooner? By some rearrangement of the time-table, they could have accomplished that service without this enormous expense. If we can judge by the state of affairs in the other departments of the Government, there is a great deal of looseness in connection with this department, and I think a Royal Commission or a committee to investigate this matter would show that there are leaks in every direction, and that we are paying two or three prices for everything purchased for the Intercolonial Railway, and for a great deal that we do not buy at all. The payment of $60 a thousand for lumber in the city of St. John, and insisting on first-class lumber for gates, and then allowing inferior lumber to be used, is an instance. If any man conducted his private business in this way he would be in the poor-house in six months.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a pity we could not discuss this question without trying to make capital out of it. The hon. gentleman's statement with regard to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific is not correct. The rate on the Intercolonial Railway is 35 cents, on the Grand Trunk 38 cents, and on the Canadian Pacific 40 cents per hundred, and that is quite enough to make the difference. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for having repeated the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's, because it is always well to hear a good thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With regard to the rate of three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, it is not a competitive rate; it was fixed before we had the competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, and it was acknowledged to be a non-paying rate.

Mr. KENNY. We had water competition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was no water competition, which necessitated lowering the rate to that point. The hon. gentleman knows that when it was lowered, the next year the chief engineer reported that a large portion of the loss must be attributable to that non-paying price. Now, it is alleged by railway men that half a cent per ton is a paying price. The difference, therefore, is about two-tenths of a cent per ton, which, on the quantity carried, would give a loss of about $200,000 a year on coal alone. But that is not the whole loss. I called attention the other night to the fact that when the Government commenced this system of carrying coal at a non-paying price, they went to work and built coal cars at an enormous cost, which they charged to capital account, and those coal cars carry the coal up and come back empty. There is no ground for a contrast with the American roads, because these roads have return freights, whereas we have not in a great many cases, and we must add to the loss the original cost of the cars, which is charged to capital account.

Mr. FRASER. I must join with the hon. member for Cumberland in saying that the rates for short distances are very large. Any Nova Scotian will admit that the rate for carrying coal from the mines at Pictou to Halifax is large. The New Glasgow Steel and Iron Company, when about to build their furnace, went to the Intercolonial Railway to find out their best terms for carrying the coal short distances, not exceeding five miles; and they changed the location of their works and placed them about two miles beyond Stellarton, because the short rates would make a difference of between $8,000 and $9,000 a year.

Mr. TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that is the reason?

Mr. FRASER. That is not the only reason, but largely is the reason. They might not have been able to get as good a site where they were, but they were willing to pay $10,000 for a site they were asked $20,000 for.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly; they would not give $20,000.

Mr. FRASER. They had the power by their Act to appropriate the land and could have taken it, and it could only have been a differenee of $10,000, but that was not to be compared to the

difference in the rates alone, which was $8,000 to $9,000 a year. I do not believe the Intercolonial Railway is losing on account of the coal, and I think it will be found, if an investigation were made, that this deficit is not due, nor is any part of it due, to the carriage of coal even to Quebec. I believe that this reason is simply put forward to cover up other reasons, whatever they may be. I never saw the reason so strongly in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for Albert to hand this road over to a commission as I do to-night. It must not be forgotten, with regard to the statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway is carrying freight as a competitor, that this Government have made it a competitor. In the matter of advertising, the hon. Minister informs me that the rate is made by the department. I will give an example of that rate. In the morning and evening edition of one paper, a short advertisement is published of the Intercolonial Railway winter arrangements, an advertisement of five inches in length, and that costs at the rate of $1,008 a year.

Mr. BOWELL. Is the hon. gentleman quoting from the accounts or from statements made by another newspaper?

Mr. FRASER. I am quoting from the rates paid as shown in the Auditor General's Report, page C—297. The Halifax *Morning Herald* is paid for advertising the time tables ten months at $48, or $480, and the Halifax *Evening Mail*, ten months at $36, or $360, making $1,008 for advertising that time-table for a year, or at the rate of $200 an inch. I do not blame the papers because they do not make the rate, but take what is given them. But I would call attention to another advertisement, that of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, a business advertisement, which is five times the length of the other—and that is charged at the rate of $100 a year. The other smaller advertisement costs nearly eight times as much. That is one little item which will give us an inkling of how this deficit is swelled up. I am very glad that the newspapers are not responsible for this charge, but I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to it and perhaps he will revise the rate. I know I can trust him to see there will never be such a tax again. If the rates for printing are made out by judicious men at the head of the department in the same proportion, we can have an idea of what we are paying for advertisements alone. I care not what paper the hon. Minister may patronize, but if it gets rates like that without competition, the paper will be more inclined to give an enthusiastic support to the Government than it otherwise would. That is only human. I have given one instance, and if I had time and patience to go through the whole Auditor General's accounts, I no doubt would find that there are other matters besides coal to which the Intercolonial Railway owes its deficits.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister of Customs made a statement as to the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial Railway. Will he state for what distances these rates are charged?

Mr. BOWELL. I stated that it was in proportion to the mileage on the different roads.

Mr. WATSON. The hauls over the Intercolonial Railway are much longer than those over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. BARRON. I spoke the other day to the Minister of Railways of the difficulty a clergyman travelling over the Intercolonial Railway had in obtaining a rebate on his ticket, but the answer which was given by the Minister was, perhaps, satisfactory. Since that the minister in question has sent me the ticket he got, and on the back it is stated that the railway company will not be responsible for loss of life or loss of baggage, and so forth. I think that is a very unusual restriction; and I understand it is not made on other railways on which clergymen are granted reduced rates. I think, if this distinction exists, it should be abolished.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so on all special tickets.

Mr. BARRON. I have a right to stand here and put a question to the Minister of Railways, and I object to the Finance Minister jeering at me when I am doing my duty. I shall do what I think is right, and I object to be jeered at by the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I was only giving you a little information.

Mr. BARRON. I am not speaking to the Finance Minister. I am speaking to the acting Minister of Railways. The gentleman to whom I refer is a very prominent Presbyterian clergyman, and no doubt will be glad to know that the Finance Minister is trying to burke the enquiry which I was making of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BOWELL. All clergymen are treated alike, whether they be Presbyterians or Episcopalians or anything else. The question whether railways should take the precaution of telling persons who avail themselves of cheaper rates that they will not be responsible for the loss of their lives, or for any damage, is a question of policy. If, however, those persons desire to pay for an insurance of the kind, all they have to do is to pay full rates.

Mr. BARRON. Hon. gentlemen opposite treat this in a jocular way, as if it were a matter of no importance. The Minister does not appreciate my point. The complaint made is that on other roads these restrictions do not govern.

Mr. BOWELL. On some roads they give no reduction at all. The Grand Trunk formerly gave clergymen free tickets, but they dropped it. Whether they give reduced rates now or not, I do not know; but I am told they do not. It is a question for a person to avail himself of the reduced rate. No one is treating this question jocularly. It is a purely business transaction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the document the Minister laid on the Table contain the arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway showing the amount paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the road between St. John and Halifax?

Mr. BOWELL. No; that document has reference to the expenditure at the St. John station.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman bring down information as to the rates paid between St. John and Halifax?

Mr. BOWELL. Do you want the agreement or only the rates?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Only the rates.

Mr. BOWELL. I will get the rates and bring them down.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the Minister stated that he was charging officials on the Prince Edward Island road who granted passes wrongly, did I understand that this principle was to be applied on the Intercolonial Railway also?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not state any principle, but I said that what I had done was to see that any manager or official who gave passes without authority should pay for them, and I intend to carry that out. If any official on any Government road gives passes without authority, or gives slips of paper, as I understand has been done, they will have to pay or they will be dismissed. I think the road ought to be conducted in that respect on business principles, and the officials should carry out the instructions they receive, and, if they do not, they should be made to suffer the consequences. Only to-day I told a high official from the lower provinces that, if he did not carry out the instructions he received from the manager, he would have to take the consequences and go.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEBEC WEST—VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Quebec West in consequence of the resignation of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, and that, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 13, section 5, sub-section 2, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, I have issued my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new Writ of election for the said electoral district.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot say for a certainty, but I understand that there is a protest entered against the election of that hon. member.

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, there is.

Mr. LAURIER. Under such circumstances, I venture to doubt if a Warrant for a new election should have been issued. I think this may require discussion at a later day.

Mr. AMYOT. I know personally that there is a protest, as I am one of the attorneys who signed the Writ.

Mr. SPEAKER. As to the statement of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), I have only to say that I know nothing whatever respecting the protest referred to, and it seems to me, from my reading of the law; that, even if I had a knowledge of that fact, I would still be obliged to issue my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The clause of the statute under which I have acted is as follows:—

"Any member of the House of Commons who wishes to resign his seat may do so by giving, in his place in the House, notice of his intention to resign, in which case, and immediately after such notice has been entered by the Clerk on the Journals of the House, the Speaker shall forthwith address his Warrant under his hand and seal to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a Writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member resigning; or

"(2.) Such member may address and cause to be delivered to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign his seat made in writing under his hand and seal before two witnesses, which declaration may be so made and delivered either during a session of Parliament or in the interval between two sessions, and the Speaker shall, upon receiving such declaration, forthwith address his Warrant under his hand and seal to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a Writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member so resigning, and a Writ shall issue accordingly."

The resignation of Mr. McGreevy was in the form referred to in sub-section 2 of this section 5. It was placed in my hands yesterday afternoon, and, in accordance with my reading of the law, I considered it my duty forthwith to issue my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. AMYOT. The resignation of a member must be valid itself first. We must take the law as a whole. If a member is not allowed to resign while his election is under protest, his resignation is not a proper resignation. I think it is worth while to enquire seriously into this matter. Action might be deferred until to-morrow in order to allow the Minister of Justice to look into it himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no necessity to defer any action about it. If the matter were of pressing importance, it would be well to have the precedents looked into, but the view taken by Mr. Speaker appears to be that, the resignation being placed in his hands, it is his imperative duty to issue his Warrant. It does not follow that an election will immediately take place, or that the statute will be infringed which says a member shall not offer his resignation while his election is contested or during the period within which it may be contested. On the contrary, after the Speaker has issued his Warrant, as I presume he has done, the next step is to issue the Writ, and at that stage the information may be used as to the existence of a protest against the election of the member.

Mr. LAURIER. The House has not yet been informed that you, Mr. Speaker, have issued your Warrant for a Writ for an election in the City of Kingston.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may point out to the hon. member that the position in which I am placed in regard to a vacancy caused by the death of a member is entirely different from that in regard to the resignation of a member, and it may be as well for me to draw the attention of the House to that question. The section reads:

"If any vacancy happens in the House of Commons by the death of any member or by his accepting any office, the Speaker, on being informed of such vacancy by any member of the House in his place, or by notice in writing under the hands and seals of any two members of the House, shall forthwith address his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new Writ for the election of a member to fill the vacancy, and a new Writ shall issue accordingly."

Under that statute, I think my attention must be drawn to the fact that a vacancy has occurred either

by the death of a member or by his acceptance of office before I can issue my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course this is a matter of opinion, but I would have supposed that, having had placed in your hands a motion providing for the funeral of Sir John Macdonald, that would have been sufficient notice of his death.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The question raised as to the issue of a warrant in this case is a very important one.

Mr. OUIMET. I rise to a question of order. What is the question before the House? Is it the issue of the writ for Kingston, or the issue of the writ for Quebec West? There is no motion before the Chair.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There may be a question of privilege.

Mr. OUIMET. A question of privilege must always be followed by a motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I shall follow my observations by a motion and put myself in order in that respect. I say that, when contested elections were tried by a Committee of the House, the Speaker had official cognizance that the election was contested. But there is another matter of which the House has official cognizance. There were certain charges made against Mr. McGreevy, affecting his character as a member of this House, charges made by a member of this House, and referred to a Committee for the purpose of reporting to this House upon them. What the character of that report may be, I cannot say; but there is no doubt that the whole House has cognizance that such a charge is pending. If that charge is established, it may be that Mr. McGreevy will be expelled from this House in consequence of the report of the Committee. Now, it does seem to me that this attempt to anticipate the report of the Committee, is a matter for very serious consideration. Supposing Mr. McGreevy had been charged with some very serious crime which would render him unfit to sit in this House, and that the charge had been referred to a committee, and that the committee had not reported—can the member come before the House and anticipate the decision and report of the committee, by tendering his resignation and ceasing to be a member of the House? That is the question that is involved in this resignation of the member for Quebec West, and I think it is a matter of such serious moment that the House ought to have an opportunity of considering it. It may be that the Crown may refuse to issue the Writ; but I do not understand that to be the duty of the Crown. It seems to me that in the issue of the Writs the function of the Crown is purely ministerial; it must act as a matter of course, it has no discretion in the matter. An attempt to exercise that discretion would be an abuse of the trust, and if there is to be discretion exercised at all, it ought to be exercised by this House. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It cannot be doubted that the question is one of very considerable importance in view of the instructions given to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But I submit that it requires no action, as I stated before, at the present time, principally for this reason, that if it be a question affecting the privileges of the

House and its power over the person who stands charged before the House, and who is on trial before one of its Committees, the practice which the House should follow in that case, I submit, would be to instruct the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine the precedents and report to the House the course that ought to be followed. But it happens in this particular case that that is the very Committee charged with the investigation and whose duty it will be to present a report on these very charges. Therefore the Committee is seized of that as well as of the other matter, and must inevitably, in making its report, deal with the question of precedents.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the warrant is issued, I understand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Committee will be in a position in a few days to decide whether the resignation is effectual.

Mr. LAURIER. But in the meantime the Warrant has been issued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Writ has not yet been issued.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The misfortune in this case, I respectfully submit, consists in what may hereafter turn out to have been, perhaps, a hasty action on your part, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt the law is as read by you, and is to be found in the Acts respecting the House of Commons, and that law reads that any member may resign his seat in the several ways you have mentioned, and upon your being notified, you are forthwith to issue your Warrant. But the 5th section to which you have called the attention of the House, is followed by another section which I respectfully submit, must be read in conjunction with the one you have read. The 5th section says a member may resign his seat; the 7th section says no member shall tender his resignation in case his election is lawfully contested. So that whether you have been notified or not, does not matter; if it is a fact that Mr. McGreevy's seat is lawfully contested at this moment he cannot tender his resignation to this House. The tender of resignation is void, the Warrant which issues is void, and the Writ which issues upon that Warrant will be equally void. I think it is a matter of regret that that hasty action was taken. I do not think, perhaps, the Speaker is entirely to blame, but, as a matter of fact, we are informed by an hon. gentleman, from his place in this House, that the facts recited in section 7, which, if they exist, prevent a member from tendering his resignation, do exist in this case. If that is so, then Mr. McGreevy could not tender his resignation, and you could not issue your warrant. I think myself that it is unfortunate that the warrant is issued, and that steps should be taken at a very early date, perhaps by the Committee to whom the alleged misconduct of this gentleman has been referred, to ascertain whether these facts do exist, so that your Warrant might be recalled, if necessary, at the earliest moment.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It seems to me some action should be taken now with regard to this matter, because the Journals of the House will have entered upon them the fact that you have announced the resignation of the member for Quebec West, and that you have issued your Warrant; whereas, if the reading of the law by the hon. member for

Queen's (Mr. Davies) is correct—and I agree with him—section 7, which states that no member shall tender his resignation while a protest is pending, covers the preceding section, and the resignation, therefore, is null and void; and no matter whether you have been informed of it or not, or have any knowledge of it, you have issued the warrant in ignorance of the fact, if such is the fact; and if it is the fact, it is clear that the resignation is null and void. Now, if it is necessary or desirable that some enquiry should be made into this question, I think it should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine what is the true reading of the law, and I think in the meantime the announcement you have made to the House should be in some way withdrawn and not entered upon the Journals, because it would be awkward to come back in a few days with a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections and to have all these proceedings you have announced to us, erased from the Minutes. But it seems to me clear at present that the resignation is null and void.

Mr. AMYOT. I understand there is no fault attributed to you, Mr. Speaker, but the member for Quebec West has abused your good faith and has added another offence to the others that he has already committed.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that the 5th report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in.

Report concurred in.

BOURCIER & CO.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That all accounts for goods for the Department of Public Works, as found in the Reports of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, on page 32, part II, for 1883-84, $317.40; on page 48, part II, 1884-85, $584.27; on page 48, part II, 1885-86, $677.03, together with all cheques for the payment of the same; and also all accounts for goods purchased from H. Bourcier, or Bourcier & Co., or Bourcier & Bro., during the same years, together with cheques for payment of the same, be forthwith produced for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Nineteenth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to say to this House, that I have been credibly informed and believe, a member of the present Parliament has been guilty of trafficking in the patronage of the county he represents; that he has been guilty of disposing of Government offices for a consideration. Personally I know nothing of the matter. I only desire to say, that I have been credibly informed and believe, that the facts on which the charges are based can be established before this House or a committee of it. In order that there may be no doubt as to the facts on which the charges are made, and no doubt as to the nature of the charges, I will read to the House the charges that are preferred against the hon. member implicated. Last evening I notified the hon. member against whom this complaint is about to be lodged, that I would to-day or at some early day bring the matter to the attention of Parliament. I will read a statement of the charges, and I will place it on the Table of the House. It is as follows:—

That in the year A.D. 1888, there was a vacancy in the position of Government lighthouse-keeper in the Government lighthouse at Presqu'Isle Point, County of Northumberland.

That one Hedley H. Simpson was an applicant for said office.

3. That Edward Cochrane then was and now is the the member for the House of Commons for the electoral district of the east riding of the said County of Northumberland, and a supporter of the Government.

4. That in the year 1888 it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Edward Cochrane and Hedley H. Simpson, that if the said Hedley H. Simpson would make and deliver to one James Stanley two promissory notes for $100 each, endorsed by some responsible person, he the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Hedley H. Simpson to the said office of lighthouse-keeper for the Government lighthouse on Presqu'Isle Point.

5. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, did make the said two promissory notes for $100 each—procured their endorsement by a responsible party—handed them to the said James Stanley, who received the same and placed them in a bank for the use of the said Edward Cochrane personally or for political purposes.

6. That the said Hedley H. Simpson subsequently paid the said notes.

7. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, received the said appointment.

1. That in the summer of 1889, Obadiah Simpson was promised by the said Edward Cochrane the Government office of keeper or attendant of one of the swing bridges over the Murray Canal.

2. That in the summer of 189 , the said James Stanley, who is a confidential friend and warm political supporter of the said Edward Cochrane, sent for one Arundel R. Simpson to call and see him. He did, when the said James Stanley proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson, with the knowledge and consent of the said Edward Cochrane, that if he, the said Arundel R. Simpson, would pay $150 and give to his father, the said Obadiah Simpson, the life lease of his farm (as compensation for his not being appointed such bridge-keeper)—he had been promised and had not received the said office, he, the said Arundel R. Simpson, would be appointed such bridge-keeper.

3. That shortly afterwards the said Arundel R. Simpson had an interview with the said Edward Cochrane on the same subject, when the said Edward Cochrane said to him that they could not take the $150 for said office; that Stanley should not have made that offer, that other arrangements had been made with one Wesley Goodrich who agreed to pay $200 and give said life lease for said appointment.

4. That the said Edward Cochrane then and there corruptly proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson, that if he would pay said Edward Cochrane $200 and give said life lease, he would be appointed. This he refused to do.

5. That subsequently it was corruptly agreed to, by and between the said Wesley Goodrich and the said Edward Cochrane, that if the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Wesley Goodrich to the said Government office of keeper of said bridge, he, the said Wesley Goodrich would pay the sum of $200 and execute to the said Obadiah Simpson, father of the said Arundel R. Simpson, a life lease on his farm, with a condition in said lease that if said Wesley Goodrich lost said appointment said lease would be cancelled.

6. That in pursuance of the said corrupt bargain the said Wesley Goodrich paid said money and executed said lease, and caused his wife to execute the same, to the said Obadiah Simpson, on part of lot No. 18, in the 2nd concession of the Township of Cramahe, in the said county, for the rent of one peppercorn a year and on the condition that if the said Goodrich should be released by the Government from attendance on said bridge, said lease would come to an end and be void, but said condition was not to apply in case said Goodrich should be discharged on account of any act of his own.

1. That the said Edward Cochrane, while he was such member of Parliament and had the patronage of the Government in and for said county, corruptly entered

into other corrupt contracts with other person or persons in the years 1888, 1889 and 1890, that if such person or persons would pay a certain sum or sums of money, such person or persons would receive from the Government the position of keeper or keepers or attendants of other bridges on said canal, and that in pursuance of such corrupt bargain and bargains such payments were made and such appointments were received.

2. That said Edward Cochrane, during the periods aforesaid, made such corrupt offers to other persons, which offers were not finally carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to say anything more on the subject. I do not propose to follow up the statement I have made with any motion to this House. I am not the guardian of the honour of Parliament; that responsibility rests upon the shoulders of gentlemen upon the Treasury benches, and I shall leave the matter in the hands of hon. gentlemen, at all events for the present.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The charges which the hon. gentleman has just read by way of a matter of privilege, require more attention than they can possibly receive from merely listening to the reading across the House; more especially as when the hon. gentleman commenced to read them, it was impossible for some of us to hear distinctly the first part of the paper which the hon. gentleman had before him. Under these circumstances, I beg to say that I think the better course would be that the hon. gentleman should table that paper to-day, and the attention of the House will be called to the subject to-morrow. I presume that by that time the hon. member charged will have an opportunity of seeing the charges and be prepared to make a statement in reply.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I said I would table the papers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw to the attention of the House, that this statement cannot be entered upon the Journals of the House, unless some motion is made in that regard.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the hon. member makes a motion, perhaps he would allow me to suggest that the other course would be the better one. There is no necessity for its being in the Journals to-day, and the hon. gentleman can make his motion to-morrow, and this can go by way of notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will lay the statement on the Table.

DISMISSAL OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. PERRY. Before the House goes into Supply, I wish to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Railways to the fact that the return to an Order of the House respecting the dismissal of two employés of the Prince Edward Island Railway, is incomplete. All we have is a letter of the superintendent in chief to the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, ordering him to dismiss these men promptly. I want to know from him when we will get the information as to why these men were dismissed. I want to know from him from whom Schreiber got these orders. If this information is not forthcoming, then I can only come to the conclusion that these men were dismissed for no reasons at all, only for being suspected of having voted for Liberal candidates.

Mr. BOWELL. I made enquiry yesterday from the general manager of the road why these men were dismissed, and whether he had any further correspondence than that which was already laid before the House. He told me that the orders were received from the late Minister of Railways to dismiss these men promptly, and that is all he had on record.

Mr. PERRY. I want to know the reason why they were dismissed.

Mr. BOWELL. It is very difficult for the manager or myself to give him that information. Mr. Schreiber said that was the only order he received, and he carried it out.

QUEBEC WEST—VACANCY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, with respect to the announcement which you made at an earlier stage of this sitting, that you have received a communication from the member for Quebec West, notifying you that he had tendered his resignation as a member of this House, and that you had issued your Warrant for a new election, some doubts appear to exist as to what the practice is or ought to be; and as the matter is a very important one, I beg to suggest the desirability of referring to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the finding of the fact whether or not at the time he tendered his resignation his seat was being legally contested. That fact ought to be found in any event; and whatever course the House may take afterwards upon that finding, is a matter for the consideration of the House. But the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), having stated from his place in the House that the seat is contested, I take it that this House should feel itself compelled at once to take action in the matter. I would, therefore, move the following resolution:—

That, whereas Mr. Speaker did this day inform the House that he had received from the Honourable Thomas McGreevy, the member for Quebec West, a tender of his resignation as a member of this House, and that on the receipt of such resignation he, Mr. Speaker, had issued his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a Writ for the election of a new member in the place of the said Honourable Thomas McGreevy; and whereas, upon such information being given to the House, the hon. member for Bellechasse did from his place in the House state that the election of the said Honourable Thomas McGreevy is now being lawfully contested, this House doth empower and direct the Committee on Privileges and Elections to enquire and report to this House whether the election of the said Honourable Thomas McGreevy was being lawfully contested at the time he tendered to Mr. Speaker his resignation as aforesaid, and if such fact is found in the affirmative, whether the Warrant of Mr. Speaker should have issued for the issue of a new Writ, and what practice should be adopted with reference to similar resignations tendered to Mr. Speaker in the future by members of this House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT and Mr. PRIOR rose.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Victoria has the floor.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. member for South Oxford is going to make a motion, I will resign in his favour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am about to make a motion ; I am much obliged to my hon. friend. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to vote the further supply of money for the Crown, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter of some considerable importance with respect to the safeguards which the practice of this House has provided for the purpose of seeing that the money placed in the hands of the Ministers of the Crown is judiciously and honestly expended. As the House knows, the main precautions which up to this date, and from the period of Confederation, or nearly from the period of Confederation, have been taken by the House for the purpose to which I have referred, are mainly these two. First of all, we have created a special officer, our Auditor General, who is placed by Act of Parliament in a position closely analogous to that of the judges of the various courts, to whom we are in the habit of looking for detailed information as to the expenditure of public funds, and also to see that the requisite formalities and vouchers which ought to surround such expenditure have been attended to and complied with. The other measure of precaution which the House has seen fit to take ever since Confederation has consisted in this, that we have appointed an important Committee of this House, containing at present rather more than one-fourth of all the members having seats in this chamber, for the purpose of examining the accounts of the past year, and such items of other years as the House may see fit to refer to the Committee. That Committee, as everybody knows, is a very important Committee. It is usually granted by the House the power to examine witnesses upon oath, and to take down full reports of all their statements. Now, Sir, what I desire at present is to obtain from the House some definition or declaration of the extent of the powers and duties which that Committee possesses. It is not my intention, Sir, to occupy any great portion of the time of the House, but rather to confine myself to stating briefly what I understand, for my part, after a considerable experience in the ways and working of that Committee, to be its functions and its duties, and also to state briefly the reasons why I think that understanding should prevail. The House after consideration can then decide whether the motion which I propose to submit, clearly defines the functions of the Committee. Now, Sir, according to my understanding of the case, in the first place, the Committee of Public Accounts is strictly and in terms a Committee of investigation —an inquisitorial committee, if you so choose to call it. That Committee is bound from the nature of the case to ascertain whether the various sums of public money which this House places at the disposal of the Government of the day are properly and honestly expended. Sir, as a corollary and sequence to that, it is, in my judgment, no barrier or answer to any proceedings taken in that Committee to say that the facts which may be brought out on examination in reference to any particular item so referred to a Committee, touch or do not touch the conduct of any Minister of the Crown or any member of the House. In point of fact, according to my understanding of the duties of the Committee, it is their special duty, as everybody knows it is the general duty of this House, to investigate the conduct of Ministers of the Crown and to see in particular how public moneys are expended. But it is by delegation of the House, in a special sense, the duty of the members of the Public Accounts Committee to see that the public money is properly and honestly expended ; and if, in the course of that investigation, questions should arise touching the conduct of any Minister of the Crown, so far from that being a barrier to investigation, it appears to me that it is rather a special reason why that Committee should proceed with the investigation and make it, if possible, more thorough and searching. I do not at all desire to contend that the Committee of Public Accounts is bound to sit in judgment on the conduct of members or on the conduct of Ministers. That is not the contention. What I do assert is that they are bound to find the facts, without fear or favour, and without reference to the circumstances, whether they may or may not in any way affect a Minister of the Crown or anybody else. Having found those facts, be they good or bad, it is their duty, in my opinion, to report them to this House, who, having those facts before them, may then take such action as to the House seems proper. Now, should that position be disputed or the contrary contention be maintained, it appears to me that the utility of the Public Accounts Committee, or of any committee of that kind, would be most seriously affected, if not altogether destroyed. I desire to call the special attention of the House to this fact. Every single item of the Public Accounts contained in the Auditor General's Report is referred every session to this Committee, and every single item therein is expended on the responsibility of some member of the Government and Minister of the Crown. The fact that any irregularity may be discovered with respect to those items, of necessity, reflects more or less, even if it be but in a somewhat slight degree, on the capacity or honesty of some Ministers of the Crown. It is utterly impossible that we should investigate all these matters, and discover the errors in them, without in some degree more or less reflecting on the head of the department under whose sanction these payments were made. It appears to me it is scarcely possible that any enquiry could be pushed to its legitimate end if the contrary contention to that which I lay down be maintained. Now, Sir, I do not want to detain the House ; I rather want to make this plain statement, and to obtain the opinion of both sides as to whether or not this is the true theory of the Public Accounts Committee. It appears to me that this has become, in a special sense, the correct interpretation of the duties and powers of that Committee, since, upon the same principle, we have given the powers to the Auditor General to which I have referred, who has taken off the shoulders of the Committee the care of examining into the minute details of those comparatively formal enquiries, which, in other days, used to occupy a considerable portion of the time of the Committee on Public Accounts. I think that abundant proof has been given in the course of the last few months, if not of the last few years, that the only way is that which I have pointed out, and that it is only by recognizing the plain and clear fact, as it appears to me, that this House is a committee of investigation, whose bounden duty it is to see that the public moneys are honestly and judiciously expended, that we can justify the existence of this Public Accounts Committee at all. Therefore, for the purpose of removing all doubts on the subject, and of having a

short, explicit declaration of this House on the matter, I move that :

It is the undoubted right of the Committee on Public Accounts to investigate all circumstances connected with the payment of any of the several sums of public moneys referred to that Committee, and that in the course of such investigation no evidence should be refused on the ground that it may disclose improper conduct or relations on the part of a Minister of the Crown or of any other party in connection with such payment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With great submission to the riper experience of some members of this House, who have sat in it longer than I have, I venture to deprecate, as a general principle, the moving of resolutions, on going into Supply, which touch in any way the procedure and practice of the House, or any of the privileges or scope of enquiry and powers of its committees. These matters, touching as they do the procedure of the House, affected as it is by the precedence in other Parliaments, require consideration which can hardly be given to motions on going into Supply, because a motion on going into Supply is moved without notice, whereas anything touching the powers of a committee of the House or its procedure ought to be very carefully considered, after ample notice given to all the members of the House, not merely as between the two parties in the House, but to every member. Again, motions on going into Supply generally partake of a political character, into which considerations of party enter, whereas I am confident that any matter which touches the rules or the procedure of the House, or lays down a principle that may be useful in conducting our business, either here or in the committees, can be given proper deliberation on both sides and disposed of, without the slightest regard to party considerations whatever. Fortunately, the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not open to the objection that we require notice of it, because it affirms a principle which I cannot suppose it would be possible for any member of this House to deny. Now, the principle which the hon. member lays down can be best illustrated—and I beg to assure him that, in speaking thus upon it, I am advocating its passage, lest a doubt may have arisen in his mind as to the propriety of the course he asks the House to affirm—by the practice adopted by the House generally in regard to the Public Accounts Committee. It is that, when the report of the Auditor General is laid on the Table of the House, it is referred to that Committee for the purposes of investigation. Undoubtedly, in regard to that reference or in regard to any other reference that may be made to it, that Committee is a committee of investigation. From time to time, as occasion may require, or as circumstances may be shown to the House, other items, even though they refer to past expenditure, to years that have passed away, may be referred to the Committee for the same purpose. No one can deny, and certainly on this side of the House we do not pretend to deny this afternoon, that, in the investigation of any reference made to the Committee by this House, it is entirely proper for the Committee to hear evidence which may be adduced, no matter what consequences may ensue to any member of this House. It matters not, therefore, in the least whether the Committee finds that an item in the account which is before it for investigation affects the credit and honour of a Minister or of a private member of the House. The one claim I should make, if it were necessary to do so—but it is not necessary, because there is nothing to the contrary in this resolution—would be that it shall be the duty of the Committee carefully to see that the proceedings before them is not searching for evidence, fishing for evidence, a proceeding for the purpose of affecting the honour and credit of any member of the House or a member of the Government, but that the evidence shall be pertinent and relevant to something which the Committee has been instructed by the House to investigate. Further, I say the moment the Committee—I speak of the present Committee, and I will refer to future Committees in the same way as long as I have a right to say anything on the subject in this House—the moment the Committee is satisfied that evidence is adduced which is relevant to any enquiry which this House has asked the Committee to undertake, that enquiry should be continued, no matter how fatal it may be to any member of this House. The one safeguard which, I say, it is unnecessary to insist on, should be contained in this resolution, because it contains nothing to the contrary, is that the Committee shall not be made use of by outsiders for the purpose of attacking the honour and credit of members of this House. If it were necessary, I might go further and say that we do not desire to adopt any technical rule or any rule as to relevancy even to protect the honour of any member on this side of the House or any member of the Government. On the contrary, all that we shall ask, whenever the occasion may arise, is not to be protected by any rule of relevancy, but that the charge shall be made relevant by being made on the floor of the House and referred to that Committee or to some other committee for investigation. We ask that such a charge shall proceed, but that it shall proceed regularly, and then let the Committee on Public Accounts or any other committee receive everything in the way of evidence that is regular and pertinent and proper to any enquiry the House has ordered it to make, regardless altogether of what the consequences may be.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

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

Mr. BOWELL. I promised the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), last night, that I would lay on the Table a statement of the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial and other Government railways. I have it here, and it is as follows :—

Increased accommodation at Moncton	$10,608 75
Increased accommodation at St. John	4,355 17
Increased accommodation at Mulgrave	3,555 40
St. Charles Branch	12,033 49
Indiantown Branch	402 63
Dartmouth Branch	413 94
Original construction	531 94
"Y" at Truro	1,500 00
Rolling stock	50,083 44
Total	$83,184 74

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks, not perhaps of great national importance, but of great importance to the constituency I represent. The object I have in view is to try and show this House, and more especially the members of the Government, the necessity that exists for dealing more fairly and liberally with the city of Victoria, of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives. If the House will bear with me for a little time, I will endeavour to show the reasons which oblige me to say that the dissatisfaction which exists among my constituents is well founded. I have here some figures which will show more forcibly than anything I can say what the facts are, and though they may be dry, as figures generally are, I hope that the hon. gentlemen who have the welfare of the Dominion, and therefore the welfare of British Columbia at heart, will take some interest in them. I will speak more particularly of Victoria, that being the constituency I represent, but I hope also to be able to show that British Columbia as a whole deserves the attention of the Government, and has claims which they should not overlook, as I fear they have done, to a certain extent, heretofore. I am glad to say that, notwithstanding the utterances made by the members of the Opposition, assertions that our farmers have their farms mortgaged to the very last penny they can get on them, that our mechanics are ground down by heavy taxation, that now there is a deadly pall overhanging the country north of the 49th parallel, a pall which is likely to descend upon us at any moment and engulf us in ruin and destruction,—notwithstanding these assertions, which I believe are not borne out by facts or figures, I am glad to be able to tell the House that British Columbia as a whole and Victoria in particular are flourishing exceedingly. Owing to the progressive and far-sighted policy inaugurated and pursued by the present Government, we in British Columbia are now joined to our eastern provinces by the bands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. With the advent of that road to our coast, an era of prosperity commenced in British Columbia which I am not afraid to prophesy will not only continue but will increase by leaps and bounds so long as the Government gives our industries in that new province the protection it has given to those in the older provinces of this Dominion. I have here some figures that I think will prove to this House that we are to a great extent progressing. I find that the exports from British Columbia of lumber in 1886 amounted to the sum of $194,448. In the year ending June, 1890, they had risen to $325,881. Now, that was for export alone, but there is a tremendously large trade already developed and increasing, I am happy to say, with the eastern provinces of this Dominion. We are now shipping lumber as far east as New Brunswick. We are shipping large quantities of our timber to Cobourg, where Mr. Crossen uses it for making railway cars. I am also able to say that Mr. Van Horne, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is using British Columbia timber in the new house he is erecting in Montreal, which I think is a great compliment to the province from which I come. I find, also, that the exports of fish in 1886 amounted to $643,052; and for the year ending 30th June, 1890, they have risen to the sum of $2,374,717. I find that our whole exports of coal in 1886 amounted to $973,195, and they have risen in 1890 to $2,375,770. Sir, if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has done me the honour to listen to these figures, I feel sure he must admit that there is still a little to hope for from at least one of the shreds and patches of this Dominion. Sir, let me give the House a few figures to show the commercial importance of the city of Victoria as a port and as a distributing point. I find that the duty collected in the Victoria Custom-house for the year ending June, 1891, amounted to $928,678.94; the duties collected from Customs in the whole of British Columbia, amounted to $1,357,305.65; so we see that the goods that passed through the hands of the Victoria merchants paid over 70 per cent. of the amount of Customs levied in that province by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. Besides this, the Minister of Inland Revenue collected a sum of $149,712 in British Columbia during that period. Under the Chinese Act $107,000 were collected; so we find that the total revenue collected in British Columbia, a province with only a small population, was $1,614,017. I find the exports for the year ending June 30, 1890, from the city of Victoria, amounted to $3,143,289; while the imports for home consumption during the same period, amounted to $3,215,559. The exports for the whole of British Columbia during the same period were $5,763,467; and the imports for home consumption for the whole of British Columbia, were $4,387,486. Thus we see that Victoria had the honour of doing 54 per cent. of the export trade, and 75 per cent. of the import trade. Now, as the total exports of British Columbia in the year 1886 were $2,953,616, and the total exports for the year ending 30th June, 1890, were $5,763,467, we find that our exports from the Province of British Columbia in four years have risen 95 per cent. Sir, I find the total tonnage entering the port of Victoria for the year ending June, 1890, of sea-going vessels, was 662,217 tons, and of coasting vessels, 627,504 tons, making a total of 1,289,721 tons. So I think I have proved that Victoria has a right to claim to be a port of importance in the Dominion. Now, Sir, I am glad to say that all this business did not pass through the hands of the people of Victoria and of British Columbia without leaving some profits. I find that on 30th June, 1890, there were deposited in the Government savings banks of Victoria, $1,155,158, thus showing the healthy financial condition of the class of people who usually put their savings into these savings banks. I am perfectly aware that that sum is not as large as it was a year or so ago, but that is not on account of trade having fallen off, or on account of hard times in the province, but it is due chiefly to the action taken by the Minister of Finance in lowering the rate of interest from 4 to 3 per cent. I find that in the chartered banks on that date, there was deposited by the people, outside of the Government deposits, the sum of $2,788,271. I find that the post office revenue of Victoria has risen from $23,756 in 1887, to $36,543 in the year ending 30th June, 1891. I may state, also, that the assessed value of the city is over $25,000,000, and this year there will be some $1,500,000 worth of new buildings erected in that city. Now, I think I can challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to show me any other city in Canada

or in the United States with the same population as Victoria, that presents a more flourishing condition, or that is on a more prosperous and a more financially sound basis, than the city I have the honour to represent. I believe the census will show that the farming lands of British Columbia are being rapidly taken up, and I am informed on very good authority that next year enough grain will be grown in that province, not only to supply the demand for home consumption, but there will be a little left for export. One of our most important industries, the sealing industry, has, I am sorry to say, this year had a very grave set-back, owing to the arrangements that have been made between the Imperial Government and the United States Government closing Behring Sea. That is an industry in which there is some $425,000 of capital invested in schooners and outfits, and 1,082 men are employed. Nearly all these vessels sail from the port of Victoria. The closing of that sea has been a great loss to the city and to the province in general, because the sealing industry was stopped so soon, but even before it was stopped, seals had been caught worth, in the aggregate, over $400,000. It is very easy to see what a large sum of money would have been brought into the province if the people had been allowed to pursue their occupation during the sealing session. Whilst on this subject I would like to be allowed to say to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the sealers of British Columbia are sincerely grateful to him for the ability and the zeal he has shown in working up their case and presenting it before the Imperial Government; and whatever may be the opinion of sealers in regard to the outcome of the negotiations between the Imperial Government and the United States Government—and I am bound to say that the majority of them believe that the old country has been overreached by the United States Government, especially in regard to sending up the commission at so late a period—whatever, I say, may be their opinion in regard to that arrangement, they have perfect confidence in the ability of the hon. Minister of Fisheries, and also in the Government, to state their case properly before the Imperial Government. Now, Sir, I gather from certain sources, such as my own personal observation, from newspaper reports, and from the blue-books, that there are several towns in this Dominion that are not contributing anything like the amount of revenue that the city of Victoria is contributing to the Dominion, that have had large sums of money expended upon their Custom-houses and post offices, while Victoria, notwithstanding the persistent representations of her members in this House, has been obliged to do with old buildings that are entirely inadequate for the purpose for which they were intended. Owing to the largely increased business in late years, our Custom-house and our post office are both too small for the purposes for which they ought to be used. I am sorry to say that I am told that the post office itself is not at all healthy. Now, this was all very well years ago, but another set of circumstances now exist. I would like the Government to explain to me why, instead of patching up the present buildings as they promised to do, by little additions, they cannot give us buildings such as they put up in other towns, that would be a credit, not only to the city in which they are erected, but to the Dominion? I find that in the city of St. John, N.B., which returns a revenue of $938,000, or about the same as Victoria, a Custom-house has been built there costing $330,000, and a post office costing $174,000. I find in Hamilton, with a revenue of $826,000, or less than that of Victoria, they have a post office costing $348,000. In London, furnishing a revenue of $555,000, or about half that of Victoria, they have a Custom-house costing $120,000. In Winnipeg, with a revenue of $638,000, or about two-thirds that of Victoria, they have a post office costing $207,000; while Victoria, which pays over $1,000,000 per annum, has to put up with a Custom-house that cost at the utmost $39,000 and a post office which cost $42,000. I want it to be distinctly understood that I do not blame the Government one single moment for erecting those buildings to which I have referred, because I believe that every one was needed and every cent spent on them was money well invested, and I wish the representatives of those cities to know that I have no word to say against them for obtaining those buildings. Neither would I grumble if I thought our buildings were suitable and in a proper state for the work that is to be done in them. But I do not think so, nor do my constituents. I repeat the demand that my constituents be treated as fairly and liberally as those of any city of the Dominion. While I am speaking to-day I wish to say a word or two in regard to something that occurred in one of the committees of investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRIOR. It is in regard to a letter written by a well-known contractor, in which he states—and he had been in Esquimalt only a week—that the people of British Columbia were an indolent people. I wish most emphatically to deny that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What were the words he used?

Mr. PRIOR. I, perhaps, have not so good a memory as the hon. member for Queen's, but I shall be very glad to hear them again, because I am satisfied I can refute them. Hon. gentlemen need not go further, in order to see what sort of people the British Columbians are, than to look at the older members who represent them here. Take, for instance, the member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), who left eastern Canada when quite a young man and underwent the perils and hardships of a pioneer's life in the early days of California and British Columbia, and who now in his later years is enjoying comparative ease, is respected by all, and has been elected to the highest political position which his fellow-citizens can give. Take the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara), who left eastern Canada when quite young, and travelled across the plains and Rocky Mountains before anyone thought of the "iron horse" in those regions. To his energy and determination we are indebted for the opening up of some of the most magnificent water stretches in British Columbia, where now some fine steamers ply, and by his integrity, enterprise and energy, he has made for himself a name to be envied, and has been returned as the representative of his district both in the Local Legislature and in this House continuously since the Union. Take my hon. colleague, the senior member for Victoria. He left Brockville in the early days and went to make his home in British Columbia. Many and many a day has he packed his blanket over the rough

trails in British Columbia, which the Minister of the Interior knows so well, but he had the stout heart and backbone of a Canadian, and after close attention to business for many years during which he amassed a fortune, he has now the esteem and respect of every man, woman and child who knows him in British Columbia. Such are the people of British Columbia, who are called indolent. There are hundreds and hundreds of them who have done the same, and who by their energy and perseverance have become well off. I would be wanting in the very essentials of manhood if I allowed this opportunity to pass without standing up in defence of the brave and hardy pioneers of our province. Sir, we have enterprising and energetic men who will send the province ahead, if only they are fairly treated by the Government. One gentleman, Mr. R. P. Rithet, has expended $150,000 in erecting wharves at Victoria, so that sea-going vessels might ride there in safety, including the China and Japan steamers belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I ask the Government to place a proper amount in the Supplementary Estimates to assist in dredging opposite this wharf, so that there may be no further excuse for the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers not calling at the capital of the province. I may mention that we have been witnesses to a most curious phenomenon at Victoria lately. It seems that so soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers came near the wharves, the ground rose and the waters immediately became shallow, but so soon as any other steamers of the same draught arrived they came alongside the wharves. For some time the *Batavia* was run by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and there never was sufficient water to allow her to come to the wharves, and in fact she could not call at Victoria. So soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtained their own steamers and the *Batavia* ran as an opposition line, she came in with 3,000 tons on board and there was no trouble at all. I knew the Canadian Pacific Railway could do nearly everything they liked on land; I thought their power stopped at high-water mark, but it apparently does not. The members from British Columbia did not occupy any of the time of the House during the Budget debate, as they did not believe they could add anything to the eloquent speeches made by some of the ablest men of the House, and I, therefore, hope hon. members will pardon me for addressing them during these few moments. Let me entreat the Government to treat British Columbia with no niggardly hand at the present time. It is a province possessed of boundless and varied resources, resources so great that members from the province are almost afraid to tell the truth for fear of being looked upon as grossly exaggerating the facts. Let the Government grant railway subsidies where they are really needed, let them erect public buildings where needed, let them spend money on public works where they are needed, let them protect our manufacturers, farmers and artizans, and within the next few years we will see British Columbia such a hive of industry and populated by such a happy, prosperous and contented people as have not their equal on the continent. It is not only unfair to British Columbia that the Government, after granting large sums to the old provinces, should not grant the necessary sums for a new province like it is; but, in my humble judgment, I consider it a most unwise and short-sighted policy. It is a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy. Let the Government spend the pennies now in opening up our resources, and in a few years I warrant them the pounds will return to their coffers, filling them to repletion.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should like to say a few words in answer to the very interesting and able address of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior). Being an old British Columbian, I sympathize entirely with the remarks which he has made to the House. As is well known, I lived in that country for over twenty years, and since I left it I have kept in touch with the province. I may say that the few dollars I have made in my life, now extending over fifty or sixty years, and been able to put aside, were made in British Columbia some twenty years ago. It has been reported that I am a wealthy man, that I am rolling in wealth made in every part of the country in which I ever lived; but the only money I ever made in my life and put aside for investment, was made in British Columbia twenty years ago, and my money to-day is invested in that province. I believe that to-day, for any young man or any man possessing energy and ability, there is no place on the globe like British Columbia. I have travelled over that country more than any white man in it; I know it from the south to the north, from the east to the west. I have seen that country from one end to the other, and I wish hon. members could have seen it as I have seen it. The hon. gentleman who has spoken with regard to British Columbia has confined his remarks principally to that portion of it which lies in the south-western part of the province, where the population is thickly settled, and where settlement is going in. I have seen it for hundreds of miles north of that, and there is just as good a country there as there is in the south, and to-day there is not an immigrant going in there, there will not be an immigrant until the country is opened up, and the only way it can be opened up will be by public works. I agree with the hon. gentleman that I think this House and the Government ought to assist in every possible way to open up that grand country. With regard to the special portion of his speech in reference to the expenditure on public works in British Columbia, to which the hon. gentleman wished to draw the attention of the Government, I, for one, felt very much as that hon. gentleman felt, and as British Columbia members have felt, that they have not received as liberal treatment as I think the commercial showing of the hon. member to-day proves they are entitled to. However, it is only within the last two or three years since the railway has crossed the continent, and time passes quickly, that population has rapidly gone into that country, and that public notice was directed especially to that part of the Dominion. Population is increasing, and as population increases so will the representation of the Province of British Columbia in this House increase. I am in hopes that after the census returns are in, that British Columbia may be entitled to a larger voice on the floor of this House, and it is then, as we all know, that we are able to get what we think we are entitled to. I am in hopes that the day is not far distant when British Columbia will have a larger voice in this House. On behalf of myself personally, and on behalf of the Government, I am

quite sure that they realize the situation, and speaking without authority, I do believe that the Government are coming to the conclusion that British Columbia should be treated more liberally with regard to this public expenditure. I will not say anything further just at present, and I would not have spoken on the matter, were it not that I felt from my heart that the words expressed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) were the true voice of British Columbia.

IMPORTATION OF MINING MACHINERY.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Minister of Customs, a matter affecting his department. I have had placed in my hands a statement by a gentleman named Ed. V. Wright, of the city of Ottawa, and in this statement he declares, that in the year 1887 he imported from the United States into Canada, a certain quantity of mining machinery of a kind which he says was not manufactured in Canada, and upon which he says he paid to the treasury $1,600 duty. He further states that he has learned that other mining machinery was imported into Canada duty free, prior to his importation and at a time when the same law was in force as was in force when duty was collected upon his importation. In this statement that he has placed in my hands, he alleges that certain American citizens and companies on several occasions have had remissions of the duties on mining machinery imported by them, and all prior to the Act of last session which enabled the Government, in some circumstances, to remit such duties, as, for example, where the machinery was of a character not manufactured in Canada. The statement that he has placed in my hands, if correct, shows that he has not been treated as others have: and I would ask the Minister of Customs, that he would at an early date, lay upon the Table of the House particulars in regard to such matters. I will give the hon. Minister the statement which I have in my hand, for his guidance, as it gives the particulars with great minuteness. I am at a loss to understand how this gentleman could be taxed and others exempt from taxation, and under these circumstances, without further comment at the present moment, I would ask the Minister if he would lay on the Table of the House at an early date a statement showing the amount of mining machinery that has been imported into Canada duty free, since 1880, or upon which there had been any remission or refund of duty, and showing the dates of these importations and the names of the persons who so imported the machinery. Does the hon. Minister want the statement?

Mr. BOWELL. No. This is not a new matter to the department. It is one that has been before it ever since, or for a few months after, the importation of the machinery to which the hon. gentleman alludes, and the statements made therein are not, and cannot, be verified or substantiated by the facts. The machinery imported by Mr. Wright was imported before the concession was made in the law permitting the importation of such mining machinery as was not manufactured in Canada, free of duty under certain restrictions. Mr. Wright, it is true, applied for the remission of the duty upon the machinery which he had imported, and I informed him that, as head of the department, I had no power or authority under the law to make such remission to him or to any other person; that such remission could only be made by a change in the tariff, as it now stood upon the Statute-book I told him that the department was administrative in its character, and not law-making, but that the Treasury Board had full power and authority under the Audit Act to make a remission of duties under certain circumstances, and that his case should be laid before the Treasury Board for its consideration. In accordance with that promise, I took his statement, which, I presume, is somewhat of the same character as the one to which my hon. friend has referred, to the Treasury Board, and the Treasury Board refused to recognize a principle which asks for a remission of duties upon a request of that kind upon the ground that it was not manufactured in Canada, because it would be establishing a precedent to which there would be no end. There is scarcely a week, or certainly not a month passes in the year, that similar demands are not made for all kinds of machinery. Mr. Wright has not been treated differently from any other importer. There have been cases in which matters have been taken to the Treasury Board for its consideration, and they have acted upon them, but I have no recollection at the present moment of any remission of duties upon mining machinery that has been imported under similar circumstances to those under which the machinery of Mr. Wright was imported into the country. There is a case lately in which a remission of duty was made upon mining machinery that was imported, upon affidavits having been made and fyled that it could not be manufactured in Canada, but that machinery was imported into Canada and paid duty on the exaction of the collector at the port at which it was entered, after the passage of the law which now stands upon the Statute-book admitting such machinery free. The House can readily understand, if an error has been made in the collecting of duty upon an article which is made free by law, the propriety of it being refunded to the parties who made the importation; but it is another principle to adopt that because the law has been changed to-day, admitting a particular article free into the country, therefore, all articles of a similar character which were admitted into the country prior to the passage of such a law, should have the duty refunded. That is the position in which Mr. Wright's case stands. I do not hesitate to say that, personally, I sympathize with him and all others who have entered into mining operations in the same manner that he has. This matter has been before the House two or three times. The late member for Ottawa County called my attention to it privately and also across the floor of the House once or twice, and I explained to him fully that there was no power in the Customs Department or in its head to remit duties of any kind; and, under the circumstances, he was satisfied that the department had done all it could to meet the views of Mr. Wright, not only in its administrative capacity, but carried his petition to the only power which, under the law, could remit such duties, the Treasury Board; but that board, for the reasons which I have stated, declined to accede to the prayer of that petition. If the hon. gentleman will move for any Orders in Council or other papers affecting this particular question, I shall, of course, have no objection to bring them down, but I must decline to pro-

mise here to do that which I fear could not very well be done, because I would have to examine all the documents and all the correspondence in reference to the admission of machinery for years past, which includes volumes; for, as I have already informed the House, almost every week, certainly two or three times in a month, applications are made to the department to do just that which the gentleman who gave that paper to the hon. member for North York is asking us to do, and that which I am sure the hon. gentleman on a moment's reflection would not expect. Let him put the matter in such a shape that we can know exactly what is wanted, and I will endeavour to have the information brought down at the earliest possible moment; but I can assure him that the statements he has made, which have been published in the press as a grave charge against the department, have no foundation in fact. Mr. Wright was treated just as other persons in similar circumstances have been treated, and I could not, as head of the department, do otherwise than I did, having no power to refund duties to anyone.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. Minister would produce copies of the Orders in Council under which remissions of duties on mining machinery have been made, that might satisfy Mr. Wright. He is under the impression at the present moment that he has been treated in one way, and others in another; and as the hon. Minister says that no such remission could take place except under the provisions of the Audit Act, it must have been by virtue of an Order in Council, and it could not be much trouble to look up the Orders in Council bearing on the case and lay them on the Table.

Mr. BOWELL. The only objection I have to that is to set a precedent for any member to rise and demand that certain returns shall be laid before him. The only proper course is for him to make a motion for the return, and have it ordered in the regular way.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say to the Committee before we go on with these items—and I would like the attention of my hon. friend from South Oxford—that the different departments of the Government find themselves in difficulty at the present time owing to the total, or almost total lack of supplies. The small amount that was taken three or four weeks ago has been expended, and some very important branches of the service are now really without any funds at all. There seems to be only two ways of getting this difficulty made right. One is to ask the House again to vote without discussion a proportionate amount of what remains. The other is to see whether we cannot, within a reasonable time, say within six, seven or eight days, pass the bulk of these main Estimates, and so get the supply in the regular way. I should be very averse, if it can be avoided, to taking up a day of the time of the Committee, in adopting the course we adopted before, and then having to go over each item, and spend as much time upon it as if this had not been done. So I invite the hon. gentleman opposite, and his colleagues, not to forego reasonable discussion, but to confine the discussion as far as possible within reasonable limits, so that we may soon have the necessary supplies. If that cannot be done, I shall have to ask the House to vote a proportionate sum, or there will be very great detriment to the public service.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal $935,000

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to allow this item to stand? I moved some time ago, in the Public Accounts Committee, for the production of certain papers in regard to the contract of Allan & Fleming, and unless they have come down to-day or yesterday, they have not come down at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection that it should stand, but I am not aware of what return the hon. gentleman has asked for. I have no recollection of the question being brought under my notice. If it had been, I should have endeavoured to have it laid on the Table before this. If there is any information which I can possibly give the hon. gentleman, I would be very glad to give it. Unless he wants some very important information, which I have not got, I think we had better go on with the item.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman, for reasons which he can well understand. I wish to investigate the payments to Allan & Fleming, and certain matters in connection with their contract. I have just sent to the clerk of the Committee to ascertain if the papers have been brought down.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to letting the item stand, but I really do not see how that can affect the item, which it is necessary to pass now in order to proceed with the construction of the canal. Supposing that the worst suspicions of the hon. gentleman be verified, that will not affect this case in the least.

Mr. MULOCK. Still I should like to ask some questions.

Lachine Canal..... $350,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems rather a large sum. It is very much larger than has ever been demanded for a good while for this canal. I was under the impression that the works there were all pretty well completed, but this appears to indicate a very considerable further expenditure from time to time, much larger than I like to see.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's statement is quite correct so far as the large expenditure is concerned, but he will bear in mind that the enlargement of the Lachine Canal has scarcely yet been begun and it will require a much larger amount than this before it is completed. The purposes for which this amount is required are the construction of a drain 6,600 feet along in rear of the town of Lachine, deepening the River St. Pierre near the Grand Trunk crossing, culverts, water pipes, &c., and the purchase of land. $50,000 are required for the purchase of ground on which to place the material to be excavated from the bottom of the canal, and $136,000 are required for deepening and bridging. It has become absolutely necessary to give greater accommodation in crossing the canal in Montreal where it passes near Point St. Charles, either by the construction of two bridges or the enlarging of the present one. The traffic has become so enormous that something has to be done

to accommodate it, and to prevent danger to passers-by. The total amount expended up to the 31st of December, 1890, was $6,528,462.92, and the total cost when completed will be $7,800,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When that is done, what will be the depth of water and the size of the locks? My recollection is that the whole canal had been deepened to 14 feet or upwards, and that a part had been deepened to the extent of 16 feet.

Mr. BOWELL. No; the canal was deepened under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie to 12 feet, and it has become absolutely necessary, if all the other canals are to have a depth of 14 feet, that the Lachine Canal should have the same depth. The masonry is sunk to a depth of 14 feet, so that only dredging is required.

Mr. CURRAN. I am glad to notice that in this large amount is included the amount voted last year and the year before for a new Lachine canal bridge. The late chief engineer of Canals, Mr. Page, was for a number of years averse to building another bridge. After representations had been made to the Government four or five years in succession, Mr. Page at length consented to a bridge being constructed, the cost of which was estimated at $25,000. The year before last that item was put in the Estimates. It was later found that that sum would not be sufficient, and last year the sum of $45,000 was voted for that purpose. In the meantime Mr. Page died, and his successor seems to have a very strong aversion to carrying out this idea of building an extra bridge, and thinks it would be better that we should have one bridge of double the capacity, so that there would be only one obstruction to navigation instead of two. All the parties interested, the Grand Trunk Railway and all these enormous foundries, and factories, and mills situated at Point St. Charles, are perfectly willing that either one plan or the other should be adopted, but for years back we have been exposed to accidents to life and limb at every hour of the day, owing to the utter absence of sufficient means of crossing the canal to and fro, and there is only one small sidewalk for foot passengers which has been annexed to the Wellington bridge; so that the people are obliged to rush across amidst a train of coal carts and all kinds of vehicles. There are tens of thousands of people and thousands of vehicles crossing there every day, and, unless this improvement is carried out, I shall not be surprised at any time to hear that a very serious accident has occurred at the Wellington bridge. Now, I urge upon the Minister that during the forthcoming winter means be taken to have a bridge constructed. We have had the sum voted twice in the Estimates, but on both occasions the matter has been deferred. It is of the greatest importance, and I am glad that the Minister for the time being has consented that constables shall be placed at either end of Wellington bridge and Black's bridge. At least, the Deputy Minister informed me to-day that he felt that was necessary and that the traffic must be regulated in some way. I received a letter from Mr. Wainwright yesterday, which I placed in the hands of the Minister, urging in the strongest manner that this matter should be regulated, and that constables should be placed to keep back the coal carters and those who are driving heavy vans and prevent them from rushing forward, crushing the lighter vehicles and exposing people to danger at all times of the day. The traffic at that point has increased to such an extent that no one who does not visit it from time to time can imagine what it is. I urge upon the Minister to have a new bridge constructed during the coming winter, or to have the present bridge enlarged to such an extent as to suffice for the travel and traffic, and so that proper accommodation may be given to foot passengers in order that they may not be left, as they have been, exposed to the loss of their lives. I hope this matter will be pushed forward with all energy and despatch. I make this appeal to the Minister in the strongest possible terms, and I sincerely hope that next spring will see the people of that section of the city provided with what is an absolute necessity to them, and that no interference will be allowed with the progress of the work, which, if it be delayed for another year, will be, I fear, a grave dereliction of duty on the part of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister to say that this expenditure of $350,000, which is practically to entail an expenditure of $1,000,000, has regard to the deepening of the canal to a depth of 14 feet? He does not propose, as I understand, to enlarge the locks.

Mr. BOWELL. The Deputy Minister informs me that is not necessary, as the locks are sufficiently large now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think none of us would be disposed to begrudge any reasonable expenditure which would be necessary to give a 14 feet navigation through the St. Lawrence; but, though it is not perhaps within the power of the acting Minister to speak with much practical knowledge on the subject, I would ask whether the department are prepared to guarantee that we can get a 14 feet navigation at low water from Kingston downwards without an enormous expenditure. The hon. gentleman knows that the water levels of Lake Ontario and of portions, and I think almost all, of the St. Lawrence waterway, vary very considerably. I have heard it stated that the variation was as high as 3½ feet to 4 feet, though I suppose that is the extreme limit, but I know from personal observation that it does vary 3 feet. I know the question has been raised by eminent engineers who have been in this House, whether this 14 feet navigation of the St. Lawrence could be obtained without an enormously heavy expenditure; and I should like again to know from the Minister in charge if the department have absolute data sufficient to assure them that 14 feet navigation can be obtained except by the expenditure of an enormous sum, a sum far in excess of anything we have contemplated yet or have put down in these Estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. I have the full statement in my hands, commencing with the Lachine Canal and extending to the Welland Canal. As to the Welland Canal, I may mention that the enlargement is complete, at a cost, in round numbers, of $16,100,000. The Sault Canal will cost at least $2,500,000 to complete. Grouping these canals, the cost of their completion will be as follows:—St. Lawrence Canals, 14 feet depth, which

I understand from the engineer can be obtained, $12,150,402.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister pardon me for interrupting him for a moment. He says the cost of deepening the St. Lawrence Canals to 14 feet will amount to about $12,000,000. I suppose that includes the $2,000,000 he is now asking for?

Mr. BOWELL. If the Committee will bear with me for a moment, I will give this statement. The cost of the finished canal and river navigation *via* the St. Lawrence, from Lake Superior to Montreal, will be, in round numbers, 41 millions (exclusive of about 15 millions spent before the enlargement was begun); of this about 26½ millions have been spent and 14½ millions are required to complete. The highest canal of the series is at Sault Ste. Marie, where there is to be a short canal and a single lock of large dimensions, designed to permit of vessels drawing 19 feet passing at low water. When I reach that item I shall explain why the changes have been made to increase the capacity of that canal. All the other canals between Lake Erie and Montreal are arranged for a navigable depth of 14 feet. Those portions of the river and smaller lakes which require to be improved so as to secure a 14 feet depth throughout are included in the above sum of 14½ millions. It will be recollected that up to 1876 the intention was to carry out the views of the Royal Commission of 1870, and to make the Welland and the St. Lawrence Canals of a navigable depth of only 12 feet. But so many representations were made in favour of an increase to 14 feet that the Government, in 1876, decided to adopt this as the navigable depth. In the meantime the Welland Canal had been completed to the 12-foot gauge, and had to be subsequently deepened 2 feet. None of the other canals between the Welland and Lachine were, however, begun before the greater depth was adopted. On the Lachine, the foundations of the permanent structure were put down to the full depth for vessels drawing 14 feet—but about 6½ miles of the canal itself has yet to be lowered two feet to obtain this depth. The bottom is chiefly rock. The cost of completing this canal is estimated at $1,250,000. For about four miles above the head of the Lachine Canal, Lake St. Louis is obstructed by numerous shoals consisting principally of hard material, the removal of which is necessary to form a channel suitable to the enlarged 14 feet navigation. This, together with some minor improvements, including provision for lights, &c., will probably require an expenditure of $1,250,000. Between Lake St. Louis and Lake St. Francis, there is a rise of about 83 feet in the river, which is at present surmounted by the Beauharnois Canal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. After careful surveys and examinations extending over some years, the conclusion has been arrived at to build the enlarged scale canal on the north shore. This canal is estimated to cost about $4,750,000. In Lake St. Francis the obstructions to a 14 feet navigation are but slight and are found near its upper or western end. Their removal is estimated to cost about $90,000. The works of the Cornwall Canal are all under contract. The two lower locks, &c., were completed in 1882. The four other locks, weirs, &c., are now nearly finished. A considerable length of the canal, however, remains yet to be enlarged. The banks also require to be strengthened, &c. To complete this canal will cost about $2,120,400. I will, however, inform the Committee that the deputy, with the assistance of Mr. Shanly, is now considering the propriety of making some change in the contract which has been entered into for the enlargement of a portion of this canal, whereby that portion of the river lying between the head and the foot of Sheiks' Island can be utilized by the construction of two large dams which would cost about $350,000. Without going into particulars, the change which it is proposed to make, if it should be so recommended by the engineer, will save about $100,000, notwithstanding the fact that of the sum which has already been expended, and which it might be necessary to pay to the contractors who are now performing the work, the calculation is, roughly speaking, to make a saving of about $100,000, with much better navigation. However, this change is now under consideration, and no decision has yet been arrived at. Between the head of the Cornwall Canal and Prescott the main obstruction to the navigation of the river by vessels of 14 feet draught, namely, at the Galops Rapids, has been removed. A considerable amount of work is yet to be done to complete the channel throughout. Nothing has been done towards the enlargement of the canal at Farran's Point so far. At the Rapide Plat, the works remaining to be done to complete the enlargement have been recently placed under contract. The works on the Galops Canal are now well advanced. As before stated, the improvement of the river outside this canal has been completed, so as to give a 14 feet channel at low water of the river. This, I am informed, has been considered to be the lowest portion of the St. Lawrence. To complete the Williamsburg Canal, namely, the Farran's Point, Rapide Plat and the Galops Canals, together with the necessary river works between the Cornwall Canal and Prescott, the estimated cost is $2,771,400. The cost of the improvements between Montreal and Prescott is set down as $22,220,000, of which amount $10,069,598 has been spent, leaving, as I estimated a moment ago, $12,150,402 for completion. The Welland Canal enlargement is completed, costing, in round numbers, $16,100,000. The work which has been commenced on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal will be of much larger dimensions than any of the others. It will require $2,393,500 to complete this canal. Grouping these canals, the cost of their completion will be as follows:—St. Lawrence, 14 feet, $12,150,402; Welland Canal, 14 feet, $91,000; Sault Ste. Marie, 19 feet, $2,393,500, making a total of $14,634,902, or as previously stated, about $14,500,000. The total amount expended on the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals prior to the commencement of any works of enlargement, either for the present 14 feet scheme, or for the 12 feet scheme, which it has replaced, is $15,146,854. This, I think, will be valuable information, and will enable the House to understand the exact position, financially and otherwise, of these works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how long will it take to complete those works?

Mr. BOWELL. It will take some years, from the fact that nothing can be done towards the enlargement of the Lachine Canal except at a period

when it will not interfere with navigation. I suppose that doing the work by piecemeal—the contractors understand that better than I do—costs more than it would if you were to put on a full force the whole length of the canal. I may say to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), that the reason why means for the protection which he has claimed for people crossing the canal, have not been adopted before, is set forth in a letter which has been received from the superintending engineer, Mr. Parent. He said that he had not reported because he was consulting with the authorities in Montreal with regard to some legal points that might arise. It was subsequently thought better that the Government, having caused the obstruction, should assume the responsibility by putting policemen there in order to protect the people from accident and loss of life.

Rapide Plat..... $400,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new canal?

Mr. BOWELL. This is in connection with the new canal and the enlargement. Sections 1, 2 and 3, comprising about three miles of enlarged canal, and the construction of a new lift lock, were recently placed under contract, and the work has been commenced. On section No. 1, the contractors are Mesrs. Poupore, Fraser & O'Brien; on section No. 2, the Weddell Dredging Company; section No. 3, Poupore, Fraser & O'Brien; section No. 4, upper entrance, William Broder.

Mr. MULOCK. Were these works let to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. BOWELL. The deputy informs me the lowest tenders were accepted after public advertisement.

Galops..... $280,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is this work now under contract?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Who are the contractors?

Mr. BOWELL. W. A. Allan.

Mr. MULOCK. When was the contract let?

Mr. BOWELL. I find I was in error. The work to which I was referring was completed in 1888, W. A. Allan being the contractor. The present works are new upper entrance, guard lock, and weir. The contractors are Murray Cleveland; the work was commenced in 1889, and $280,000 are required for the work during the year 1891-92.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the total amount of this contract?

Mr. BOWELL. I will obtain the information in a short time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to know what is the nature of the work for the last two or three items. Is it dredging chiefly?

Mr. BOWELL. Chiefly dredging.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount paid for dredging?

Mr. BOWELL. About 30 cents.

St. Lawrence River and Canals.....$300,000

Mr. BERGERON. The Committee will allow me, I hope, to make a few remarks upon this item. In 1879 I made a request to the House for all papers relating to the construction of the Beauharnois Canal. If I remember correctly, I said something about reports of the engineers, and I was informed by the Government of that time that there was no intention then of enlarging and deepening the present canal or building a new canal. Since then nearly every session, knowing that some surveys were being made north of the St. Lawrence and also around the Beauharnois Canal, I have asked the Government whether it was their intention to either deepen or enlarge the present canal or build a new canal on the north side of the river. The answer I always received was that the subject was under the consideration of the Government. During the last election we heard that the canal to connect Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis was to be built on the north shore; but I did not credit the report, thinking it might be merely an election dodge, an occurrence that very seldom happens. But it appeared to me that the Government should not decide upon the construction of a work of such importance purely and simply upon the report of one engineer, who may be a very good engineer and against whom I have nothing to say; but, surely, the Government should take advantage of the many able men at their disposal before arriving at a decision and inviting the country to make an expenditure of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. I saw the other day by a report brought down to the House, that the Government had three plans before them; one was to build a new canal on the south shore, using only a part of the Beauharnois Canal; the second was to deepen the present canal, and the third was to build a new canal on the north shore. The Government, it appears, have decided to build a new canal on the north shore. This decision was arrived at on the report of Mr. Monro, one of the engineers of the Department of Railways and Canals. What I wish to say is simply this: I do not look upon this as a political question, for in my opinion it is too important and too serious a matter to strike the attention of this or any Government upon the political aspect only of it. I look upon it as a great national and commercial question, and a question of high engineering skill, more than of anything else. The electors whom I represent in this Parliament, and from whom I have heard lately are very much interested in this matter, and they agree with me in the belief that this decision was somewhat suddenly arrived at by the Government, and that it was come to without that amount of consultation and study of the subject by their engineers, which should have taken place. I have only lately commenced to think myself that this matter might be serious. It seems to me that it is in the interest of the Government themselves, that they should be most anxious to have the clearest and the most convincing reports of engineers on this undertaking before they commit the country to a large expenditure of this sort. It is very well known, not only to an engineer, but any sensible man can see for himself, that at the foot of the Beauharnois Canal, the ice moves away in the spring, on the south shore or Beauharnois side, about a fortnight before it leaves the north or Cedar side of the river. That is well known by every farmer, and by every man, woman and child in the neighbourhood that this is the case, and it has been so reported to the Government. Now, as

I am informed, the Beauharnois Canal is built in solid land. It has been told me by engineers, and especially by one gentleman in whom the Government has a great deal of confidence, since I understand he is consulting engineer of the department, I refer to Mr. Walter Shanly; and he has stated to me that the Beauharnois Canal, of all the canals belonging to the Dominion of Canada, is the best built and the most solidly constructed, We know that the same occurrences which happen almost yearly in the Cornwall Canal cannot happen in the Beauharnois Canal. Evey one knows the amount of money that has to be expended in repairing the Cornwall Canal, and I am credibly informed by those who ought to know, that unless the Cornwall Canal is constructed with stone walls it will be a source of damage and delay to navigation every year. The proposed Soulanges Canal will have to cross two rivers coming from the north and flowing into the River St. Lawrence, and I believe that the difficult task will have to be undertaken of diverting or changing the course of these rivers, that it may not injure the canal which it is now proposed to build. I believe further that the Soulanges Canal, if it is built, will have to be built in the very same form and shape as the Cornwall Canal, and the very same difficulties will be experienced with it. One report on the Beauharnois Canal says that at the head of the canal there is some rock, and another report says that it is quick sand, so that the two reports differ. I was pretty much of an eye-witness to the soundings which have been made there, and I say here in the House of Commons, that the Government cannot rely upon the reports which they have received in this connection. The work has not been done by engineers, the engineers themselves were not there, but they hired men who were not engineers and sent them in skiffs to make the soundings. These men so sent, I know well, have not even the first knowledge of navigation. They worked there for about a fortnight or three weeks, going around from one place to another, and the farmers themselves were perfectly astonished to see these people picnicking, as they called it, and sending in a report upon which it seems the Government has made up their minds to involve the country in such a large expenditure. I am not an engineer myself, and the people who are complaining of this are not engineers, but I may say that the people of my county, and the people of the whole Dominion, are deeply interested in this work, and the Government before they finally commit themselves to this new scheme should have the results of the deliberations and experience of competent engineers. The Government have now very good engineers; I have a good deal of confidence myself in the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals who is a man of great experience, but he could not make a personal examination of that district himself, and he could not of course find time to have seen the place with his own eyes in order to make a report upon it. I might go further than that, and in order to show with what little precaution the Government has committed themselves to such a scheme, I may say that the engineer of the Beauharnois Canal, Mr. Parent, whom I see present to-day, has not even been consulted about it. He is a gentleman who knows more about this canal than any other engineer, because he has been in charge for eight or ten years. He knows the course of the water, he knows the nature of the land in that region, and although he knows more about it than any other engineer yet he never has been consulted.

Mr. TARTE. How is it?

Mr. BERGERON. I am just asking how it is; I am asking it in the name of the people whom I represent, and in my own name as a representative in the Parliament of Canada. If I am well informed, Mr. Shanly is the consulting engineer of the Government in the Department of Railways and Canals; he is the engineer who has supervised the construction of the Beauharnois Canal; he is the gentleman who has declared to the Government that the construction of the Beauharnois Canal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence was better than on the north shore—because at that time even there was a question of building the canal on the north shore—and it was under Mr. Shanly's advice as an engineer that the Beauharnois Canal was built in its present location. Now, if Mr. Shanley is the consulting engineer of the Government, why did not the Government, before committing the country to such an expenditure, before deciding upon the construction of that canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, have the opinion of their own engineers, of which Mr. Shanly is one. I would remind the House that in this matter I am not speaking for my own county only; I am not speaking for one county or two counties, but I am speaking in the interest of the whole country, and I say that there should be very convincing evidence before this work is undertaken as to whether it would be better to build a canal on the north or on the south shore. If Mr. Shanly is consulted, and if he reports in favour of the north shore, then I feel satisfied that everyone will come to the conclusion that it is the best site, and the most advantageous in the interests of the surrounding country, and in the interests of the whole Dominion. Until such report is made by a thoroughly competent engineer, the Government should hesitate before going on with this work.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose at six o'clock, I had very nearly finished the few remarks I had to make. I had been trying to impress upon the Government the importance of putting before a board of engineers the reports of the different engineers who have been making surveys on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and upon the Beauharnois Canal. I think it is most important not only to this side of the House, but to everybody here, that every precaution should be taken before we conclude to incur an expenditure of about $5,000,000, so as to make perfectly sure that we are acting in the best interests of the country. Now, I was glad to hear this afternoon from the acting Minister of Railways and Canals—and I know that when he said so he meant it—that the Government had come to the conclusion to build that canal on the north shore after having made careful surveys and examinations for years. Now, this is just where I join issue with the Government,

I am under the very strong impression—and I say it as a friend of the Government—that careful surveys and examinations have not been made, as they have been reported to have been made. The engineer in charge of that work may have been a very good engineer; but, I believe there are more brains in three or four heads than in one; and when the Government are in a position to obtain the advice of the very best engineers, they should consult them before deciding upon a work of such a large dimensions. I see by the report of which I spoke this afternoon, that the Beauharnois Canal has cost $1,673,000. If the proposed canal is built on the north shore, taking for granted that the cost will be as much on one side as on the other, and that both will be equally good for purposes of navigation, the Government will be abandoning nearly $2,000,000 that have been spent in building the Beauharnois Canal and in keeping it in repair and in all the expenses connected with it.

Mr. MULOCK. What do you mean by abandoning?

Mr. BERGERON. Because, when the other canal is completed, the Beauharnois Canal will be perfectly useless for purposes of navigation; it will be abandoned by vessels, when the other is deepened to 14 feet, because the vessels will go by the canal on the north side. Now, the Minister said, this afternoon, that the Deputy Minister has said that they want to save money. That is quite natural; but I repeat what I said this afternoon, that, if they want to save money, my impression, and the impression of everybody who has been there and has no interest in the matter except the public interest, is that, by abandoning the south shore and going to the north shore, they will be involving the country in an expenditure of which they cannot see the end. They say it will cost $4,700,000. It is admitted that the Beauharnois Canal has cost $1,673,000. Now, the engineers do not know what this work will cost. There is only one who is at all in a position to know, and the others are speaking after him. Mr. Parent, the engineer of the St. Lawrence Canals, between Montreal and Valleyfield—the Lachine Canal and the Beauharnois Canal—has never mentioned anything about this matter to me; he has never come to me and said that he would like to be consulted; but in a businesslike way I asked Mr. Parent one day—I may say it was after the elections: "Have you ever been consulted as to the line of the canal, as to putting it on the north shore?" Mr. Parent answering me, and he could not do otherwise, said: "No; I have never been consulted." Mr. Parent is the resident engineer who goes over the place every week, and who knows more about that river than any engineer in Ottawa. Now, the Government are undertaking an immense contract there, and incurring a great expenditure of money of which they do not see the end, upon the report of one engineer, who may know as much as he likes of engineering, but who does not know more than two or three engineers together; and the Government should not undertake that work before it is reported upon by a board of engineers. I ask this as a member of Parliament and as a citizen, because it is an immense amount of money that is going to be expended. They should also have the advice of their own consulting engineer, Mr. Shanly, in whom I have confidence, and in whom the country has confidence. If this is done, whatever the choice may be, the people will see that every precaution has been taken. I hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration. It will be perfectly useless for me to ask anything more. I am speaking very earnestly and sincerely on the matter. I am not speaking for my constituents merely, but as a public man in the public interest, because this is an engineering question, and I hope that what I have said will be taken in good part.

Mr. GIBSON. When a great work of this kind is being undertaken, political discussion should be laid aside, and some attention should be given to the opinions of the gentlemen who have made examinations and surveys as to the merits and the demerits of the work. I might say that, as far back as 1887, in conversation with Mr. Page, then chief engineer of canals, he told me that, in his opinion, the north shore would be the most favourable and the most economical site on which to build this canal, and I am sure that the Government, in making the appointment of Mr. Munro for this purpose, selected him solely for his practical knowledge and the experience he has had in enlarging the old and new Welland Canals. As a practical man, I know well the difficulties to be encountered in operating the canal and at the same time enlarging it. When the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) recommends that the canal be made on the south shore, he can hardly understand the difficulties that have to be encountered, because it was quite another matter to increase the depth of the new Welland Canal from 12 to 14 feet to increasing the depth of water in this canal, which is only 9 feet. The work would, therefore, be almost insurmountable, because to do that would close up navigation. There is another reason why the canal should be built on the north shore. It has got the depth of water required, and it is in the natural position because the deep water in the channel of Lake St. Francis is on the north shore, while to get into the Beauharnois Canal the river has to be crossed just above the rapids, which would be a constant source of danger to navigation, especially in the case of larger vessels. In addition to that the new canal will be built for $500,000 less on the new location; and even if the old canal were done away with, it could be used for manufacturing purposes, so that the country would be better supplied with two canals at $500,000 less money and have the old canal for manufacturing purposes. It is for Parliament to consider whether $500,000 is not worth saving, and at the same time not prevent the navigation of the St. Lawrence Canal system. Knowing Mr. Munro, as I do, for a number of years past, it is hardly fair for the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to say that he has not given this matter careful consideration. That hon. gentleman seems to lay great stress upon the advice and opinion of Mr. Shanly. I think if he will apply to Mr. Shanly, he will find that he also advocates the north shore, and not only he, but also the Deputy Minister, Mr. Trudeau. Any practical man who knows anything about building canals could hardly do anything else. The hon. member for Beauharnois spoke with great respect of the old canal. If I understand anything about the old canal, it was a failure as a public work, and was put there for political purposes; and it has

been a constant source of trouble by flooding that flat country, the Government having been compelled to pay damages caused by these floods to the extent of $4,000 to $5,000 in that vicinity. I am sure that if the County of Beauharnois extended to the north shore, we would never have heard anything about the improper location of the new canal.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. When I asked for the report of those engineers who surveyed the canal in Coteau Landing, in the County of Soulanges, I gave a description of all the disadvantages which were attributable to the deepening of the Beauharnois Canal at the time, and I advocated the advantages of the proposed north shore canal. Well, I see that amongst the objections made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) are the following: He says, first, that there are three rivers to be crossed by the new projected canal in Soulanges County. That is true, but he did not speak of the topography or the dimensions of those rivers. The first is a small river, what we call *Rivière à la Graisse*, a small rivulet, not wider than ten feet. The second one is La Rivière Rouge, about 40 feet wide; and the last one is Rivière de Lisle, about 60 feet wide. These are all the rivers to be crossed by the proposed canal, and they are no objection at all, as they will not augment the difficulties in building the canal, because only culverts will be required. If the hon. member for Beauharnois had studied a little the report of Mr. Monro, the civil engineer now surveying that proposed canal, he would have seen that in the County of Beauharnois there are three great difficulties, because there are three railroads there to be crossed by that canal, and we know the accidents to which navigation is exposed on this score while deepening a canal. Mr. Monro lays great stress upon these difficulties, which, he says, will augment the cost of enlarging the canal at Beauharnois, and he says the difficulties are very great, and such as will not be experienced on the north shore.

Mr. SCRIVER. Would not the north shore canal cross a railway?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. No; because the Grand Trunk Railway is just about half a mile from the banks of the River St. Lawrence. There is no railway at all to be crossed by the new canal.

Mr. SCRIVER. What about the Canada Atlantic Railway?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Yes, that is the only one, near Coteau Landing. The hon. member for Beauharnois spoke about the civil engineers, and asked the Government to wait before voting this amount of $270,000. I do not see why they should wait. the question has been ventilated in every respect since twenty years. In 1872, 1873 and 1874 civil engineers were sent by the then Government, and all their reports were favourable to the County of Soulanges, north shore side. He spoke of the civil engineer, Mr. Parent. I must confess frankly that I do not know Mr. Parent, except by reputation, but I presume the science of Mr. Monro is equal to his, and that the Government has employed him because he is a good engineer. Mr. Monro, in his report, which is contained in the report of the chief engineer, and which was laid before the House on Wednesday last, did not rely solely on his own science and observations, but also upon the studies and observations of the civil engineers who surveyed that canal in 1872, 1873 and 1874. The report states:

"During the past two years there has been obtained by means of careful examination, detailed surveys and estimates of cost, conducted and furnished by Mr. Thomas Monro, an engineer of this department, a large amount of information in supplement to the data gathered on the subject in 1872-73 and 74, under the direction of Mr. John Page, chief engineer and Mr. G. F. Baillairgé, assistant chief engineer."

And it adds:

"These examinations have dealt with both the north and south shores of the St. Lawrence, covering all the practical routes on either side. The earlier examinations were made with a view to a 12 feet navigation. Those of Mr. Monro apply to the enlarged scale of 14 feet."

We have not only this report given by the present Administration, but also the result of the investigation, not only of one or two, but judging from the length of time, of three or four engineers at least, and all speak of the difficulties to be found in enlarging the Beauharnois Canal. This is what it says again in reference to that canal:

"To enlarge a canal and at the same time to keep it open to navigation during the summer months is attended with great difficulties. The building of structures in the winter season should be avoided if possible. It would be preferable and less costly in most cases to build an entirely and separate work.'

Then see what the report says as to the soil, compared between the north shore and the south shore:

"Referring to the borings made in the line of the channel at the Valleyfield entrance and also a line surveyed to Knight's Point, to the westward of the present entrance, as well as in the Beauharnois Canal itself, as far as St. Timothy, Mr. Monro says:—'The general character of the excavation may be described as consisting of layers of boulder stones and clay, overlying what appears to be a mixture of quicksand and clay, in varying proportions. In many cases the drill, after penetrating with difficulty the crust of boulders, stones, &c., went down freely to a depth of about 25 feet below low water mark, showing a soft and unreliable bottom. Experiments made with this material proved that it does not stand at any slope, however flat, under water. To attempt its removal to the depth required to obtain a channel suitable for a 14 foot navigation, in such a position, would be a formidable if not impracticable undertaking. The amount which would certainly slide in from the sides could not be even conjecturally estimated, whilst it might prove impossible to maintain the required depth at any cost. To keep vessels off the contiguous shoals in heavy weather, it would be advisable to protect the channel with piles or crib work, backed up by the excavation from the cut, but the cost of such a plan could not be approximately estimated.'"

So the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) sees that the report of the engineer is clear. He says it is almost impossible to deepen the Beauharnois Canal because of the nature of the soil, and, as I told the House, it is almost all stone in Beauharnois, whereas in Soulanges it is different. The whole of the soil in Soulanges is nothing but good clay. You cannot find any stone or any boulders and it would cost very little if we compare the new work with the whole of the work on the Beauharnois canal. The hon. member for Beauharnois spoke of his own canal as a thing that would be useless if it were left there, and you were erecting another on the north shore. The Beauharnois Canal would be very useful still, because the navigation is augmenting every year, and all the vessels of small tonnage could pass through that canal while all the large vessels could pass by the north shore canal. Besides that, I am sure the Government would derive good revenues from the present canal, because there are numerous and very important water powers there. I will read a part of the report affecting the advantages to be found if the Government completes the canal on the north shore. This is what the Government engineer says:

"Turning, then, to the alternative of a canal on the north shore, such undoubted advantages are presented that decision is inevitably led in this direction.

"These advantages may be summarized as follows:—

"The direct continuance on the north shore of the St. Lawrence Canal system and of the deep water channel of Lake St. Francis carries with it the avoidance of the double crossing of the River St. Lawrence above and below the three rapids named.

"The westerly crossing at the head of the rapid is one of danger, the risk being enhanced in the presence of a westerly wind sweeping down the lake.

"The western entrance to the proposed north side canal would be in a convenient, safe and easily approached bay —Macdonald's Bay.

"At this western entrance very little ice forms.

"The eastern terminus would also be favourably situated. The material to be excavated is mainly clay, and the engineering difficulties to be met with are few and of no serious character. The experience of several years has shown that the formation of ice is certainly no greater a barrier to navigation at this eastern entrance (the Cascades) than it is on the opposite south shore at the entrance of the present Beauharnois Canal."

As for the cost, there is a difference of about $1,000,000. That is to be considered by the Administration, because the saving of $1,000,000 is something, as we all know. I will read the conclusion of the engineer. The report further states:

"For the reasons above given, I cannot recommend that the new canal be constructed on the south shore, and I advise in general terms, after full consideration of the whole matter, that approval be given to the scheme for its construction on the north shore, by the route as shown on the plan proposed by Mr. Monro, between Macdonald Point, near Coteau Landing, and Cascades Point; subject to such modifications in detail as may appear desirable; the locks to be of the dimensions adopted for the enlarged canals of the Dominion, namely, 270 feet long and 45 feet wide, with a depth of water sufficient to pass vessels drawing fourteen feet. The width of the canal at the bottom would be 100 feet."

After having spoken of the disadvantages of the Beauharnois Canal, this is the conclusion to which Mr. Monro arrives:

"It will be observed, on reference to the general map, that the approach to the western entrance at Valleyfield from Lake St. Francis is embarrassed by shoal water outside not described, but which would probably add somewhat to the cost of constructing the channel there. There is also the additional objection of having to cross the strong current of the river at the head of the Coteau rapids in order to make the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal from the north or deep water channel of Lake St. Francis with vessels drawing 14 feet, as in case of their becoming unmanageable in such position, serious results would probably ensue. But it is believed that a sufficient number of facts have been already cited to warrant the conclusion that it is clearly advisable under all the circumstances to construct a canal to join Lake St. Louis and Lake St. Francis on the north shore of the river St. Lawrence rather than to attempt the reconstruction of the present Beauharnois Canal."

Well, this honourable House ought to understand that the conclusion is very clear. The project has been studied under every aspect, and I think after what the engineer says about there being a difference of $1,000,000 between the two schemes, this House will be ready to vote $270,000 to begin the work as soon as possible, because it is in the interest of the country first, and that will be in the interest of the county I represent. Another question to be considered is the question of strategy. All our canals are built on the north side of the St. Lawrence, this is the only one built on the south shore. I am sure this House will have no objection to voting $270,000 to this canal.

Mr. BERGERON. I will say a word or two in answer to the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject. I can understand that this question touches deeply my hon. friend from Soulanges (Mr. Mousseau). It is his pet scheme, although he did not talk like that during the last election, because he was elected on the ground, as he said, that the Government would not build it there, and he assured the electors that the Government were humbugging them. I am glad to see that my hon. friend has more confidence in the Government now. He has read some reports of the engineers, and that is not surprising. I am not discussing the report of the engineer, because I am not an engineer myself, any more than my hon. friend, the doctor, is an engineer. But I have no doubt the Government have come to this conclusion upon the report of an engineer. The only thing I complain of is that they should accept the report of one engineer instead of laying it before a board of two or three other engineers in order to have them supplement the first report. I do not think the Government would lose anything by doing so. The hon. member for Soulanges will not lose any thing if the report of Mr. Monro is correct, and other engineers will say so. If the report of Mr. Monro was not correct, why, then, the country would save the money which it is now proposed to expend there. The member for Soulanges has repeated the same old story that I have heard for the last 15 years in the Counties of Beauharnois and Soulanges—although I do not wish to speak of this question from a local point of view. The hon. gentleman speaks about strategy. Well, he is supporting a party that wants to go hand in hand with the United States, that wants to have unrestricted reciprocity with them, and in that case I do not suppose it would make any difference on which side the canal was built; the American soldiers would not come into this country if that policy prevailed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to see that I have the approval of the hon. member for South Oxford, at any rate. My remarks seem to strike home. Now, the hon. member for Soulanges has a very nice way of settling that engineering matter. He says we want two canals, a large canal for large vessels passing by my place, and a small canal for small vessels passing through your place. Now, I do not want to regard this question from any such point of view, I do not treat it from a political point of view. I carried my county by over 300 majority in spite of the Government saying they would build the canal on the north shore, and my friend Mr. Bain was beaten. These facts show that the location of the canal did not affect the political results. I am speaking about the canal purely from a business point of view. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has also taken a hand in this debate, although he comes from a district so far away; he takes a hand in it, not for the sake of Soulanges against Beauharnois, but because he looks upon it as a great public work. On some points, however, I differ from him. He says that in 1887 Mr. Page said that the canal should be built on the north shore, that that was the most natural place in which to build it. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to Mr. Page very often upon this question. Every hon. gentleman here may believe me when I say that I do not suppose a single week has passed since I have been in Parliament without some of my electors writing to me to enquire about the Beauharnois Canal. Of

course, I cannot make every one of them understand it in the sense that I understand it, namely, as a work of great public utility for a large section of this country; naturally, some of them look upon it, like the hon. member for Soulanges, from a local point of view. I have frequently spoken about it to Mr. Page, and Mr. Page never said to me that it should be built on the north shore. I do not mean to say that he was bound to tell me what he thought about it. He never told me that it would be cheaper and better to build it on the north shore. Every time I have spoken to him about he answered me: "My dear sir, I do not know yet where we shall build it. We are merely taking measures and soundings, we are examining the engineering features of the undertaking to find out whether it would be better to build it on the north shore or the south shore." I put it to the good sense of the House—could Mr. Page, the chief engineer, say, in 1887, four years ago, that it would be better to build it on the north shore, when it was only last fall that the engineers decided to build it on the north shore? That would be equivalent to deciding the matter before studying it. That is what I am complaining of. I say it has been decided without examining it thoroughly; I say that the Government are going to spend, I fear, a million dollars before they find out that they are spending money uselessly. The hon. member for Lincoln said that if the Government deepened the Beauharnois Canal during the season of navigation it would greatly impede navigation. Well, we have the example of the Lachine Canal, which was deepened and enlarged in its old bed without impeding navigation very much, and that canal is one of the best constructed canals in Canada. The hon. member for Lincoln said something about rapids at the entrance to the canal. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I know the place very well, I have been there very often, and there are no rapids at the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal. There were rapids when the canal was first built and, as has been stated by some one, the engineers had to make a dam between Grand Isle and the mainland. But that work has been done, and it remains there to-day, and is not going to be taken away. I can appeal to my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) who knows the place well, and I am sure he can testify that there is no rapid at all at the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal, whereas, in order to enter the Soulanges Canal you have to take it a great deal higher than Coteau Landing, or else you will go straight into the rapids at the opening. The thing is perfectly clear to any one who is acquainted with the facts. I believe the hon. member for Lincoln knows little or nothing about it, he lives far away, and may never have passed there in his life, but I can assure him that there is no rapid at all at the head of the Beauharnois Canal. There might be some quicksand, however; on that point I am not so sure. There are engineers who say there is no quicksand, and others who hold a contrary view. There is just a little doubt, and I think the Government should see their way clear before going to this expenditure. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln, in a patronising way, and supposing we look upon it from a local point of view, says that the people of Beauharnois need not complain, because, if the Government abandons that canal, we will have valuable water powers. I repeat again that we are not regarding this question from a local point of view. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that so far as water powers are concerned we have water powers of great value in Valleyfield to-day, enough to run fifty factories if capitalists could be found willing to invest their money in constructing them. He says the Government will save half a million. He does not know anything about it. He speaks by the report of the engineer; but he does not know it of himself.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. More than that amount.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt the hon. gentleman is in favour of the Government saving money. I repeat the hon. gentleman speaks from the report of the engineer. It is that report I speak against; and I say it should be substantiated by other reports before we are bound to accept it. I say so frankly, and I believe it, and I do not care who the engineer may be. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Shanly has given a report in favour of it. The last time I spoke to Mr. Shanley he told me it was absurd to try to build a canal on the north shore. He was then a member of Parliament, and I do not know whether he has changed his mind or not, but I do not think he will deny he made the statement to me. So far as Mr. Trudeau is concerned, he takes the report of Mr. Monro. He may have confidence in Mr. Monro, and it is his right. But has Mr. Trudeau gone there and sounded the bottom of the river and examined whether it is rock and quicksand, or taken any measures to make a report? No. Mr. Trudeau has not time to do it; and if he has made a report it is one based on the report of his engineer. It has been said the Beauharnois Canal was built for political reasons. That must have been a long time before I was born, and I will not discuss it. The canal is there; it is a good, sound, solid canal, as any engineer will say; and, as it is built there. I do not think its location should be changed except for very good and substantial reasons, reasons of economy, and reasons higher than the one brought forward to change the line of the canal. The hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Mousseau) has said he is in favour of the report of Mr. Monro—I have not seen it—and he says that on the south shore the canal would have to cross three railways. If all Mr. Monro's report is like that part, it is not very accurate. There is only one railway crossing the canal, and it is the Canada Atlantic. The Grand Trunk comes on the other side of the canal. The Canadian Pacific Railway will pass ten or fifteen acres from the canal on the other side, and the new road that is being built will arrive by the line of the Canada Atlantic; and so there is only one railway crossing the canal. It is stated that this question has been ventilated for many years. I know that in the County of Soulanges—and I compliment the hon. gentleman on the fact—it has been discussed for years. He knows that, when he was a very good, solid Conservative, like I am now——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not deny it. The unfortunate circumstance about me is that I am too independent in character. But I was going on to say that when we canvassed at elections together, it was a question in the county, and it has been generally discussed there. The question has been debated for the last fifteen years, and elections have been run on nothing but that question.

During the last election, when the Government came and said they would build a canal on the north shore, I did not believe it. The hon. member for Soulanges ran his election on the fact that it would not be built there. The hon. gentleman now says that is the best place, that it could not be built anywhere else and that it should be built there. I have spoken sincerely on this matter, and I hope the Government will look into it before pledging themselves to carry out the proposed change. Whether they build the canal on the south shore or the north shore does not affect me personally or my county. To be candid, I may say that if there were no canal in my county I would be the happiest of men. But the Government before spending four or five million are bound as trustees for the people to see that the best line is chosen, that no report of an engineer should lead them to build the canal unless they are perfectly satisfied, after every possible means of information have been exhausted, they are doing the best thing for the best interests of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I should think that the member for Beauharnois would rather sympathize with the proposition for a canal on the north shore, for nothing would represent his political actions more than two canals, one on each side of the river. I remember very well the time when the hon. member thought he was a very bad Conservative. I happen to have a book here dated 1891 which, speaking of his political record, describes him as an independent Conservative. He has budded out into a full-blooded Liberal-Conservative, and he will no doubt remain that so long as there is a majority on that side of the House. However, I did not rise to discuss the hon. gentleman's politics. He has properly said that we should discuss this question apart from politics, on the merits of the question. We agree that the trade of the country demands the completion of the canal system at the earliest possible date. We desire to have the canal of the capacity of the Welland Canal, and we could not proceed more safely than to place this question in the hands of an engineer who has done so much for the Welland Canal. I am sure the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) did not intend to reflect on the engineering skill of Mr. Monro.

Mr. BERGERON. I have said so.

Mr. MULOCK. Although the hon. gentleman said so, yet the tenor of his argument was against the report. So while in one sense he did not desire to reflect on the skill of the engineer, at the same time the whole burden of his song was that it was not a reliable report. In that case it should not be allowed for a moment to be a matter of doubt as to whether the engineer in question is or is not competent. He has been in the public service many years. His monuments are to be found along the whole of the canal system. A year or two ago a foreign nation sent its delegates to Canada to examine into our canal system, attracted by the reputation which so deservedly belongs to those great works and to the authors of them—I refer to the engineers who came here from Russia a year or two ago. Having returned, they made most flattering references to the high skill manifested in the building of the canal. In that case it is only fair that we should not by any possible omission in the course of this discussion detract from the merits of the contractors. We are reminded by the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Mousseau) that this is not a new question, that an agitation has been going on for many years, that engineer after engineer has spoken in favour of the north shore, including Mr. Page, Mr. Baillairgé, and others; and when we have the only remaining point in the question, the engineering difficulties, decided for us, I fail to see what will be gained by further delay. If we are to have the canal, let us have it at the right place, and I believe we can have no better authority than one of the engineers who has taken charge successfully of our canal system for many years. If it could be shown that that engineer in his report has made any great mistake, or that his ideas would not be safe to follow, then I would agree with my hon. friend that it would be only prudent to delay; but, with such a record as there is, I fail to see that anything else would be accomplished except delay, and if a delay in the construction of the canal resulted in the loss of a constituency of the Government on the north side, further delay might result in the loss to the Government of a constituency on the south side. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has no personal or political aim in view.

Mr. BERGERON. None at all. The hon. gentleman cannot say as much himself.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no interest except the public interest in the matter, and I surely can have no local interest. I must say that I was greatly impressed by the arguments that fell from the hon. gentleman who so well represents the constituency of Soulanges (Mr. Mousseau), and his analysis of the merits of the route reported on by the engineer, is certainly a very strong presentation of the case in favour of the adoption of that report.

Mr. SCRIVER. I shall not detain the House with any very lengthened remarks, but I would like to be permitted to say that the south shore canal was adopted many years ago—quite within my recollection however—and after a very careful survey was made of both shores; a very careful survey extending over several years. Some hon. gentleman has said to-night that it was adopted as the result of some political advantage, but I have no such recollection. On the contrary, I have a distinct recollection that it was adopted solely on engineering grounds. I have been for a good many years a member of this House, and scarcely a year has passed without this question having been agitated. It was more agitated a few years ago when the late Mr. Lanthier, who was an enthusiast in regard to this question, one session after another, got up in this House and advocated the construction of the canal on the north shore. It is quite within my recollection that that gentleman, a man of great talent, a man who had made the question a subject of careful study, was the only one on the floor of this House who advocated earnestly and strongly the adoption of the north shore route. I think I am not mistaken in saying that Mr. Walter Shanly, who was for many years a member of this House, and who was perhaps better qualified than any other member of it to speak understandingly on this subject, never advocated the change from the south shore to the north shore. I cannot speak, of course, from an engineering point of view, and I have not examined the report of the engineer on this question, but it does seem to me rather a suspicious circumstance, in view of the fact that year

after year for many years past the Conservative Administration in this House never listened to the representations of the gentleman who formerly represented Soulanges; that at this particular junction of affairs, when Beauharnois County seems to have been quite secured to the Conservative party, and when, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has said, it returned him at the last election by a triumphant majority, while at the same election the Conservative Administration lost the Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges on the north shore—it does seem to me as though there might be some political question involved in the proposal to now construct the canal on the north shore. There may be some hope on the part of the Administration of the day that by proceeding with the construction of this canal, they may restore to their ranks the lost Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil. At all events such a suspicion seems quite natural under the circumstances. But, to a man taking a common sense view of the matter, the fact that there is now available to the trade of this country, —a canal it is true drawing only nine feet of water—a canal, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has said, which is substantially and well constructed, and which is doing the trade of the country satisfactorily; would seem to indicate that it is an uncalled for expenditure to construct a canal on the north shore. The objections mentioned by my friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), that there is some difficulty experienced by vessels entering the canal are not real, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) stated. There is no difficulty at all for the vessels entering the canal at its western opening. The question of the damages to land west of the opening of that canal caused by the erection of the dam, is one of no importance, because these damages were settled long ago. As to the question of what my friend from Soulanges called "strategy," the proximity of the canal to the American border is certainly not a question worth considering in this day of railways. I have said that the canal in existence now is quite sufficient for the trade of the country. I may say, that ever since the completion of the Canada Atlantic Railway, I have been in the habit of crossing the canal on that railway twice a week, and often four times a week, and the train by which I was travelling has never within my recollection been more than three of four times detained, waiting for a vessel to pass. That fact would seem to evidence that there is no great pressure of traffic on that canal. I agree with my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), that the Government should not proceed to take the important step of commencing this work, without further engineering advice than is before it now.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but I think I am in duty bound to give to the Committee the reasons why the Government have adopted this course, and the reasons why the north shore has been selected as the proper place in which to construct the enlarged canal. There would be much force in the arguments of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), so eloquently and forcibly urged as they were, if only one engineer had inspected, or given an opinion upon the question; but when it is remembered that this is a question that has been discussed for the last twenty years, every session in this House, both from an engineering and commercial standpoint, it can scarcely be considered that it is a new project. The engineers who have given an opinion as to the propriety of the construction of the enlarged canal on the north shore are, first: Mr. Page, who had a strong opinion on this question; Deputy Minister Baillairgé is also in its favour. Mr. Trudeau, the present deputy head of the department and the chief engineer of canals, has also expressed a decided and strong opinion in favour of the project. It has been stated that Mr. Monro is the only engineer who has investigated this question and made a report upon it. It must be remembered that Mr. Monro is an engineer of some eminence in this country, that he has been employed on the most difficult and important works that have been constructed by the Government of Canada, that he is mainly responsible for the location and construction of the enlarged Welland Canal. So important did the department consider his services, and so eminently qualified did they regard him for the work in which he had been engaged, that they selected him from the whole staff of engineers who are now or have been in the employment of the Government, to send him to England to investigate and report upon the construction of that important canal which is now being built from Liverpool to Manchester. Anyone who has taken the trouble to look at that report will, I think, come to the conclusion that he is a gentleman whose opinion should at least be respected on a question of this kind. Now, I am a little surprised at the statements made in reference to the opinions held by Mr. Shanly. I need not say to this House or to Canada that if there is one engineer or one public man in Canada in whose opinion there is more confidence placed than in another's by all classes of the community, no matter what their political opinions may be, it is Mr. Shanly. Before coming to the House yesterday, I had the pleasure of a long conversation with Mr. Shanly on this subject, and one of the first expressions he gave utterance to was that the Beauharnois Canal should be on the north shore. I asked him then his opinion upon the propriety of constructing the enlarged canal upon the north shore in preference to enlarging the one on the south shore, familiarly known as the Beauharnois Canal. He gave a number of reasons why he was in favour of the north shore, and among them was this important one: He said it would be one of a continuous line of canals all the way down the river, that it was more easy of access, and what is of no little importance, and what was pointed out also by the hon. member for Lincoln, that it would cost less and be a much better canal than the Beauharnois Canal, if enlarged. Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to refer to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) as to the reasons that might possibly have induced the Government to take the course they have. He charitably intimates that as the constituencies of the north shore were lost to the Government at the last election, the Government have adopted this policy in order to, I suppose—to use the familiar expression which is bandied about so freely now—to bribe the electors in those counties. The hon. gentleman might give us this credit at least, that, having come to the conclusion to construct a new canal on the north shore, notwithstanding the fact that the electors, many of them, for the

reason indicated by the hon. member for Beauharnois, thought proper to express want of confidence in the Government, the Government intend faithfully to carry out the project upon which they had decided before the electors in any of those constituencies had given expression to their opinion. It is too much the habit, in discussing important questions of this kind, to attribute political and unworthy motives to the Government. I was rather pleased with the remark made by my hon. friend from Lincoln, because, though a strong party man, he expressed the opinion freely that in discussing a question of so much importance to this country, we should rise, at least for the moment, above the paltry tactics to which too many men are apt to resort. One of the last men in the House from whom I would expect these tactics is my hon. friend from Huntingdon, with whom I have had the pleasure of associating in this House for the last twenty years; and let me hope that as he grows older he will display more charity and less party feeling in discussing a matter of this kind. Now, I do not intend to detain the Committee at any length. After having given the opinions of the most eminent engineers in Canada, in favour of the course adopted by the Government, I propose to give a few more reasons, and then leave the House to decide whether the course pursued by the Government is the correct one or not. I do not blame my hon. friend from Beauharnois for the course he is pursuing. On the contrary, I believe it is the duty of every member to give utterance to his conscientious opinion as to the best course to be pursued in the interest of the country. I would not like to accuse my hon. friend from Huntingdon of taking the course he does because he lives on the south shore, and because the Beauharnois Canal is nearer to his constituents than the one on the north side of the St. Lawrence would be. That would be uncharitable, and I would not think of doing it. I take for granted that his motives are as pure in expressing the opinions he has, as if he had spoken on the other side. Now, according to the reports and the conclusions arrived at by those whose opinions we must adopt on this question, I find that this canal is located on the north shore of the St. Lawrence between Coteau Landing and Cascade Point, and that it is to give 14 feet of navigation on the north shore for over $500,000 less than it would cost to enlarge, or rather, reconstruct the Beauharnois Canal. Of course, my hon. friend from Beauharnois says that is only conjectural—that the expense may be much greater. I am not prepared to say that it may not; but I am taking the calculations that have been made by the engineers after they have carefully studied the question of the relative cost on the two sides of the river.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. It will be less than that certainly.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quoting the figures which have been given by the engineers. I will afterwards give the figures to show that the opinion expressed by the hon. gentleman is correct if the engineers' estimates are carried out. In the second place, it will be a much more natural line, because it is the continuation inland of the deep water channel of Lake St. Francis, which is on the north side. The report says:

"The ground on the north shore is so favourable for an inland line that there is, to all intents and purposes, practically a straight line through and therefore it can be passed through by large vessels at the maximum speed possible in a canal. The harbours at both ends, which is an important point, are both good and that at the west end is remarkably good."

I find the calculations made as to the construction of this canal on the south shore is $5,700,000 as the cost of one of the routes. On the north shore, the cost is estimated at $4,750,000, showing an actual saving, if the calculations be correct, of $950,000. But if the other plan which has been suggested on the south shore be taken, that would reduce the expenditure by $250,000, leaving a difference between the two propositions of $700,000. These are the reasons which have been presented to the Government by the engineer whose special duty it was to make these investigations and locate the canal, and with these facts before them the Government could not by any possibility, having in view the general interests of the country and the economical construction of these works, take any other course.

Mr. BARRON. Has anything more to be done on the south side to make the canal navigable?

Mr. BOWELL. It is already navigable.

Mr. BARRON. Is there any canal at present on the north shore?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know if the Deputy Minister can advise us whether we may expect the same enormous disproportion between the estimated and actual cost of new canals, as we have found, to our sorrow, has existed in connection with other public works, even erected within a stone's throw of this building. Can the deputy tell us whether he expects he can keep within the estimate?

Mr. BOWELL. Those who have the honour and pleasure of knowing the Deputy Minister know that as a rule he is non-committal, and his answer is that he hopes not. The hon. gentleman will admit that the estimates with regard to the canal on the south shore are just as apt to be below the mark as those which apply to the north shore.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I admit that. Is it much shorter on the north shore?

Mr. BOWELL. It is about the same length.

Mr. BARRON. In view of the promises made by the other side with regard to the Trent Canal, it would be much better to spend this money in building that canal rather than in providing a canal on the north shore of the river when there is one already on the south side, and a part of the Trent Canal would run through the hon. gentleman's constituency.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is more accurate with respect to figures, I hope, than he is with regard to the geography of the country. The Trent canal does not run through one foot of my constituency.

Mr. BARRON. You are interested in it.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not half the personal interest the hon. gentleman has, but it would be strange if we could get through a discussion on any canal subject without hearing a little squeak from the hon. gentleman with reference to himself.

Murray Canal..... $50,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the total cost so far?

Mr. BOWELL. Up to the 31st of December, 1890, it cost $1,418,193.84.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is it estimated to cost, when completed?

Mr. BOWELL. $50,000 are required to settle with the contractors and to complete and fully equip the canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was some apprehension, at one time, that some portion of the canal would pass through quicksands or that the banks were in danger of caving in.

Mr. BOWELL. They have been found not to exist. There is no quicksand, nor have the banks caved in, but there was an additional expenditure which was not anticipated, in consequence of one portion of the canal having struck the rock before reaching the bottom.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the difference between the estimate and the actual cost?

Mr. BOWELL. The original estimate was about $850,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the actual cost has been $1,600,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The estimate was for a less depth, and it was afterwards decided to deepen, in order to enable vessels navigating the lake to pass down the Bay of Quinté.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth is it now?

Mr. BOWELL. It is 12½ feet at the lowest water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the engineers secured an equal depth in the Bay of Quinté all through? Is the Bay of Quinté channel deepened to 12½ feet, or is that left over?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the channel is 12 feet at the lowest point. As the hon. gentleman knows, at Telegraph Islands west of Deseronto is one of the shallowest parts of the bay, and it is also shallow up near Niggar Island. I was informed by the captain of a vessel from Dalhousie the other day that he found plenty of water in the bay, more than 12 feet, and quite sufficient for vessels navigating the lake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know the river steamers use it. What receipts, if any, are obtained? I suppose some tolls are charged?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is opened, is it not?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; over 1,000 vessels passed through last year, and I believe they are more numerous this year. I had a statement of receipts and expenditures, and I think I read it the other day. Last year 1,008 vessels passed through.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What would the tolls be, roughly estimated?

Mr. BOWELL. The tolls are regularly collected upon the canal, and the only vessels that pass through free are in pursuance of the system of allowing steamers to pass free when they go on excursions for church purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I suppose also for societies of a kind that may be described as educating the people in the way they should go in the direction of brotherly love?

Mr. BOWELL. On the 12th July, you mean?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; does that apply?

Mr. BOWELL. The permission does not apply to that or to the Odd-Fellows or the Free-Masons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not suspect the hon. gentleman of making any exception. He speaks of 1,000 vessels. That may mean little or much. The vessels of the Richelieu and Ontario Company pass that way going up to Toronto, but I do not think they do going down. Still they pass a great many times in the course of the season, and a very pretty sight it is, as the hon. gentleman knows, but I suppose a great many of the 1,000 would consist of passenger craft passing backwards and forwards a great many times.

Mr. BOWELL. It would have been more correct had I said that vessels had passed through 1,000 times. I did not mean 1,000 vessels.

Trent Canal—Construction of lock and improvement of navigation between Lakefield and Balsam Lake.. $74,000

Mr. BARRON. I do not intend this evening to take up the time of the House by discussing this at great length, but on a future occasion, I hope this session, we may devote three or four hours at least to discussing the merits and demerits of this canal. I see the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) and the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in their seats, and I would ask them to note the fact and tell their constituents when they go back, that it has been announced to-night by the acting Minister of Rail ways and Canals that the Government intend, at a cost of four or five millions, to build a canal on the north side of the St. Lawrence River when there is one on the south side which is still apparently available, and yet they will not put a dollar in the Estimates for the construction of the Trent Valley Canal. I particularly call the attention of the hon. members for East and West Peterborough and of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) and of the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) to the fact that the Government are entering upon the work on the St. Lawrence to which I have referred, and will not vote a solitary cent for the Trent Valley Canal, that work which has been time and time again promised—it is true just before a general election—to the people in the Midland district of the Province of Ontario. But I do not propose to-night to discuss this matter at any length. I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that for five successive sessions I have pointed out that at Fenelon Falls, north of the lock, the bridge remains as it always has done. I ask the Minister now what is going to be done about it? There is a lock at Fenelon Falls which has cost between $250,000 and $300,000. It is a very excellent lock, it is true. Good work was done there. A lockmaster has been employed year after year at Fenelon Falls, and the receipts last year were just $35.50, and the reason for that has been that for all these years since that lock was built, a bridge has been left across the river at one end of

the lock, absolutely preventing any navigation whatsoever through that lock. The Government cannot plead ignorance of the matter. They cannot even say they have not received information from other quarters than their own engineers, because time and time again has their attention been brought to the fact that that bridge remains there and renders the lock impassable for craft of any kind except row boats. Their own engineer, in his last report, says, speaking of Fenelon Falls :

"This part of the route cannot be used until the swing is placed in the railway bridge at the upper entrance of the lock."

Are you, I ask again for the hundredth time, going to leave the bridge there as it always has been, or are you going to have something done to benefit the people by making use of the lock and the canal which you have built there at the enormous expenditure of between $250,000 or $300,000? Now, I understand that the Government are anxious to do something to make that water navigable, to make the lock beneficial to the people so as to enable them to go up and down from one lake to another. But they are cheeseparing about this business ; they are willing to give something to the Grand Trunk Railway, and let the Grand Trunk put in a swing bridge. I tell the Government there is no use talking about a swing bridge. A swing bridge there would not be safe, it would be impossible by reason of currents. But they must make some arrangement with the Grand Trunk by which that bridge is removed entirely and the railway is put south of the lock where the banks on either side of the river are high enough to enable vessels to go underneath a railway bridge there constructed. Now, there may be a question of law involved in this matter, and I wish the Minister of Justice were here to discuss it. But it seems to me that where there is a non-navigable river made navigable by the Government, the Government then might require, by law, that any obstruction should be removed ; but that the Government be at the expense of removing the obstruction, which in the case under discussion might be an expense of $50,000 or $60,000. I understand this proposition to be perfectly sound and good law, and I say that the Government to-day cannot escape liability for the removal of this obstruction. But to go and say they will give the Grand Trunk some $10,000 or $15,000 to put in a swing bridge, will not answer the purpose, because a swing bridge will be unavailable, and besides, will be always dangerous, and I understand the Grand Trunk for these reasons contend they very properly refuse to put in a swing bridge. Now, I want to draw the attention of the Minister again to the fact that they have been paying a lockmaster several years a salary of $250 or $300, and the receipts last year were only $35.60. The fact of allowing these receipts to be so small, is militating against the reputation of the route, because people do not understand that the reason why the receipts are so small is that the route is made impassable by reason of this bridge. I would, therefore, like the Minister to say what is the intention of the Government in regard to that bridge. I would like him to say if it is the intention of the Government to make any arrangement with the Grand Trunk at once, because he will remember that every session this matter has been brought to his attention, and the same time-worn promise has been made that they would see about it. But that has been going on for five years now, and we are just where we began. Surely the Minister must see how unwise and vicious the Government's policy is—to go to the enormous expense of putting a lock there, having the entire system of navigation on a long line of internal waters interfered with and absolutely destroyed by reason of this bridge. Now, their own report year after year has told them that there are many vessels in the upper waters wanting to come down into the lower waters, and are prevented from coming down by reason of this obstruction. Contracts have been entered into by different people, which they have been unable to fulfil by reason of this obstruction, they expecting that the Government would do its duty in the premises, but I am sorry to say they have been depending upon a broken reed—depending, at all events, upon promises which have always been broken. No wonder the people feel indignant at the Government for the course they have pursued. After the Minister has thought fit to answer these remarks, I shall ask him some more questions with regard to this route.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman prefaced his remarks by stating three or four times that he intended to take some future opportunity to devote two or three hours to this question. He has now discussed it with general condemnation, as he is wont to do every time that he addresses the House upon this subject. If it were not uncharitable, I would say that the hon. gentleman is more interested in the political effect which he thinks he can accomplish by the course he is pursuing, than he is desirous for the construction of the canal. That may be uncharitable, still, if it were not unparliamentary, I should be inclined to say so ; but as it is unparliamentary for me to make such an insinuation, I refrain from doing it. Still, his language and his reasoning are such as would naturally lead anyone to that inference. The question of the navigation of the Trent Canal has been before the country for a great many years, and I hope the hon. gentleman will live long enough, as I hope myself to live long enough, to see it constructed. I remember very well in my boyhood reading of the Murray Canal project. At that time there was scarcely an election, nor has there since been an election, in which that was not a plank in the platform of the person who sought the suffrages of the people on the Bay of Quinté and in the County of Northumberland. I have the pleasure of knowing that the work has been completed, and it requires very little more to make it produce the good results that we anticipate from it. But the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I tell him that the statement he makes in reference to the project of building the Beauharnois Canal, is entirely unfair—I was going to use a stronger expression ; but it appears to me the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) has forgotten, or intentionally omits to state, the fact that there is one grand project of increasing the canal accommodation from Lake Superior in the west down to the sea board, and that the $5,000,000 to which he has specially called the attention of the members for Peterborough East (Mr. Burnham) and West (Mr. Stevenson) is part of the expenditure on that great scheme. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to go to his constituents, or is he prepared to go into East and West Peter-

borough and tell the electors—because they are reasonable men, they are men of common sense—that we should spend no less a sum than $16,000,000 in the enlargement of the Welland Canal, when we are about to expend some $3,000,000 on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and that to render them available for the purposes for which that expenditure has been made, we must increase the depth of water in all the canals until we reach the sea board? Yet we have an hon. gentleman calling the attention of the representatives of the people, and more particularly of the representatives from the constituencies more immediately interested, to the fact that we are spending $5,000,000 upon the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal on the south, or $4,600,000 in the construction of a new canal on the north shore, when we refuse a dollar to the enterprise in which he is interested. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks this House is so stupid as not to understand the absurdity of the proposition that he has laid before it. The hon. gentleman says that this canal to which he has referred, and in which he is so deeply interested, will cost four or five million dollars, or a sum equal to that we are expending on the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal, or the construction of a new canal on the north shore. The proposition now before the country in regard to the completion of the Trent Valley Canal is to obtain a depth of water from Georgian Bay to Bay of Quinté of 5½ feet. What are the facts in connection with the estimates, apart altogether from the merits of the scheme? The hon. gentleman says it is going to cost only four or five millions. I have before me Mr. Page's estimates for works not yet commenced, and it is $9,984,000 for a five feet and a-half canal on the route to which I have referred. Mr. Rubidge estimates it at $8,864,500. I could give, if it were deemed advisable, the estimated cost of the different sections with which the hon. gentleman is perhaps as well acquainted as I am; but if we are to adopt the theory mentioned by the hon. member for Oxford, these estimates may prove a long way below the actual cost. However, I do not intend to enter into a full discussion of the question to-night, and I would not have said so much had not the hon. gentleman attempted to make political capital out of it, rather than argue the merits of the work itself. The only practical point to which he called attention was that of a lock and that of the bridge. I admit frankly that there has been a great deal of delay, and I may say unnecessary delay, in accomplishing the object which he and those interested have in view, and that is in having a bridge, whether a swing bridge or not, or the Grand Trunk should change its line and cross the river at another point to be determined hereafter. But I can assure the hon. gentleman during the short time I have been in charge of the department I have taken active measures in connection with this bridge to insist on the Grand Trunk Railway doing that which we believe the law compels them to do, and which they deny their liability to do. That work will be completed at as early a day as possible. If there is anything necessary to make the locks available for the purpose for which they were constructed, this item in the estimates will be quite sufficient to accomplish the object we have in view. Of course, I defer to the superior knowledge and engineering skill of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) who shakes his head. If he would confine himself to shaking that intellectual head and not using his tongue, the House would be convinced of the very great wisdom it contains. But the engineer whose duty it is to inform Ministers on this question, tells me, and no one knows better than the engineer who is on my left, that this sum is ample to accomplish what the hon. gentleman has in view, that the bridge, if we are obliged to construct it, will be made available and some of the boulders and obstructions which now exist in those portions of the river and lake at present navigable, removed. We will be quite prepared to have a tilt with the hon. gentleman if he desires it on some future occasion, but let us discuss this question on its merits apart from political advantages to be derived from it.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister undertakes to give me a lecture——

Mr. BOWELL. Why not, you gave me one.

Mr. BARRON,—because I found fault. Yet he admits there has been a great deal of delay and of unnecessary delay.

Mr. BOWELL. I said unnecessary delay. I did not repeat it.

Mr. BARRON. He wonders that I rose after five years, asking that the people's rights be recognized, and showed a little warmth at the delay which he himself admits should not have taken place, and which he characterized as unnecessary delay.

Mr. BOWELL. That is in regard to the bridge.

Mr. BARRON. As regards the rest of the route, he says there has been a great deal of delay.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman referred to my intellectual appearance. Perhaps I am not very intellectual in appearance, but at all events I am quite willing to allow my appearance in regard to intellectuality, to stand side by side with that of the acting Minister of Railways. As regards this particular work, the acting Minister of Railways knows so little about it that he says $74,000 in the Estimates will be quite sufficient to do all we ask to be done, to secure free navigation from Balsam Lake down.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing of the kind. I referred to the bridge and the lock.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman knows so little about the matter that he is not aware that the only obstruction from Balsam Lake down is the bridge. Moreover, he should have stated what the law is in connection with it. The liability is upon the Government here to do the work necessary to make the river navigable and remove the bridge. If he knew anything about his duties as acting Minister, he would be aware that when a higher power makes a river navigable, which in its natural state is non-navigable, that Government has to bear all the expense in making navigable that which was non-navigable. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the Government dare not put up a swing bridge because it would be exceedingly dangerous. He knows further that the Grand Trunk Company have strongly insisted that they would not allow a

swing bridge there. Yet the hon. gentleman was not sufficiently candid to tell the House that the Grand Trunk Company had refused to allow a swing bridge there, and that the only way to get over the difficulty was to have the railway cross the river below the locks. Yet the hon. gentleman undertook to lecture me, because, in my zeal to see the canal built, I waxed a little warm in the interests of my constituents. The hon. gentleman claimed that I showed no knowledge of the subject. Much respect as I have for the hon. gentleman, I know much more about the work than does the acting Minister. He has told the House that the cost of the Trent Valley Canal is to be $10,000,000, according to Mr. Rubidge. But he was not candid enough to state that a large portion has already been spent. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman does not know how much has been spent.

Mr. BOWELL. I stated it was for works not already commenced.

Mr. BARRON. The estimate of Mr. Rubidge was $8,685,000, of which there have been expended $1,600,000, leaving a balance of $7,585,000, instead of $8,685,000, which the acting Minister would lead the House to believe was the estimate of the cost of work to be done. Now, Sir, we know, too, that these locks have been very expensively built. Year after year the Government have been promising that this Trent Valley Canal should be built, and quite lately they shielded themselves behind a commission; they wanted to have delay take place, in order that they might excuse themselves to the people to whom they were making promises that this canal should be built, and so they had a commission appointed to investigate the matter. That commission reported in reference to the locks as follows:—

"The attention of the commissioners has been called to the width of the locks at present completed. There are twelve of these, 134 feet long by 33 wide. For modern locks this width is very great in proportion to the length. They are of the same size as those on the Rideau Canal. The latter, however, were built to accommodate side-wheel vessels, which at this day is not necessary to use. The commissioners suggest that a width of 23 feet would be sufficient."

I would ask the attention of the Minister to this particular fact, that the commissioners reported that the width of the locks already constructed is too wide, and that the locks themselves are too expensively built, and we find that by adopting the suggestion of the commissioners, there would be a saving of $20,000 on each of the 71 locks still to be built, or a saving of $1,420,000. Then regarding the class of work which the commissioners suggest should not be so good as it has been, there would be a saving of $2,000,000. We find, therefore, that according to the commissioners appointed by the Government to investigate this Trent Valley Canal project, there would be a saving in all of $3,420,000, thus reducing Mr. Rubidge's figures to $4,125,000, instead of the $8,000,000 odd dollars which the Minister would like this House to believe would be the cost of the works already to be constructed. It is a very curious coincident, and I would ask the House to notice it, that the reduction of Mr. Rubidge's figures by reason of carrying out the proposition made by the commissioners, would make the ultimate cost of the canal $4,125,000, and I would ask the Minister to note the fact that these figures almost correspond with the estimate of Mr. Starke, another Government engineer. When the Minister told us that this canal was going to cost $8,000,000 odd on Mr. Rubidge's estimate why did he not tell us that Mr. Starke, another engineer—their own engineer—had estimated that the cost would be $3,200,000 to complete the canal. I would ask the Minister to note that if the changes suggested by the commissioners in their report were adopted Mr. Starke's figures would almost correspond with the reduced figures of Mr. Rubidge, if the suggestions made by the commissioners were carried out. The Minister undertakes to lecture me for showing some anger, as I think he called it, in regard to this matter, and he attributes to me that I cannot discuss any question of this kind, without showing political motives. I think the Minister has already been told to-night that there are others in this House who can show political motives. The hon. member who sits beside me, (Mr. Scriver) told the Minister himself a few moments ago, that possibly the Government might be desirous of building the Beauharnois Canal on the north side of the River St. Lawrence, for political motives. I do not say that is so; but, in the meanwhile, the hon. Minister ought to be careful in charging me with political motives. If political motives have been shown by anybody in this House, I think I may say they have been shown by the gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, because the very moment that I became member for North Victoria, the work on the Trent Valley Canal ceased all through my riding, and from that time to the present not a dollar has been spent towards the great end in view, because the people of North Victoria—if I am to attribute political motives—returned an opponent of the Government. Although all the facts show that political motives have been characteristic of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, yet because, anxious as I am for the construction of the canal, I show some warmth at the unnecessary delay which the Minister himself admits has taken place, he rises in his seat and accuses me of political motives. I say that the fact that work has ceased in my riding since I was elected, tends to show political motives on the other side of the House. I am zealous in the interest of my constituents as I always shall be, and I hope I am zealous also in the national interest, but I am bound to point out that if political motives are to be attributed, that they may with more reason and justice be attributed to the members of the Government who have stopped work on the Trent Valley Canal in my county since my constituents returned an opponent of the Government. I have a right also to find fault with this Government for not keeping faith with the people interested in the Trent Valley Canal. Let me read to this House a telegram which was sent by the late leader of the Government just prior to the last election. Mr. Murphy, of Trenton, was very anxious, in the interest of the Government opposite, that the constituencies should return supporters of the Government, and he telegraphed to the late Premier about the Trent Valley Canal, and what was the reply which he received? I will read it to the House, *ipsissima verba*. The telegram says:

"KINGSTON, 3rd March, 1891.

"To D. R. MURPHY, Trenton.

"The Trent Valley Canal Commission having reported favourably on the completion of the scheme, Parliament will be asked in the Estimates next session for a grant for the purpose.

(Signed) "JNO. A. MACDONALD."

That telegram was sent on the 3rd March and the elections took place on the 5th March. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to deny that that telegram was sent, and if they do deny it, I ask the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) and the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) to get up in their seats and state, if a telegram of which I have read a copy, was not read at a public meeting in the town of Peterborough, at which they were both present. I have read a copy of that telegram; the original was read at a public meeting in the town of Peterborough; and what does it say? That the Trent Valley Canal Commission have reported favourably on the scheme, and that Parliament will be asked next session to vote a grant for the purpose—that is, this session. And yet the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals gets up and lectures me for showing some zeal. Here is a pledge made by the late Premier that Parliament would be asked for a grant for the building of this canal, and we find that not one dollar for it is in the Estimates. I complain, not that their promises made year after year have been broken, but that the promise made two or three days before the elections has been broken and disregarded. Do they not know that they carried constituency after constituency by these promises? Does not the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) know that men asked him about the prospects of the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, and that he told them on the faith of that promise: "Yes, the canal is going to be built." And yet, when I tell the Government that their promises are broken, that the people have been deceived right and left, the acting Minister gets up and lectures me for showing some little warmth, because he is my senior in age. I say I am justified in showing some warmth on this occasion, because the whole history of the Government has been one of deception, of broken promises, of broken faith with the people—promising year after year before the elections that the canal would be built, but forgetting their promises as soon as the elections are over. Yet they propose to expend about the same amount of money that would build the Trent Valley Canal, in order to construct a canal on the north side of the St. Lawrence, when they have one already on the south side of the river. Therefore I have a right to show some warmth, and any hon. gentleman would do the same thing if he found that his people had been deceived and the public money wasted; and I hurl back the insinuation made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that I have shown undue warmth and zeal, or that I have been actuated by improper motives in this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. After that magnificent speech, would the hon. gentleman say whether I correctly understood him to say that some $4,000,000, had been spent, and that the original estimate of Mr. Rubidge was $8,685,000?

Mr. BARRON. I said that it was $8,685,000, and that there had been expended already, $1,100,000, leaving $7,585,000 of Mr. Rubidge's estimate.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman kindly say where he got these estimates?

Mr. BARRON. They were furnished by an engineer, James N. Irvine, who takes them from Mr. Rubidge's report dated November 15th, 1887.

Mr. BOWELL. I may tell the hon. gentleman that those figures, like his speech, are incorrect. The expenditure up to December, 1890, was $750,467.98.

Mr. BURNHAM. I am glad that the hon. member for North Victoria has taken this particular project under his wing, and is giving it his assistance. I am not certain, from the tenor of his remarks, whether he is taking this interest in the subject, on account of political advantage that may accrue to him and his party, or on other grounds. At all events this particular work is one of considerable interest to the constituency which I represent, and to which the hon. member for North Victoria has referred on several occasions. The hon. gentleman has referred to the attitude of myself, and the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) in this matter. Now, I do not propose to find any fault with the Government because they propose to expend between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000, for a canal on the north side of the St. Lawrence river, because I consider that that work is necessary if we are going to have the Trent Valley Canal. The commerce that would come down the Trent Valley Canal must necessarily use the St. Lawrence canals; and if the whole system is to be carried out, we who are interested in the Trent Valley Canal are perfectly satisfied with that expenditure. I understood the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) that he would bring this matter up on some other occasion, and it appears that now he has had all the discussion he proposes to have on the question. Speaking of the cost of the canal, he refers to Mr. Rubidge's estimate of about $8,000,000, and I think the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the work can be constructed for a very much less sum, because the works now constructed are stated by the commissioners in their reports to be unnecessarily expensive. There could probably be saved $2,000,000. That, I understand, is what the hon. member for North Victoria refers to when he speaks of the saving that could be effected on the estimate made by the engineer. Now, I do not propose to go into a discussion of the merits of this canal. I understand that we shall have an opportunity on a future occasion to discuss the question in this House; but I must say that we feel that the Government have pledged themselves to the construction of this work. Its merits may not be generally known to the members of this House, and I hope we shall have an opportunity again to bring the subject more fully before the House. At all events, the telegram that was read by the hon. member for Victoria, I think, stated the position in which the Government stands with regard to this work. The Government appointed a commission to examine into the question, and the hon. member for North Victoria says they shielded themselves behind the commission. Now that is not a correct statement of the facts, because what the Government did was this: There were some doubts as to whether there was sufficient water supply to carry on this work, and the Government referred that matter, as well as all other matters in regard to the canal, to three gentlemen, two of whom, at all events, they considered altogether disinterested. These were Mr. Kennedy, the harbour engineer of Montreal, and Mr. Turner, the engineer of Toronto. Mr. Kennedy, so far as

I know, went there rather prejudiced against the work, having known nothing about it beforehand; but after he had gone over the route and inspected the whole matter, he came to the conclusion that it was a work deserving consideration, not only as a local but as a national work. He considered that it was beneficial, not only to the locality, but to the Dominion as well, and his report is on these lines. He recognized the necessity of constructing the work as a national work. Now, I think that if the work can be constructed for even the amount of money estimated, $8,000,000, it will not be asking too much that the Dominion should undertake that enterprise, especially when we consider that half a million people are along the route of that canal and that some of the best lands in the country are situated in that section, and that the natural waterway requires only 50 miles of canal, to make it a complete navigable waterway through the centre of Ontario. If the work can be done at that cost, the Government will be remiss in their duty if they do not undertake it, and the report of the commission certainly would justify them in carrying it out. With regard to the bridge at Fenelon Falls, which the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) has complained of, the Government have built two expensive locks immediately below this obstruction; and I do think the Government should take steps to remove that obstruction and enable the people to get the benefit of the works which have been constructed there. As the hon. member for North Victoria is going to bring the matter up again, we will have an opportunity of discussing it more fully then.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not wish at this hour to say anything that may prolong the debate, but as the hon. member for East Peterborough has spoken on the matter, and I think, fairly and justly, I may be permitted to give my opinion. I am very much disappointed in not seeing a large sum in the Estimates, in view of the telegram we received from the First Minister that there would be a sum placed in the Estimates this year in accordance with the report of the commission appointed by the Government. The excuse for years back has been simply that as soon as the commission reported, if that report was favourable, a grant would be made. We did not expect the canal to be built at once, as it will take years to build it, but we did expect that a sum would be placed in the Estimates which would satisfy the people to some extent that the Government meant to go on with it. I know that, in consequence of the decrease in the sugar duties and other things, the Government are averse to incurring expenditure; but, surely they might guarantee that next year they will place sums in the Estimates for this work. No matter what Government is in power, that section of the country will force them to do this work eventually. The people there are determined to have it; and if they do not get it, the Government may expect a solid opposition from Trent Valley. No matter what Government may be in power, there is no doubt that sooner or later they will be forced to construct that canal. It may be well to say that it is not necessary and that we are expending a vast amount of money in the St. Lawrence; but there is a country growing up behind us that a few years ago was not in existence. That country is represented by sixteen or eighteen members and will soon be represented by more than twenty members, who will probably have something to say in the matter. The people are determined they shall not be kept in the background for ever, and shall have facilities for transportation. Large manufactories are building along the route of that canal. According to the report of the commission, the canal can be built much cheaper than the engineers reported. The locks can be built much cheaper, and need not cost anything like what has been mentioned by the engineers. The gentlemen who composed that commission took a great deal of pains, went over every part of the proposed route, and made a very fair report, and a unanimous report; and I think their report should not be overlooked, especially as the Government have at different times distinctly told us that as soon as their report was in, if it was favourable, they would certainly push on the construction of that canal. With regard to the bridge at Fenelon Falls, we know that no vessel can go up there in consequence of it, and the Grand Trunk Railway refuse to build a bridge with a swing in it. I went with the engineer, Mr. Page, several times to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they proposed to deflect their line below the locks, if the Government would contribute a liberal share towards the expense. The Government agreed to contribute $12,000, but the company would not take less than $25,000 or $30,000, and nothing came of it. I did trust the Government would see the necessity of doing something, for I am sure something must be done if they wish to retain the confidence of that section of the country.

Mr. SPOHN. I am glad to see the hon. member for West Peterborough and others so outspoken with reference to this matter. They really seem to mean business, and if they would act up to what they say, they would soon have the canal. I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, have the Government any intention of making any survey of the western portion of the canal? I am aware a sort of survey was made some years ago, but it was generally considered that the estimate was greatly exaggerated. I understand that the route of the western section as well as that of the eastern has not been fully surveyed, and that the route that is most feasible has not been settled on as laid down on the map.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware that any further survey is required except it be to locate the canal in case of the whole work being put under contract for construction.

Mr. SPOHN. I understood there was no regular survey of the western portion, because it was not known where the canal would terminate. If a survey were made you could make some estimate of the cost.

Mr. BARRON. I am sure the Minister of Railways will be inclined to offer me some sort of an apology after hearing what the member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) said just now, because whatever might be said in regard to my political motives could not be said in regard to either of the two hon. members for the County of Peterborough, who could have no such motives against the Government and especially against the Minister of Railways. I thank these hon. gentlemen for supporting what I said. I was very glad to hear the

hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) speak as he did. I know the exceedingly enviable reputation he bears in Peterborough for everything just and upright, but last session I found that two or three times he wore a different face towards the Government from that which he wore to his constituents at home, so I was agreeably surprised to-night to hear him take the Government to task for their unnecessary delays in this way. I hope the hon. member will be just as active in the future in regard to this canal as he apparently has promised to be to-night. I did notice that the member for West Peterborough showed a great amount of knowledge in regard to this canal. I think that, judging from the comparative knowledge on this subject of the hon. member for West Peterborough and that of the Minister of Railways in regard to this work, they should substitute places.

Mr. WALLACE. Explain that, please, "substitute places."

Mr. BARRON. I do not know where the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was educated, but if he will send for the dictionary he will find the word "substitute" and the word "places" and he can find that out for himself. I am glad that the hon. members for East and West Peterborough have assisted me in regard to the bridge, and in all earnestness I say to the Minister, who thought I was in error in stating that $4,000 was not sufficient, that it is not sufficient for that purpose, and I say further that, when he put that amount in the Estimates, I am sure he had no idea of applying it for the removal of the obstruction caused by that bridge. If this discussion is going to finish, I would ask the Minister if he will be kind enough te tell me what is the salary of the lockmasters at Fenelon Falls, Bobcaygeon and Buckhorn?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot speak positively. I am informed that it is about $200 or $250 per annum: but that can be easily obtained by looking at the Auditor General's Report. I desire to say to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Spohn) that the surveys he refers to have been made by the engineer, and the figures I have given have been based upon the route which has been selected. If the hon. gentleman would like to know what they are, I have no objection to give the calculations. I suppose he would call the western section the portion from Lake Simcoe to Georgian Bay, or from Lake Couchiching to Matchedash Bay. From Lake Couchiching to Matchedash Bay, a distance of 13·21 miles, the estimate is $1,882,400. From Lake Simcoe to Couchiching is navigable. Still the eastern section below that will be from Balsam Bay to Lake Simcoe, 17·74 miles, which will cost $2,067,134. The works are completed from Peterborough to Balsam Lake, and that with the distance to Matchedash Bay will make a total to the Georgian Bay of 58·67 miles.

Mr. BARRON. I am advised that some of these lockmasters do not exactly attend to their duties but engage in other business, leaving their duties as lockmasters to be performed by any person else whom they may employ. I would like to know if that practice is allowed by the department.

Mr. BOWELL. The department is not aware of the correctness of the statement made by the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Barron). The practice is not allowed by the department, and if it exists, the lockmasters do this contrary to their instruction.

Mr. BARRON. I did not mean to say that the Minister or the department knew of it, but I am very glad to ascertain that it is not allowed by the departments.

Mr. McMULLEN. This discussion has been conducted for almost the whole evening between the acting Minister of Canals and my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron). I had an opportunity of visiting Fenelon Falls some time ago in the course of a business tour, and I went over the bridge to which reference has been made. I also saw the lock, and it appeared to me a piece of folly on the part of the Government to have entered upon the construction of a lock there without first finding out at what cost the bridge could be removed after the lock was built. It appeared to me there was a reason for the Government hurrying up that work. I understand that, when that lock was undertaken, the constituency was represented by a gentleman of a different political complexion to my hon. friend, and it was thought necessary, in order to secure the constituency for that hon. gentleman, that the expenditure should be proceeded with immediately. I say it is folly for the Government to have proceeded with the expenditure of $250,000, on which they are now paying 4 per cent. interest, or $10,000 a year, to erect a lock at a place where there is a bridge 4 feet above the water, which you cannot get through comfortably even with a row boat, and that has remained in that condition for some time. I do not know whether the acting Minister of Railways has seen it, but I think if he had he would have come to the conclusion that it is one of the greatest exhibitions of political folly to be found in this Dominion. There is a lock that cost $250,000, constructed for a political purpose, and there it stands as a monument of folly and nonsense in face of a bridge not 300 yards away, and within 4 feet of the water, and the people of this country are paying 4 per cent. on the money that has been invested in it. I do not know what the probabilities are with regard to the ultimate success of this proposed line of canals and locks. All I have to say is, that if the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson), who expressed himself plainly to-night with regard to this undertaking, intends to press it upon the Government with that evident determination that characterized his utterances, he had better hurry up and get them to carry out their promises, because if he does not do that, the probability is that the whole enterprise will soon come to a sudden collapse, and he may be deprived for the balance of his life of an opportunity of pressing upon the present Government the duty of completing this undertaking. My hon. friend should not permit the Supplementary Estimates to pass this House unless an item of this kind is put into them. I know the influence my hon. friend exercises; he generally gets credit for exercising a good deal of influence, and I think he is worthy of it, because he is a very devoted and unswerving supporter of this Government, one who is always in his place to vote, and is always willing to swallow any proposition of the Government; unlike the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Ber-

geron) he never kicks over the traces. However, I hope the hon. gentleman will not succeed in getting the Government to spend any more money on this canal, because I do not think it is in the interest of the country. I do not think the time has arrived when it is necessary that we should construct such a piece of folly as that undertaking would be. It was commenced for a political purpose; it has been kept on foot for a political purpose, and every now and then, when political exigencies arise, a lock is completed—not because there is any immediate hope of using it, but because it is considered necessary, from a political standpoint, that something should be done. Now, last year, when the late First Minister sent a telegram that has been read by my hon. friend, he was moving in a political direction. It was sent just before the general election, on the 3rd of March, and on the 5th of March the people were to vote, and he was anxious the electors of that section should know that the engineers had reported in favour of the scheme, and so far as he was concerned he promised that a sum should be placed in the Estimates to carry out their recommendation. Now, with all the expressed affection and admiration of hon. gentlemen opposite for the ability, and for the statesmanship, and for the gallantry of that hon. gentleman who, we regret, is no longer here, I think those who were associated with him at that time, have shown very little respect indeed for his memory in that they did not implement that telegram by putting a sum in the Estimates to carry out his pledge. They have not shown that respect that my hon. friend the acting Minister of Railways would lead the public to suppose that he and his friends entertain towards the memory of the late Premier. Now, I do say that I have travelled through this Dominion from one end of it to the other, and I have never witnessed such a sickening and miserable exhibition of political folly in my life as the construction of that lock at Fenelon Falls, standing there and viewed by the people of this Dominion as representing an expenditure that is virtually wasted. It is lying there unused, unless a row boat might go through, but you can send nothing else through it; there is not even room above it for an ordinary barge or steamer to turn round in and go back again.

Mr. STEVENSON. I suppose I am to understand from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that if I want this undertaking completed, I must lose no time in pressing it upon the Government, because if he and his friends come into power, they would be sure to upset the whole thing. I presume he wants us to understand that he speaks as a probable Minister of Agriculture, and represents the opinion of his party on this question. How does the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) like that? And how how do other hon. gentlemen opposite, who stand in the same position that I do, like that announcement from such a high authority as the hon. member for North Wellington? If he has expressed the opinion of his party on the subject, it is well for us to know their exact position on this matter. We know very well that when they were in power before, they did nothing towards it; they threw the whole thing into the hands of the Ontario Government, and the Ontario Government gave a charter to a company who built this very bridge which prevented navigation at this place. That is a point that should not be forgotten; they have no right to throw stones at us. We are acting in the best interest of that section of the country, and no body should blame us for trying to get that canal built. We have received very little consideration from the hands of any Government in that section of the country, although we pay heavy taxes, our imports are very large, and we pay a very large amount to support the Government, and I see no reason why we should get such a knock-down as the member for North Wellington has given us tonight. If that is his opinion with regard to this scheme, it is well that our people should know it, and that we should know where the Opposition stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. From the standpoint of my hon. friend I do not think it matters very much which party may be in power, if they are going to take as much time to complete this route as they have taken already in doing what has been done. If I am rightly informed, it took the Government four years to complete this lock. Now, I understand there are 71 locks yet to complete, and if it takes four years to complete each lock, it will be 284 years before they are all finished, and I am afraid that neither my hon. friend nor myself will live to see that work completed.

Mr. MULOCK. This is an ever annual recurring subject of discussion in this House, having received a considerable stimulus in 1884, when a large deputation of distinguished men from the territory in question—and I dare say the hon. member from Peterborough, who has just spoken (Mr. Stevenson), was one of the deputation, or if not, he feels he ought to have been—at all events, such a deputation came down here to interview the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) and other members of the Government. I remember hearing them declare that no Government could be allowed to stand, no Government could have the confidence of that part of the country, unless they at once, if not sooner, completed this great canal. On that occasion Sir Charles Tupper declared that there were no engineering or financial difficulties in the way, and he pledged himself and pledged the Administration to the immediate completion of that work. The Minister of Customs smiles; I have no doubt that his recollection will corroborate me in this statement.

Mr. BOWELL. It does, with the exception of the word "immediate."

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what particular time was mentioned, but I believe it was intimated that it would happen before another election, which must have been within five years. At all events, on that occasion the deputation, composed of persons very like my hon. friend—who is blowing, I suppose, hot and cold on this question—declared that no Government could have the support of that part of the country unless they actively proceeded with the construction of this work. Now, there has been a great deal of hedging for three or four years on this subject. I do not find any member from that section of the country, with the exception of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), who seems to be earnest in pushing this measure through. They seem to be only too glad to let the matter sleep and be forgotten if possible. When a small item appears in the Estimates

and a discussion arises, hon. gentlemen opposite pose before the public as being still actively concerned in the development of this great work. Where do they stand to-day in regard to it? What has become of the great public opinion that existed in the Trent Valley in 1883-84? What has become of the commissioner's report? The commission took two or three years in which to prepare a report. Now that the Government have the report of the commission declaring the work a feasible one, what is the policy of the Administration on the work as a whole? Does the Administration propose to abandon the work as a through line and simply use it for local purposes, or does it propose to carry out the work as originally contemplated as a through route by which the wealth of the North-West would come down and find an outlet in Lake Ontario? That was the scheme to which the Government pledged itself, the one for which the people of that section of the country declared themselves, and the scheme which secured many a seat in that section for the Government. If the contract is not to be carried out, the people should know it, in order that the people may be able to express themselves at the polls. At present it is right that the Government should announce to the public what their policy is in regard to the general scheme. I ask the acting Minister of Railways to announce the policy of the Government as to this scheme.

Mr. BOWELL. All they ask, at present, is the money for these works of absolute necessity in connection with the scheme. When the Supplementary Estimates come down, we will be in a position to announce exactly what the policy is for the future.

Mr. BARRON. Then, when the Supplementary Estimates come down the Government will announce their policy?

Mr. BOWELL. I said we should be in a position to do so.

Mr. BARRON. And you will do so?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Grenville Canal.....$7,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the department any report and estimate as to the cost of the proposed Ottawa Canal?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the Minister will explain what this item is.

Mr. BOWELL. It is for matters in connection with the final settlement of the contract in connection with the construction of the canal.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think this is that full information which the Committee should receive. We should have a statement as to what the amount is for, if it is done by contract, and if this is part of the contract work. If the amount is over and above the contract we should be informed that it is for extras.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed by the deputy that it is to make a final settlement with the contractor for works which have been completed and are to be completed, and whatever incidentals may arise in connection therewith. If the hon. gentleman wants the items, I shall be very glad to have them prepared and placed on the Table. It will be somewhat difficult to say the exact amount to be paid on each particular item under a contract that has been in existence for some time and is about completed.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to public works, if they are performed under contract and we are asked to vote money, we should know whether it is to discharge liabilities under contract or otherwise. We should know the work for which we are paying. The hon. gentleman does not know whether it is for repairs, construction, or completion. We should know if there was a contract, if it was let by public tender, the amount and other details. The time has arrived when this House should, on every occasion, before voting public money, have the fullest information. It should know what the contract was, the liability incurred, whether the amounts have been charged at contract prices and whether claims are made for extras. This session I have looked into many matters connected with public works, and I regret to say that in most cases there are great additions to the contract prices, showing either laxity in drawing the original specifications or changes in plans after the work was entered upon. Neither is desirable in the public interest, and therefore all these matters involving the payments of public contracts should be explained in the way I have mentioned. If the Minister cannot give us the information, the vote should stand over.

Mr. BOWELL. I have informed the hon. gentleman that this is to make a settlement of the contract in regard to the enlargement of the canal. It is impossible to give the information asked until a final estimate is made. I am informed there is some dispute with the contractor, he having been offered, so long ago as when Mr. Page was in charge, a certain sum in settlement which he refused, and this sum it is hoped will cover the amounts which the department think is due to the contractor when a settlement can be finally arrived at. I do not know that I can possibly give more information until a settlement is made. Then, it would be possible for the department to lay upon the Table the exact measurement why a certain sum was given, and how many feet or how many cubic yards it covered in the excavation. I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish to be unreasonable, but I only repeat that the hon. gentleman has admitted in so many words that he knows nothing about it. He says this sum of money is to be paid to the contractor in settlement of some claims, and I assume that because it is in the Estimates. Can he tell us whether it is in payment of a certain sum of money for a contract which was the result of a public tender?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. This work was done after the contract was awarded to the contractor as the lowest tenderer, and this is complete. The name of the contractor is Mr. Goodwin, of Ottawa.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this money on account of the original contract price, or is it because of extras?

Mr. BOWELL. The officer says that the contractor did put in a large amount for extras which was refused by Mr. Page, and hence a final settle-

ment has not been arrived at. The work was done, as I have informed the hon. gentleman, under contract, and as he knows himself they usually put in a large claim for extras, whether they get them or not.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this for something over and above the original contract price?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot give that information.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, you should.

Mr. BOWELL. I dare say I should, but I question very much whether information of this kind, which the hon. gentleman has pressed for with such persistency, has ever been asked. Where a final settlement has to be effected, the usual course is to put in such an estimate as the department thinks is necessary to cover all the legitimate claims against it, but I scarcely think my friend is reasonable in asking this information.

Mr. MULOCK. You are very persuasive, and it is such an improvement on general methods, that I will not press the question further for the present. I think we should be informed whether this money is in discharge of the contract price, or whether it is for extras; but it is quite clear we cannot get that information.

Tay Canal--Completion of..... $30,000

Mr. MULOCK. Better let that item stand.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman wishes the item to stand there is no desire to press it, but you have had an elaborate discussion on this question, and this sum is necessary for the completion of the work which has already been commenced.

Mr. MULOCK. I made a motion in the Public Accounts Committee on the 31st July for the papers connected with the letting of this contract; but these papers have not been brought down yet, and I think we ought to have them before us before the item is considered in Committee. It is quite impossible to intelligently discuss the question without having these papers.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) I trust the Minister will not press this item to-night, because it is important before we can understand it thoroughly and discuss it intelligently, that we should have all the papers. It is true that we had a lengthened discussion the other night on the subject of the Tay Canal, but that discussion will in no way affect the discussion on this particular item. Before I ask the hon. gentleman to let the item stand, I would remind him that he stated on the first of this month that the cost so far was $440,000. Was this item of $30,000 in addition to that $440,000?

Mr. BOWELL. The present appropriation consists of a revote of $14,950 and a new vote for the balance of the $30,000. The amount is required to complete the Tay Canal and give increased wharf accommodation in the town of Perth, the work being now in progress; and also to pay the contractor who formed the basin and wharves south of Gore Street. The amount of the final estimate which is not yet completed, and the work in progress consists in widening and deepening some 1,200 feet of the river which forms a part of the canal. I explained very fully before why the contract was awarded to the present contractor whose tender, was, if I recollect aright, about $200 more than the lowest. This was done on the recommendation of the deputy head, and all the reasons for it I gave to the House in an answer two or three days ago, and in doing so I exceeded the information sought for.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That did not answer my question. What I wanted to know was whether this sum asked to be voted is in addition to the $440,000 which the hon. gentleman stated had already been expended?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is an additional sum to meet the expenditures which have been incurred.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then, this is to complete the extension from the basin up to Haggart's mill?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; and the other improvements which I have read to the Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And the swing-bridge?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I think not.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; that is included. I may explain that the contract price of $22,800 included the bridge and the piers, and the contractor has made a deposit of $4,000 to complete the superstructure.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand from the Minister that this is intended to cover some other things, including a balance due on the basin. That surely cannot be so, because Parliament was assured in 1888 by Sir Charles Tupper that the sum then asked for would complete the basin, and we were given the same assurance in 1889.

Mr. HAGGART. You must understand that there is $16,000 unexpended of the amount asked for, which it was stated would finish it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is not the point I make. We were assured in 1888 that the amount then asked for would complete the basin, and the Minister now says that part of this sum is to finish the basin. Every step in this matter shows the necessity of our having the papers before this money is voted, in order that we may judge whether the statement made by the Minister now is in accordance with the statements made in 1888 and 1889.

Mr. BOWELL. We will let the item stand, if the hon. gentleman desires it, and any information that can possibly be given will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If you get the papers, that is all I require.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that some person should be prepared to say what public service was rendered by the extension of this canal. I have read the report by Captain Wise, and I am at a loss to understand what public service was rendered, and I think that is a matter that will have to be explained when the matter is discussed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would have been well if this whole matter of the Tay Canal had been referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and an enquiry had into the merits of the undertaking; because a very large amount of money has been expended, and so far as I can judge from the information given to the House, it was hardly a work called for by the public interest.

Overhauling the superstructure of the pier at Port Dalhousie and removal of shoal, also construction of piers for bridge at Thorold..... $22,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this construction of piers at Thorold for? Is this a new bridge?

Mr. BOWELL. That is necessary through the decay of the timber, and the superstructure requires renewal.

Towards the construction of the culvert at Stromness..... $7,500

Mr. BOWELL. At this place there is at present a culvert not of sufficient area to discharge the flood and drainage water, and to remedy this the culverts and its approaches were lately cleaned, but this failed to meet the difficulty and a larger culvert is necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. Has it been put under contract?

Mr. BOWELL. No; tenders have been called for.

Towards construction of a new swing bridge between Stromness and the Buffalo and Brantford Railway crossing..... $3,000

Mr. GIBSON. Is it the intention of the Government to advertise these works?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; some have been advertised for already.

Towards the purchase of lease No. 1420 from the St. Catharines Water Power Company..... $21,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean that we are to pay more than $21,000 and that this is an instalment of the sum total?

Mr. BOWELL. This covers the whole expenditure to buy out the rights of the parties interested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the rental under the lease?

Mr. BOWELL. My recollection is that it is a small sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If to cancel a lease, under which we are receiving only a trifling sum, we are called upon to pay $21,000, a copy of the lease should be laid upon the Table, and we should have a full explanation of the circumstances. This is purchasing our own property, and it appears to me we are setting a rather bad precedent. I thought these water leases were all made on terms which enabled the Government to cancel them without the necessity of dipping deeply into the public purse.

Mr. BOWELL. This is one of the old leases that were in existence when the old Welland Canal was taken over by the Government from the Welland Canal Company. A great deal of difficulty has arisen owing to these leases being, it is argued, in perpetuity; and in order to avoid these difficulties in the future it was decided by the late Mr. Pope to purchase and get full control of them. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the most rigid conditions should be placed in all these leases if they are granted at all, but I am somewhat inclined to think that the fewer leases are given by which the water is drained from the canal the better. The Order in Council upon which this agreement was entered into has been laid before the House together with this report. The late Minister of Railways, who recognized the importance of acquiring these leases, recommended this purchase, and the sum of $21,000 was agreed upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the proprietor of this property?

Mr. BOWELL. The price agreed upon was arrived at by one of the railway officials and one of the Dominion arbitrators. The company was represented by Mr. Merritt, with whom negotiations were commenced under the authority of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MULOCK. We ought to have all the papers down. I suppose the arbitrators took evidence under oath, as the law requires?

Mr. BOWELL. All the papers available will be brought down.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. MULOCK. No; this is to stand. It is very inconvenient that these items should be grouped. Under one resolution I find no less than 13 items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let it stand, on the understanding that the other items pass.

Mr. BOWELL. I agree with the hon. gentleman that these items should not be grouped, but this is the manner in which they have always been prepared, and I fancy that the reason is that the whole amount might be available for the different works in case one was exceeded and the other was not. If this item is allowed to pass and there is anything in the correspondence which will justify opposition to it, when it comes to the final vote the discussion can take place just as well as by allowing it to remain now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that these matters are not discussed on concurrence. We are not raising this question in a captious way, but the hon. gentleman must see that this is an item which requires the production of the papers and further information. It is a very peculiar item, and bears on the whole question of the leasing for manufacturing purposes of canal water, which is exceedingly dangerous in many cases. With the exceedingly small hydraulic rents that we receive the public get no compensation for the constant bother and annoyance that occur. I venture to say that the loss of this $21,000 last year would be equal to all the hydraulic rents we would receive in a year.

Item allowed to stand.

Chambly Canal—Raising banks, lowering bottom of canal, rebuilding lock walls, dredging, building dry rubble walls, &c..... $33,150

Mr. MULOCK. Explain this, please?

Mr. BOWELL. This is for dredging in the harbour of St. John, providing meeting places for boats, raising the banks, filling behind the walls at Isle Ste. Thérèse, including also the purchase of 140 tons of coal, salary, wear and tear, and so on, taking down and rebuilding the east chamber wall of lock No. 4, taking down and rebuilding locks 7 and 8, to complete the dry rubble wall, to protect and widen the canal, and to build a durable dry rubble wall at a point at the foot of the west embankment in the parish of St. Loup and the parish of St. John, to prevent landslides into the canal, and to protect the public roads.

Mr. MULOCK. It is rather an *olla podrida* to put coal and public works in one item.

Mr. BOWELL. This is the total expenditure chargeable to income, therefore includes coal.

Mr. MULOCK. There is too much grouping together of these items. Here you have work and material grouped together. Is the dredging referred to under contract, and what is the price?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not under contract. It may be done probably by the Government dredge. If not, it can be given out by contract at so much per cubic yard.

Mr. MULOCK. None of this has been undertaken yet, then?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Towards the settlement of Lamoureux Bros.' claim..... $1,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this claim.

Mr. BOWELL. This is to pay for land taken from the parties for the range lights at the lower entrance of the Chambly Canal, covering also a certain protection wall and beach lot. This property having been occupied by the department for the last 8 years, the present settlement has been arrived at by the Government valuator, who has appraised the land and damages at $1,000, with interest from 1883.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the amount of land that was taken in respect of which this claim for damages arises? Was it an expropriation, or was it damage occasioned by a public work?

Mr. BOWELL. There was about half an acre of land which was situated in the village of Chambly.

Mr. MULOCK. Did the Government expropriate half an acre?

Mr. BOWELL. The land was not expropriated; it was simply taken possession of and the range lights placed upon it. The party who owns it complains that these range lights have interfered with his site for buildings, and it was deemed advisable, in order to put an end to all future trouble, to purchase the land. They had it valued at $1,000 and paid interest on that sum for the time that it has been in the possession of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Was it valued by Dominion valuators?

Mr. BOWELL. The superintendent says he does not remember who the valuators were.

Mr. MULOCK. The valuation, I presume, has taken place recently?

Mr. BOWELL. He thinks it is Mr. Simard, who was one of the Dominion arbitrators—he and the two other gentlemen to whom I have referred.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you not Dominion arbitrators for the Province of Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; Mr. Simard is one.

Mr. MULOCK. Was this arbitration made under the Act? If so, why was it not conducted by the official arbitrators?

Mr. BOWELL. I think I said it was done by the official arbitrator, Mr. Simard.

Mr. MULOCK. That is only one—there are three.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not necessary, I think, under the Act, that the whole three should sit, or that even two should act. One of them is sufficient to go and appraise and report.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it was the award of one only?

Mr. BOWELL. The superintendent tells me that if his recollection serves him well it was done by Mr. Simard; he is not sure whether Mr. Cowan and the third arbitrator were with him or not.

Mr. MULOCK. Without asking to have the item stand, I think that the same information that was asked for in regard to the previous matter might be supplied to the Committee in this matter. With the understanding that the award and the evidence be laid upon the Table, I will not ask to have the item stand.

Mr. BOWELL. I will see that they are brought down.

Towards the settlement of the Yule estate claim and incidental expenses..... $1,200

Mr. BOWELL. This sum is required to purchase a strip of land required for the by-wash, leading from the Chambly Canal to the River Richelieu. The land is required for the formation of a ditch or by-wash, considered by the superintending engineer in 1887 to be absolutely required for the safety of the works of the canal. The amount was fixed by the Government valuator at $450, and an additional area was required for the erection of an electric light station on the canal. The land is valued at $378. The estate, I may add, has not accepted the settlement we proposed, and it will be necessary to take expropriation proceedings.

St. Ours Lock—Towards overhauling the foundation..... $4,500

Mr. BOWELL. This is required in consequence of a serious leakage of water by which this lock was undermined and threatened with destruction. It became necessary to take steps to have it repaired, and for the prevention of further mischief this sum has been expended to protect the works.

Mr. MULOCK. I see in last year's estimates there was an item of $20,000 for the same work?

Mr. BOWELL. The superintendent says that is quite correct, but they had to secure an additional sum in order to complete it.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it means that the overhauling of the lock is costing $25,000?

Mr. BOWELL. Between that and the stoppage of the leakage to which I have referred.

Mr. FOSTER. $5,000 is the revote. It is out of the original appropriation.

Mr. MULOCK. Was this done under contract?

Mr. BOWELL. No. It belongs to that class of works that cannot be well done under contract.

Mr. MULOCK. How was it done?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer says that when a break of that kind occurs it is almost impossible to tell what is necessary to be done. In fact, before you can give out the contract the damage

might be ten-fold. This work was done under the superintendence of the engineer then in charge.

St. Anne's Lock—Strengthening old pier below lock..... $35,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That appears to be a pretty large expenditure for a pier there. How is it occasioned?

Mr. BOWELL. This is for repairing and rebuilding the piers that were built in 1853, and for the outside facing of the work. It is in such a dilapidated condition that the renewing and strengthening is a matter of necessity. The new structure is crib-work, with a dry basin wall as superstructure. The work is now under contract. The names of the contractors are Bruder & McNaughton.

Mr. MULOCK. When was it put under contract?

Mr. BOWELL. About eight months ago. The work is going on.

Mr. MULOCK. Was the lowest tender accepted?

Mr. BOWLEL. Yes. As a rule, the lowest tender is always taken, and if it is not taken a special order is passed in which the reasons are given.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not assume that the lowest tender is always accepted. I think the officers of the department might look over *Hansard* when it is printed, and if they have made mistakes they should see that the matter is brought to the notice of the Committee at some future session.

Mr. BOWELL. I trust that from the discussion the officers will learn to furnish all this information in future.

Mr. MULOCK. To refer again to the item. Is it money required to complete the contract, or has it to do with extras or additions?

Mr. BOWELL. To complete the contract, and the superintendent says it is not to cover any extras or additions.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the contract price?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information. I will make a note of his question.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is taking a vote for a round sum. It never happens that a contract is taken for a round sum, and yet the hon. gentleman says there are no extras or additions.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I am informed.

Mr. MULOCK. The amount is $39,000. I fancy the officers will find there has been a slight mistake, and there is some provisions here for extras or additions. I have never seen a tender for a round sum.

Mr. BOWELL. That argument would be correct if the work were given out in a lump sum. It is impossible to only approximate the quantities when it is paid by the yard. The contract may be at so much a yard, and the quantity cannot be ascertained until the work is completed, and consequently we must take a round sum.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the details of the contract will be laid before the Committee, showing the rate at which the work was awarded. That information will be furnished?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I have asked the deputy to bring down the contract.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister explain this item—"puddling, $3,600."

Mr. BOWELL. It is to pay for excavation that is being carried on.

Mr. MULOCK. How is it being done?

Mr. BOWELL. By day's work.

Mr. MULOCK. Has this work been performed, or is it under way now?

Mr. BOWELL. It has not yet been commenced.

Carillon and Grenville Canal..... $30,000

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item for land damages and services of valuators?

Mr. BOWELL. $900 is to pay land damages and services of valuators on Carillon Canal. The deputy says this is an approximate amount required for this purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a curious item to appear at this time of day. The land required should have been acquired long ago and all claims settled. How do you come to require new land in that quarter now?

Mr. BOWELL. I quite realize the force of what the hon. gentlemen says, but, strange to say, that in the case of the canals around the St. Lawrence, which are built for half a century, there is scarcely a year that there are not more or less claims for land values. They are always cropping up for some reason or another.

Mr. GIBSON. With regard to the rebuilding of the masonry in the wing walls above the guard lock at Grenville, it seems to me that $14,000 is a large amount of money for that work. That would cover, in my mind, about 1,400 yards of first-class masonry, and it appears strange to me that this amount of money should require to be expended on the wing walls above the guard lock.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to be necessary in order to protect the falling down of the wall occasioned by the flow of water under this dam. I suppose the intention is to make this a little more permanent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would not apply to the wing walls of the guard lock.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps the engineer could give us some idea of the length of the wing walls at the guard lock. It seems to me an extraordinary sum to expend for that purpose.

Mr. BOWELL. They are two or three hundred feet long, and about twelve feet deep.

Mr. GIBSON. What class of masonry is built in the wing walls?

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer says it is rubble wall masonry, built in cement.

Mr. GIBSON. That makes the case much worse than it appeared at first. That second class masonry would cost only about $6 per yard, but suppose there were 2,000 yards of masonry embraced in this contract, at say $7 a yard, that would only amount to $14,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The superintendent tells me that these walls are on an average 5 feet wide.

Mr. GIBSON. What does the engineer calculate as the cost of this class of work?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Parent, the superintendent of the canal, did not make a calculation.

Mr. GIBSON. I think he was the gentleman referred to by the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) as his authority on the Beauharnois Canal, but now it appears he is a superintendent, and not an engineer, and cannot give an estimate. There will be about 2,500 yards of masonry in this work, and I fail to find where it will cost as much as is asked for. Taking the walls at 300 feet long, 12 feet high and 5 feet thick, that, according to my calculation, would amount to 666 cubic yards, and taking both sides of the canal it would give us 1,332 cubic yards. The estimate would give us a cost of more than $10 a yard, whereas I think that $6 a yard would be ample for that kind of work.

Mr. BOWELL. I will ask the deputy about it, and get the information upon which he made his calculation.

Mr. GIBSON. I would also like to get some information about this $15,000 for repairing and strengthening a portion of the Carillon dam.

Mr. BOWELL. I have been confounding these two items of $15,000 and $14,000. This item of $15,000 is the one to which my remarks referred, and not to the other item. That work has not yet commenced.

Mr. GIBSON. I think the engineer is making more than a liberal allowance for this class of work, if it is contemplated that the wing walls will be 300 feet long, 12 feet high and 5 feet thick, because I claim that even if the walls were 1,300 or 1,400 yards long from $6 to $7 a yard would be ample provision.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed this is an addition for pulling down the old wall and for a large quantity of excavation. By the next time we go into Committee I will endeavour to ascertain whether the engineer has over-estimated.

Mr. GIBSON. Taking down the old work would not add more than $1.50 a yard, because a large proportion of the stone work from the old wing walls would be available for the new work. The Minister may have made a mistake in the length; but if the length is only 300 feet I still maintain that there is double the money provided for this class of work than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BOWELL. I have given the length of the work as it has been given to me. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Trent River Canal—Towards the settlement of W. H. Hall's claim..... $900

Mr. GIBSON. What is this?

Mr. BOWELL. It is to settle the damages for closing the mill-dam through the construction of the dam at Lovesick. The award was made by the special valuator, Mr. Wood, employed for that purpose.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournement of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST.

Mr. SPEAKER. In accordance with the Order of Tuesday, the 18th instant, I did issue my warrant to the acting Serjeant-at-Arms to take in custody the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, and I have now a report from the acting Serjeant-at-Arms in reference to his efforts in that direction:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,
"OTTAWA, 20th August, 1891.

"SIR,—I have the honour to report that I reached Quebec yesterday at three o'clock p.m., and at once made diligent search for Mr. Thomas McGreevy at his residence, office and other places, but could not find him. Later, I was informed, by what I considered good authority, that he had left Quebec by the Grand Trunk Railway, but I was unable to ascertain his destination. I have no doubt that he left Quebec several hours before I arrived at that city.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"HENRY R. SMITH,
"*Acting Serjeant-at-Arms.*"

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In reference to the impeachment that I made in the House yesterday against the member for the electoral district of the east riding of Northumberland, I may say to the House that I have abandoned the last charge, and, therefore, there will only be the three charges to investigate. I beg to move:

1. That in the year A.D. 1888 there was a vacancy in the position of Government Lighthouse-keeper in the Government lighthouse on Presqu'Isle Point, County of Northumberland.

2. That one Hedley H. Simpson was an applicant for said office.

3. That Edward Cochrane then was and now is the member for the House of Commons for the electoral district of the east riding of the said County of Northumberland, and a supporter of the Government.

4. That in the year 1888 it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Edward Cochrane and the said Hedley H. Simpson that if the said Hedley H. Simpson would make and deliver to one James Stanley two promissory notes for $100 each, endorsed by some responsible person, he, the said Edward Cochrane, would procure the appointment of the said Hedley H. Simpson to the said office of Lighthouse-keeper for the Government lighthouse on Presqu'Isle Point.

5. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, did make the said two promissory notes for $100 each—procured their endorsement by a responsible party—handed them to the said James Stanley, who received the same and placed them in a bank for the use of the said Edward Cochrane personally or for political purposes.

6. That the said Hedley H. Simpson subsequently paid the said notes.

7. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, received the said appointment.

1. That in summer of 1889 Obadiah Simpson was promised by the said Edward Cochrane the Government office of keeper or attendant of one of the swing bridges over the Murray Canal.

2. That in the summer of 1889 the said James Stanley, who is a confidential friend and warm political supporter of the said Edward Cochrane, sent for one Arundel R. Simpson to call and see him. He did, when the said James Stanley proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson, with the knowledge and consent of the said Edward Cochrane, that if the said Arundel R. Simpson would pay $150 and give to his father, the said Obadiah Simpson, the life

lease of his farm (as compensation for his not being appointed such bridge-keeper)—he had been promised and had not received the said office, he, the said Arundel R. Simpson, would be appointed such bridge-keeper.

3. That shortly afterwards the said Arundel R. Simpson had an interview with the said Edward Cochrane on the same subject, when the said Edward Cochrane said to him that they could not take the $150 for said office, that Stanley should not have made that offer, that other arrangements had been made with one Wesley Goodrich, who agreed to pay $200 and give said life lease for said appointment.

4. That the said Edward Cochrane then and there corruptly proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson that if he would pay said Edward Cochrane $200 and give said life lease he would be appointed. This he refused to do.

5. That subsequently it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Wesley Goodrich and the said Edward Cochrane that if the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Wesley Goodrich to the Government office of keeper of said bridge he, the said Wesley Goodrich, would pay the sum of $200, and execute to the said Obadiah Simpson, father of the said Arundel R. Simpson, a life lease on his farm, with a condition in said lease that if said Wesley Goodrich lost said appointment said lease would be cancelled.

6. That in pursuance of the said corrupt bargain the said Wesley Goodrich paid said money and executed said lease, and caused his wife to execute the same, to the said Obadiah Simpson, on part of lot 18, in the 2nd concession of the Township of Cramahe, in the said county, for the rent of one peppercorn a year and on the condition that if the said Goodrich should be released by the Government from attendance on said bridge, said lease would come to an end and be void, but said condition was not to apply in case said Goodrich should be discharged on account of any act of his own.

That the foregoing statement be referred to a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Caron, Dickey, Tisdale, Skinner, Mulock, German and Cameron (Huron), to make full enquiry and report thereon.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the charges made by the hon. member for Huron against me in his place in the House yesterday, I have to say that I am innocent of the charges made against me, and that I never made any corrupt agreements in reference to these matters. As to the allegations made in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the second branch of the charges, I say, as before, that no such corrupt agreement as is stated in paragraph 5 was made between me and Goodrich, either directly or indirectly. I desire, however, in relation to this portion of the charges, to state that Goodrich paid $200 towards liquidation of a deposit which had been advanced by persons other than myself several years before, on the contestation of a local election in which I was not a candidate, nor interested, except as a member of the party, and none of the said money was received by me for my personal use, nor for my political benefit, other than as above stated. It had been understood that I would recommend for appointment to the bridge an old man named Obadiah Simpson. An arrangement was made between Simpson and Goodrich by which Simpson was to take a life lease of Goodrich's farm. This arrangement was in no way for my benefit, personal or political, and I derived no advantage therefrom.

Mr. DICKEY. I should like to ask the House to relieve me from the duty of serving on that Committee. I have been a member of the Privileges and Elections Committee, which has had very long sittings, and has now before it for review very nearly 1,800 pages of evidence, that have to be read and the arguments of counsel considered; and I do not think it fair to ask any member of that Committee, who proposes to give an intelligent consideration to that mass of testimony, to serve on another Committee that will involve long sittings and close attention, in order to do justice to the subject. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to substitute the name of some other person for mine. There are numbers of professional men on this side of the House who will take my place. I do not want to shirk any duty, but at the same time I think it only fair that I should be relieved from serving on this Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I may say to the hon. gentleman that the suggestion did not come from me, but from the other side of the House, although I was very much pleased when the hon. gentleman's name was mentioned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest the name of Mr. White, of Shelburne, instead of the name of Mr. Dickey. I must object to the resolution passing in its present form. The hon. gentleman has struck out paragraph No. 2 of the series of charges, which is a kind of sub section of the notice as printed, but I certainly think that the preceding paragraph should be struck out. It reads as follows:—

"1. That the said Edward Cochrane, while he was such member of Parliament and had the patronage of the Government in and for said county, corruptly entered into other corrupt contracts with other person or persons in the years 1888, 1889 and 1890, that if such person or persons would pay a certain sum or sums of money such person or persons would receive from the Government the position of keeper or keepers or attendants of other bridges on said canal, and that in pursuance of such corrupt bargain and bargains such payments were made and such appointments were received."

I think that is altogether too vague and that it should be struck out. If the hon. gentleman afterwards is prepared to make specific charges in regard to that transaction they can be referred to the Special Committee, but until they are so made I think the charges should not be referred by the House. I may say that the course usually insisted upon when charges are preferred against a member of the House has been that they should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; but I think that it would be well to concur, on this occasion, in a departure from that course, because the Committee on Privileges and Elections is now altogether overcharged with work. They have a reference before them involving the consideration of 1,500 pages of printed evidence, and the House made a reference yesterday on other branches of the same case which will involve an enquiry, another examination of witnesses, and a report to the House. I wish it to be understood that in this reference to this Special Committee it is only in view of the circumstances that we consent to depart from the usual practice on this occasion. I hope that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) will concur in the suggestion that the charge "paragraph 1" is altogether too vague to be referred.

Mr. LAURIER. I altogether agree with the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice, and I offered the same suggestion myself to the hon. gentleman. The charge is so very vague in its nature that it ought not to be a matter of investigation. I agree with the views of the Minister of Justice in this, and I believe that my hon. friend will not persist in these charges unless they are specified, and unless he is now in a position to specify them more fully than he has done. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to substantiate the charges so that the member impeached can answer them, they could go to the Committee, but they should not remain in the form in which they now

are. With regard to the statement of the Minister of Justice that we are departing from the usual practice in not referring this to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I would remark to the Minister of Justice that this practice was introduced some years ago against the protests from this side of the House. At all events the event may show which is the best way, whether in having a large committee like this Committee on Privileges and Elections, or a Select Committee to investigate certain charges.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to say that I am quite sensible of the force of the objection raised by the Minister of Justice, but the difficulty can be got over without the necessity of striking out the paragraph. At the first meeting of the Select Committee I shall be prepared to hand to the chairman a specific statement, just as specific as the first and second statements of the charges are. I shall hand him a specific statement of the other charges, with the names of the parties implicated, and that will give the member against whom the charges are preferred all the information that is required, just as effectually and just as fully as if I had then been in a position to make the charges when this statement was drawn up. I repeat that I shall, at the first meeting of the Committee, or perhaps before that, hand in to the hon. member implicated, if he desires, a specific statement of the specific charges, with the names of the parties concerned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must still press the objection. The hon. gentleman will see that when the House makes a reference this afternoon it makes an instruction to the Committee to report on that charge as it stands there, and if the charge is to be followed in the way he proposes, by a specific complaint, the House has a right to know that before it gives any instruction to the Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have no objection to that course, if it is understood I have a right to prefer the other charges and refer them to the same Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There can be no doubt about that.

Motion that the name of Mr. White (Shelburne) be substituted for that of Mr. Dickey on the Special Committee, agreed to.

Motion that "paragraph 1" of the third series of charges be struck out, agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the Select Committee to report on charges against Edward Cochrane, a member of this House, be authorized to employ a shorthand writer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the motion is put, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he desires the evidence in the Committee to be taken on oath. If so, it must be done by an Order from the House, because Committees have several times refused to take evidence on oath unless the House had given an order to that effect, and the hon. gentleman will find that that course will be pursued by this Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that the law is clear, that any Standing Committee of the House may take evidence on oath. Of course, the Committee would not be compelled to do it, but in a case of this kind I apprehend that there is not a member of the Committee who would object to it. If there is any doubt about it I would move that it be an instruction to the Committee to take the evidence on oath.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the matter is optional with the Committee it ought not to be optional. The House ought to instruct the Committee, and on so serious a charge against a member of the House the evidence ought to be taken on oath. This is the provision of the law on the subject:

"Whenever any witness or witnesses is or are to be examined by any Committee of the Senate or House of Commons, and the Senate or House of Commons shall have resolved that it is desirable that such witness or witnesses shall be examined on oath, such witness or witnesses shall be examined upon oath or affirmation, where affirmation is allowed by law."

I am reading from Mr. Bourinot's book, and I am reading the section of the statute of 1876. It is the House that determines, and even if it were the Committee, it is not a matter that the House should leave to the discretion of the Committee.

Motion, as amended, with the addition of the words, "and that the said Committee be instructed to examine witnesses upon oath," agreed to.

THE CENSUS RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. I see that the hon. Postmaster General has just come in. He told us the day before yesterday that he could in a couple of days give us a pretty close estimate of the census, and I would like to ask him further in reference to that.

Mr. HAGGART. I told the hon. gentleman that there were several returns not yet in, that we could give such an estimate as we gave before, and that it would be only approximate in some cases and actual in others. But I understood that the feeling of the House was that it would perhaps be better not to bring down a report until we could bring the actual figures, which will be ready shortly.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if I asked for such an estimate and were satisfied with it he would bring it down; and I said I did ask for that and was satisfied with it, and I understood that it would be brought down. The House has not expressed any opinion against bringing down this estimate, because the House has not been asked to express an opinion, except the casual expressions of approval and disapproval when the matter was discussed. Whatever may have been said casually in the way of approval and disapproval, I think the House and the country have a right to have had the whole of these figures before now. That not having been provided for, I think we have a right to such information as the hon. Minister already possesses. He admits that it will be a very close estimate, that in fact only a very few unenumerated districts remain to be reported from; and on the whole, he led us to understand that the difference between the approximate report which he could now bring down, and the full report that would come out ultimately, would be so trifling as to have no effect whatever on the deductions that would be drawn from the figures. I must ask him then to carry out the offer he made the other day of bringing down what he has at present, and letting us have the rest afterwards.

Mr. HAGGART. I will make enquiries this evening, and give the hon. gentleman a definite answer to-morrow. I judged from the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who I thought voiced the feeling of a good many on that side of the House, that it was better that no returns should be made until all the returns are completed.

DESTRUCTION OF PAPERS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Government whether a statement that I have seen is correct, that an Order in Council has been passed authorizing the destruction, in the various departments, of certain files; I do not know whether it has reference to their age or not. I would like to know whether there is such an Order, and to what class of documents it refers.

Mr. FOSTER. There is, I think, an Order in Council which was adopted after a thorough investigation of the English system, and that Order prescribes for the different departments, I think, what papers may be destroyed, and after what time. I will look into the Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no destruction of files, but such papers as money orders, cheques, stubs and things of that kind. The only Order is one amending a previous one, and classifying the papers that may be destroyed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be very desirable if those Orders were laid on the Table, both the original one and the amending one, so that we would know exactly what the papers are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a matter of two or three years ago. There has been nothing passed since.

OYSTER BEDS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked a question the other day with respect to the intention of the Government in regard to leasing all or any of the oyster beds of Prince Edward Island, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told me that it was not proposed to lease beds now fished by the public; and he was kind enough to send me a list of the applications for leases and the locations for which licenses are to be granted. One of these applications is for Summerside harbour, another for York River, and another for the sea and all the rivers. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that unless very careful surveys are made respecting the localities he will be very apt, if he grants these applications, not only to give up the newer beds, but the old beds as well. This is a matter which has created a great deal of agitation between those who are seeking for these licenses and a large class of men who make a living by oyster fishing. No doubt the object of these gentlemen is a laudable one. No doubt, some of them desire to lease oyster beds for the *bonâ fide* purpose of cultivating good oysters, and that is an object it would be well for the department to promote; but at the same time public interest requires that these large public beds which are fished by the people at large, should not be sacrificed to any desire on the part of gentlemen to promote what they call oyster culture. Their object, though a good one, must not be allowed to interfere with the rights of the public, and I invite the hon. gentleman to tell the public that he will take care, before any leases are given, that accurate surveys will be made and the existing rights protected.

Mr. TUPPER. I agree with what the hon. gentleman has said. The department is proceeding on the principle of not granting licenses in the case of fisheries where the beds are worked by the fishermen as a whole, and that accounts for the great delay with reference to these applications, which are applicable to a very large extent of territory. Care is taken to ascertain exactly the condition of the district and the proposed beds, so that we may avoid taking away from the fishermen their source of livelihood. I may add that our policy with regard to the public fisheries is that in cases where we have practically the unanimous support of the fishermen we take charge of the fishery and re-stock the beds, still keeping them as public fisheries and making regulations afterwards. That is only done, however, at the desire of the fishermen of the locality.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the return which I moved for three months ago with reference to the expenditure of public money throughout the Dominion since Confederation, under several heads, been prepared? I was assured by the ex-Minister of Public Works, nearly a month ago, that it was in course of preparation and would soon be brought down. I am anxious to see it, with reference to the Estimates now before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will make enquiry; but unless some work had been done in preparing it before it was moved for, it will not be possible to bring it down this Session.

SUPPLY—THE BANCROFT TENDER.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to call the attention of the House to a matter of great importance——

Mr. FOSTER. We have received no notice that this motion would be put to-day, and I thought there was an arrangement by which it was understood such notices should be given. To have given a notice would conduce to a proper discussion of the subject, more especially under present circumstances, when the Minister of Public Works is not in his place.

Mr. AMYOT. I was going the other day into the question when I was stopped on account of the Rules of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no rule of the House to prevent your going on.

Mr. AMYOT. Or rather because the printed evidence was not before the House. The evidence has, however, been before the House for some days. Of course, if I am going against any understanding between both sides I will yield at once.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister is quite right. We have been endeavouring to carry out the courtesies due from one side to the other, and have taken care to give notice of every amendment so far. I was under the impression that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had given notice of this. However, no one can be

taken by surprise, as the subject of the motion has been before the House for some time.

Mr. AMYOT. There was only one paper which was not before the House the other day when I was stopped from proceeding, and that was the verbal evidence on Bancroft; and I have only two lines of it to quote. The Government themselves knew all the facts long ago. This matter is of great importance, not only because of the amount involved, but also with regard to the method of procedure in a department depending upon this honourable House. It was in 1888 that the Government decided to undertake the construction of a dock at Kingston. The location of the dock was not then decided upon, and it was declared that the marine interests there were not able to provide for the construction of such a work. The probable cost was fixed by the late Minister of Public Works at from $250,000 to $450,000, and $75,000 was then asked from this Parliament. The following year, 1889, it was said that the probable cost would be $350,000, and Parliament was asked to vote the sum of $124,000. The exact measurements of the dock were then given. It was said that the length would be 280 feet, the width at the bottom 70 feet and at the top 72 feet, and the width at the entrance 48 feet; and it was said that it would be sufficient for the largest vessels that ply on the lakes. In the next year, 1890, Parliament was asked to vote $160,000, and it was then declared that the probable cost would be $318,000, and this was to complete the work; but now, in 1891, by the last returns at our disposal, we find that the probable cost reaches the amount of $450,744.62, making a difference between the two last estimates of $142,744.62. In the first place, it does not seem right to me that we should undertake such a large construction without sufficient data, without knowing exactly what it will cost, or, at all events, without having sufficient data to show how far the finances of the country will be engaged in that work. But there was wide suspicion in many places with reference to that contract. The contractors on public works are men well known everywhere. The ordinary tenderers for these large works are well known by all the community who take any share in the building of public works. The name of Bancroft, however, was not known anywhere, and everyone was asking himself, who is that Bancroft? The contract had been going on since the month of March, 1889, or over two years; cheques were constantly signed by Bancroft, the plans were signed by Bancroft, but Bancroft was to be found nowhere. The matter was brought before this House in the form of a notice of motion asking for the papers. The papers asked for came in after a considerable delay, but they were incomplete. What part of the papers came here appeared to be right enough. Bancroft's name and Bancroft's signature were there with his seal, and all the papers were prepared with all the ordinary formalities of law, but we had no idea who was the famous man. We could find no clue whatever to his whereabouts, except that, in his tender, his post office address was given, and it was 524 of the post office at Kingston. Then we enquired who is the proprietor of the Kingston post office box 524, or rather who was the proprietor at the date when the tender was prepared and sent into the department. We could not obtain any answer. The Government was earnestly requested to grant the information. We told the Government: You have any number of officials at Kingston; you receive money there for the post office boxes; you must have a register of those who pay money for those boxes; when your inspector goes there he must have the names submitted to him, or how could he check the exactitude of the accounts if the vouchers were not there, and if, by an extraordinary occurrence, there is no record kept of that, surely amongst the numerous officials of the post office you will find one with a sufficient memory to remember who went daily to the post office for letters and papers addressed to Mr. Bancroft two years ago. But that was of no avail; the contract was going on with Mr. Bancroft, and the cheques were being issued monthly and weekly to pay Mr. Bancroft, and the Parliament of Canada was laughed at. But we were decided not to give up, and we began an enquiry in the Public Accounts Committee. We could not go straight to Mr. Connolly, of whose existence, unfortunately, we were sure. We went round the citadel or round the fortress and we brought in those persons who had had any connection with the signature of the contract. We brought in Mr. Saucier. A gentleman had been introduced to him by Mr. Gobeil, both Mr. Gobeil and Mr. Saucier being employés of the Department of Public Works, as Mr. Bancroft. So he had seen Mr. Bancroft signing the contract and also signing the numerous plans which are now on the Table of the House. We brought Mr. Gobeil. He knew not Mr. Bancroft, but a gentleman of that name had been introduced to him by Mr. Connolly. Then we got in the officer of the Finance Department. He knew nothing about Bancroft, but he had received a cheque signed Bancroft, and then we guessed that the Union Bank of Ottawa must know something about Bancroft, that that bank must have accepted Bancroft's cheque, because that cheque must have been accepted on the 28th March, the very day on which the tenders were filed, and there was no possibility for a cheque accepted in Quebec on that date to reach Ottawa on the same day. We got the manager, Mr. Anderson. He had seen the cheque and had accepted the cheque under the following circumstances: The Quebec Union Bank had placed $20,000 at the disposal of Mr. Nicholas Connolly, to be payable at his order in the Ottawa Union Bank. Mr. Bancroft never filed an appearance there. Mr. Nicholas Connolly went there with a cheque signed by Bancroft and asked that $20,000 should be placed to the credit of Bancroft. He immediately tendered Bancroft's cheque, got it accepted, and that is the cheque which reached the department. Then we had no Bancroft again. We had only the cheque with a new signature. We were of opinion that it was a forgery; it looked very much like it, but we had no evidence of it. Then we decided to attack the citadel itself, and we called in the Messrs. Connolly. Mr. Michael Connolly came in, and, if you refer to the evidence given before the Committee, on page 8, question 142, you will find that Bancroft does not exist; Bancroft has never existed; he is a supposed party; he is a fraud; he is one of the means employed to deceive, not only the Government, but the whole people of the Dominion of Canada. We then to-day have the evidence, in spite of the Post Officce Department, in spite of the ramparts built around Bancroft and around his

fraud and forgery, we have irresistible evidence that Bancroft does not exist, and that the Government of Canada are going on with a contract with a fictitious party. All those plans you see there, all the contracts that are here, all the tenders that were sent in bearing the name of Bancroft and all his letters are false documents constituting a forgery and being the means of obtaining money and valuable consideration under false pretexts. You will remark, Mr. Speaker, that, so soon as the attention of the Government was called to that contract, so soon as the Government found out that we were looking into the matter in order to find who that Bancroft was, their inevitable duty was to cancel the contract at once and put a stop immediately to that gross fraud. Unfortunately they did not do so, and to-day it is my duty to call those facts to the attention of this House and to lay down before the country, the facts of the case as I understand them. Now, what are the fact of the case? In 1889 tenders were called for in the public papers, in the usual way, which were to be received by the department on the 28th March, 1889. They were received, 20 in number, sealed in an envelope, on the 28th and opened on the 29th. And by whom were they opened? The usual custom was to have the tenders opened by Mr. Perley, the Chief Engineer, with either Mr. Baillairgé or Mr. Gobeil, but this custom was not followed. They were opened by Mr. Baillairgé and Mr. Gobeil, Mr. Perley not being there. I do not quote this circumstance to draw any consequence from it, but I say it was one of the many circumstances that are of a nature to indicate that there was something extraordinary in connection with this contract. The notices for tenders contained the following words:

"Intending contractors are requested to bear in mind that tenders will not be considered unless made on the printed form supplied, and accompanied by letters stating that the person or persons tendering have carefully examined the locality, have satisfied themselves as to the nature of the materials to be excavated, and the foundation for the coffer-dam and its probable cost. The tender must be signed with the actual signature of the tenderer."

It was, then, most distinctly stated to all the contractors that they must fyle with their tenders a letter to the effect mentioned in this notice, and they must sign with their own signature, otherwise their tenders would not be considered. In spite of that notice Bancroft's tender was not accompanied by the letter requested. It is not to be found in the records, though all the other tenders except Connolly's and another one, out of the 20, are accompanied with the necessary letter. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there must be an object in requiring the signature of the actual tenderer, and what is the object? Most decidedly it must be in order that the Government may know exactly with whom they are dealing; they do not want to deal with a man declared by the courts or by Parliament to be unworthy of holding a contract from the public; they do not want to deal with men of tarnished reputation, or with insolvent persons, or with persons who are known in the past to have executed fraudulent contracts. In the present case, after having exacted those conditions from the public at large, when the question comes up of accepting the tender of Bancroft, the Government do away with the condition, and thus do injustice to those who have complied with the condition. This circumstance is very important, and shows that something wrong was going on in the department. Bancroft's tender and Connolly's tender were both accompanied by a cheque of $20,000, and those two cheques were in the handwriting of the same party. That is another circumstance which should have opened the eyes of the department. Connolly, the writer of the two cheques, was well known, as will be seen in a moment, by the department. Now, there is another circumstance which should have awakened the suspicion of the department. Connolly's tender—and I speak of it because it is now before the House,—is written in a disguised handwriting, it is written in a kind of moulded handwriting, but the figures are not; and if you compare the figures in Bancroft's tender and Connolly's tender, you will see that they were written by the same hand. Now, all of these tenderers, with the exception of Bancroft, were perfectly well known to any one who is at all conversant with the construction of large buildings in this country. Bancroft alone was not known. Should not that fact have opened the eyes of the department and of its head? I am sure that if Connolly had come immediately after Bancroft's tender, we would have seen in that case what we have have seen so frequently elsewhere, that is, the lowest tenderer disappearing and Connolly remaining the lowest tenderer. That was evidently the object in putting Brancroft's tender at a low figure. But when the tenders were opened it was found that between Bancroft's and the Connolly's, there were five other tenderers. It was impossible to undertake the task of buying them all off; there were too many interested, there were too many influences supporting the different tenderers. So Bancroft had to be held to, or the Connollys would have been deprived of the contract for the Kingston Graving Dock. And who were those parties? Bancroft's tender was $260,680. Messrs. Randolph Macdonald & J. A. Aylmer came next at $265,810, a difference of less than $5,000 between the two. Next came Messrs. Henry Macfarlane & O. E. Murphy, for $285,300.75; next came James Richardson, John Gaskin, Thomas Henry, George G. Wilson & James Swift, at $297,955.01; next came George Goodwin, at $301,033.55; next Mr. F. B. McNamee, at $317,967; after that came Nicholas & Michael Connolly for the sum of $322,576. That was ascertained on the 29th of March. From that date to the 4th of April we hear nothing of the tenders; we do not see that the department took any action whatever, everything remained silent in the pigeonholes of the department. Then, two letters reached the department on the 4th of April, and those two letters are well worthy of consideration. Everything in them is remarkable. I will first give communication of those letters to this honourable House. One is dated from the "Russell House." I may say here that I tried to find out from the "Russell House" who Bancroft was, but the man was perfectly unknown there. He had never been there under any circumstances. He had not been there either at the date mentioned or at any other date. That letter reads as follows, and is in the handwriting of Michael Connolly, so well known to the department:

"OTTAWA, 4th April, 1889.

"A. GOBEIL, Esq.,
"Secretary, Department Public Works,
"Ottawa, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg to inform you that since tendering for the construction of the Graving Dock at Kingston, Ont., I have entered into an agreement with Messrs. N. K. & M. Connolly, of Quebec"——

And this is written by one of them--

—" to join with me, should my tender be accepted in the construction of the same.

" As the Messrs. Connolly are well known to the department, and have all the necessary plant and implements—

Yes ; they had many plants and many plans to rob—

—" for an immediate commencement of the work, I trust my tender will receive the favourable consideration of the department.

" I have the honour to be,
" Your obedient servant,
" ANDREW C. BANCROFT."

Next to that is M. K. and N. Connolly's letter. Many letters from them may be found in the department, but this one is on a small sheet of paper, type-written—an unusual way for the Connollys to communicate with the department. Who had told Bancroft and the Connollys that both of them had to write to the Secretary instead of the Minister or the Chief Engineer, I do not know. At all events, the Connollys wrote as follows :--

" OTTAWA, 4th April, 1889.

" A. GOBEIL,
" Secretary, Department Public Works,
" Ottawa, Ont.

" DEAR SIR,—We desire to inform the Department of Public Works that, in the event of Mr. A. C. Bancroft's tender being accepted for the building of the Kingston Dry Dock, we have agreed to enter into contract with him, and will use our best endeavours to complete the work in as short time as possible.

" Very respectfully yours,
" N. K. & M. CONNOLLY."

The officers of the department and the Minister must have asked themselves, how is it that so soon as the tenders were sent in, six days after each of the tenderers had made a deposit of $20,000, they are ready to form a partnership. What are the reasons? Why did they not decide to go into partnership before tendering? What had occurred since, that should induce them to form a partnership? Who told them that Bancroft's tender was the lowest? How did they get their information—through whom? For they must have known it. Yet nothing has transpired from the department, not one letter had been sent, no communication had been made, at least avowedly, by any one to the tenderers, though they combined together to become partners, without any plausible reason whatever being made or given. That partnership was of itself very suspicious, and should have aroused the suspicions of the department. Upon those two letters being received by the department, what do we find occurring the next day? Mr. Perley wrote to Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works, in the following terms :—

" CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
" OTTAWA, 5th August, 1889.

" SIR,—Of the tenders that have been received for the construction of a dry dock at Kingston, Ont., the lowest is submitted by Mr. A .C. Bancroft.

" Mr. Bancroft has stated that in the event of his tender being accepted, he has associated himself with Messrs. N. K. and M. Connolly, of Quebec, and the Messrs. Connolly have stated their willingness and desire to be associated with Mr. Bancroft in the construction of this work.

" The amount of Mr. Bancroft's tender is much below an estimate prepared by myself—— "

You will remark, Mr. Speaker, and we will have occasion perhaps to notice, that contracts have been refused because tenders were lower than the estimates prepared by the chief of the department. In this instance, and it is a very remarkable one, the chief engineer says: " Bancroft's tender is much below an estimate prepared by myself." What is the amount of that estimate we do not know.

There is an officer to whom we pay $4,000 a year and who receives *pourboires* besides, and he has to write without rendering an account to anyone, to decide in his office privately what would be the cost of the work, and he is accountable to no one. We are asked to-day to believe his word, without even knowing what was the amount he arrived at, and by how many hundreds and thousands of dollars Bancroft's tender was lower than his estimate we do not know. He goes on to say :

—" and in my opinion would have but little margin for a person inexperienced in the construction of a dry dock——"

Who told him Bancroft was inexperienced? Who told Mr. Perley that Bancroft had had no experience in building that kind of dock? This is asserted as a matter of fact by him under his oath of office in a communication to the Minister, and by the Minister transmitted with his recommendation to the Executive Council. Under the sanction of his signature it is asserted that Bancroft had had no experience in building docks. Such an act of boldness in the administration of public affairs has not yet been seen in this country, and I hope will not be seen much longer—

—" but as Mr. Bancroft has associated with him the Messrs. Connolly, who have built the dry docks at Quebec——"

Oh yes, they have—

—" and Esquimalt——"

Yes, they have there, too—

—" and are the possessors of the whole of the special plant required for such work, I believe that the work in question can be executed for the amount of Mr. Bancroft's tender.

" I have the honour to be, Sir,
" Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) " HENRY F. PERLEY.
" *Chief Engineer.*

" The Honourable
" Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
" Minister of Public Works."

Will you tell me, Mr. Speaker, how it is that with Messrs. Connolly a tender much below the official estimate of the cost may be accepted and a contract executed, and yet with Bancroft alone the same could not be executed? The Government asks for a tender to-day in a part of the country where I have never gone. I have some funds at my disposal at the bank either personally or by the help of friends. I employ an engineer. He takes the plans submitted by the department and makes estimates and gives me the probable cost. When I receive the contract I need not go there at all. I may have my employés there and the assistance of engineers to do the work, and there are the officers of the department to see that the plans and schedules of the department are properly carried out. What has the personal experience of the tenderer to do with the matter? At all events, we see, under the signature of Mr. Perley, that Bancroft was a person inexperienced and that the Connollys were experienced. The truth is that Bancroft did not exist, and that the Connollys had too much experience for them to be entrusted with any work for this country. This was on the 5th of April. On the 12th of April the Minister reports to the Executive Council, and on the 15th of April the Executive Council approves of Bancroft and the Connollys receiving the contract, and the work went on. They have been going on for many months, and perhaps we would never have known anything about it if this enquiry had not been opened, because nobody could dream

of such audacity and perversity as these men coming to this country under false names to obtain such contracts. But let us see how the low price was made up for at which the contract had been awarded. On the 2nd July, 1890, Mr. Louis Coste for the chief engineer—Mr. Perley is not there—he has reported it is true that Bancroft had no experience, but to report further it requires some other engineer. Mr. Louis Coste for the chief engineer, as I have said, writes to the department in the following terms:—

"SIR,—The attention of the department having been called to the fact that the entrance to the Kingston Dock, as proposed, is not of sufficient width to accommodate all the steamers and propellers plying on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence, and which will hereafter use this dock for repairs, some of which have a breadth of beam of nearly 55 feet—such as the *Cibola*, of the Niagara River Line—I have to advise that the width of the entrance be increased from 48 to 60 feet. This alteration will not entail any modification of the present contract, as far as prices are concerned, the only change being in the mode of construction of the masonry, which will have to be built to suit a caisson 12 feet longer than originally intended.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"(Sd.) LOUIS COSTE,
"*For Chief Engineer.*"

I ask myself, Mr. Speaker, by whom the attention of the department was called to the fact that the entrance of the Kingston Dock was not of sufficient width? That is an important matter for us to consider. We should know where that officer, Mr. Coste, has taken his false information, as we shall see in a moment. We should know wherein he has received his information to boldly contradict, in an official report, the affirmation of the hon. Minister of Public Works previously made in this House. By whom was he informed of that? Did any marine interest ask for that widening; did any mariners ask for it; did the press ask for it: did any interest whatever say that the entrance to the dock was too small? No, Sir, they did not; but here we see in a report by Mr. Coste, in the absence, for some cause which we do not know, of Mr. Perley, he writes that the attention of the department has been drawn to the fact that the entrance to the Kingston dock is not of sufficient width. Now, we have the declaration of Sir Hector Langevin on the 22nd March, 1889, that an entrance of 48 feet would be sufficient for the largest vessels that ply on the lakes. This was officially stated on the floor of this House. What ship had been enlarged since that statement was made; has there been any new ship on the lakes, or has the *Cibola* been swelled since then? At all events after this letter, which was, as I said, written on the 2nd of July, we see that on the 5th of July a report dated on the 2nd of July, is sent to Council, which approves of the same and the report of Mr. Coste is contained in the report of the Executive Council. The report of Council is as follows:—

"On a memorandum dated the 2nd July, 1890, from the Minister of Public Works admitting that the plans and specifications prepared for the construction of the Dry Dock, at Kingston, Ont., which is now under contract, provide for an entrance to the dock 48 feet wide. The Minister states that attention having been called to the fact that the entrance to the Kingston dock, as proposed, is not of sufficient width to accommodate all the steamers and propellers plying on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence and which will hereafter use this dock for repairs, some of which have a breadth of beam of nearly 55 feet, such as the *Cibola* of the Niagara River Line, the chief engineer advises that the width of the entrance be increased from 48 to 60 feet."

It was not the chief engineer that had made the report. It was Louis Coste for the chief engineer, but I suppose that those small affairs do not matter much. It had more weight, of course, when they saw it was the chief engineer himself that had reported. The report goes on to say:

"The Minister further states that this alteration will not entail the modification of the present contract as far as prices are concerned, the only change being in the mode of construction of the masonry, which will have to be built to suit a caisson 12 feet longer than had been originally intended. The Minister recommends that authority be given to increase the width of the entrance of the dock at Kingston from 48 to 60 feet. The Committee advise that the requisite authority be granted.

(Sgd.) "JOHN J. McGEE,
"*Clerk of Privy Council.*

"To the Hon. Minister of Public Works."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we must understand the position as it was then. It was authorized on the 5th July, 1890, to enlarge the entrance of the dock from 48 to 60 feet, which, of course, diminished the size of the walls of the entrance by 12 feet. That change was authorized on the specific conditions that it would entail no further cost, and that the country would not have to pay one cent for that change. I suppose that up to that point I will be told that there could have been no objection if the work was as good as had been done. But let us see what occurred after that. The same Mr. Coste, still "for the chief engineer," on the 22nd July, 1890, writes again to the department as follows:—

"SIR,—On the 5th instant, an Order in Council was passed granting authority to increase the width of the entrance to the graving dock at Kingston from 48 feet to 60 feet, in order to accommodate all steamers and propellers plying on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence, and which will ultimately use this dock for repairs.

"This Order in Council was passed on the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, after a report made by myself, acting for the chief engineer.

"In this report made after a rapid examination of the plans, I stated that the alteration in the width of the entrance would not entail any modification of the present contract as far as prices were concerned, the only change being in the mode of construction of the masonry which would have to be built to suit a caisson twelve feet longer than originally intended.

"I now beg to state that after a more thorough examination of the locality and plans, and with more information furnished by Mr. W. O. Strong, the engineer in charge at Kingston, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is not necessary to widen the entrance to 60 feet, 55 feet being ample width to permit of all vessels now built or likely to be built on Lake Ontario to enter the dock. The widest Canadian vessel now afloat is the *Cibola*, of the Niagara River Line, whose beam is 55 feet.

"The detailed examination of the plans shows, however, that this change in width will entail an extra expenditure of about $34,000, made up as follows:"

He gives the details, and then goes on:

"It is obvious, however, that with this comparatively small extra expenditure (the estimated cost of the dock is about $350,000) the Kingston Graving Dock will be greatly improved, inasmuch as it will be available to all Canadian vessels which may have to use it, and I have therefore no hesitation to ask that permission be granted to make the change.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) "LOUIS COSTE,
"*For Chief Engineer.*"

This report was approved by Sir Hector Langevin and presented to the Council, who approved of the same on the 7th of August, Now, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the details of this letter, we find that the first report of Mr. Coste was made hastily, with-

out due information, and was erroneous. Really, Mr. Speaker, would any man watching over his own interests keep in his service one second an employé who would without due care advise him to make a change of 12 feet in the entrance of a dock, costing over $300,000? Well, that man, who wrote on the 2nd July, comes back on the 22nd, twenty days later, and says: My first report was hastily made, and here is another one more carefully made; and the Government accepted that second report;—a man who in the very same letter says: I act without any reflection; I act as a child: therefore the conclusion should be, do not believe, do not trust me. In the very same letter, however, he advises the Government to incur an expense of $34,000 in round figures, and for what? He had said some days previously that to widen the entrance from 48 feet to 60 feet would cost nothing, not a cent; but on the 22nd of July he says that to enlarge the entrance from 48 feet to 55 feet will cost $34,000. Where is the man who is able to support such a report as that? Where is the man who would give one minute's credit to an engineer, whatever may be his name, or his age, who, over his own signature, advises the Government to accept such data as that? And I am sorry to see that the Minister in charge of the department, whose activity has been so often boasted of, has signed and endorsed that report, and that it has been reported in detail to the Council, and adopted. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that at the date, the 22nd of July, 1890, the total estimated cost of the Kingston graving dock is put at $350,000; but on the 25th February, the hon. Minister of Public Works had said to this House:

"The total estimated cost of the dock, including everything, is $318,000; and this is required to complete the dock."

That is when the amount of $160,000 was asked from this Parliament. But on the 19th of March last we find that the $160,000 asked for to complete the works had not been found sufficient, and a special warrant was issued, signed by His Excellency, for $60,000 more.. I need not give the details. The usual formalities were fulfilled: the engineer made his request, the officer approved, the Governor in Council ratified, and the special warrant was granted. But, Sir, when this special warrant was applied for, some new wants must have been born somewhere; and the chief engineer, over his own signature, gives us a detail of the probable cost of the whole work, which was no longer $318,000, nor $350,000, but $450,744.62. It had increased by over $100,000 above the highest estimate previously given, which was stated by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the floor of this House; and that change in the contract, widening the dock from 48 feet to 55 feet which it was agreed to put at $34,000, was no longer $34,000; it had reached $50,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to procure yet the last progress estimate. The only one we could get was the one up to the 31st of March last. I see by that last estimate, the last item is this extra work or coffer dam, ordered the 15th of August, 1890, $16,000, and that is due to the widening of the dock. That is one of the consequences of the change made in the contract, not foreseen by the contract, and would seem to me to add to the total cost the amount of $34,000. There is another item, the preceding one, for an allowance of 705 cubic yards of concrete extra cement, difference in price per yard $1.40, or $987. I give those details to show that the increase in the cost is due to extra payments unduly made to the contractors. But I have been surprised not to have been able to obtain at the department or at the Committee of Public Accounts, where they were ordered, the last progress estimates of the work. I understand they have been sent to Kingston, and the officers of the department are censurable for having sent such documents without keeping copies for the use of this House, more especially when the House is sitting and when these officers knew this matter was being investigated by one of the Committees of this House. I have received information that the increase in the cost of the widening is due to the fact that the coffer dam has given away twice, causing very large expense. These damages should not be sustained by the country. They should be borne by the contractor, for if he is not able to build a proper coffer dam, he should bear the loss. I believe that, under these circumstances, we have not yet received the necessary papers. We have not the details, we have not the estimated cost, made out by the engineer, of the total work, we have not the probable cost of the extra work, we have not the necessary documents to form a competent opinion, and I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to this point, that he should at once see that an engineer is appointed to investigate into the whole matter. Let me read to the House words which have been spoken not far from here:

"I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite to join with us in trying to find out what the facts are about this alleged rascality."

I ask the Government to join with us on this occasion in trying to find out all the facts concerning the alleged rascality I am now discussing. It is their bounden duty to do so. They have gone too far in withholding information which would have enabled us at once to establish the fraud before the country. They have gone too far in proceeding with the execution of a contract with a fictitious individual represented by criminals and rascals. Let me quote again the words spoken by the leader of the Government in the other chamber:

"We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and if found guilty that summary vengence may be exercised upon those who are found guilty of appropriating public money—stealing—be they high or low. That is the recommendation of the Government and this side of the House."

Well, Sir, I apply these words to our honourable adversaries, and I tell them it is their duty to join hand in hand with us in finding out rascality wherever it exists and punishing the criminals wherever found, whether high or low in the ranks of society. It is the duty of the Government to help us in raising the standard of public morals in this country. The First Minister went on to say:

"I appeal to my hon. friends opposite to assist us in an enquiry of a precisely similar kind to that which is proceeding in another place on a subject which is legitimately before us, and help us to probe that enquiry to the bottom and then join us in punishing the guilty afterwards."—*Hon. Mr. Abbott's Speech in Senate.*

These words were repeated by the Tory press all over the Dominion. But there must be equal justice applied to all, and I hope the Government will hear my humble voice, and join us in what

we ask them to do. I have shown the facts of the case, as far as I could ascertain them. Whether there is anybody in the concern interested with the Connollys I do not know ; there has been no quarrel between the brothers Connolly ; their letters and telegrams have not been given to any outsider and we do not know what has occurred. There may be some reply to my charges, but the thing looks very suspicious. I cannot say if any information was given to the department, but I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that in the tender of the Connollys, handwriting is discovered which looks very much like the handwriting of some one of the officers of the Department of Public Works, whose handwriting is on some of the papers submitted to this House. Now, how is it that the Government were not informed of these facts before? We have at Kingston a young and, I suppose, worthy officer of the name of Perley junior, the son of the gentleman who, by misfortune, received a testimonial and for whom was intended another testimonial of $2,000, the whereabouts of which we cannot find to-day. That young Mr. Perley cost us in the year 1888-89 the sum of $1,851.71 ; and how is it that neither father nor son ever informed the Government of what was going on? Can they have been transacting business in the name of the country with a man whose existence was only supposed? If I look to the opinions of the press, I find that over a month ago in a leading paper, it was written :

"The case should be investigated without delay. Sir Hector, Mr. Perley senior and Mr. Perley junior must tell us how they came to let a work of such magnitude to a non-existent person ; why they allowed some one else to write his cheques and letters and even to sign the contract for him ; why they allowed the work to be carried on for an hour without demanding to see him in the flesh ; and why they increased the contract price by 80 per cent. with much else that is painfully obscure. Let the two Perleys accept a friendly hint and make a clean breast of this matter at once. It may prove a more serious business for them than any yet unearthed."

The two Perleys did not take the hint, nor did the Minister of Public Works, nor did the Government, nor did the hon. the Postmaster General, who shielded the guilty parties by not giving us the required information. That act of his made the Government an accessory after the fact to the crime that had been committed. That crime consisted first of forgery. All these signatures of Bancroft on these plans and contracts and letters are forgeries, and when we dare commit forgeries with such a party as the Dominion of Canada, we must feel that we have a strong hold on the party, that we have a strong hold on all the organized power that reigns and commands. This audacity indicates a state of things which is deplorable to the utmost. These signatures, and this tender, and this cheque are not only forgeries, but they are actually obtaining money under false pretences, at the detriment and loss of the private individuals concerned whom I named a moment ago. This contract was for a large sum. All the profits that the other tenderers would have made have been taken away from them, have been stolen from them by a forgery, and a repeated forgery. That fact alone should be sufficient to open the gates of the penitentiary for the guilty parties, and it is not only towards the individuals that there has been criminal action. The country has been induced to give value under false pretenses. Then, it is a forgery, it is the crime of obtaining value under false pretenses, and it is a real crime of robbery against all the tenderers who were lower than the Connollys. The facts I have enunciated imply a gross negligence on the part of the officers of the department to whom this country has given charge of so many millions of dollars and wherein such large sums are spent yearly. You will remember that I said in the beginning that no letter accompanied the first tender, in spite of the notice. You have seen the most extraordinary changes made in spite of common sense, in the works. I have shown you that—I will not say fraudulent—but extraordinary payments have been made for coffer-dams without our knowing for what reason, this country would have to pay for the errors in the building or in the works committed by the contractors. Under these circumstances, so as to put a check to the audacity of men like the Connollys and their accomplices, if any there are, I intend to propose a motion to this House. It looks very much as if they had accomplices because, if they were alone, they would not dare to go on with false names. Would any man venture to go to the Government of the United States, or to England, or to France, and sign a tender under a false name and another tender under his own name, and hope to get a contract under the false name of the party whom he fancies or asserts to exist? This indicates a very strange set of things, and it is time that all honest men in this country who do not despair of the future of Canada should join together in this matter ; and I beg the Minister of Justice to help us to bring the guilty parties before the courts, where they will meet with the punishment which they deserve. I move that all words after "That" in the original motion be erased, and the following substituted in lieu thereof :—

The documents and papers submitted to Parliament in relation to the Kingston graving dock contract, and the evidence taken before the Committee on Public Accounts and reported to this House, show that gross fraud and forgery were committed in connection with the said contract, and culpable negligence in connection with the letting of said contract, and the changes made in the terms thereof, and the payments made under said changes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. the Minister of Finance called the attention of gentlemen on the other side of the House this afternoon to an arrangement which was made in pursuance of a courtesy which has prevailed in this House for many years, and which, though not of other obligation, has generally been accepted. Under this arrangement it was understood that notice should be given to the Government of any motion to be made on going into Committee of Supply. That custom has been departed from for some totally unexplained reason this afternoon, and a motion has been sprung upon the House involving, apparently, serious considerations, without the customary courtesy having been extended, though last night the customary courtesy was exacted from this side of the House to state what business we proposed to take up this afternoon. There is only one explanation of this course possible, and that is that it is considered desirable that the judgment of this House should be asked on this question without the House being fully informed of all the facts. If hon. gentlemen opposite choose to assume that position, I have no doubt the country as well as the House will understand how much more desirable it is that public questions should be debated on principles of fair-play, after explanation is given which both

sides of the House may understand, before the House pronounces judgment in regard to any public department. I have to say to the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution this afternoon that the only intimation we had that he intended to move this session, or to bring the question before the House, was when he arose the other afternoon and proceeded to speak upon it. His attention was then called to the fact that the evidence on which he was addressing the House, had not been printed or distributed to members. It was probably considered more opportune that, even without the evidence which has been taken upstairs and which was then being printed and distributed, the judgment of the House that afternoon should be asked upon the question; but when the point was raised and it was seen that we were entitled to have the evidence upon which the hon. gentleman was addressing us, he agreed to defer his motion, without any intimation of the day when it was to come on, or of the fact that he intended to move upon the question at all. I think every member on this side of the House supposed that his intention in addressing the House the other afternoon was to call attention to the facts of the case merely, or to put some questions to the Government for the information of the House. I shall not pretend to follow him into the details of the facts arising in this case. Every member of the House who is free from prejudice will understand perfectly, and everybody who takes pains to examine this debate hereafter, will understand, that in relation to a transaction of that kind, not only involving the evidence which was taken before the Public Accounts Committee, and which we have had an opportunity of reading, but involving likewise a discussion as to the papers which have been in the hon. gentleman's possession, and which we have not had access to since, and had no notice that they would be brought before the House this afternoon, it would be folly to attempt to follow the hon gentleman or to make an argument upon the details of the case. Now, I may add that yesterday afternoon, in pursuance of the hon. gentleman's request that I should give him further papers upon this subject, I handed to him, immediately on receiving them from the Department of Public Works, twelve documents not one of which I have opened myself or seen, but he has had the privilege of addressing the House upon them this afternoon, whereas if I had chosen to keep them from him, he would have lost part of his case as he would not have had an opportunity of informing himself upon it. I mention that for the purpose of showing the absurdity of any attempt to discuss, with any degree of fairness, a question of this kind, and I think the judgment of the House will be that we ought not to adopt the resolution brought forward under such circumstances, even if the case were as strong as the hon. gentleman has put it to the House. Now, with regard to the observations which the hon. gentleman has made upon this question, I shall have nothing to say as to the terms in which he has stigmatized the conduct of the contractors of whom he has spoken as having committed forgery; but when the hon. gentleman carries his reflections further, as he has done, and stigmatizes persons connected with the Department of Public Works as conniving at this, as being in complicity with it, and when he has even made a statement here that the Postmaster General had implicated the Government in transactions which he says ought to be stigmatized with the names of forgery and false pretenses. I have simply to say that the outrage which was committed by such a resolution being proposed is intensified ten-fold by the disgraceful terms in which it was advocated. Now, let me call the attention of the House to what the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee was as regard this transaction, and as regards the use of this anonymous name. I repeat that I do not intend to challenge the hon. gentleman's observation that forgery was committed upon the department by the persons who put forward a fictitious name; that may be so, it is probably so; but I shall be able to show the House easily, by a reference to the evidence taken before the Committee of Public Accounts, that that forgery or that pretense was not put forward successfully upon the department through any want of ordinary care and vigilance on the part of the officers of the department. Indeed, I think that the hon. gentleman has made a case calling upon me to show that the public of this country has not suffered by the circumstance of a fictitious name having been used on that occasion. Now, Sir, what was the transaction in so far as it relates to the use of a fictitious name? It is that when the tenders were called for by the department at the time for receiving tenders, down came a tender in the name of one Bancroft, and it happened to be the lowest tender by at least $5,000. What was to be done with it? It was regular in every point of form, it was accompanied by a cheque payable to the order of the Minister for the requisite deposit of $20,000. In so far as any official of the Public Works Department was concerned, it was just as genuine as any other tender. Now, here was a tender coming in from a distant city, from a person named Bancroft entirely unknown in the department, but in the regular form and accompanied by a cheque for the money. Now, it is true that in one particular there was an irregularity connected with that tender. The call that was made for tenders required that they should be accompanied by a letter stating that the person signing had visited the locality and made himself familiar with the work to be done. The letter did not accompany this particular tender, that was a technical irregularity. It might have empowered the Minister of Public Works to reject the tender; but he would have been assailed here more strongly than he has been this afternoon for throwing away $5,000 of public money, and not giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, but taking a higher tender merely for a technical irregularity like that. It was an irregularity which the Minister could waive and which, under the circumstances which followed, he was justified in waiving, because, as I shall remind the House when I come to that circumstance in particular, before the contract was signed, persons became associated with Bancroft who were known to the department, known to be familiar with work of that kind, known to have erected the graving dock at Esquimalt, and known to be reliable contractors as far as their ability to execute the work and their means o execute the work were concerned. So that at the outset the tender of Bancroft came before the department in proper order—laying aside the irregularity as to the letter, which does not touch the question of the fictitious name—and it is the fictitious name on which the hon. gentleman has built his whole indictment this afternoon.

This tender came before the department in the regular and ordinary way, and was accompanied by a cheque for the money. What was the next step? The next step was to inform this person, Bancroft, that his tender had been accepted, that his tender was the lowest, and that the contract would be awarded to him. Then, even if he were unknown to the department, even if the slightest breath of suspicion attached to his existence, his reality would be put to the test; and remember that in all the investigation which has taken place before the Committee of Public Accounts there is not one word of testimony that any suspicion existed in the minds of a single person connected with the Department of Public Works as to the genuineness of that tender, or as to the existence of Bancroft. The case would have stood against the department in very different terms if anybody had been able to say that the attention of any single official had been called to the fact that it might be possibly a fictitious tender, but it was not. In good faith and in the ordinary course, a letter was sent to Bancroft's address stating that his tender was the lowest and would be accepted. What came in reply? Why, there came in reply a letter which would tend not to awaken suspicion as to the existence of Bancroft, but, on the contrary, a letter which would have lulled any suspicion, if any had existed, a letter acknowledging the receipt of the communication, stating that the tender would be accepted and informing the department that he had associated the Connollys with him, who were known to the department, and who had the necessary means, plant and experience to carry on the work. The next step the hon. gentleman complained of was that there was then a report, or a statement of the engineer, saying that Bancroft had had no experience in work like that in Canada; and the hon. gentleman asks, who could tell that he had had no such experience? Well, it was not very difficult to tell, because there had been only three graving docks constructed in Canada, and every one connected with the department knew that Bancroft had had no connection with them in the capacity of contractor or in any capacity known to the officers of the departments. But they knew of the Connollys. They have become famous since, I admit; but the Minister and the officers of the Public Works Department under Mr. Perley, certainly, had no reason to suppose that the Connollys were not competent as contractors, for it is no secret that the work which they have done upon their contracts is above reproach as regards quality of workmanship at least. Therefore, when the letter came from the supposed Bancroft, stating that he had associated the Connollys with him, the officers of the department had at least the assurance that he had men with him possessing abundance of plant and means, and experience, too. Under these circumstances the contract was awarded. The hon. gentleman has addressed the House this afternoon as if it were an extraordinary circumstance that when this tender from Bancroft came in, some one did not at once scent a mystery, and say there was no such man in Canada. Why, the Public Works Department was not the only establishment imposed on in that regard. How did the so-called Bancroft manage to get the cheque and the money to his credit? One of the Connollys went to a bank and drew from his account $20,000 and put it to the credit of the name of Bancroft, and produced a cheque and asked the manager to certify it, and the cheque drawn by Bancroft the manager of the bank certified. Under these circumstances, with the bank certification that $20,000 stood to the credit of Bancroft at the bank, and was available for the Minister of Public Works, it would have been a very shrewd and prophetic vision that would have conceived the idea that no such man as Bancroft existed. There was another step still. If there had been any suspicion that Bancroft was a fictitious name in the minds of the officers of the Public Works Department, the matter surely could have gone on safely until the time came to sign the contract and then Bancroft would have to appear in the flesh. And somebody did realize in the flesh and appear as Bancroft. What safeguard would the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) suggest under these circumstances? A tender comes to my department in answer to a call for tenders for a contract, and it is found to be the lowest by $5,000. I find it accompanied by a cheque certified by the manager of a reliable bank and the tenderer presents himself to sign the contract. What guarantee, what safeguard, would the hon. gentleman suggest? He could only suggest one, that the extraordinary precaution should be taken of having the person identified when he came to sign the contract, as if the cheque for $20,000 were not sufficient identification of him. But in this instance he was identified. The Connollys, who were in and out of the department in connection with other public works every day, or one of them, came to Mr. Gobeil, Secretary of the department, and said: "This is Mr. Bancroft, who comes to sign the contract with us." Mr. Gobeil goes to the office of Mr. Saucier, who had the document prepared, and Mr. Gobeil introduces the supposed Mr. Bancroft and Connolly to Mr. Saucier, and when the document is spread before them he turns to Mr. Bancroft and says, "Bancroft is to be first to sign." A conversation took place and Connolly, addressing the supposed Bancroft says: "Bancroft, you sign first." All down to this time the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has been treating Bancroft as a mere fiction, a myth. But when he appeared in the flesh it was difficult for any officer of the Public Works who had never seen the man before to be gifted with such inspired vision as to say: "You are not Bancroft at all." If the hon. gentleman can find in the public departments of Canada or anywhere else in the country any man gifted with powers of that kind, I can assure the hon. gentleman we will avail ourselves of his services and pay him the highest figure this Parliament will vote for a salary; provided, however, we are at liberty to keep a watch on him, for there would be something very uncanny about him. The supposed Bancroft, twice identified—introduced to Gobeil by Connolly, introduced to Mr. Saucier by Mr. Gobeil and Connolly, stepped forward in the flesh and signed the contract in a plain round hand. Then came the time for Connolly to sign. He did so, and the witness took the document to the Minister of Public Works; and the Minister, having been assured that Bancroft had come forward, had signed, and that Connolly had signed too, and that Bancroft's money was there and Bancroft was there himself, the Minister signed the contract as any one of us would

have done under the circumstances. Yet this is stigmatized by this resolution, and by the hon. mover, as a fraud on the department. So it was. But it is stigmatized by this resolution as a fraud on the department at which the department connived: and so it was not. So the contract went on, and it was worked at from day to day, from month to month and from year to year, and the name of Bancroft appeared regularly and the signature of Bancroft appeared every time money was to be paid, letters were to be written, or anything was to be done. I think the hon. gentleman's statement that there was a false pretense may be true in the popular sense of the term. There was not a false pretense in drawing the money in the legal sense, because it was signed by other men and the money was paid for actual value given to the people of Canada. The result of it, furthermore, is that while we must stigmatize it as a fraud that might lead, under other circumstances, to dangerous results, and that while we should put a stop to it by any possible means, as a matter of fact we have got a work of solidity and stability, which hon. gentlemen have not raised a doubt about in the long debates which have taken place during this session, from the first time the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) began to enquire with a palpable note of interrogation all over him: "Where is Bancroft, and who is Bancroft?" The quality of the work has not been impugned. We have got a good work, $5,000 cheaper than if that pretense had not been made to the department, and a higher tender had been accepted. The documents which the hon. gentleman has read prove this, and hon. gentlemen opposite may shout as long as they please, they cannot shout this fact off the record. If this tender had not been accepted a higher tender would have been accepted. The tender, of course, would not have been accepted if the circumstances had been known, or if it had been suspected by the department that there was no such a man as Bancroft; but without that suspicion, and with everything tending to prove the contrary, the tender was properly accepted and the contract entered into. It was not until late in the session that the circumstances was in any way known to the Minister of Public Works or to any of his officers that Bancroft was not a reality but was merely a fictitious name. The hon. gentleman called our attention to the fact that there had been an enlargement of the dock; and so there was. The dock was widened to the extent of 12 feet. The hon. gentleman declared over and over again, not with any intention of misleading the House, because in other parts of his speech he made admissions which refuted the assertion that this enlargement had been made without the representation of any person whomsoever. But the contrary is the fact. Representations were made in writing to the department that a dock 48 feet in width was not sufficiently wide to accommodate steamers and other vessels then on the St. Lawrence and the lakes. And it was upon that statement that Mr. Coste was asked to make his report, and that he did report to the department.

Mr. AMYOT. That is not in the record.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman had given me notice of his motion I would have given him that record.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. AMYOT. The record was supposed to be complete long ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman knew it was not complete, because, when I handed him those papers yesterday afternoon, I informed him of others which I would endeavour to get for him, which I would get for him, and which were on the way. If the hon. gentleman had told me that he wished to make a motion of this kind on Friday or on Monday, I would have telegraphed and made sure that every available paper was placed before him.

Mr. AMYOT. That is about the final estimate and nothing else.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman had informed me of any paper which was missing, I would have taken the utmost pains to have had it for him, and if we had heard last night that a motion on this subject would be brought before the House, that of itself would have been notice that would entitle him to expedition as regard any paper that is not brought down. I have not heard from him any complaint whatever, that the papers which have been brought down do not answer the motion which he made for the papers: but the fact is, that representations were made that a 48 feet dock would not be sufficient for steamers that were upon the St. Lawrence and the lakes. I have accepted the hon. gentleman's statement that that does not appear among the papers, as he has made the statement, but I should like him to look again, because, if I am not much mistaken, as I said a few minutes ago, the subsequent portion of his argument indicated that representations were made, for instance in regard to the steamer *Cibola*. If he will examine the fyle of the papers in which that representation in regard to the *Cibola* appears, he will find that representations were made by the steamship company which owns that steamer, that the dock was not wide enough to accommodate steamers then upon the lakes. It was under these circumstances that Mr. Coste's report was asked. Now, the hon. gentleman has made some strictures against Mr. Coste on the ground that at one time Mr. Coste stated that the widening of the dock would not increase the expense, and that he immediately afterwards withdrew that statement, and gave the Minister a statement of the additional expense. I think that this criticism was a little severe, because Mr. Coste, before his department acted upon his report that the expense would not be increased, before that report could have been acted upon, placed before his Minister a report stating just what the additional expense would, in his opinion, be; and, under these circumstances, I do not think that he should be stigmatized as either unworthy or incapable. The department was not misled, the Government was not misled as regards the question of that increased expense, because as I said before, when it was resolved to increase it we had before us Mr. Coste's corrected statement that an additional expense of at least $30,000 would be incurred by the widening, and the information which I have at the present moment is that Mr. Coste's estimate with regard to the additional expense of widening will not be increased, and that the $30,000 which he stated to be the probable additional expense will cover the amount. I shall not follow the hon. gentleman into his observations with regard to Mr. Perley.

The unhappy circumstances which have connected the name of the father with transactions which every person acquainted with his long public service must indeed very greatly deplore, are accompanied at the same time with circumstances which make it almost inhuman to speak with any degree of severity with regard to him, especially the circumstance that his health is such that it is almost impossible to interrogate him with regard to these matters now. But I am sure that the hon. gentleman was guilty of unconscious injustice and severity when he threw reflections upon the son, a young man who has been but a year in the public service, whose character and career are unstained by a single defect or a single mistake, so far, and who surely is entitled to pursue his career in life without a stigma being thrown upon him with regard to unworthy motives in the discharge of his duties. I have given the hon. gentleman the reply which courtesy required I should give him. I have given him the best information I could under the circumstances which I indicated a few moments ago.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman who said "hear, hear" will understand me, and endeavour not to misinterpret to the House, as I am sure he would not willingly do. I have had to answer the hon. gentleman who made the attack while the papers were in his hands and without notice that it could come. I have given him an explanation, from which I hope the House will gather that, under the circumstance, the language of the resolution is not that which the House should adopt.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I always listen to the Minister of Justice with the greatest possible attention. This afternoon I was more than usually desirous of paying attention to the hon. the Minister of Justice, because I desired to know exactly how he, as a lawyer and an ex-judge, and a Minister of the Crown, proposed to defend to the Parliament of Canada and before the people of this country the conduct assailed by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). The Minister of Justice complained that this motion was sprung upon the House, that he had no notice of it, and that he was not in a position, therefore, to offer the best defence that could be offered. Everybody knows that for the last month, at all events, the subject of Bancroft and the Connollys, and the frauds alleged to have been committed in connection with the Kingston graving dock, has been in everybody's mouth. Everybody knows, and nobody better than the Minister of Justice, that for a month or two my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), together with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), have been making statements and making enquiries as to a letter box in the post office in Kingston said to be held or leased by a Mr. Bancroft. Everybody in Parliament knew that the subject was a subject of discussion and enquiry before the Public Accounts Committee. Everybody, including the Minister of Justice, must have seen in the public press the extraordinary and startling statements that were elicited on oath before the Public Accounts Committee. Everybody, a week or ten days ago, must have seen that one of the parties implicated in this contract under oath declared that he was guilty of fraud and forgery in obtaining that contract. The hon. Minister of Justice knew, every member of Parliament who attends to his business knew, that a few evenings ago the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) rose in his place in Parliament with a view of discussing this question. The hon. gentleman should have known—and if he did not know nobody in the House was in the same position—that my hon. friend proposed to bring the subject of this fraud and forgery before the Parliament of this country, and follow that up with a resolution condemning the whole transaction. I, therefore, say that the hon. Minister of Justice has no reason to complain that this motion has been sprung upon the House without notice. The hon. gentleman complains that this motion was sprung upon the House with a view of catching a snap verdict from the Parliament of Canada. I assure the hon. gentleman that we have no desire to capture a snap verdict. If we cannot get the verdict of the Parliament of Canada, and the verdict of the country, condemning the Administration opposite on the course they pursued, especially with respect to this contract, we do not want a judgment at all. The facts, so far as anybody can understand them, and so far as we know, are now fairly before Parliament. The hon. gentleman tells us that there are some documents not submitted. Why were they not submitted? Those papers have been asked for by the hon. member for Bellechasse. Some of them the hon. Minister of Justice now tells us are in the possession of the Government still. They have no business to be in the possession of the Government. When a member of Parliament, with the sanction of Parliament, asks for the production of papers upon a great public question, it is the bounden duty of the Government to submit those papers to Parliament; and keeping back this paper or that paper, the Government may rest assured, will not prevent hon. gentlemen on this side of the House from enquiring into the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman admits that fraud and forgery—as rank a fraud and as gross a forgery as ever the hon. gentleman tried when he occupied a seat upon the bench in his native province—was perpetrated upon the people, and perhaps, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, upon the Government of Canada as well. I say, as gross a fraud—I will go further, and say as gross a piece of connivance, if one can understand the evidence, was committed by the Department of Public Works as was ever committed by an official department in this or any other country; and if there was no criminal connivance on the part of the Department it only shows that those in charge of that department are men utterly unfit to be in charge of any public department: it simply shows that they are nothing less than imbeciles. Now, I propose for a moment or two to direct my attention to this great public work of Canada, the Kingston graving dock; and I think that every unprejudiced man in Parliament, if there are any in Parliament—every unprejudiced man in the country, at all events—will come to the conclusion, from the documents submitted to Parliament, that upon those documents it is as clear as anything possibly can be that there has been criminal connivance with the fraud and forgery of the Connollys, or the grossest negligence on the part of those in charge of the Department of Public-

Works. The history of this fraud is an extraordinary one, and it may be divided into two parts. First, there is the history of the tender and the signing of the contract; and then there is the story of the changes made in the contract and of the moneys paid under these changes. The hon. Minister of Justice said that the country had suffered nothing—that the tax-payers had suffered nothing. Is it nothing, in the hon. gentleman's estimation, that a contract should be increased from $260,000, the original figure, or $318,000, as we were assured by the Minister it would be, to $500,000? In this has no substantial wrong been done to the tax-payers? Is that the notion of fair-play and justice to the people of this country which the Minister of Justice has imbibed since he has become a member of the Administration, that $100,000 or $200,000 is a mere bagatelle, to which the people of this country pay no attention? Verily, the hon. gentleman will find a different state of opinion when he next consults the people of this country. I have said that for the purpose of discussion this subject may be divided into two branches—the history of the tender and the contract, and the story of the changes in the contract and the moneys paid under it. The history of the tender and the contract is a history of fraud and forgery; the history of the changes in the contract and the money paid under it indicates that the scheme was carried out in pursuance of departmental connivance at the fraud and forgery. Now, Sir, let us see chronologically how the story pans out. Tenders were called for; tenders were received. The Connollys sent in a genuine tender, prepared by the Connollys and signed by Michael Connolly; they sent with that tender a genuine cheque, signed with the genuine signature of Michael Connolly; they also sent in with that tender a letter such as the call for tenders makes an imperative condition on which the tenders shall be sent in, written by Michael Connolly and signed by Michael Connolly; and all these documents, as I understand the rules of the department, were submitted to the Minister of Public Works. In addition to that genuine article, they sent in the forged tender of Andrew C. Bancroft—forged by whom? By Michael Connolly, whose genuine tender with his genuine signature was before the eyes of the Minister of Public Works. They sent also the forged cheque accompanying the forged tender of Andrew C. Bancroft, and that forged cheque was signed by Michael Connolly. The Minister of Public Works, before he was called upon to decide whose tender he should accept, had before him all these documents in the handwriting of Michael Connolly. It was admitted that Michael Connolly was a man well known in the department, a man who had extensive dealings with the department, and his signature was well known in the department; and are we to be told by the hon. Minister of Justice, in justification of his late colleague, that the Minister of Public Works, with all these documents before his eyes, was so blind that he could not distinguish Michael Connolly's signature on one document from Michael Connolly's signature on another document? Are we to be told that he closed his eyes, that he was blind, that he could not see. Sir, upon no other theory can the hon. gentleman convince the people of this country that there was not connivance somewhere. Now, I propose to prove to this Parliament—and I assume the full responsibility of it—that there was criminal connivance on the part of the Public Works Department with the granting of this contract to Andrew C. Bancroft, and with this fraud and forgery. Twenty tenders were submitted to the Minister. It is only necessary to consider three of them. The rest are of no consequence. One, and the lowest, was the Connollys, in the name of Bancroft; the second was that of Macdonald & Aylmer; and the third was the genuine tender of the Connollys. The bogus tender of Bancroft was some $5,000 less than the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer, and $61,000 less than the genuine tender of the Connollys. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you as a sensible man, not a lawyer, with more brains perhaps than a dozen of them—I ask you, Sir, as a sensible juror, sitting there in the jury box, if you would not ask first, why it was the two Connollys forged Bancroft's name to a tender just $5,000 below Macdonald & Aylmer's tender, when they had their own tender in for $60,000 more than the Bancroft tender? What object had they? Why did they not rest upon their own tender? Why should they put in a bogus tender and forge the name of Bancroft to it, unless they knew at the time that the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer was some $55,000 below their own. That is the only theory which can explain their course, for it cannot be argued for a moment before sensible men that these Connollys did not put in that tender in the name of Bancroft, knowing that, according to the order of the tenders in the department, they were $55,000 above Macdonald & Aylmer's. The conduct of the Connollys, the conduct of the mythical Bancroft, and the conduct of the Department of Public Works, can only be explained upon that theory, and that theory alone. And the theory is further established by this fact, that according to the call for tenders they had to be submitted to the Minister of Public Works on the 28th of March. Singularly enough, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to you again as a juror, the two Connollys were in Ottawa, registered at the Russell House, on the 28th March. Singularly enough, upon that 28th of March Michael Connolly prepared the Bancroft tender in his own handwriting. Singularly enough, Michael Connolly signed that tender in the name of Bancroft; singularly enough, Michael Connolly admits in his own evidence, I believe, that he carried that tender from the Russell House to the Department of Public Works, and left it with the Minister; and still more singularly, all that was done about the last minute of the last hour of the last day of putting in the tender.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). At six o'clock Sir, I was drawing the attention of the House to the conduct of the department, and pointing that the tender of Bancroft was carried over to the Department the last hour of the last day under suspicious circumstances; and this, in connection with the other circumstances to which I drew the attention of this House, was such evidence as could lead but to one conclusion, namely, that by the connivance of somebody in the Department of Public Works information must have been received by the Con-

nollys of the position of their tender. In other words, they must have been aware that the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer was below theirs, and that unless a lower tender was put in, in the name of somebody, they would not get the contract. Now, that is not the only circumstance which Parliament ought to consider. I am free to admit that no Minister of the Crown, no member of the House, no private citizen, ought to be convicted or charged upon mere suspicion. There must be something more than that. There must be such facts and circumstances as can lead the mind of any reasonable man but to one conclusion. Now, the circumstances I have just detailed are not the only ones upon which it is fair to ask Parliament and the people to conclude that the tender of Bancroft was put in through the connivance of some one in the department. What are the other circumstances? The usual practice was followed in this case. Tenders were called for, and in the calling for tenders there were two express conditions clearly and distinctly defined. The first of these conditions was that a letter of the tenderer must accompany his tender, and in that letter it must be shown that the tenderer took steps to make himself conversant with the work to be done and with the material necessary to be used or excavated, as the case might be. That is an essential condition of calling for tenders. The second condition was that the letter and the tender must be signed with the genuine signature of the tenderer. The hon. Minister of Justice, in his remarks, declared that these conditions were trifling and unimportant; that the Minister of Public Works, if he insisted upon those conditions being observed, if he refused to give the contract or to receive separate tenders on the ground that no letter accompanied the tender, would be censurable by this Parliament. The hon. Minister treated this as a matter of no consequence or importance. But, Sir, if that condition is a matter of no consequence, if it is one which the Minister of Public Works has the right to ignore of his own sweet will, why was it inserted as a condition at all in the call for tenders? The tender of Bancroft was not accompanied by that letter, it was not signed with a genuine signature, and in that respect the tender of the Connollys in the name of Bancroft ought to have been rejected by the Minister of Public Works, if for no other reason than that alone. The Minister of Public Works knew perfectly well, when he got the Connolly tender in the name of Bancroft, that one of the conditions in his call for tenders had not been complied with. His plain duty then was to reject that tender as not being legal. The Minister of Public Works did not do so. It is another link in the chain of circumstantial evidence which in my judgment is irresistible, bringing the conclusion to my mind, and I think to the mind of any honest man, that there was connivance somewhere. The tender was not accompanied by a letter. The Minister of Justice said that was unimportant, and the Minister of Public Works was justified in receiving the tender although it was unaccompanied by the letter. Now, let us see, up to that time, what the Minister of Public Works had before him on which he might form an honest opinion as to the genuine signature which the call for tenders required should be with every tender sent in? What documents had he before him? I have already pointed out that up to that time he had the genuine tender of the Connollys, the genuine cheque of the Connollys, the genuine letter that accompanied their tender, signed at all events by Michael Connolly; he had also the forged tender signed by Michael Connolly and the forged cheque signed by Michael Connolly, and with all these means of information before him, according to the statement of the Minister of Justice, he does not appear to have taken the first step towards finding out whether the signature was genuine or not, and why the necessary condition in the call of tenders was not fulfilled, because the letter so called for was not there. Now, this essential condition of the tender not having been complied with, it was the plain duty of the Minister of Public Works to have rejected that tender. He did not reject it. Why did he not reject it? Because, if he had rejected it the Connollys would not have had the contract, and it would have been awarded to Macdonald & Aylmer, and, consequently, the hon. gentleman set aside the most important condition in his call for tenders, a condition which is inserted in every call for tenders issued by the department. The Minister of Justice says it was of no importance, and the Minister of Public Works would not be censurable for accepting the tender without that condition being complied with. Was the Minister of Justice in Parliament a few years ago when the Government of which he is a member set aside a tender upon a ground which was not as forcible as this? Does he not recollect that the Parliament of Canada, through the Minister of Railways and Canals, called for tenders for the construction of a section of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Moody to Emory's Bar? Does he not know that upon that occasion, as on every other occasion when they called for tenders, they insisted upon a certified cheque accompanying the tenders? Does he not know, at all events by reading the parliamentary proceedings, if not otherwise, that of the tenders which were sent in two were of special importance, one being that of Macdonald & Charlebois, which was the lowest by over $259,000, and the other that of Andrew Onderdonk, which was $259,000 above that of Macdonald & Charlebois? Does the hon. gentleman not know that the tender of Macdonald & Charlebois was accompanied by a marked cheque of the Bank of Montreal, which, by an oversight of the clerk, was marked "good for two days only?" Does he know that on the fifth day of the month the Minister sent to the Bank of Montreal here to know if the cheque was still valid and the bank here communicated with the bank in Montreal and received the reply that marking the cheque "good for two days only" was a mistake, and the cheque was good until paid? Does he not know that the department and the Government, and every member of the Government, were notified of the fact that the cheque was perfectly good? Does he not know that the Minister, in face of that notification from the Bank of Montreal, reported to his colleagues that because the cheque, by mistake, was marked "good for two days only," that the tender should be passed over and the contract should be given to Andrew Onderdonk, at a cost to the tax-payers of the country of $259,000 more than the amount of the other tender? If he is aware of these facts, how can he, as a lawyer and as a Minister, justify the Minister of Public Works

in meting out one kind of justice to one tenderer and another kind of justice to the other? The firm of Macdonald & Charlebois were in bad odour with the Government at that time. They were not Connollys. They were not ready to come down handsomely, and they did not come down handsomely, and so the Minister ignored the notification he received from the Bank of Montreal, and by that the tax-payers of this country lost $259,000. By the little scheme of the Minister of Public Works, or of the Connollys in connivance with the Minister of Public Works or with his department, this present contract has cost the tax-payers $190,000 more than the contract called for, and $125,000 more than the Minister of Public Works assured the House in 1889 the works could be constructed for. I may be mistaken, and hon. gentlemen may think I am prejudiced, but I can assure hon. gentlemen that when I entered upon the investigation of this matter and read the papers I made a covenant with myself that I would deal fairly and justly with the department as well as with the people of this country; but the irresistible conclusion forced upon my mind was, that there was gross connivance, either on the part of the head of the department or the subordinates of the department, with the Connollys, to give the contract to them in the name of Bancroft. Now, that evidence is further confirmed when we look at the dates, and it is important to consider the dates and to take the documents chronologically. We have more than I have spoken of upon which the Minister of Public Works, if his eyes were open, if he had not made up his mind that the Connollys should get the contract, must have a suspicion in regard to these tenders. On the 4th April we have a letter apparently written by Bancroft and signed in the genuine handwriting of Michael Connolly. On the same date we have a letter from the Connollys, stating that they had associated Bancroft with them, and that if he got the contract they would join him. With all this before him, with these cheques before him, with these two or three letters written by the Connollys to the department before him, and with the letters apparently written by Bancroft, but really written by Connolly, before him, it is aking us to believe too much when we are asked to believe either that the Minister of Public Works or the officials of the department were wholly ignorant of the fact that all these documents were not signed by the Connollys, but some by the Connollys and some by this man Bancroft. Up to the 4th April, 1889, about the time the Minister was considering these tenders, he had before him, in order to form a conclusion as to the *bonâ fides* of this man Bancroft, not only the absence of the letter accompanying the tender, which was sufficient to arouse the suspicions of any man, but he had before him the whole of the correspondence and the whole of the tenders, including the genuine tenders, the genuine cheque and the genuine letter of Michael and Nicholas Connolly, and the fraudulent cheque and the fraudulent tender of Bancroft in the handwriting of Michael Connolly; and yet we are asked by the Minister of Justice to believe that the Minister of Public Works and the officials of that department acted in perfect innocence when they gave this contract to a man supposed to be named Bancroft. We are ask to believe that. Mr. Speaker, it is a stretch of imagination, it is drawing too much on the fertile imagination of anybody to ask them to believe that all that could take place in the department without exciting a particle of suspicion. There are other circumstances that lead one to the irresistible conclusion that the department did know. I have shown you by these letters that they had notice as clear as the noon-day sun. They had before them such letters and such papers as would lead any reasonable and sensible man to the conclusion that there was something wrong with this tender of Bancroft. We are asked by the Minister to believe this state of facts, that the tender was sent in, that the tender was opened, that the contract was prepared and signed, and yet the Minister of Public Works knew nothing about it. If he did not know anything about it, it was his business to know. What was he there for? For what do the people of this country pay him a salary of $7,000 a year? Where were the Perleys, the Gobeils and the other officials of the department? Is it to be supposed that these men are innocent idiots and saw nothing wrong in these facts? Only one conclusion can be drawn: either that they were cognizant of the fraud that was being perpetrated, or else that they wilfully closed their eyes to the condition of affairs. Now, Sir, so much for the tenders, and so much for the contract. I say again, that that tender and that contract was based upon fraud and forgery; I say further that the department connived at it. If the department did not connive at it, the department was guilty of culpable negligence and ought to be censured by the Parliament of Canada. Now, there are some extraordinary circumstances in connection with the changes that were made in the contract subsequent to the execution of the contract. This man took the contract for $260,000; the works have now cost us nearly $500,000. That of itself was enough to arouse the suspicion of the department, if the officials were honest men, but it aroused the suspicion of nobody. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the direct sequence of the frauds and the chronological order of the correspondence can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that all these changes were made in pursuance of the original fraud and forgery with the connivance of the head of the department. The changes cannot be explained upon any other reasonable presumption. Now, the first change that is suggested is suggested by Mr. Louis Coste in a letter to Mr. Gobeil, the Secretary of the Department of Public Works, in July, 1890. Now, what did Mr. Coste say in that letter? He says:

"The mouth of the entrance should be increased from 48 to 60 feet. This alteration will not entail any modification of the present contract so far as prices are concerned."

Who suggested that to Mr. Coste? Is Mr. Coste a man in authority in the Public Works Department? Is he the chief engineer? Is he a man whose statement the Minister of Public Works or any other Minister should take? He is nothing of the kind. He signs himself as acting for the chief engineer of the department, and the chief engineer's signature or name does not appear in this connection. Mr. Coste makes that report. Who suggested it? Whose interest is it in? Whose benefit was to be attained? Was it in the interest of the tax-payers of this country? Verily, no, Sir; but it was in the interest of the Connollys, and in their interest alone. Now, observe that on the 2nd July Mr. Coste writes to the department suggesting the change. Observe the

promptness with which the Minister of Public Works sets to work, observe the alacrity with which he obeys the commands of his master. On the same day upon which he got Mr. Coste's letter suggesting the widening of the entrance from 48 to 60 feet, he makes his report to the Council. Why should he make that report to the Council so hurriedly if it was in the interest of the tax-payers? He, a man of intelligence, a man of brains, a man who was never known not to have his wits about him all the time—he knew that it was not in the interest of the tax-payers. On the very moment the Minister of Public Works got that letter from Mr. Coste he reports to the Council and makes a recommendation in the following words:—

"That the entrance be increased from 48 to 60 feet, and the Minister further states that the alterations will not entail any further modification of the present contract so far as prices are concerned."

What is the necessity for this extraordinary promptness on the part of the Minister of Public Works? To gratify and to satisfy Connolly, to carry out, so far as he knew how, the scheme which was the result of the original fraud and forgery. Two days afterwards the Council approved of the minute, and so far so good. There is not much to be said about that. If it were to put some money into the pockets of the contractors and take a little out of the pockets of the tax-payers, even then that would not amount to a very great deal, if it had stopped there; so far as I am concerned, I would not have engaged in this discussion and forged another link in the chain that is being tightened around about the department. Two or three weeks afterwards new light dawned upon the mind of Mr. Coste. It does not appear who shed the rays of light over the mind of Mr. Coste. Someone suggests another change in the entrance to the dock, and on the 22nd day of the very same month this same Mr. Coste writes to this same Mr. Gobeil, secretary of the Department of Public Works, and mildly suggests the necessity, in the public interest, of reducing the width of the entrance from 60 to 55 feet, declaring that public purposes would be served by this reduction, and declaring at the same time that the reduction from 60 to 55 feet would cost the tax-payers of this country $34,000. Now, I ask the Minister of Justice to pause right there, and ask himself this question: In whose interest was this last change made? Was it made in the interest of the people of this country? Was it made in the interest of the Government of Canada? Or was it not rather made for the sole benefit of the two Connollys? For who else's benefit should it have been made? There was a reduction from 60 to 55 feet made at a cost to the tax-payers of $34,000. See again the promptness with which the matter was dealt with by the Minister of Public Works. Without a moment's delay the Minister reported to the Executive Council, recommending that this change be made, rescinding the old order authorizing the extension of the width of the dock from 48 to 60 feet, to cost nothing, and passing a new Order in Council, authorizing the reduction of the width from 60 to 55 feet, at an additional cost of $34,000. It is a matter of calculation. If it cost $34,000 to reduce the width from 60 to 55 feet it would cost $68,000 to reduce it another 10 feet, and exactly $74,000 to increase it from 48 to 49 feet. The people have, therefore, reason to be thankful that the Connollys did not ask for an increase to 49 feet. If they had done so, the cost to the people of this country would have been, as I have said, $74,800. We have only to pay $34,000 on that account, but now it is $50,000. We should be thankful for small mercies and grateful that we have escaped so well. Let us see a little further in regard to this matter. Another link in the reasoning that makes the conclusion invincible to every intelligent mind that there was something wrong in the Public Works Department is this. I find that on 16th March Mr. Perley reports to the Minister that a sum of money is required, $22,000 on the contract, $18,000 for caisson and $20,000 for pumping plant. The Minister, without a moment's delay, reported to the Executive Council and told them the money was required; and he further told them there was no money in the Exchequer and that a Governor General's warrant was required. Following the events in chronological order, hon. members will find that every step taken in connection with the contract, from the hour it first was brought forward to the present time, plainly discloses that it was conceived in sin and carried out in fraud and iniquity. An Order in Council was passed, as asked by the Minister, for $60,000, and the Governor General's warrant was issued for that amount. On the eve of the sitting of Parliament, when these question of misconduct, maladministration, fraud and forgery would receive the sharp criticism of hon. members, the Minister of Public Works asks for a Governor General's warrant for $60,000, and he gets it, and the money is paid. Just after the general election, when money was required to pay old election bills, this Order in Council was passed, and the Governor General's warrant was issued. No one knows much better how to do this than does the Minister of Public Works. He was brought up in a good school, he proved an apt pupil and he was a Minister of long experience and pointed the way. There is another circumstance that would lead anyone to the conclusion that something was wrong, not only in connection with the obtaining the Governor General's warrant, but the way the Governor General's warrant was obtained. There was a letter sent by Mr. Perley to the Public Works Department on the 16th March, quite lately, in which he gives all the sums necessary for the completion of this work. He points out the whole amount needed, and some of these items require the consideration of Parliament. First, there is the contract $260,878; for widening, $50,000; valves, $3,000; caisson, $20,000; hauling gear, $5,000; pumping plant, $25,000; engine house, $15,000; shop tools, $2,500; coal shed, $1,000; storehouse, $2,500; residence for lockmaster, engineer's office, $5,000; sluice and gates, $2,500; bilge blocks, shoes, &c., $2,500; electric plant, $2,500; expenditure to 30th June, 1889, Auditor General's Report for 1889, part D, pages 172-73, $33,763.87; superintendence, $20,000; contract, $260,680.75, exceeds by $190,263.87—$450,944.62. Sir Hector said, 25th February, 1890, the cost would be $318,000, exceeded by $132.944.62. This sum is $190,263 in excess of the contract, and about $125,000 in excess of the sum Sir Hector Langevin assured Parliament would be the cost. The items are curious and important, and they deserve the consideration of Parliament and of the Minister of Justice. I am sure the Minister of

Justice stated the truth when he said he had not examined the papers; but I recommend the Minister, when matters of this kind are talked of in Parliament, that he, as representing the Department of Justice, should make himself conversant with the facts. I am quite sure that if these statements had been submitted to the Minister of Justice he would have been the first man in Parliament to have pronounced them, in the face of the statement made by the Minister of Public Works, to bear unmistakable evidence of fraud. There are curious items, as I have mentioned, and I will refer to two or three of them. First, there is the contract price; the amount then required was $190,262 in excess of the contract price. The widening of the entrance increased to $50,000; first, the width was to be 60 feet without costing the people one farthing extra; second, it was reduced from 60 feet to 55 feet, at a cost of $34,000; now we have reached $50,000, according to these estimates. Will the Minister of Justice have the kindness to tell us where the $50,000 has gone? Will the Minister of Justice or any member on the Treasury benches have the kindness to tell us why those contractors obtained $50,000 for reducing the width of the dock, when every one knows it could not have cost them one farthing extra, but have lessened the cost. Will the Minister of Justice tell us what became of the $50,000? Recollect, Mr. Speaker, the tender of Bancroft was about $50,000 less than the tender of the Connollys. This $50,000 nearly makes up the deficiency, and the Connollys have got by this mode of managing the affairs of this country even now the amount of their original tender. The Minister of Public Works declared in his report to Council that the caisson would be $18,000; it is now $20,000. He declared that the pumping plant would be $20,000; it has now reached $25,000. It would be better to settle with the contractors at once, as every month adds to the enormous expense of the work. Then, as to the item for superintendence. Will the Minister who has charge of the department tell us how $20,000 were required for superintendence, &c.? What does the "&c." cover? It covers a multitude of sins and wrong-doings. Why the Government of Canada should pay $20,000 for superintending the construction of this dock in Kingston is what no one knows; no doubt some members of the Administration know, but other members may know nothing about it. I repeat that the whole history of this tender and of this contract is a history of fraud, and the whole history of these changes, made from the hour when the tender was first delivered to the department down to now, discloses to my mind, without any doubt, reckless extravagance, waste, deception, jobbery, fraud and forgery. Sir, the boldness and daring, to use the words applied by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), with which the frauds were initiated and carried out are simply startling. I believe myself that the case, from the beginning to the end, is unparalleled in the history of this or any other country. Now, Sir, is it not time that these frauds should stop; is it not time that the stealing, and the jobbery, and the peculation, and the fraud that permeates every department of the Civil Service in Ottawa should be put an end to? Why, Sir, notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice said the other night, these disclosures, such as are connected with the Kingston graving dock, have startled right-thinking men in every portion of Canada, irrespective of party politics. These startling disclosures, and these frauds, and this peculation, and this stealing, has aroused the pity and the contempt of our neighbours on the other side of the line. These startling disclosures that have been made during the last two or three months, among other things the Kingston graving dock, have aroused the indignation of honest people on the other side of the line, and in the mother country. Canadians cannot afford this, and the honest public opinion and public sentiment of Canada cannot tolerate such a condition of affairs. We cannot afford to palliate these gross irregularities; we cannot afford to toy with fraud, with peculation, with stealing, with connivance or with forgery, in any part of the public service. When a statement was made the other night by a gentleman on this side of the House that the condition of affairs in this Canada of ours was simply startling, and that we had become, by our misconduct, a by-word and a reproach among the nations of the earth, the hon. Minister of Justice took him to task for the statement he had made, and he then made the following declaration:—

"Another observation which the hon. Minister made with respect to the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, to which I must take exception, is his allusion to the present state of public morality in Canada. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that while the fame of Canada had been great for purity in public life, its name had lately become a by-word among the nations. As one member of the House I must protest against that statement. I declare for my part that nothing which has transpired of late in connection with the public service of Canada warrants any such expression here or abroad."

Has the hon. gentleman been slumbering for the last six months; is the hon. gentleman a second Rip Van Winkle, whose eyes are opened after 20 years slumbering? Does the hon. gentleman know what is passing in the world around him? Does he know what is passing in the public departments and in the Committees of this House? Does he know what his own newspaper organs—at least, a good many of them—have been saying of the condition of public affairs in this Dominion of ours. If he does not know, then it is time the hon. gentleman's eyes were opened on the subject, and I propose to open them to-night, so far as my humble abilities will permit me. Sir, it is the height of folly, it is like the ostrich hiding her head in the sand and imagining she is hidden from the whole world; it is shutting our eyes and going it blind, to say that there are no frauds disclosed and no misconduct revealed during the last few months. It is inducing his own followers to go it blind, as he did try to force them to go it blind to-night. When the hon. Minister of Justice had no argument to answer the motion of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) he excused himself on the ground that he was not familiar with the facts, and had not an opportunity of reading the papers; but he assured Parliament that, all the same, hon. gentlemen behind him, and hon. gentlemen around him, would vote to sustain the Government. I have a better opinion of the hon. gentleman's supporters than the hon. gentleman appears to have himself. I do not believe that they can be driven and lashed into supporting an Administration, when the Administration is clearly wrong. I will show the hon. gentleman what is passing in the world around him, and what his own newspapers, received in his own office, and paid for by his own office, say on this subject. You take the

Toronto *Telegram*, a newspaper with strong Conservative leanings, and it writes as follows :—

"If Sir Hector Langevin knew what was going on in the Public Works Department and profited by wrong-doing he is a rogue. If all this crookedness existed and Sir Hector did not know of it, he is a fool. In either case he is unfit to be chief of one of the two great spending departments of our Government."

That paper received some Government patronage last year according to the Auditor General's Report. The Arnprior *Chronicle*, which received Government patronage last year, writes as follows :—

"Enough evidence has already been adduced to prove the department rotten at the core, and no sane person would think of defending the actions of McGreevy *et al.* It is plain that Sir Hector will be swept out of political life, for the Conservative party cannot defend his course. Like Rykert, he must be relegated into the quiet shades of obscurity and serve as a warning to others."

The Ottawa *Journal*—I do not read it, but I am told it is the evening Conservative organ of the Government at Ottawa ; at all events, I find it down in the Auditor General's Report last year for $291.04, and, therefore, I assume it is a Government organ. It says :

"If the Government and the Conservative party are wise, they will stop at no half measures to stem the tide, and we venture to say that it is a half measure that minor officials should be decapitated for illegalities affecting a few dollars in each case, while Cabinet Ministers, against whom serious accusations are made, and who are practically on trial before the people, remain in charge of the departments out of which much of the evidence for or against them must come."

The Montreal *Star*, down for $829 of the Government money, writes very strongly of the condition of affairs, and among other things I venture to quote this one passage :

"If it were right in principle for a Cabinet Minister to pocket a thousand dollars out of a Government contract, how could it be wrong in principle for a poor devil of a second-class clerk to pocket a hundred in the name of his mother-in-law or sister-in-law ? Never since the Pacific scandal has the Government at Ottawa appeared in such a bad light. Were a general election held to-morrow the Liberals would sweep the country to the cry of "turn the rascals out."

Not only have the Conservative journals of Canada—some of them, at all events—spoken out freely and boldly and denounced this Administration from the top to the bottom, for their gross dereliction of duty, if not for their criminal connivance with fraud and forgery, but the very smell of the corruption at Ottawa has crossed the broad Atlantic, and we find the English papers discussing the question just now. I quote from an English paper of the 10th August the following :—

"As just exposed, a more sordid spectacle of corruption has never been presented by a free people. Whatever defence individuals and politicians may make in the United States, it it is abundantly clear that the cancer of corruption has eaten deep into Canadian institutions. Political life in the United States is not particularly pure, but we would be exceedingly surprised if the Canadian record could be beaten."

And yet the hon. Minister of Justice tells us that neither at home nor abroad has the conduct of the Administration or the conduct of the departments from the highest to the lowest made Canada a reproach and a shame among the nations of the earth. The hon. gentleman has evidently been sleeping. I say again, Sir, that you may search the history of this country or the history of any other country in vain for the last 150 years to find a parallel to this unparalleled condition of affairs that exists right under the Vice-regal nose in the capital of the Dominion of Canada. Almost every department is saturated with corruption, until the very air of Ottawa is tainted with its foul odour. Sir, what will be the result of all these frauds now open, now plain, now exposed, in connection with the Kingston graving dock and other public works ? Is there an honest man in the Government ? Or is the Government like the City of the Plains, without a good man or an honest man in it ? I do not believe it. I believe there are two or three fairly honest men in the Goverment. If there are, let them take warning ; let them set their faces steadily in favour of the right and against the wrong ; let them expel from the Government every man tainted with this moral leprosy. If not, let them withdraw themselves, with whatever little shreds of character they may have left after their association with men worse than themselves. Sir, the whole thing is rotting, has rotted ; the whole thing is crumbling, has crumbled to decay ; the whole thing is passing, has almost passed away. The old ship has sunk ; the old ship is almost at the bottom ; let the honest men in the Government leave it before it becomes a complete wreck ; and I know this, Mr. Speaker, that the good and true men of Canada everywhere will earnestly pray that we may have a sharp and speedy deliverance.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is but right that I should say something on the present occasion, as the great public work now under discussion has been constructed in the city whence I come, where I was born and brought up, and where I have lived all my life. It is therefore needless for me to say that I take a great interest in it. Now, very little has been said in this discussion as to the necessity of the Kingston graving dock at all, or as to whether it has been placed in the right position. I do not propose to go into that question, further than to say that when we have spent so many millions of dollars as we have done in utilizing the great waterways with which Providence has endowed our country we should be failing in our duty if we did not make that canal system perfect in all its parts. The strength of a chain is tested by the strength of its weakest link, and so the chain of our waterway system would be defective if one of its links were wanting. At the present day the large and costly vessels engaged in the carrying trade of the inland waters, drawing from 14 to 16 feet of water, and carrying from 70,000 to 75,000 bushels of grain, would not come down to Lake Ontario if no means were afforded on that lake for docking and repairing them. The owners of those large and costly vessels would prefer to take a lesser freight and go to Buffalo, where in case of accident their vessels could be docked, and where their cargoes could be transhipped and sent *viâ* the Erie Canal to New York and thence to Europe ; and our great waterways of the St. Lawrence, and our seaports of Montreal and Quebec, would lose the trade which we have been endeavouring to get for them by enlarging and perfecting our canal system. It was a necessity, then, that there should be a graving dock built on Lake Ontario to complete our canal system. The Boards of Trade of Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston and other ports all united in petitioning the Government, and in sending deputations to Ottawa to ask that that great work should be constructed ; and they named Kingston as the place where it should be located, be-

cause Kingston is the port where those cargoes are transhipped to be sent to Montreal *viâ* the St. Lawrence, and thence to Europe. For these reasons the Government undertook, and in my opinion wisely undertook, the construction of this great public work; and I may say that no matter in what way we may view the inception of this contract or the circumstances connected with it, let any practical man go and view that work, which is now being finished, and he will say that it is a credit to Canada and the Government, that it is a credit to the contractors and the workingmen who built it, that it is a substantial and solidly-built work. It has been practically completed for some weeks, and it only now awaits the putting in of the gates or caisson. So much with regard to the work. Now, Sir, the motion which is placed in your hands asks this House to condemn the Government for their culpable negligence in letting the contract, for the changes made in the terms thereof, and for the moneys paid under such contract. Now, what evidence has been adduced of this culpable negligence? We have the returns which have been brought down and laid on the Table of the House; we have the evidence which has been taken before the Public Accounts Committee; and it is upon that evidence that we are asked to base this resolution condemning the Government for culpable negligence in letting the contract and in making the changes. What is this evidence, Sir? The evidence is that some twenty tenders were put in for this work, among them one by a man named Andrew C. Bancroft, whose tender happened to be the lowest. There is no evidence, there is no insinuation made, that this tender or any other tender was put in after the prescribed time, except one which was mentioned in the evidence of Mr. Gobeil; and that tender was not considered, because it was away up, the highest of the whole lot. All the tenders were put in regularly, and Mr. Gobeil, in his sworn evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, testified that all those tenders were in before the office closed on the 20th of March, that they were in at half-past one o'clock, that they were locked in a safe of which he kept the key, that no one had access to those tenders, and that they were not opened until the next morning, when they were opened in the presence of himself and Mr. Baillairgé, the Deputy Minister of Public Works. There is no evidence that there was any tampering with the tenders at all, and we must therefore accept the evidence given by Mr. Gobeil. The hon. gentlemen opposite had opportunity before the Public Accounts Committee to call every official of the Public Works Department; they had opportunity to call the Minister himself and cross-examine him, just as he has been crossed-examined severely before another Committee of this House; but the only evidence given is that these tenders were put in, and that no one had access to them to see them, or manipulate them, or tamper with them in the slightest degree. Now, I happened at that time to know that there was a tender put in by some gentlemen in Kingston who were desirous of getting the contract. I know that their tender was not the lowest, but they were very anxious to learn why they should not get the contract; and when it came to my knowledge that there were lower tenders, I said to them: You cannot expect to get the contract, because your tender is not the lowest; whoever is the lowest and puts up the money must get it. The Minister was of the same opinion, and the lowest tenderer, who put up a cheque for $20,000, got the contract. Now, unless it can be shown by evidence, and not by mere insinuations, that the Minister knew this was a mythical person, he would have been guilty, not of culpable negligence, but of malfeasance, if he had dared to give that tender to anyone above that lowest tender. This lowest tenderer got the contract; and although he was a mythical person, although the tender was put in under the name of another, I want to know has the country suffered by it? The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) said he would consider only three tenders. He would consider only the tender of Bancroft, and then the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer, which was $5,000 higher, and then the Connollys tender. But why does he consider only these three? Does he think that these three were the lowest? No such thing; there were many tenders between the Macdonald tender and the Connollys. The Connollys tendered at $322,000, and there were tenders reaching all the way from $260,000 to that amount. Why, Sir, if Bancroft & Connolly had not got the contract there were half a dozen other tenderers who would have got it. The contract was given to the lowest tenderer. How did the country suffer by that? But, say hon. gentlemen opposite, extras were given them. Now, let us see what extras were given. The hon. member for Huron has told us of the great and apparent blunder which was made—not a blunder only, but a crime—because, he says, there was a proposal to widen the entrance of the dock from 48 to 60 feet, by which the cost would not have been increased, as there would have been less masonry to construct, and that would have made the work cheaper to the contractors. And, he says, then it was widened from 48 to 55 feet, and the estimated cost was $34,000. But he has overlooked a very important paper which has been laid upon the Table. He has overlooked the plan, which shows that not only was the entrance to the dock widened, but the whole side of the dock was widened, 9 feet at the top and 7 feet at the bottom, causing an excavation the whole length of the dock and increasing the expense all the way through, besides increasing the expense with regard to the coffer dam, all of which is set out in the estimate of the engineer; and although the engineer estimated the cost of widening the dock, not of the entrance, at $34,000, all the contractors have been allowed for it is $31,000. Yet we are told that an Order in Council was passed just after the election to give $50,000 for the widening. Will any hon gentleman show that that sum has been paid, or what sum has been paid the contractors at all for that work? I have looked at the figures, and find that the only amount paid the contracters for extras is $31,000 for the widening of the dock, and the total paid them up to date is only $256,000, including all their extras, although their contract price was $260,000. I have been informed by these gentlemen who tendered for the work in Kingston and did not get it, although they offered to do it for $292,000, that they were very glad they did not get it, because they found the cost of the work was going to be greatly exceeded and they would not have made anything out of it. And yet we find

these favoured contractors took it at $31,000 less, and they are supposed to have made a tremendous fortune.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But they get $190,000 more.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is where hon. gentlemen opposite are mistaken. These contractors did not get that. These increased expenses were not for Connolly Brothers, contractors for the dock, but they were for the pumping material and caisson and the engine house. The evidence of Mr. Michael Connolly, given before the Public Accounts Committee, shows this. He said:

"We tendered on the machinery and were not awarded the contract; we tendered on the caisson and were not awarded the contract; we tendered on the engine house and did not get that."

These are the favoured contractors, these are the men who have got the *entrée* of the Public Works Department and on whose account we are asked to blame that department. We find that they tendered for three separate and important works connected with the Kingston dry dock, and did not obtain any one of them.

Mr. TARTE. When?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It must have been last year or sooner. I do not know the dates, but it was when the tenders were advertised for, and they were all advertised for. Although I speak as a citizen of Kingston and know something about the dock, I knew nothing about the Connolly Brothers, contractors, until long after they took the work. I have never been consulted by them with regard to a single item in connection with their work, and I have never written a letter to the department or spoken a single word to anyone connected with ths department about them or their work. I know as little of their transactions as any one in this House, and can act freely and independently with reference to this matter, because I know nothing about their contract and have never been consulted by them about any of the changes or proposed changes. But I read this from the evidence, that they tendered for these separate works and did not get one of them. That does not look as if they were the pampered favourites of the Public Works Department. Here are three important works connected with the dry dock and involving large expenditures. The pumping plant alone cost $24,000, the caisson $17,000, and the engine house another large sum. Yet not one of these contracts did they get. These extras asked for in the estimate of the engineer were to pay for these public works, and I am informed that the total amount paid to Connolly Brothers is only $256,000, although their contract price is $260,000, and although they have widened the dock and have changed the caisson recess from the west to the east. I do not see among the papers any estimate showing what that is to cost, but I have looked at the plans, and I tell the hon. mover of this resolution that he has been under a mistake when he thinks that this sum of $31,000 paid the Connolly Brothers, or $34,000, as estimated by the engineer, was for the cost of widening the entrance. It was the estimated cost of widening the dock. The hon. member for Huron waxed eloquent, and he spoke of the letter of the engineer being dated on a certain day, recommending that change, and of the recommendation to Council having been made the same day. Well, I tell the hon. gentleman that at that time they were building the dock and had some of the stones laid for building it, according to the original plans, and if there had been any delay the cost would have been so much greater. If it was going to be altered at all it was right, and necessary, and proper that it should be altered at once, and I know that the owners of this steamboat *Cibola*, and some other steamboats, made complaints that the Government were building this fine and costly dock, which would be a credit to the country and a great public work, and yet that it would not receive some of the steamers plying on Lake Ontario, and they said it ought to be made large enough to take in the largest vessel plying on Lake Ontario. I consider the Government did only their duty in changing the width of the dock and making the alteration promptly. The dock was changed so as to give an additional 9 feet width at the top and 7 feet at the bottom all through.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How came the blunder in the dimensions to be made in the first place?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am not in the secrets of the Government; but I suppose it was originally intended to accommodate the grain vessels coming down the Welland Canal, and the dock was made to accommodate the largest of those vessels. Then the *Cibola* was brought out in parts from Scotland, was put together at Deseronto, either in the winter when this contract was let or the winter after, and she was too large to go up the Welland Canal, so it was found necessary, if she was to be accommodated, that the dock should be enlarged. They are building larger vessels all the time, and I expect in a few years there will be applications to enlarge this dock even from its present size. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) talked about fraud, and forgery, and perjury, with that recklessness which is characteristic of him. He spoke with a glibness and profuseness on that subject at which I could not help being astonished. He made these walls ring with his denunciations of those crimes. It brought to my mind some years ago, when frauds were being exposed in this chamber, and that hon. gentleman did not raise his voice in so loud a manner. When frauds were referred to in connection with the Goderich harbour, when "my friend Moore" made $34,000 out of the people of this country——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I was not here then.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then that is the only excuse he has for having kept silent. That was some excuse for him, but I never heard of him in the country or on the platform denouncing those frauds.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You should get your facts right. I was not in Parliament then.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; the hon. gentleman was not here because—I will not say why.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Because I sent a good man in my place.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I shall not detain the House much longer. I assert that any hon. member, if he is truly desirous of exposing fraud and putting it down, if he will give us any case of fraud or jobbery, will find no members of the House more eager to expose and discover fraud and put it down than hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But,

when any member gets up here and declaims about fraud, and forgery, and perjury, and does not found his charges upon some evidence, he cannot expect hon. members to vote for a resolution condemning the Government for culpable negligence when there is not a jot or tittle of evidence to support his statement. I have here the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, and I ask any hon. member to show a line which proves or goes to prove that there was any fraud, or jobbery, or negligence, culpable or not, in letting this contract. The hon. gentleman had every opportunity of calling witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee to substantiate his position. He did not do so, either because he knew he could not prove it, or because he did not wish to do so; but the evidence before us is simply that of Mr. Saucier, Mr. Gobeil, Mr. Montague Anderson and Mr. Michael Connolly, and in all that there is not a word to justify the resolution put in your hands, nor do I find anything to justify it in the papers which have been laid upon the Table. The fact is, that this contract was let to the lowest tenderer, whether a mythical person or not. There was no perjury connected with it. I am not prepared now to say what forgery is, but signing the name of a mythical person is not always forgery. Whatever fraud there was, was not in connection with the Public Works Department, but was committed against the Public Works Department, and surely the hon. gentleman will not ask us to condemn the Public Works Department for a fraud committed against that department. The contract was let to the lowest tenderer. The country has saved by it. The work has been well and properly done, and if hon. gentlemen can show that there have been any improper changes they might have something to go upon. The only change they can show is in the widening of the dock, and everyone will admit that that was a proper change. There is no suggestion that it has cost more than it ought to have cost. What, therefore, are we to condemn the Government for? Where is the evidence of culpable negligence in the payment of the moneys for these changes? There is not a shadow of evidence on that. The hon. gentleman has not made his case complete. He has not shown, as he might have done before the Public Accounts Committee, what money has been paid. There is no evidence here of any money having been paid. He simply read the estimates of the engineers, and we do not know that those have been paid. In fact, I am informed that they have not been paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was the Governor General's warrant for?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That does not say the money has been paid. It simply places the amount to the credit of the Public Works Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then it was issued unconstitutionally and illegally.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then we may discuss that, but this resolution does not touch that question. Let us judge this resolution by the evidence and see whether it is substantiated or not, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, to all independent thinking men, to read the evidence, and I think they will come to the conclusion that there is nothing whatever to justify the resolution which has been placed in your hands.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. GIBSON. This matter of the Kingston Graving Dock has been so thoroughly discussed by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) that there is very little left for me to say, except that, as a practical contractor, looking over the papers in this case, I have several matters to submit to the House which I think will be evidence to the contrary of what my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has stated, that no additional sums have been unjustly paid by the Government upon the Kingston graving dock. He also says that the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. I will call the attention of the House for a few moments to a letter which was written in connection with the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer. On page 55 of the returns brought down to the House I find, accompanying the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer, the copy of a letter which reads as follows:—

"We hereby certify that we have visited the site of the proposed dry dock at Kingston, carefully examined the locality and have satisfied ourselves as to the nature of materials to be removed, the foundation of coffer dams and probable cost as required by advertisement. Besides the sum placed in our tenders for pile and crib work dams (in accordance with plans exhibited) we beg to submit you an offer for construction, maintenance and removal of a puddle clay or earth dam in place of those called for (a section of which we enclose) for the sum of $17,000."

Now, Sir, as will be seen by this letter, Macdonald & Aylmer offered to construct a dam at a cost of $17,000 in place of a crib dam and pile dam combined, for which they asked the sum of $53,000. Now, to take their dam at $17,000 would reduce their estimate to $36,000. It is only fair to say that in the schedule an error occurs in the extension of 750 cubic yards of masonry at $10, which reads only $750, whereas it should read $7,500, making an addition to their contract of $6,850. If you add that to the $229,810, that would make Macdonald & Aylmer's net contract $236,660. Taking that from the Bancroft offer of $260,680.75, we find that the Macdonald & Aylmer tender was $24,020.75 less than the Bancroft & Connolly tender. Now, I submit that if all the care had been exercised that hon. gentlemen opposite claim has been exercised, and had always been exercised, by the Public Works Department, then a gross injustice was done to Macdonald & Aylmer and to the country by the Government not sending for them and examining them as to the proposed dam which they offered to construct, and thus saving $24,020.75 to the treasury of the Dominion. Now, it may be observed that according to the advertisement every contractor was obliged to go to Kingston and examine the locality for himself, and to state in his tender that he had done so, and that he was in a position to enter into the contract upon the conditions and specifications presented before him. Now, Sir, how does it come about that, in the matter of Bancroft—whether he was a myth or not, he was certainly unknown to the Public Works Department; he was unknown among the contractors and among public men—how did it come about that an unknown man, who had made a tender which ought to have been thrown out and never considered at all, was able to send a letter, on the day following the extension of the contract, stating that he was prepared to enter into the contract, inasmuch as he had secured the Connollys as partners with him, and, on the same day, the Connollys wrote very

much to the same effect—that they had entered into partnership with Andrew C. Bancroft and were prepared to carry out the contract at the prices submitted in the Bancroft tender? Now, I submit, that Bancroft tender was not the lowest tender by $24,000. I am not going to consider the question as to who was present at the signing of the contract, or whether anyone was there to represent Bancroft. We may suppose that the contract, after it was signed, was commenced very shortly afterwards, and not until the 2nd of July, 1890, do we find that any alterations were asked for with respect to the Kingston graving dock. Now, on the 2nd of July, this year, in speaking in Committee about this Kingston graving dock, this House was given to understand that the only alteration made to that dock was by increasing the width of the entrance from 48 to 55 feet, as already mentioned by some of the speakers, and I mentioned it myself on the floor of the House. Now, the engineer reported that on account of the *Cibola* being of such a breadth of beam it was then supposed that an entrance of 48 feet wide would need to be extended to 60 feet, and the engineer reported that that alteration in the width of the opening would cost the country nothing. Accordingly an Order in Council was passed sanctioning the increased width of the entrance. Twenty days afterwards, on the 22nd of July, the engineer discovers that the *Cibola* was only 53 feet beam and that 55 feet entrance at the opening of the dock would be sufficient for all purposes, the engineer stating then that a 55 feet opening would cost in round numbers $34,000. Now, to my surprise, I not only find that the increased entrance had been made to the dock, but I find by the plans laid upon the Table of the House this afternoon that the dock itself has been widened 7 feet, and there is no Order in Council or no document in the possession of the Government—at least, they have not brought down any to the House—to warrant this change in a public work of this kind. I say it was a piece of bad engineering on the part of the chief engineer on a public work of such magnitude, and the Government are responsible for it, in that they did not first acquaint themselves with the requirements of the shipping trade of our lakes, and I venture to say that had this been done in time, not a dollar would have been required for extras. But that was not the mode of procedure adopted with the Connollys and Bancroft. Now, I find that in addition to the dock being widened 7 feet they have changed the caisson chamber from the west side of the dock to the east side, for what reason I know not. I find in a special report laid down here that the different amount for the increased widening of the dock is in a different schedule by itself, and provided for under a separate contract; yet, notwithstanding that, a very large amount of money, something over $15,000, has been paid as an extra amount for the side wall of the dock. Now, I find in this special report covering the recommendation of the engineer for the change being made, that there are 2,500 cubic yards of rock excavation. While on this subject, I may say that when the engineer submitted this report to the Minister of Public Works and when the Minister submitted it to Council it was discovered that the engineer was quite willing to allow the contractor $2 a cubic yard for this rock excavation instead of $1, as mentioned in the schedule of contract prices. Fortunately, however, for the country, and to the credit of the Ministers be it said, this was discovered, and in the recommendation made for the Order in Council, $34,000 was granted, less a reduction of $1 a yard on the actual number of yards excavated in the widening of the dock. I find the Government have paid for 2,500 yards of rock excavation, but from the way in which the hon. member for Frontenac spoke it seemed to be very doubtful if the contractors received a dollar. But we have the documents showing that certain estimates have been made by the engineers, and I presume on those estimates those gentlemen received their pay. I find they have been paid for rock excavation, 2,500 cubic yards at contract price $1 per yard, $2,500; extra drains, 400 lineal feet at 20 cents, $80; concrete, 246 cubic yards at $6, $1,500. Masonry: in dock floor, 175 cubic yards, at $9.35, $1,636.25.; in walls, 120 cubic yards at $8.25, $990; 135 cubic feet of granite at $1.85, $249.75. Extra length of caisson chamber, masonry, 109 cubic yards at $8.50, $926.50. Concrete, 85 cubic yards at $6.10, $518.60. The engineer allowed these gentlemen $10,000 for additional work in coffer dam. If hon. members will look at the Bancroft-Connolly contract they will find that those worthy gentlemen engaged themselves to provide a dam for the whole of the work for $25,000; yet for this little piece of alteration, because I still have doubts about the dock being enlarged, the engineer has seen fit to allow $10,000 for work in the dam. In Bancroft's tender there was an item of $8,000, and this meant supplying the pumping machinery to keep the site dry from commencement to completion of work. For a small portion of the work they are allowed $1,170. The price was arrived at by calculating the extra surface of the water in the dock and the extra time taken to finish the work, during which time the contractors had to keep the whole of the dock free of water. The engineer allowed the contractor $700 for the use of the derrick. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look up the specifications, as I will do shortly, they will find that in every specification for works of this kind the plant and machinery are included in the price mentioned in the contract. I say here in my place in this House as a contractor, and as one who has probably had as much experience in masonry as any man in my years in the country, that this sum of $750 was an unwarrantable gift made by the chief engineer, or the engineer who recommended it.

Mr. HAGGART. Their prices were not paid under the contract. This was an estimate furnished by the department so as to give the department the value of the work.

Mr. GIBSON. I will give the hon. gentleman all the information if he will wait a little while. I am not as old a politician as the Postmaster General, and I hope he will not put me off my pins, as they say.

Mr. LISTER. You know more about masonry.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps I do. On extra cribbing there was paid 31,148 cubic feet at 10 cents, $3,114; cutting crib, $750. I spoke of $750 being paid the centractors for the delay and the use of their plant. I find in addition these same worthy gentlemen are to be paid $600 for removing their plant. There is not a derrick in Connolly's possession at Kingston dock that cannot be taken down, removed to any part of the works, and set

up for $60, and those who are not able to do it for that money are not worthy of the name of contractors. It is unfortunate that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were not provided with a copy of the last estimate of the work done at the Kingston graving dock. It is only fair to say that I was told to-day that the July estimate is at Kingston, and consequently hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cannot be provided with a copy of it. I do not see any reason why a copy should not be made from the same calculation as the original which is now at Kingston, and I claim that if we were in possession of that estimate I would be able to show some facts that would astonish hon. gentlemen opposite. I am free to say that I honestly believe that when the Minister of Justice was speaking this afternoon he was under a delusion and under the effect of mis-statements made to him, because I could show from the estimates made by the engineer when the work was commenced and the estimates on which the tenders were based some of the greatest differences in quantities I ever found in my life. In looking over estimates of engineers, contractors know they are always very liberal in their allowances as to quantities, in order to allow sufficient for the completion of the work. It is a sound principle that when an engineer goes either before a railway company or a Government with a great undertaking of which he has charge he will always make ample provision for every contingency which might arise, and I know all contractors will bear me out in saying that they would be very glad on all occasions to take the estimates of the engineer for the contract price. In the estimated quantity of masonry, which is No. 4 in the schedule, on which the chief engineer based Bancroft's tender, there are 8,250 cubic yards. Instead of that quantity I find that in the estimates for the month ending 31st March the quantity returned is 1,075 cubic yards, or an excess of $15,056.25. There is where some of the extra money is going. As to the iron work, it is so jumbled up in the return that there is no possible way of getting at it without taking the whole quantities. I find that according to the estimated quantities of cast-iron under No. 32 the engineer estimated 92,000 pounds; No. 33, 16,000 pounds; No. 34, 6,700 pounds; No. 35, 25,000 pounds; these four numbers embracing 142,700 pounds of cast-iron. According to this document these worthy gentlemen have been paid for 286,000 pounds of cast iron. In addition to that, in item 36 for the rolled joists—and the weights of them are given in the specifications—I find that there were 6,650 pounds of rolled joists, and they have been paid for 15,234 pounds. Now, Sir, this is not a piece of work which is built in a wall. If it is in the Kingston graving dock every inch of it can be seen, and if the Government is honest in this matter and desirous of ferreting this thing out to the bottom, as they pretend to be, let them send two independent engineers to Kingston, and let them measure every piece of the work that has been done; let them bring back a report to the House and state whether the Kingston graving dock is seven feet wider or not, and whether this cast-iron has been built or not, and whether this 10,000 yards of masonry has been built or not. If they do this, I think that they will come to the conclusion that whether the Public Works Department, or the head of the Public Works Department, or the Government is to blame or not, it is quite evident to me, as one of the gentlemen who tendered upon that work, that a gross fraud has been committed on the country by the connivance of gentlemen in the Public Works Department.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on this subject, and I think that after an examination of the whole matter the House will see how very, very little there is in these charges "of rank fraud accompanied by gross perjury and connived at by the Public Works Department," as some hon. gentlemen on the other side have declared. In the first place, you must take into consideration the whole circumstances in connection with the building of this dock. I intend to go into it specifically and to give it in detail. I think it was in the month of February, 1889, that tenders were called for the construction of this dock, and on the 28th of March succeeding the tenders were received. The accusation is made by the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) that the tender of a man named Bancroft must have been put into the Public Works Department after the other tenders had been received, that a knowledge had been given to the person who made that tender that Mr. Macdonald was the lowest tenderer, and that information had been given of the amount of each tender for the construction of the work. What tittle of evidence has there been adduced this evening in support of this charge, which is one of the gravest charges which have ever been made against a man in any public department, or against any Minister conducting the affairs of this country? There has not been a particle of evidence produced here for the purpose of sustaining that charge. On the contrary, the evidence produced before the Public Accounts Committee is directly opposite, and proves that no such thing could have occurred. The officer who received these tenders stated that the latest tender came in at half-past one or two o'clock in the afternoon, and that after that no tenders were received. He received those tenders, took them to a safe, deposited them in that safe, opened them next day, and the evidence was brought out, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), that the envelopes bore evidence that there had been no tampering with them, and the officer of the department clearly swore that no person could possibly have had possession of them. They were opened in the presence of Mr. Baillairgé and Mr. Gobeil. So much then for the statement of the hon. gentleman that there was criminal connivance in the Department of Public Works, that it was self-evident that there was criminal connivance, that that tender was handed in for the purpose of being lower than Mr. Macdonald's tender, and for the purpose of giving that work to Mr. Connolly. There were 20 tenders received. As the tenders were made out by a schedule of rates it took some time to schedule them out and to apportion and find out which was the lowest; but as the evidence shows, they were all treated in the same manner. The tender of one Andrew Bancroft was found to be the lowest. Now as to the statement of the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Cameron), that it was the duty of the Government to reject these tenders because they were in similar handwriting, let me ask what reason is there that the Govern-

ment should reject a tender because it was in the same handwriting as another. Suppose that the twenty tenders were in presumably the same handwriting, was it the duty of the Government to reject them because of this? What did the Minister of Public Works do with the tenders? The sums were totalled out, handed to the Minister of Public Works, and all he knew was the different parties who had tendered and the amounts of their tender, and who was the lowest. How was he to know that Mr. Bancroft was not a person who was entitled to tender, or was capable of performing the work. It is true that in the Department no such a man as Andrew Bancroft was known, or could be known, and if his tender was not accompanied by a letter a few days afterwards, from parties who were competent to do the work, who had been contractors for the Government and had performed their work in a skilful and efficient manner, it would have been the duty of the Minister to find out who Bancroft was, and to see whether he was capable of performing the work or not. But, after he got the assurance of competent parties that the work should be carried out, I say that the duties of the Minister ended there. He had the assurance of parties who were efficient contractors and who were capable of performing the work, that the work would be efficiently performed. The duty of the Minister ended there. It was not his duty to enquire; and I suppose the idea never struck him that there was no such person as Andrew Bancroft. He simply performed his duty to the department and to the country by accepting the lowest tender. He did accept the lowest tender, and he saw that the money was deposited necessary for the fulfilment of that contract, and further than that, he saw that the contract was associated with parties who were capable of performing the work. What fault then is there to be found with the Minister for that? The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) states that on another occasion the Government took a different view of the matter. The hon. gentleman and his friends, when speaking upon the other side of the House took a different view of it also, and they said that although that the tender was an illegal one, although it was accompanied by a cheque that was only good for two days, it was the duty of the Government, as there was a large amount to be saved for the country, to accept that tender. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) takes a different view and a different form of argument, and he says: Oh, the tender was illegal. Mr. Andrew Bancroft was a myth; it was the duty of the Government to discover whether there was such a person or not, and to strike the tender out altogether as illegal. I leave it to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I leave it to any one in the House, if it is a thing that can be charged to the Government of the country or against the Minister of Public Works that there was a fraud committed on the country because the Minister had no means of knowing that there was no Andrew Bancroft—and there is not a tittle of evidence to show that he had any means of knowing—and because he accepted the lowest tender, associated as it was with a party who was perfectly capable and competent to do the work. Then there is a charge against the Minister because the engineer-in-chief stated to him that a certain Niagara Steamship Company had informed him that they had a large steamer on the lake, and that the dock should be built of such a size and capacity as to accommodate that vessel; and the chief engineer reported that the widening of the dock from 48 feet to 60 feet would not entail any additional cost to the country; and because the Minister acts promptly on that report and communicates it to Council on the same day that the engineer reports that is an evidence of connivance and fraud on the part of the Minister of Public Works. I never before heard of an argument of that kind adduced before any public assembly, or before sensible people. But it must have struck the hon. gentleman that the enlargement of a dock from 48 feet to 60 feet wide must entail an increased cost to the country. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is as competent in these matters as I would be; but it seems to me that it ought to have struck the engineer that that change would increase the cost. It would increase the width of the caisson, and the depth and breadth of the lock; it would have increased the width of the end wall; and I should have thought that the engineer at a glance would have known that the widening of the dock must have entailed an extra cost on the country. However, before any action was taken, the engineer recommended a different system to the Government. He went up and made an examination of the work, and he found that the largest vessel used on Lake Ontario, the *Cibola*, had a breadth of 55 feet; and so he reported to the head of the department that it was not necessary to increase the width of the dock to 60 feet, but that all that was needed was an enlargement to 55 feet; and he gave a detailed statement of what the total expenditure would be for the purpose of widening that dock, and that detailed statement is the statement which the hon. member for Lincoln spoke of. He puts it down at $34,000, and the Minister recommends to Council that the $34,000 be applied for that purpose; but Council refuses to increase the price of any work which the contractors had agreed to do at a certain price. One of the principal items of the increase was the excavation of the bottom of the dock, for which the contractors asked $2 a yard, and Council refuses to allow them this increase, but decided to confine them to the price at which they had tendered to do the work, namely, $1 a yard. Now, the total extra expenditure for the enlargement of that Kingston dock from 48 to 55 feet was $31,000. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite saying: Oh, this graving dock has cost so much over the original contract price of $260,000—that its cost has reached $450,000. Now, the cost of the dock, according to the contract with M. Connolly & Co, or Bancroft & Connolly, was to be $260,000, and the amount of extra expenditure for enlarging it is $31,000; the total amount therefore that those parties would be entitled to is $291,000. Of that amount there has been paid only $256,000; and when hon. gentlemen opposite state that there has been a largely increased expenditure, amounting to $450,000, why do they state it? Is it not for the purpose of misleading this House and the country, and inducing the people of this country to believe that money was improperly paid to M. Connolly & Co? I will tell the hon. gentlemen opposite how the $450,000 is made up, and I will show that the extra expenditure over the payments of $256,000 to M. Connolly & Co. is in no way connected with their part of the work:

Valves—paid at contract prices—so much per pound of iron	$ 3,000
Caisson—under separate contract—Dominion Bridge Company	18,000
Hauling gear—paid contract prices	2,000
Pumping plant—separate contract, John Inglis & Sons	23,300
Engine and boiler house, &c., separate contract, P. Navin	11,000
Shop tools	2,500
Coal shed	1,000
Fencing and gates	2,500
Shores, wedges, bilge blocks	2,500
Blocks, storehouse, &c	2,500
Residence for dock master and engineer and dock office	5,000
Electric plant	2,500
Expenditure, 1888-89, for site, preliminary work, &c.	33,763

These are the items over the $256,000 which has been paid to M. Connolly & Co., which go to constitute the expenditure up to date on the dock at Kingston.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether these are included in the estimate which the Minister brought down of $318,000 as the total cost of the work?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know about that. I think the estimate of the Minister did not include the site. He estimated the total cost at $400,000, if I remember rightly. The $318,000 was for the construction of the dock alone. The total expenditure up to the present time is, I believe, in the neighbourhood of $450,000 or $456,000. But the charge in this resolution has no reference to that, and no reference to the estimate made by the Minister. The charge in the resolution is that by gross negligence on the part of the Public Works Department, by criminal connivance of some one in the department, according to the statement of the hon. member for West Huron, a fraud and a forgery were committed on the country—that this is one of the scandals that makes Canada a by-word among the nations of the world, that this is one of the acts of corruption of which the Government are guilty; and it is just such charges as this which have been hurled from one end of the country to the other, without one scintilla of evidence to show any fraud or wrong-doing on the part of the Government. The contract was fairly and honestly let to the lowest tenderer, who associated himself with contractors who honestly and faithfully performed their work for the Government. And is not that done every day in all public works departments? If a man puts in the lowest tender, but is not known, and is told: We do not know your capacity for performing the work or whether you have the plant necessary, but you may associate yourself with others. They do not say this; but he understands what is meant, and if he is associated with some party who had been in the habit of performing the work honestly and faithfully, and at fair prices, the contract is awarded him. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite charge that the Government knew who this party was, that the Postmaster General shielded the Minister of Public Works and obtained information for the purpose of telling who Brancroft was. Now, I may state to the House, as I stated the first time the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) moved to know who was the possessor of box 254 in the Kingston post office. I had not the slightest idea for what purpose he wished to obtain the information. I gave the motion to my deputy and told him to find out, and the answer he gave me I gave to the House. When I found out for what object the hon. gentleman wished to obtain the information I ordered the department to use the most strenuous efforts to discover who it was that had the box; and I will read, in defence of myself and the department, the whole correspondence between myself and the officer, in which you will see that neither I nor the department down here is in any way to blame. Here is the answer of the Inspector:

"KINGSTON, ONT., 19th June, 1891.

"W. WHITE, Esq.,
"Deputy Postmaster General, Ottawa.

"There are lock boxes and drawers in the Kingston post office which are leased to all applicants by year or quarter; were so leased in 1889; yearly charges $4 and $6, proceeds deposited monthly to the credit of Receiver General; record of names of lessees is kept, but only for current and past year.

"ALLAN JONES."

I ordered a letter to be written to the post office inspector in Kingston, and another to be written to the postmaster, and here is the reply:

"POST OFFICE INSPECTOR'S OFFICE,
"KINGSTON, 8th June, 1891.

"MY DEAR DEPUTY,—In reply to your enquiry of the 6th instant asking who was the lessee of Box No. 254 in the Kington post office on or about the 28th May, 1889, I wired you this morning that there was no such box, but that, Box No. 524, which was vacant for some time prior to 1st April, 1889, appears to have been leased for a short time in June quarter, 1889, to one 'Bancroft' whose Christian name cannot be given, the register not being complete.

"R. T. Burns, the defaulting assistant postmaster, who had charge of the box rents, left the office in June, 1889, and the records for the quarter are not fully entered up.

"Do you not make a mistake in enquiring about Box 254?

"Yours truly,
"ALLAN JONES.
"*P. O. Inspector.*

"W. WHITE, Esq,
"Deputy Postmaster General,
"Ottawa."

Subsequently, my deputy got the following letter:—

"POST OFFICE INSPECTOR'S OFFICE,
"KINGSTON, 10th June, 1891.

"MY DEAR DEPUTY,—Your letter of 9th June instant *re* post office box No. 524 to hand. I am afraid I cannot supplement the information already given in my letter and telegram of 8th instant. There is nothing to show that the box was leased prior to 1st April, 1889, or subsequent to June of same year; but it does appear to have been rented at some time, and I can only conclude that it was leased in June quarter, 1889, to a party named Bancroft, from the facts that letters for one of that name were at one time delivered through a lock box, and that Bancroft returned 2 keys when giving up a box, as witness the memo. on envelope enclosed made by Andrew Deacon, who was transferred to the Kingston office in September, 1888. It is to be regretted that this memo. is not dated.

"Perhaps the June quarter, 1889, box-rent vouchers, would throw some light upon the subject?

"Yours faithfully,
"ALLAN JONES,
"*P. O. Inspector.*

"W. WHITE,
"Deputy Postmaster General,
"Ottawa."

In answer to the enquiry made on going into Committee of Supply, I further promised the hon. gentleman that I would have enquiries made of the letter carriers in Kingston, and would obtain from them all the information I could, so far as their memories served them, which would in any way tend to show who this Bancroft was. The letter carriers gave the information to the inspector that the letters directed to this man in Kingston post office were delivered at the graving dock to Connolly & Co.'s clerk. These are all the facts in possession of the department. Yet hon. gentlemen

opposite, notwithstanding these facts were given to the House, state that the Post Office Department shielded the Public Works Department and helped to prevent the House finding out who this man Bancroft was. That is on a par with the other accusations. Look at the whole case? Is there a single scintilla of evidence to sustain the charge of fraud against the Government? Did not the Government honestly receive the tenders? Were they not carefully guarded from the moment they came into the Public Works Department? Were they not opened in the presence of the Deputy Minister, Mr. Baillairgé, and the secretary of the department? Was the contract not awarded to the lowest tenderer? There was no evidence to show that the Department of Public Works had any cognizance at all that there was no such man as Andrew Bancroft, and the Minister did his duty faithfully in seeing that the lowest tender was accepted, and in seeing that the party tendering was associated with men who had the means, capital and material for carrying on the work; and in the extension of the dock every precaution was taken. The Government got an estimate from the engineer as to the probable cost of the extension. The estimate produced this evening shows that the probable cost was estimated at $34,000. The Government gave $31,000 to the contractor on his old schedule prices at which he had contracted to do the rest of the work. And on what ground is there a charge of corruption, of fraud, of criminal connivance, and the grossest forgery ever perpetrated in the country? Are there men on the other side of the House who, knowing the facts and circumstances, will this evening vote, on such evidence as has been produced before them, condemnation on my hon. friend who has administered the Public Works Department? Are there men here who will say that he was criminally cognizant that a fraud was being perpetrated, because of his acceptance of the tender and the way in which he managed this affair? If that is so, public opinion in this country, public regard for the reputation of the men who are ruling this country, is sunk to a low ebb, when people sitting in the same chamber, supposed to have the feelings of gentlemen, would vote in support of any such resolution as that now proposed by the hon. member for Huron.

Mr. GERMAN. Without desiring to prolong this discussion to a very great length, I wish to make a few remarks touching the question now before the House. I must say that I am somewhat surprised that the hon. Minister of Justice, at present leading this House, did not adopt in this case the course he has deemed it advisable to adopt in other cases lately, and that is, to accept the suggestion of hon. gentlemen on this side when going into Committee of Supply. I think he had as good reason in this as in the other cases lately to accept our suggestion. I think that, in the interests of the country, it is advisable to accept this principle, and I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should refuse to support the resolution before the House. That resolution is not, as I understand it, a vote of want of confidence in the Government generally. At least, it would not have such an effect had the Government not made themselves accessories after the fact. I apprehend that the Government cannot be held at all times responsible for the wrongful acts of a Minister in the department when those acts are not known to the Government, but as soon as they become known to the Government I submit that, unless the Government promptly expels the head of that department, in which those wrongful acts have taken place from his position, they make themselves accessories after the fact and are to be held equally responsible with him. This resolution does not, in the main, blame the Government, but it does blame the Public Works Department. It says:

"The documents and papers submitted to Parliament in relation to the Kingston graving dock, and the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee and reported to this House in relation to the said dock, show that gross fraud and forgery were committed in connection with the said contract."

Now, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite if that allegation is not correct. I appeal to every gentleman in this House if that allegation is not correct, and I believe that that allegation will be held to be correct by the people of this country. There was a gross fraud and forgery in connection with that contract. The evidence shows it. The facts elicited before the Public Accounts Committee show that there was forgery. The hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says that he is not sure that there was forgery. I was of the opinion that a gentleman who has been so long in legal practice would have been able to give a definition of forgery off hand. Forgery is the false making of a document with the intent to defraud or deceive. Now, can the hon. gentleman say there was not the intention to defraud or to deceive in the making up of the Brancroft tender, in the signing of the letters signed by the Connollys? It was an absolute and distinct fraud, it was a forgery, for which Michael Connolly should be arrested and put on his trial. It was a fraud against the Department of Public Works and against the Government of this country. And I say—and I believe I will be borne out in that by the sentiment of the people of this country—that it would be wise for the Minister of Justice to institute criminal proceedings against that gentleman for the fraud he perpetrated. If that is a fraud, if that is a forgery, that allegation in this resolution is quite correct. Then, why should it not be accepted? If it is correct, accept it; if it is not, reject it. Then the resolution says:

"And that culpable negligence marked the letting of said contract, and the changes made in the terms thereof, and the moneys paid under such changes."

I submit that is borne out by the evidence. Culpable negligence marked the letting of that contract. The Public Works Department were not seized of all the facts connected with the work which, when completed, would make it of practical use to the country. There was culpable negligence in their not having sufficient data upon which to construct that graving dock, a large public undertaking, necessitating the outlay of a large amount of money. It was necessary that extensive engineering surveys should have been made, that all the information should have been obtained that possibly could be obtained before it was gone on with. That was not done, and the proof is that the work was, according to the Public Works Department, necessarily changed in order to be efficient for the vessels which ply on Lake Ontario. It is very clear, from the nature of the circumstances, that there was negligence in the change that was made and in the letting of the contract. My hon. friend

from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) argues that the work is a good work. No one disputes that. The work is a good work. We, on this side of the House, do not deny that the work is a good work, and no one in the country will attempt to deny that; but that is not the gist of the question under discussion. We are not saying whether it is a good work or a bad work, but we are asking the House to say that there was fraud in the letting of the contract, and that there was negligence in the letting of the contract. The Minister of Justice and hon. gentlemen on that side of the House say that the country saved $5,000 by the contract being let to these parties. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has shown to the contrary. He has shown that if the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer had been accepted the country would have saved money. He has shown that, in the very matter of the coffer dam, there would have been a saving of $10,000. The tender of Bancroft was only $5,000 lower than that of Macdonald & Aylmer. Now, that $5,000 would have been overcome by the difference in price of the coffer dam being a trifle over $10,000, so that if the scheme proposed by Macdonald & Aylmer had been adopted, if they had been allowed to construct the coffer dam which they suggested, and being from a man so perfectly able to carry out his proposal, this country would have saved $5,000, and their price would have been lower by that amount than the Bancroft tender. But the engineers had decided that a crib coffer dam should be constructed, and no other coffer dam could be constructed according to them. The hon. the Postmaster General in defending this scheme, in endeavouring to defend the Department of Public Works, says: "Why, do we not often find the department suggesting to contractors that they must strengthen themselves financially?" Yes; we have found that course pursued. In fact, we have found quite lately that the Department of Public Works suggested to the tenderers for the Esquimalt graving dock that they must strengthen themselves financially. But we do not find here that the Minister of Public Works suggests to Bancroft that he should strengthen himself financially. We do not find that he says to a man who was never heard of before as a contractor, either in Canada or in the United States, about whom there was nothing known as a contractor, about whom it was not known whether he had sufficient plant or any plant, whether he had sufficient means or any means, that he should strengthen himself financially. And why? The only inference that can fairly be drawn is that the Public Works Department knew that the tender of Bancroft was the tender of the Connollys, and that they did not need to ask any such thing. It is not so much from the evidence adduced as from the unwritten evidence not adduced that shows the crime committed in this matter. It is because of all the facts applying to the putting in of the tender, Michael Connolly taking the Bancroft tender to the Public Works Department on the last day, the 28th March, and at the last minute of the day, and putting in a cheque in his own handwriting—a handwriting, that must have been known to the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works had too much to do with the Connollys in the last few years not to know Michael Connolly's handwriting. It must have been known to the Minister of Public Works whose handwriting that was, and whose tender that was. If he did not, Bancroft not being known in this country at all, he should have made enquiries and found out whether Bancroft was capable of doing the work. He should have found out whether he had the plant and the means to carry out that work; but we find he did nothing of the kind. But in a few days we do find a letter from Bancroft, written by Michael Connolly, saying: We have agreed to amalgamate; Bancroft will take us in, and we will take Bancroft in, and we will do the work. I say it is time that this system of letting contracts was stopped. There has been too much figuring up and figuring down. Contractors have found a trick of putting in two or three tenders, and I say that the Department of Public Works has been to blame for allowing this thing to go on as long as it has. Some contractors put in two or three different tenders. If there is any person between the lowest tender and the next highest the lowest tender can be dropped for some excuse or other, and they get the work for the next highest. If there is any person between the next highest or the very highest, or if they can buy out somebody that is between them, then they get the work for the highest tender. That was attempted to be done in this case, but there happened to intervene some honest men that could not be bought, and consequently the Connollys had to adopt the Bancroft figures. Then we find that a system of changes has been made, a system which was stated in a Quebec paper not long ago to have been adopted in the Public Works Department for years; this paper says that not a contract has been let for years in which changes have not been made. I say it is time that this House, by resolution, expressed its dissent from that sort of thing. What do we find in the leading journal of hon. gentlemen opposite? We find the Prime Minister saying a few days ago that he is determined to search out corruption to the bottom, and he calls on the Liberal members of Parliament to assist him in doing so. Sir, we are only too glad to assist him, but we find that hon. gentlemen opposite are very ready in cutting off the heads of minor individuals, but as soon as the chiefs of corruption are touched then they adopt different tactics; then they say: You must not touch us; you must not touch the heads of the departments; you may slaughter minor officials as much as you like, but the heads of departments must go free, notwithstanding the corruption, notwithstanding the negligence, forgeries and frauds that exist in the departments. I am sure that the people of this country will endorse this resolution, and if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to follow the policy enunciated by their leader in another House they must accept this resolution. No matter whether corruption is found on this side or on the other side, let it be stamped out; it must be stamped out, and it will be stamped out. We now call on hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in declaring by this resolution that corruption has run rampant long enough in this country, and we are now determined to stamp it out, by declaring that the contract in regard to this Kingston graving dock was corrupt, and that in connection with it fraud and forgery existed.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) had substantiated the resolution he

has asked this House to endorse I should gladly have voted with him.

Mr. AMYOT. Ha, ha!

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend laughs, but that is the truth. There can be no desire on the part of any honest Conservative, or any independent man in this House, to cloak wrong-doings of any kind. When I heard this resolution placed before us I took up the evidence which was taken before the Committee, and that evidence is one of the grounds laid down by my hon. friend from Bellechasse because of which we should vote with him. Sir, is there a single answer in that evidence to substantiate the various propositions implied by this motion? Now, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. German), I believe, is a lawyer; anyway, he professed to speak of what forgery was. But he did not dare to define what forgery was. Forgery is the making of a false document with intent to defraud. If you make a document that is false without intending to defraud it does not amount to forgery. Take the case of the Connollys personating, or attempting to personate, this fictitious personage Bancroft: unless you show that in some way fraud was committed it would not amount to forgery in the eye of the law, and you could not place them on their trial for it. So the very first thing we are asked to vote for in this resolution is in itself an absurdity. It is not necessary, in my opinion, to go very fully into this question. But I will say that if the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who spoke so strongly in this debate, and if the hon. member for Bellechasse, who spoke with his usual eloquence in supporting this motion, are desirous of putting down corruption in this country, if they are desirous of promoting purity and good government, they have taken a very wrong course here this evening. Because what will be the effect on the country, if they should have a good case, if they come here as they do this evening and lay a case before the House that will not bear powder and shot? What will be the effect on honest men who have examined this resolution, and have examined the alleged facts that are suggested as supporting it, when they find that there is not a shadow of foundation for the resolution, and that the time of Parliament, at this late hour, is taken up in discussing a resolution which is really, as my hon. friend from Bellechasse knows—and I do not say it discourteously—a buncombe resolution. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, says it is worse than that. It is worse than that, because it seeks to lay at the door of a man who has occupied a high position in this country, in whose department irregularities of a grave kind have occurred, and who has ceased to be a Minister of the Crown——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. DAVIN. He has ceased to be a Minister of the Crown.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. It is seeking to lay a charge at his door that cannot be substantiated. I say that it would be not only ungenerous, but it would be utterly unjust; it would be the last thing that should be done by any man who is jealous for the honour of Parliament, and jealous for pure government, to sit here quietly and allow such a resolution as that to be placed on the Table, and supported by such wild, extravagant and irrelevant arguments as we have heard used here to-night. Take the speech of the hon. member for Huron. We know very well what that hon. gentleman's methods of rhetoric are; we know very well that he has not obeyed Sidney Smith's injunction to our Yankee friends, to avoid superlatives. If the hon. gentlemen has to denounce a mole hill, it is always a mountain; and if he has to stigmatize a lakelet, it is an ocean; so that the hon. gentleman's vocabulary has to be understood, it has to be studied carefully, before we can weigh the exact meaning that is to be attached to any of his expressions. Why, what was one of the ridiculous arguments the hon. gentleman used here to-night, and it is a sample of the kind of reasoning in which he indulges. He took a list of journals, some of them known not to be Conservative papers, known to be papers hostile to the present Administration, and he read the utterances of those papers, and he said: "Those are utterances of Tory journals." How did he prove it? He proved it by saying: "I find among them papers which appear in the Auditor General's Report, one of them for $200." The hon. gentleman, therefore, held they were Tory papers, although it might be absolutely necessary, in order to give full publicity to some notice connected with one of the departments, that $200 or $50 should be expended on advertising in the *Telegram* of Toronto, or the *Star* of Montreal. I have read what the *Star* has said, what the *Telegram* and other papers have said. There is no utterance which any paper, Tory or Grit, Reform or Conservative, has uttered, condemnatory of corruption in high places, that is just, that is severely just, if I may use the phrase, that I will not endorse, that the Government of Canada will not endorse, and that has not been endorsed by the present leader of the Government in another place. As I have said, there is no party, there could be no party in any country in the world so free as the Conservative party is to condemn wrong-doing. The fact that there may have been wrong-doing in its own bosom or near its own door, or on the part of its own servants, is no reason for an hon. member declaring that the whole party is corrupt. Still less reason is it for an hon. gentlemen, I refer to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), rising and in those lugubrious tones he uses and with that kind of mute-like expression he wears, declaring we should all go down in sack-cloth and ashes, that Canada was humbled before the world, and that marks of degradation, and I know not what stain, had been placed on this Dominion. Why, forsooth?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. member for Bothwell endorse the sentiment of that hon. member? I am glad he does not. But can anything be so absurd as the statement that a whole country is corrupt in the eyes of the world because there has been an avidity on the part of its Government to put down wrong-doing in some of its departments? I say this: In the Committees, whose reports we have been receiving from day to day, the Government have done everything in its power to drag to light wrong-doing in its departments. And there is no reason why they should not do so, and punish it, too. Are we to be told that, because some corrupt act may have been brought to

light, all our public men are corrupt? We know very well that one bad shilling does not prove that the whole coinage of the realm is false; that one hypocrite does not prove that all Christians are hypocrites; and the extravagant language that has been used in papers outside Canada and quoted here, what does it prove? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a journalist, and I am a journalist. We know very well how these matters are managed. A young gentleman in London receives a telegram clothed in sensational news by the person sending it, and he wants to write a striking leading article. He writes a striking leader, and we are asked to hold that that is an expression of the public opinion of the three kingdoms! I have spoken as to what forgery was. Could there be in this case any intent to defraud? Bancroft turns out to be a fictitious individual. The Connollys personate him, use his name. Is Bancroft's tender a high tender? Is it to obtain a large amount of public money that Bancroft's name is used? Not at all. Bancroft's tender is the lowest. I find a letter here accompanying a tender. It is signed "Gibson & Fuller," and is addressed to the Minister of Public Works, and is dated Beamsville, 25th March, 1889. It reads:

"SIR,—We have the honour to enclose our accepted cheque for $20,000, payable to your order, with our tender for dry dock at Kingston, Ont. We have also to say that we have examined the locality, lands and specifications, and hold ourselves in readiness to enter into a contract to complete the work, should you award us the same.

"We have the honour to be, &c.,
"GIBSON & FULLER."

I turn to the tender, and I find that the tender of Gibson & Fuller was for $369,761.50, while Bancroft's tender was $260,680.75, or a difference of $109,080.75. Yet Bancroft's tender was fraudulent! And it is declared by hon. gentlemen opposite that it was put in with intent to defraud, and that it was a fraudulent act because Bancroft's tender was accepted.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was Gibson?

Mr. DAVIN. I look at the tender, and I find it is put in by a Mr. Gibson of Beamsville. I take up the Parliamentary Companion and I find that Mr. Gibson, member for Lincoln, lives at Beamsville.

An hon. MEMBER. It cannot be the member for Lincoln.

Mr. DAVIN. It seems to have been the member who spoke from the back benches a short time ago, and who so eloquently declared that Bancroft's tender, and the agreement resulting from it, were all that the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) declared them to be; and yet that hon. gentleman's own tender was $109,080.75 higher than Bancroft's tender. When this subject was being discussed the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) came in and he said, and he said truly, the man had no existence whatever. But was the fact that the man had no existence whatever fraudulent in itself, unless it was to take, improperly, money out of the public till. But palpably this fictitious Bancroft was, as compared with Messrs. Gibson & Fuller, the means of putting $109,080.75 into the public treasury. Having disposed of the term forgery, it is hardly necessary I should go into "culpable negligence." I see no evidence in any of the speeches delivered here; there is no evidence in this pamphlet containing the testimony given before the Committee, that there was the slightest neglect on the part of the Public Works Department in this matter. There may have been wrong-doing in other matters connected with that department. We will see as to that by-and-bye, and many of us have our own opinion in that regard; but in respect to this matter, it is perfectly palpable, in looking over the documents and evidence, that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has made a great mistake in bringing forward this resolution; and while I, for one, am as ready as anyone to condemn corrupt acts committed by whomsoever, no matter where it may be, I cannot stultify myself, and I hope hon. gentlemen will not stultify themselves, and will not weaken the effect of any efforts they may put forth to put down corruption, by voting without any foundation in evidence or documents, against common sense and against fairness, for a resolution like that under consideration.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Amyot.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay,
Allison,	Hargraft,
Amyot,	Harwood,
Armstrong,	Hyman,
Bain,	Innes,
Barron,	King,
Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Borden,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowers,	Lister,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron)
Brown (Chateauguay),	McGregor,
Brown (Monck),	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Monet,
Choquette,	Mousseau,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisle,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Savard,
Forbes,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Frémont,	Simard,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Spohn,
German,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Tarte,
Gillmor,	Trow,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Watson.—82.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Léger,
Bergin,	Lépine,
Bowell,	Lippé,
Burnham,	Macdonald (King),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonald (Winnipeg)
Carignan,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Carpenter,	Macdowall,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mackintosh,
Châpleau,	McAllister,
Cleveland,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cochrane,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cockburn,	McKeen,
Corbould,	McLennan,

Costigan,	Madill,
Craig,	Mara,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Moncrieff,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Pope,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Roome,
Ferguson (Leeds et Gren.),	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Lisgar),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Temple,
Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tupper,
Hodgins,	Tyrwhitt,
Hutchins,	Wallace,
Ingram,	Weldon,
Ives,	White (Cardwell),
Jamieson,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—99.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Corby,	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. McKay,	Mr. Truax,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Montague,	Mr. Cameron (Huron),
Mr. Tisdale,	Mr. Mulock,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) and Haldimand (Mr. Montague) have not voted.

Mr. JONCAS. I did not vote, because I was paired with the member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin). If I had voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This afternoon the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) and myself had some conversation with regard to pairing. I understood it partially one way, and he understood it another; but he left this afternoon, stating to the whip that he was paired with me. Our conversation this afternoon might well have led him to that conclusion, although I did not quite understand it that way myself. If I had voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. The statement was made during the debate by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the hon. gentleman who formerly and up to this date was supposed to be the Minister of Public Works has ceased to be a member of the Cabinet. I would like to ask from the leader of the Government here if this statement is correct?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House was informed some time ago that the hon. Minister of Public Works had offered his resignation. That is sufficient.

Mr. LAURIER. We were not informed that it has been accepted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We were not informed that it was accepted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does not require it.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Drilling and training the Militia..... $250,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to this item, as was intimated on a previous occasion, there has been for a a long time, I think, in the opinion of a considerable number, not merely of the members of the militia force itself, but also in the opinion of the gentlemen who have presided over the department, if they felt at liberty to express their views, a very great deal of doubt as to whether we are using this quarter of a million dollars to any practical good effect, more particularly with respect to the system of camps lasting from eight to ten days. What has been represented on the subject with very great force is this: That the time which is spent in these camps is altogether too short to give any instruction of any real value to the members of the militia force—that, practically, as a matter of fact, when these men are brought together in camp, nearly one-half of the time is occupied in getting them together, and nearly the other half is occupied in getting them away again; and that, to all intents and purposes, a matter of four or five days is the very outside of the instructions that is given to these people. It is also stated that very frequently the men who come into camp are absolutely raw recruits, who are changed from year to year, and, as everybody knows, it is utterly out of the question to impart any military training that is of any value to raw recruits in the very short space of time at the disposal of the officers. As I have said, several of the gentlemen who have occupied the position of commanders of the militia of Canada have more or less plainly intimated that opinion on this subject, and I would be glad to hear from the Minister of Militia what is his own opinion—whether he proposes to go in the old rut which we have travelled on so long in this matter, or whether he thinks that the time has come for revising the whole system and for attempting to obtain a longer period of training, for at least a portion of the force. Of course, my remarks apply more particularly to the rural battalions. In the case of the city battalions, I am inclined to think that a good many of the corps—though not through the medium of these camps—have succeeded in drilling themselves to a very respectable point of efficieny, and are likely to do so, camps or no camps. But with respect to the rural battalions, the statements made to me from various parts of the country all tend to show that in many cases these camps are looked upon as very little better than a kind of big military pic-nic, and that very little instruction of any value is given to the men who are brought together at very considerable annual expense to the people of the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that I fully agree with him in one particular, and that is, that the time which is allowed by the Government for the holding of these camps is altogether too short; but

a still greater evil is that they are held for the rural battalions in alternate years. Of course, it must be evident to every one that a force which is called out once every second year must be in a lamentable state of inefficiency, and however desirable it may be that the period of training should be lengthened, it is a great deal more desirable that the training should be annual. I am sure I utter the opinion of every man of the Active Force when I say that the great desideratum, and the best way in which the country can obtain value for the money expended for the militia is, in the first place, to make these trainings annual. That is admitted by every one and does not require argument. I would like to correct the hon. gentleman in his impression with regard to the actual value the country receives from the camps, in the way they are now carried out; and I speak from my own experience of the camps I have myself attended. I think the hon. gentleman has been misinformed, in the first place, as to the time that is given during these camps to actual training. One day is spent in going to the camp and another in returning from the camp, which out of the 12 days leaves ten days for actual training. Of course, Sunday is included in that, but on Sunday there are the usual parades and guard mounting, and the duty goes on the same as on other days, the Sunday parade taking the place of the drill. During the other ten days, and I speak specially for the camp held at Niagara under Col. Otter, the routine is as severe and the work is just as arduous as it is possible to get men to undergo, under the circumstances under which they are brought there. The regular duties in camp occupy during the 24 hours a very considerable portion of the force, and the same number of men are required with a regiment of 300 men to carry on the regular work of the camp as if that regiment consisted of 600 or 700, or even 800 men. Of course, that number of men are taken from their regular duties of training; but at the same time they are learning the equally essential duties incident to camp life. The men have to learn to cook their own victuals, draw their rations, mount guard, and attend to all the various duties of active warfare. Therefore, although not actually on drill, or learning the use of arms, they are learning duties which to a soldier are just as important as the military exercise; and the remainder give as much time to drill as they can fairly be asked to give or as is beneficial to them. Of course, we can all understand that if you overwork men at anything, either mental or physical exercise, you run the risk of rendering them unwilling for their task, and therefore less inclined to learn anything. I think that as much work is got out of the men during those days as it would be possible to get under any system. Then, as to the results. I admit that our force in many respects is lamentably deficient; but this result has been arrived at—I only speak of the regiments that I know of: We have in this country regiments which, however deficiently trained they may be in many particulars, are yet so far drilled and trained that you can take any one of them and immediately put them upon active service. You can put them on a train and take them out; you can march them to the camp ground; they can pitch their tents; they can cook their victuals; and there is a sufficient number of drilled men to mount guard—because there are always a number of men who persist in attending drill at all possible times for their own advantage. So that a sufficient number of drilled men are always available at once to enter upon any and every duty required of them, and to discharge those duties until those who have more recently joined the force are competent to take them up. If you have a body of men in this country whom you can assemble almost at the sound of the bugle, and march wherever you like, who are sufficiently accustomed to their arms as to handle them properly, and who are so far trained and drilled that they can perform any duties that they may be called upon to perform, you have attained a very great and satisfactory result. These men are not armed mobs; they have not only a large amount of drill, but a great deal of the spirit of discipline which enables the commanding officer to make good use of them. Now, a great deal was said in 1885 about the celerity with which the city battalions were got ready to enter upon active service. Speaking of the rural battalions, I have not the exact dates; but I know that Colonel Tyrwhitt and I got the order on one day to take out the York and Simcoe County battalions, and I think three days afterwards we had gathered our men together from the rural districts of the counties of York and Simcoe, assembled them at their respective quarters, armed and equipped and ready to go on the train in very nearly as short a time as the battalions called out in Toronto. I say that a force that can do that is a force not to be despised; and although there is necessarily a great waste of money in much of the expenses, owing to the drill being only biennial, yet we do receive from that a very great amount of benefit—benefit which would be more than doubled if the drill were made annual; and what we ask the House to do, and what I think the country would be perfectly willing to do, is to so increase the vote before the House, so as to enable the Minister of Militia to drill the whole force at its present strength every year, instead of every other year, as at present. There are of course a great many things that might be done, and a great many improvements that we should like to have made; but believing as I do that our present system is the most economical and efficient that can be devised in the present circumstances of this country, I would be very sorry to see any radical change made. I have given a great deal of thought to this matter, and I have seen letters in the papers commenting upon the present system and suggesting changes. It is not mere conservatism that influences me in my desire to see the present system continued; I believe it is the most economical system. Anyone can see that with a population of something over four millions and an expenditure of something over $1,000,000 on our military schools, and on everything connected with the militia force of Canada, it costs this country about a quarter of a dollar a head of the population. If the drill were made every year instead of every other year it would not make more than perhaps ten cents a head difference in the expenditure, and that is a small portion of the whole. Now, I wish to say something with reference to a statement that was made by the hon. member for West Toronto with regard to the military schools. I think he is wrong in his facts and wrong in his deductions. He advocated doing away with the present military schools.

Mr. DENISON. No, no; grafting them on the present system.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, he advocated a change in the manner of giving instruction—that is to say, he would allow anyone to attend those schools, under certain restrictions, whether belonging to the force or not, and give them certificates, as was done in the old military training schools which we formerly had in this country. I think myself that a great deal more might be done by the schools which we have than is done. I think, for instance, that in the summer the whole school might be turned into a camp of instruction, and if there are not a sufficient number of instructors in the schools there are plenty in the various regiments who would be glad to assist. After listening to the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that there are a very large number of officers under the present system who are not qualified, I looked over the list, and I find that the proportion of untrained officers is not so great as is supposed. There is a constant stream of young men coming through the schools, and those in the regiments who are not qualified are constantly going up to be qualified. In my own regiment, for instance, I think that six officers appeared in the the militia list as unqualified, but of these five have obtained certificates, and there is only one officer of all the 28 in the regiment who is unqualified; and I think the same remark applies to other regiments. But I think I am justified in saying that under the old system, when anybody might obtain a certificate of qualification, the force was not any better off for qualified officers than it is to-day. At that time, so far as my recollection goes, there were a greater number of unqualified officers holding provisional appointments in the active force than there are under the present system; and I know that a great many young men took advantage of that system. If they had nothing to do at the time, it was a pleasant way in which to spend the three months necessary to obtain a certificate; but of those who obtain certificates, I venture to say that not 10 per cent. entered the militia afterwards. The active force was not in the efficient condition it is in now; and there was a professional feeling among those young men which made them look down upon the active force, and hesitate to join it. No doubt, some of these young men joined the militia force afterwards, but I do not believe that these schools were as much benefit practically as the system now carried on. So far as my knowledge goes, we certainly have a better class of officers in the active militia force to-day than we have had at any previous time. Anyone who has attended the camps during the last eight or ten years cannot fail to come to the conclusion that great improvement has been made in the quality, equipment and general appearance of the men and in everything that makes up an efficient and valuable force. If the Government would only give an additional sum of $150,000 to this service, in order to enable us to have annual drill, the country would have no reason to find any fault, and the present force would become as efficient and as capable as it can be expected to be under present conditions. There is, of course, a large amount expended which does not really benefit the force, because the expenditure on the military schools—although they are valuable, and I should be sorry to see them done away with, because they set an example to the volunteers, and show them what a man ought to look like when under arms, giving the example that was formerly set by the regulars—is a large expenditure in proportion to the benefit derived. And then, of course, there is a heavy expenditure on the military college, which is hardly of any value to the active force in the country, because there is scarcely a man from the college who holds a commission in the militia. One thing which I have pressed on the Minister of Militia on several occasions is this, that every man who obtains a certain standing in the military college, say after the first year—I am not sufficiently conversant with the course in the college to make any exact proposition—should be compelled to attach himself tot he regiment of his own county and go out with it whenever it goes for its annual training. That would be an immense advantage both to the force and to the college, and would bring the college into touch with the force, instead of its being, as at present, an institution outside of and beyond the force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You could hardly interrupt their attendance at the classes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would sacrifice even that for the ten days' annual training, because this great advantage would be gained, that you would bring the military college, which is supposed to be a benefit to the force, but is really of no benefit to it now, into active sympathy with the force. You would make every graduate of the college feel an interest in the militia of the country which he does not now feel, because, as a rule, he does not join a regiment unless it happens to come in his way. Those are the two points I would impress on the hon. Minister; and as an officer of that force, having been in it ever since the Trent affair, having given a great deal of time and money to maintain it, and feeling pride and interest in it, I would earnestly urge upon the House the great necessity, even from an economical point of view, in order that we may get the full benefit to be derived from this $250,000, of increasing that amount by the small sum necessary to drill the whole force every year. This is an expenditure about which there can be no jobbing, because every dollar of it goes straight into the pockets of the men, except, of course, the small amount necessary for provisioning the force during the camps. So far as I know, this is a portion of the expenditure of the country about which there is no jobbing. I think that these contracts for the annual camps, so far, at any rate, as regards the district in which I am concerned, have always been given out with the strictest impartiality, and every effort made, and honestly made, to obtain full value for the expenditure. This extra expenditure which I urge the Government to make the country would approve. Not one man in a thousand would object to it. It would go directly into the pockets of the men, and would not be an expenditure like many others, which only benefits a few individuals. It will prove the popularity of the force in a way that cannot be contradicted. Take any county that has a regiment of active militia, officered by gentlemen living in that county, and let the hon. Minister of Militia, in the most glaring case requiring interference, attempt to lay his hands on the weak point in that force, in a manner which involves any interference with it—let us suppose the suppression of a company, or a.

case might arise which might reasonably involve the doing away with the battalion altogether—and he will see what a storm he will raise about his ears. He would not only have the member of the county, no matter what party he supported, against him, but the mass of the people. The Minister of Militia would hardly dare, even if his duty called upon him to do it, to interfere with a single regiment in the country, because the force is so popular that every man connected with the regiment would rise to resent any interference. The force is popular, the country is proud of it, and the country is willing and will gladly support this House in giving the small additional sum necessary to make the force effective, as we all wish to see it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am almost in entire accord with the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). My experience in many camps has led me to know that the proficiency acquired by the volunteer force is wonderful, considering the few opportunities they have. I agree with the hon. gentlemen in the desirability of having an annual instead of biennial drill. The trouble with the system of biennial drill is the difficulty of keeping up an interest in the force, not only among the men but among the officers. The Minister of Militia must know that if a young man attends the school and takes a position as officer in a battalion, and is then only called out to drill every two years, he cannot feel that interest he should have in the militia force. I can also endorse, from my own experience, what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the advantages derived from the schools. I would like, however, to see some changes, but I think the force has benefited from these schools. In my district, a great many of the young men who have taken positions as officers of battalions have had the advantage of the school training, and we who have been attending a long time the camps can see the benefit and efficiency acquired through the training these young men have undergone and the knowledge they acquired at those schools. Almost every one who has taken an interest in militia affairs and attended camps will agree in that view. I do hope the volunteer force will receive more consideration from this House. They certainly deserve it, and have every reason to be proud of their record, and if the Government would grant such an amount as would be sufficient for an annual drill they would do an act which would redound greatly to their credit. I do not intend to take up the time of the House by pointing out any change that might be made, because, in all probability, especially at present, no suggestion of mine would be likely to be adopted; but I will confine myself to urging, as the hon. member for Muskoka has done, the desirability of having annual drills.

Mr. TYRWHITT. The chief objection I have to the item under discussion is that it is about half the amount required to drill the entire force annually. We have a general and an extensive staff, and by drilling only half the force every year we lose the amount of good we would otherwise have derived from their services. I must confess that I believe that the schools of the present day are doing as much good as any other system of instruction which has been in vogue during the time I have been connected with the force, some 27 years. I believe the men who are being turned out by the schools of the present day are as good as those who were turned out under former systems. In 1886 I took charge of a regiment which had been disorganized and was almost on the point of being struck from the list of the active force, owing to the fact that it had not been in camp for six years. Now I have my full complement of officers, and I have found on every occasion, when I was able to induce my young officers to send in their names, that every opportunity that was given them of attending the schools when vacancies existed was taken advantage of. The school of instruction in Toronto is so popular among the officers of the country that it is almost impossible sometimes to have an officer admitted there, and in some cases I have been obliged to send officers of my corps to London, where the school has not been so long in existence and there are not so many applicants as there are at the Toronto school. I cannot agree with my hon. friend, the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who says that the college at Kingston is doing no good to the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I did not say that, but that it was doing no good to the militia.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I do not agree with him in that either, or in his saying that the young gentlemen who are at the college should go to the camps, because that is about the time for their examination; and besides, the instruction in the college is of a very much higher class than that in the camps, which is of only an A B C character. When this matter was under discussion last year, I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said what he repeated this evening, that the camps did no good. I can only say that all the officers connected with our volunteer force who have been connected with regiments of the line are surprised at the progress made by our Canadian recruits in a short time. We have a sprinkling of those who have formerly been soldiers in the Imperial army amongst our volunteers, and it certainly is wonderful to observe the short time it takes our men to get into the routine of camp duty. I can assure that hon. gentleman that the volunteers in camp commence their duties at half past five in the morning, and those duties are continued until ten at night, and I think during that time every available moment is made use of. In fact, I think more work is got out of the volunteer force for the money expended than from any other body in the world. In fact, they are the only class in the Dominion who are expected to work for nothing. During the twelve days they are in camp they receive the munificent sum of fifty cents a day, and every one connected with the force knows that it requires about a week or ten days before camp to brush up, to get the men together, to have the clothing properly fitted, and to have the men in a proper state to meet with other regiments who may be at the camp. Thus, when the volunteer counts his money at the end of the camp he generally finds himself in debt. It appears to me that this is one part of the public service where very great economy is exercised. At the present time, and for many years past, the volunteers have been treated to bread without any butter. We are told that butter is a very awkward thing to issue, and I have no doubt that if the same system of economy continues to be practised in regard to the volunteer

force the Government will soon expect them to exist without any bread. I hope the House will deal more liberally with the force in the future than it has in the past. We know that the present officer in command has recommended that the force should be drilled annually. His predecessor recommended the same thing, and I know that 96 members of this House sent a petition to the late Premier asking that a larger sum be placed in the estimates for the purpose of drilling them annually. I hope Parliament will recognize its duty so far as to see that the penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy should not be continued, but that the force should be drilled annually.

Mr. HAZEN. I am glad the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has brought this matter before the House. Anyone who belongs to a volunteer battalion knows that practically eight days every two years is not sufficient to secure efficiency in our militia service. I think it is very much to be desired that the length of drill should be extended. Many of those who form the militia battalions are recruits who have never had any experience of camp life, and yet within about eight days, they are expected to go through squad drill, and company drill, and battalion drill, and afterwards, where there is more than one battalion, they may have to go through some brigade movements. It is utterly impossible in this short time for any man to attain to any efficiency, but it is very much to the credit of the intelligence of the men who are in the militia force of Canada to find that they acquire so much skill and learning—I will not use the word efficiency—as they do in those eight days, because any one who looks at a battalion of the Canadian militia after eight days' drill must agree that they have made a great deal of progress in that time, which must be due to the intelligence of the men comprising the force. I think an amount should be placed in the Estimates sufficient to extend the drill to sixteen or even twenty days, and to allow the drill to take place annually instead of every two years. One result of that would be that greater interest would be taken in the militia, because now, the country battalions being scattered over one or perhaps two counties, cannot be expected to take the same interest that they would if they were brought together more frequently. I cannot agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that the military camps are largely military holidays. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), the men in camp have no holidays, but the whole of their time is devoted to the business for which they are there. If I remember correctly, though it is some years since I was in camp, they are called out at the hour of five; at six they are out on parade, and are drilled up to seven; they are out again at ten, and are drilled two hours, up to twelve, and then they are drilled again from three to five. Take these three parades every day, with the incidental work which is necessary in carrying on the camp and keeping it clean, keeping the uniforms clean, and every thing of that sort which is necessary, there is scarcely an idle moment given to any military man from sunrise to sunset in any of the camps of this Dominion. Now, something has been said with regard to military schools. I think we never had more efficient officers in the different battalions than we have to-day, and that is in a large measure due to the present system of schools. In every battalion throughout the country you will find a large proportion of officers, and the number is increasing every year, who have qualified themselves for the position by taking courses at these different military schools. That is not only true of the officers of the battalion, but it is also true, though perhaps in a less degree, with the non-commissioned officers, and I think the number is increasing every year, who go to these schools and attend regularly, pass the examinations, and obtain certificates from them. In that way I think the efficiency of the force is improving from year to year, and it is better officered to-day than it was in the past, and that condition of things is steadily improving. The old schools that were established in the country before the present system was adopted I do not think met the requirements at all. Anybody could attend them, whether he was engaged in the active militia force or not, and after attending those schools for a short time each man got a certificate. I happen to hold a certificate from one of those old schools myself. I know that during the winter season very often men who were out of employment and had nothing to do; for the sake of passing the time and earning a little money, were in the habit of attending those schools, and passing their examinations, without having the slightest idea of connecting themselves permanently with the militia force of the country. The officers who go to the present school are all of them either commissioned officers, or non-commissioned officers. They go there because they take an interest in the militia; they go there to perfect themselves in drill, to become efficient and to acquire such information as is necessary, and they leave the school with the intention of continuing as permanent members of the volunteer force of the country. In that way I think the present schools are doing a good work in improving the efficiency of the militia force. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) about the military college, I think they are perfectly correct, and that so far as the active militia of the country is concerned, the Royal Military College at Kingston is of little if any advantage to it. At the same time, I think that the military college at Kingston is a valuable institution to the country. Judging from the men that institution has turned out, and from the position they have taken in the force and in other walks of life, I think it is a credit to the country. It not only fits men for military life afterwards, but it gets them into good habits of discipline, and fits them for almost any profession or business in life. I sincerely trust that the attention of the Minister of Militia having been directed to this matter, he will endeavour next year to increase the appropriation for militia purposes, so that the whole brigade may be drilled, and that the time of drill may be extended beyond the brief space of ten days that we have now.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I think both sides of the House are agreed that the item under discussion is not too large—in fact, it is too small. It is refreshing to see members on both sides agree upon one specific object, and I think they are agreed that the item should rather be increased than diminished. We all know that Canadians are a nation of soldiers. From boyhood days the young

Canadian is accustomed to handle a gun, and it is second nature for him to become a soldier when he has an opportunity. I think in the Dominion of Canada we have the finest material out of which to make soldiers that is to be found anywhere. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister and of this House to the fact that in my own district a battalion has been formed for a number of years, and I will venture to say that the material of which that battalion is formed is as fine material as ever shouldered a rifle. They are scattered over a district probably 1,500 miles in extent, and ever since the battalion has been organized they have never been brought together for drill purposes. The officers of that battalion have all gone to military schools, at a great deal of trouble and expense to themselves. They have not only done that, but out of their own pockets they have bought a great deal of the clothing that was necessary for the men that is not furnished by the Militia Department, and they naturally feel, and we all know that if that *esprit de corps* is to be maintained that is necessary to make good and efficient soldiers, to teach them the art of war, as it were, they should be brought together where they will have an opportunity, at least, of knowing one another. The commanding officer of that battalion lives in my own town, and the battalion is scattered throughout the towns in the rest of the district, and I have urged upon the Minister the necessity of taking that battalion into camp. Now, the complaint is that the rural battalions only go into camp once in two years; ours would be perfectly satisfied if they had such an opportunity even as that. There is no doubt that if the time can be extended, if instead of 12 days, 16 days can be devoted to drill—and although in our district it may cost a little more to move our battalion than it does many other rural battalions, I think it is due to these officers and men who have devoted their time and means to bring the battalion up to the state of efficiency that it has now attained that the country should give them the means of making themselves more perfect. I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister the necessity of taking that battalion into camp, if not this year, at least next. I do not know what the estimate was last year; probably in the item that is before us the Minister has taken to himself sufficient funds to be able to do that another year. But we cannot expect that the officers or men will take that interest in military affairs that we desire they should take, unless the Government of the day give them the opportunity that they are justly entitled to.

Mr. TROW. I doubt whether it is necessary to have a military force for our protection of 25,000 or 30,000 men to compete against a force of a million men that could be brought into the field by the United States, the only nation who could possibly ever have any occasion to invade our country. I think our policy should be to court the arts of peace with our neighbours, instead of arraying our soldiers on the frontier as a challenge to our American friends. If it is necessary at all to keep up a force, I think it is necessary to have them regularly drilled annually. In my own section of the country I know that those who are called out one year are possibly in Dakota, Minnesota or Manitoba before being called out again, and a very large proportion of them are only called out once in two years. Many of them look upon it as a little picnic more than anything else, to go into the field for eight or ten days. I do not know that it improves their habits very much. I regret that many of our young men learn to smoke and drink in camp life, and I think it would be advisable if the officers were more strict, and showed a good example for the men in camp. I question very much if the officers are not overpaid and the men underpaid. I think that a great reform could be made in that respect. A large proportion of the grant is frittered away on the higher ranks of the officers. So far as our military schools are concerned, I think you will find that a very large number of the men turned out of our military schools, if you trace their career, are to be found in foreign armies, some of them in the United States, some in Egypt, some in Germany and in Austria.

Mr. ALLISON. In my part of the country I have been in the habit of lending horses to young men who go into training, and I do not think I have lent a horse to the same person three times. Those to whom I loaned horses one year would be in the States the following year. I think that more than two-thirds of those who went into training in our part of the country 8 years ago are now either American citizens or living in the United States. So I think the system of military training here is one of turning out men for the benefit of the United States rather than for our own country.

Mr. AMYOT. I will not discuss the question of the value of camps, for we must adhere to the present system, unless we make a radical change. In regard to our military schools, something has been said against the schools, but the hon. gentleman who offered the criticism is rather young. If he were an old man, as I am, he would have remembered the schools were established after Geo. E. Cartier, and were the means of establishing a militia force in Canada. They did very good service, and were the means of forming a great many good officers for our battalions. Nor do I complain against the schools to day, for they turn out very good cadets. But those who desire to join the active militia are obliged to attend these schools; otherwise they cannot receive their certificates. This is wrong. These schools should not be made an obstacle to the well-being of the force, and they become such when it is provided that excellent men cannot obtain certificates unless they attend these schools. Generally, those who are the most active, intelligent and earnest, and who would make the best officers, are engaged in banks or in commercial life, and cannot attend the schools. On the other hand, idle fellows, who are of little use, attend a school for weeks or months. What I complain about is, that these military schools are sometimes operating against the interests of the militia. In my own battalion I have many officers who went through the North-West campaign. They must obtain certificates from the schools or leave the force. They cannot go to the school at St. John's.

Mr. HAZEN. They can take a short course.

Mr. AMYOT. No; they cannot leave town. These men did not join the battalion on paper. When the battalion was wanted at the time of the Fenian Raid, and at the time of the North-West,

troubles it was ready. I will be deprived of 9 officers if the Government do not change the present regulations. I say: Keep your schools; I have sent many non-commissioned officers there and will continue to do so. But why exact attendance at the school? You say this is provided by law. It is a law which the Government could amend. I ask authorization for the examination of our officers who have done active service to pass examinations at Quebec without being compelled to relinquish their situations. It is a question of the efficiency of the force, and I hope the Minister of Militia will see his way to grant that favour. As regards the Military College at Kingston. I am afraid we are paying large sums to maintain an emigration school for our educated and able young men.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman lives in Kingston, I believe, and he is therefore not a good judge.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) lives there, too, and he will tell you the same.

Mr. AMYOT. We have the statement of the Minister of Militia that since the school was established 51 cadets have been employed in this country as civil and military engineers. But how much has the school cost? About $60,000 a year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not $60,000.

Mr. AMYOT. Take it at $50,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not even that.

Mr. AMYOT. We can put the cost at over $18,000 for each cadet employed here. A great many are employed in England and the United States. I admit the college gives a perfect education. What do the young men do after they leave it? They go elsewhere. We teach them the science and then they leave this country.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because we do not employ them.

Mr. AMYOT. It would cost us very much less to send them to England to obtain the same education there. I am in favour of every kind of education; but we must be practical men. If we could employ them after we had taught them engineering and military sciences, it would be well; but as we do not appear to be able to do so, we must not only look at the question of reducing the expenses but consider the propriety of putting an end to a system which takes away from this country our best young men.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I, with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), were members of the Government which established that school. So far as I am personally concerned, I have never seen any reason to abandon the position which I took and the opinions which I entertained at the time the school was established. I think the experience of the United States, during their civil war was that it was very much easier to get a number of men together and train them, than it was to obtain a number of men to officer the men so trained. So the chief difficulty for every country in preparing for emergencies when troops may be required is to get officers who are properly qualified to protect their men and able to discharge those duties that depend upon the courage and skill of a military body in case of war. I think it is a misfortune that we should lose a large number of our young men; but I never supposed it was a calamity to a country that those who have received a military education and cannot find employment in it should undertake to find active service in the armies of foreign countries. Indeed, I think that is advantageous. It is a thing that is often done by well-trained scientific men, eminent military engineers who belong to one country, to join the army of another country where they may go into active service, and it is a great advantage to them. I do not think that these men are all finally separated from Canada, nor do I think that is the notion with which they go into that foreign service. They go there for the purpose of having an opportunity to distinguish themselves in the career upon which they have entered; ready at all times to return to the country where they were educated and to which they belong, and they do rather credit to us than they do injury by going abroad. There are some things in which we apply the principle of political economy, but there are other things, where reasons of state, different and distinct from reasons of political economy, apply. I do not think that Sandhurst or some other English military school would be just the same advantage to us as the military school in Kingston. Our military school is one of the things that go to make up a nation; it is one of the things that go to create a national feeling and a national spirit, and as I am not an Imperial Federationist, I do not think for that reason that it is desirable that fusion should be made between Canada and the United Kingdom. But, Sir, while I entertain these views with regard to a school for the purpose of giving a scientific military training to men that may become the nucleus of the governing portion of the military body, I do not think that it is necessary that we should incur so large an expense and undertake to keep up so large a force as that which has existed heretofore. My opinion is, that a better understanding and more liberal relations established between this country and the neighbouring republic, will, in a large degree, render provisions of that sort obsolete; and the sooner that this is fully appreciated and the sooner acted upon, the better it will be for the revenues of the country, and I think the better it will be for our people. It is not always the most industrious class who are most anxious to give their time to ordinary volunteer service. In fact, as my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Allison) has said, the migratory population are the population that can find most time for drill and training, and it is not surprising then, that he should never have put the same party on horseback two years in succession.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The question has drifted off a little from the training of the militia to the Military College, but I desire to say a word or two on this matter. It has been stated that we are educating young men in that college to go abroad and to leave our country. That is not the case, in my opinion; because I do not consider that the young men who have left the country to join the Imperial Army are lost to Canada. They are but perfecting and continuing their military education at the expense of the mother country. These

young men are ready to come back to Canada at a moment's notice whenever their services are required; they have not left us by any means, but the mother country says: You are educating a certain number of young men for military service, you desire them to have practical experience after they have passed four years in your college, and we will take them at our expense and continue their education. That is the position of these young men at the present time.

Mr. AMYOT. What about those who go to the States?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They have gone there because their ability and training are such as to entitle them to the large salaries which they can obtain there; they are gone there because I think our Government should say to these young men who come out of the college: We will give every year four or five or six positions in our Civil Service to young men who graduate from that college, and we will give up the political patronage which we exercise in that respect for some political protégé. I believe that would be a benefit to the service. I believe that the principles which those young men are trained in, Truth, Honour, and Duty, would be good qualities to implant in our Civil Service. I believe that we should give these young men prominent positions and utilize them more than we have done in the past. I believe it would be appreciated throughout the country, if four or five or six good places would be given to these young men as they graduate from the college each year. Now, Sir, I think with these gentlemen who have spoken, that perhaps these young men who are in the college might be made a little more use of in the active militia. I would not do, as my friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says, make it obligatory upon them to leave their classes in the college and to join a battalion at the time of drill; but, after they graduate, or when they are out during their vacation, I would encourage them to join the various battalions and to do drill. I know, as a matter of fact, that very many of these graduates who remain in Canada, join battalions, and there is hardly a camp in this whole country that has not one, or two, or more representatives of the Royal Military College attached to the various battalions drilling. Their military knowledge and training are much appreciated by the volunteer officers in these camps. I may tell hon. gentlemen, that this college is also of use to the force, inasmuch as that every year there is a class of fifteen or twenty officers of the active militia force who are brought from the different schools to go through a three months' course, and to get the advantages of that college and the attendance on lectures in the classes there. In that way the Military College does a great deal of good to the active militia force. I believe that there is perhaps no sum in the militia estimates that is more wisely expended or does more good to the militia force, as a whole, than this sum of $50,000 a year which is expended on this college.

Mr. CASEY. $83,000 a year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. $48,000 a year.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. When the hon. gentleman says $83,000 a year he must remember that each student pays $400 a year, which amounts to about $25,000 or $30,000 annually paid back, so that the cost of the Military College is under $50,000 a year. I believe that that sum is well expended. We must remember that a battery of artillery of 110 or 120 men costs $110,000 a year to maintain, while we have here 80 young men, good and efficient soldiers, maintained at a cost to the country of under $50,000. Take it man for man, with our batteries of artillery and our other schools, this force is maintained at less expense and is doing great good to the country. We know, Sir, that the effect of this college has been to raise the name of Canada throughout the world, and we find that the distant colonies of Australia are following our example and are going to establish a similar college there. I believe that the action of the late Government, of which the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for Bothwell were members, in establishing this college, was a good service to the country, and the institution they established is a credit to Canada.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, has naturally spoken in the interest of his native city, and I am willing to admit that he probably speaks his real views in regard to this college. It is very natural that, with the college under his eye all the time, he should take a personal interest in it, and take an optimistic view of the college and its results. But I am bound to agree with those on both sides of the House, who have pointed out that we do not get all the advantages from that institution which we ought to get. The hon. member for Bothwell, thinks that it is as important to have a number of trained officer as to have a supply of men for the ranks. That is true; but we do not secure the supply of trained officers from the college at Kingston. It has been pointed out that large numbers of them go abroad, to the United States and to European countries. It is well enough to say that we can get them back; but how are they to be got back? If they are in the military service of a foreign country, they must have taken the oath of allegiance to that country, and they are not likely to be allowed to return to Canada. Even if they have gone to England, they would not be allowed to return from there. Were any sent back when we had our trouble in the North-West?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, there were a great number employed up there.

M. CASEY. But how many that came back from England or a foreign country? I do not think a single one came back of those who were trained in our college and exported for foreign consumption. As my hon. friend from Frontenac points out, we are simply training young men and giving them an excellent scientific education, with the effect if not the object of enabling them to obtain high salaries in the United States. As there is a very small opening for them in this country, they emigrate to a country where there is enterprise or business enough to afford them suitable employment. So that practically you may take it that the great majority of those educated at the Kingston College seek employment in some country outside of Canada; and whether it be the United States or Great Britain or any other country, when they get there and obtain good situations, they are anchored there

for life and are not going to come back here in the case of trouble in the North-West, or in the case of any other trouble whatever. I do not think it is part of our duty to furnish money, especially under the head of Militia and Defence, for the purpose of training young men to go abroad as an advertisement of the Canadian Military College. That is about all the good we get out of it, and I do not think it is worth the money. My hon. friend from Frontenac suggests that we should keep these young men at home by putting them in the Civil Service. Here again we are landed in a difficulty. If these young men are fit for good positions in the Civil Service, and are put there, where are they when they are wanted for service in the field? Can we afford to take away the brightest ornaments of the Civil Service and send them away to be food for powder in the battle-field? I do not think that would be very practicable either. If these young men are to be of any service to us, the only place where they can be put is in some position in connection with the active militia itself. We have not permanent positions in connection with the militia, which are sufficiently well paid to attract them, with the exception of those of brigade major, or deputy adjutant-general, which are very few in number. But if we cannot provide them with some such positions, we are only giving them such a training that they must necessarily leave Canada to make their training useful to them. The result is that we are losing a good many well-educated young men who would be kept at home but for this worse than useless expenditure of public money. Now, I want to say a few words about the item which is really the one under discussion, that in regard to drill pay and instruction. I agree with a great deal that has been said in regard to this. It is the most popular and the most justifiable line of expenditure connected with the Department of Militia. The money goes directly from the treasury into the pocket of the volunteer, and from his pocket into that of somebody else during the camp. It is not taken home by the volunteer, but goes at once into circulation and promotes business. That constitutes about one-fifth of the expenditure on Militia and Defence, and taken in connection with the $50,000 for ammunition and the grants for the Dominion Rifle Association and the other rifle and artillery associations——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The item for ammunition was passed about a week ago.

Mr. CASEY. I am not criticizing the item for ammunition at all. I say that these items, taken together, constitute almost the only part of the militia vote for which we get real value. For that reason I am inclined, rather, to point out how a larger amount might be afforded for drill pay and incidental expenses connected with the annual training than to ask for any reduction of the item. It was with the view of pointing out how that larger amount might be afforded that I referred to the Royal Military College. I am satisfied that if that source of expenditure were entirely cut off, and the money employed in drilling so many more men every year, we would have a larger amount of trained officers and men who would remain in the country. With the same object in view, I must enter my protest, in general terms, against the large amount paid for the different permanent schools and batteries. It is not in order to go into details at present, but I may take another opportunity of doing so and showing how large economies can be effected with regard to those schools, and the money thereby saved applied to this object. The actual effective expenditure that goes to the men, apart from the expenditure on training officers, is one-quarter of the whole militia expenditure. I am referring to the drill, ammunition and rifle association grants. The most important part of the annual training is the training in rifle shooting. It is becoming clearer, year by year, that modern battles are fought with the rifle, and that it is those who can shoot best who win. If we needed any illustration of this in modern British history, the wars with the Boers in South Africa would furnish it. These men were absolutely destitute of military training, but they were excellent shots and set to work to stalk and shoot the British soldiers, as if they were so much game, and they succeeded in making game of the British soldiers, to a remarkable extent. The very best regiments of the British army were decimated by these untrained Boers, who knew how to shoot.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Canadian bores are not such good shots.

Mr. CASEY. They sometimes only shoot off their mouth and miss the mark in doing so. I say the Boers on that occasion renewed the lesson taught by the New England settlers to the British troops a hundred years ago, namely, that accurate marksmanship is worth all the drill and discipline in the world. I know perfectly well, from my past experience as a volunteer, that shooting is not effectively taught.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I am alluding to my personal experience. It is most essential, in connection with this estimate, that attention should be paid to systematic training in the use of the rifle at these camps, because at present the instruction is given very hurriedly. I would remind the hon. Minister of Militia that he has promised from time to time to consider the question of furnishing improved arms to the militia. They cannot be trained in the use of arms unless they have them; and now that the Martini has been discarded in the British army to some extent, and that another weapon has been adopted, which will ultimately supersede it entirely, there is a capital opportunity for us to obtain quantities of Martini rifles for the use of the volunteers. They are not a perfect weapon, but vastly superior to the Snider-Enfield. The question of pay has been referred to. I heartily agree that it is too little. The man to whom fifty cents a day is an object is not fit to make a good volunteer. No doubt the men serve, some through patriotism and others for the fun of the thing, but some undoubtedly come in for the fifty cents, who cannot make it in any other way and we do not want that class. Of course, as long as sufficient numbers of good men can be had at fifty cents, it would be absurd to pay more, but the evidence of all the officers is that there is difficulty in securing sufficient recruits and especially in securing the continuance of the same recruits at this price. If the drill were made annual and the pay increased even if a smaller number were drilled every year, at the end of ten years there would be a vastly greater number of

drilled men in the country than there is now, and we would secure something like continuity of training. Another point to which I would draw attention is the hardships to which the men are subjected in camp. Men are taken from their ordinary avocations and put under canvas and subjected to a rigorous discipline and hard work, equal to that to which regular soldiers are subjected, and the consequence is that every year there are large crops of illness arising from the annual training, sometimes breaking out during the camp and very often after the camp. If the hon. Minister of Militia himself had to get up at the hours enforced in camp and drill two or three hours before breakfast and several more in the day, he would realize to what a strain he is putting the average volunteer. I know, as a matter of fact, that even the hard working young farmers, who are accustomed to the hard work of a farm, find the camp work exhausting. The hours of drill might be mitigated and an additional day or two given to the camp, and the effect would be to get better work out of the men and teach them their duties better, because the man who is tired out really cannot get the benefit of the instruction given him. But it does seem quite useless to discuss these matters. Year after year the majors-general commanding our forces make certain recommendations which are almost invariably quietly shelved. Year after year the officers of the militia force, supporters of the hon. gentleman, find fault with the management of that department. Year after year the Minister of Militia tilts up his chair and leans the back of his head on the back of the chair, closes his eyes as he is doing now and lets the stream of argument quietly roll on. I am not aware that any argument has drawn from him any expression of opinion of his own except once, when he stated that ammunition which was not good enough for use at the target was quite good enough for use in the field. I think that brilliant discovery is the hon. gentleman's sole original contribution to the discussion of military matters in this House, and until he takes more trouble to find out the opinions of military members of this House on the subject, it is likely to remain his only contribution. Later on it may be necessary to take a general survey of the whole of this subject, because now we are strictly limited to this particular item, and I hope that the Minister will prepare his mind for that occasion and will be more ready to discuss this question then than he is to-night.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think one point has been overlooked. If you are determined to train the militia, it would seem to be a necessity, first, to have a militia, and in order to have a militia they should be entitled to fair treatment. I think they should have a building at headquarters to cover their heads and to keep their arms dry. When a sum is voted for a drill shed for a battalion, the amount should not appear in the Estimates for three successive years without the work being carried out. That is very discouraging, and when, at the end of three years, the Minister of Militia, whose duty it is to look after the militia, proposes to shift that duty off his own shoulders and to ask a municipality to undertake the work which belongs to the department, the people in that municipality scarcely understand it. I ask the Minister now if he has received a communication from the city of Brantford in reply to one sent by the Public Works Department suggesting that the city of Brantford should build a drill shed for the 38th Battalion, and the Government would give this $10,000 to it. I understand that they have replied that it is not the duty of a municipality to erect a drill shed. I think it is a new thing for the Government to attempt to shirk the responsibility in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is wandering from the question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I am not. I would have made my remarks very much more fully on the item under the head Public Works, but I had unfortunately to go away for some days, and the item may have been passed before I get back.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has been passed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, not the item in Public Works. I think the treatment the 38th Battalion are receiving and have received—and I say it in all good nature; I want to impress it upon the Minister and upon his colleagues—is not in the interest of the militia force, and, if they had not a great deal of patriotism and public spirit, if they had not a desire to maintain their position as a regiment. it would have broken down, and it would seem that this last communication addressed to the city authorities will be almost more than you can expect them to stand. If I understand rightly, the municipality have requested the Militia Department to remove the building from the present site which they have leased to the department for a peppercorn a year. If the building is removed, what are you going to do with the regiment? Is the Minister prepared to have that regiment disbanded?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the position it is in. What is to be done if the drill shed is to be removed and there is not another one in its place? The municipality say it is not their business; and of course it is not, and they cannot be expected to do it. Without trenching on debateable ground, the question is if the regiment is to be maintained as a regiment, and it is a credit to the force, is it on this account to go down? That is the whole question. The member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that the fact that the people were in touch with the militia force and felt a pride in them would be evidenced if any Minister attempted to interfere with the force though it might be weak in some parts, but he would find the people with the force. If that is true, as I believe it to be, what is to be said in regard to a regiment which is the pride of the people, every officer and member of which have been sacrificing themselves for the good of the regiment, after bearing for three years the treatment they have received, I believe it will prove true that, not by the Minister interfering, but by the Minister not interfering and neglecting the battalion, whether by his own fault or not, the people will disapprove of his inaction. I would like to have some statement before I go away as to what course the Minister intends to pursue, as I may be questioned upon it when I reach home.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This item has been so well received that I have only a few words to say in answer to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I cannot for one moment believe that as good a battalion as that to which the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Paterson) has alluded would disband when the Government, with the liberality which the hon. gentleman is always willing to accord to the present Government, has placed in the Estimates the amount of $10,000 for the purpose of building the drill shed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why do you not do it? It has been there for three years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know the difficulties that have arisen, but the hon. gentleman must agree with me that the Government accorded to Brantford the amount of money which Brantford asked the Government to grant it. Brantford cannot complain, because we carried out what we were asked to do, and in the manner in which we were asked to accord it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was the officers asked it, not Brantford. Before the Minister leaves that point, will he say what he is going to do about the removal of the shed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before I come to that point, I wish to answer those hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon this matter. The hon. member for South Oxford has referred to the few days which are accorded to the militia for training purposes. I believe, from the information which I have received from those whose duty it is to advise me on military matters in my department, that 12 days would be sufficient, considering the amount of money expended to-day by Canada; but I believe it is important that the whole militia force should be drilled every year, and I wish to draw the attention of Parliament to that subject. That has been the policy which I have advocated, although I do not complain of what has been done in the past in a country like ours, where we have great public works to develop and it is necessary to be prudent in the expenditure of public funds. But when the day comes that Canada can afford to drill every militiaman once a year instead of every two years, I think the money will be well expended, and the force will receive much greater benefit. Hon. gentlemen acquainted with this subject know that if a man who enlists for a period of three years, enlists immediately after one camp, during that whole period of time he may receive only one drill. Now, I think the money would be properly invested if it was invested in such a way as to give the force 12 days drill every year, and I think that just as soon as we can possibly afford to do so we should drill the whole militia force annually, and the appropriation for that purpose should be increased as soon as we are able to increase it. Every man should be drilled every year as long as he belongs to the force. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated that it was desirable that the training should be annual. Well, I altogether agree with him, and I think that every man who has taken an interest in the militia force of Canada will agree that an annual drill is almost a necessity if you want to have an efficient force. The hon. member for South Oxford stated that the training accorded to the force only amounted to about five or six days. I think the hon. gentleman has underrated the time given to drill. I admit, as hon. gentlemen know well, that the day of going into camp is lost so far as the drill is concerned; but the exercise of camping is part and parcel of the education of a soldier, it is necessary that he should know how to camp, and how to strike a camp. Then when he leaves the camp, that is another day lost to drill. Then, as my hon. friends have stated, the Sunday parade is very important, and it is a part of the education of a soldier, so that I think the days taken up in going into and leaving camp are not at all lost, but they are a benefit to the force. Like several hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, I should myself like to have 16 days' drill instead of 12, or even to have 20 days' drill as they have in Switzerland. But I think, according to the advice I have received from every competent military man who has ever come to Canada, and who has had an opportunity of judging our force, with an annual drill of twelve days, Canada could rely upon a force efficient and perfectly trained. I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that the only purpose for which we should keep up this force, is defensive and not offensive; but I think the money that Canada is expending on the force would be more properly expended if, in addition to the present amount of $250,000 for annual drill——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I call your attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—if in addition to the $250,000 which is now accorded by Parliament, an additional amount of $170,000 were granted for the purpose of training the force every year. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has stated, as well as other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that the intelligence of Canadians is such that they require less time to become well drilled than do the men in other countries where they are selected from a different class of people. In Canada our militia force is selected among the intelligent sons of farmers, and during the time which they drill they can become more efficient than the men in other countries who are selected from a different class. The military school has been referred to. From the experience I have acquired, and from the information I have acquired from military advisers, I must again express the opinion, which I have expressed on another occasion, that the schools which we have under our present system—not having the advantage of having the Imperial troops with us that we had under the old military schools—still, I think, our present system of schools is producing very good results indeed. The military college has also been referred to. Well, I leave it to those who have seen the great success of our cadets all over the world to decide whether it would be an advantage or a disadvantage to destroy an institution which has not been organized by the party at present in power, but which has produced results that Canada can be proud of. I can only say in addition that, being consulted by a stranger as to the best means of organizing the forces in Australia, Sir Andrew Clark, one of the great military authorities, said: You cannot do better than to copy Canada's example by establishing such a military college as they have in Kingston. I think the men who have been turned out from that institution have proved themselves to be fitted to represent Canada in every portion of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that we are losing the services of these men. Well, Sir, during the trouble of 1885 in Manitoba and the North-West, as soon as it was known that troops were required, the department was deluged with telegrams from cadets receiving large salaries in the United States in various

occupations, and some in other countries, tendering their services, ready to give up their position and everything else and to come back home and fight the battles of Canada. I think the experience they are acquiring in the Imperial service and elsewhere is so much additional advantage to the college we have established. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Allison) seems to believe that the militia force is composed of men who go away to the States, because those who borrowed horses from him never came back. It may be due to the fact that the horses were not exactly what they expected, and they did not care to try the experiment a second time. In taking up the rolls of the militia force it appears that, although many of the men have removed to different places, they have generally joined some military organization, which permits them to help the country and continue the training they had commenced. So far as my personal views are concerned, I believe there is no money expended by Canada that is more beneficial to the Dominion than is the amount for drilling the militia force, and I hope the day will soon come when we will have an annual drill. I am aware that 96 members of the House signed a petition to the late lamented leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, asking for an annual drill of the militia force, and I hope it will be carried out as soon as possible. In reply to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) I may say I did receive the communication to which he adverted, and I had to refer it to the Public Works Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did it not contain an intimation to the Militia Department to remove the drill shed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does the hon. gentleman propose to do under those circumstances?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not prepared to say, for I had to refer it to a different department.

Mr. BORDEN. What changes have been made in the permanent staff of district No. 9? I have a copy of the district orders giving a list of the staff officers, who are to go into the camp of instruction on 15th September, and in that list I do not see the names of the deputy adjutant general or the district paymaster. I think, when such important officers are omitted, some explanation is necessary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some trouble arose between those officers and the department as to the manner in which they had administered the affairs of the department. They were submitted to an investigation and they are under suspension, and that is the reason why they could not be sent in the former positions they occupied as commanding officers.

Mr. BORDEN. Then I understand the matter has not been finally settled.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. WATSON. May we expect that the 95th Battalion will go into camp in the near future? It has been in existence six years, and has never been in camp. In regard to the militia expenditures, I believe a great deal of the money used might be judiciously expended in other ways to greater benefit to the country. A portion might advantageously be used in inducing young men to come here as immigrants, who would fight the battles of the country if need be. A smaller number of militiamen better equipped and better drilled than they are to-day would be of greater service than the larger number now supposed to be under arms who are not well drilled and not sufficiently well equipped. It would be well if the country could devise some means whereby every school teacher would have a military training and give military instruction and drill to the boys at school. This would also be a great benefit to our young men physically. If the force were reduced by one-half and better equipped and drilled, it would be advantageous to the country, because everyone knows that a militiaman is often in camp only once in his life. In some places, great efforts are made to fill up the companies at camp time; but this has very little benefit. No doubt what has been stated by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) is correct, and bad habits are formed by boys and young men in camp.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WATSON. I know some young men have been practically ruined by going to camp. By training the boys at school a similar result would be obtained without their running the danger of acquiring bad habits in camp. These are some of the means whereby part of the money expended on the militia force might be more advantageously used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this discussion had occurred at a more convenient time, I might have had a good deal to say in regard to the policy of the Government, and some of the observations made. But looking to the fact that it is now half-past one a.m., I am not inclined to enter into a disquisition on military policy or any other policy, except to say this: that the hon. gentleman would have been wise to have accepted my suggestion and to have taken up other items at this hour. Of course this may be taken up on concurrence, if the Minister of Militia will agree to that; and if we shall have some reasonable liberty on concurrence, I shall defer any observations until that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Royal Military College..... $77,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For the same reason as I defer observations as to the militia, I am not going to enter into a discussion into the Royal Military College, although there is a good deal to be said about that; but I will just say this to him: That I am afraid that he will find if the matter is looked into—and I make the statement in no party spirit, but I make it with very considerable regret, for it is an institution in which I have always taken a great deal of interest, and which I am inclined to think will not be found to have injured the prospects of Canada up to the present time—I am afraid he will find, that from whatever cause it may be, that institution is not as popular, nor possibly in some respects as well managed at present as it was in years gone by. I am afraid there will be, unless care is taken, a marked decadence in the quality of the officers that are turned out from that institution. I make that statement to the hon. gentleman, and I do not make it unadvisedly. I advise him, if he has, as I know he has, the interest of that college at heart,

to make a careful enquiry into the discipline and status of it.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister if there is any hope of the 90th Battalion going into camp this year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The companies, of course, drill under the ordinary regulations, but I am afraid it will be impossible to call these companies together for battalion drill this year. The hon. gentleman knows that these companies are at great distances from each other, and that transport runs away with a lot of money. I am afraid that under the limited estimates this year, it will be impossible for me to tell the hon. gentleman that the battalion drill will take place.

Mr. WATSON. They have been now in existtence for six years, and unless they are called together this year or next for battalion drill, I am afraid they will disband.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will try next year.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House ajourned at 1.30 a.m. (Friday).

INDEX.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1891.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Withdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1600.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2743 (ii).

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Amherstburg Dry Dock (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1580 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4590 (iii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2981 (ii).

Allison, Mr. D. W., *Lennox.*

Elliott, G. M., Inspector of Gas (Ques.) 5576 (iii).

Napanee Public Buildings, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).

Canals—Income (Rideau) 5222 (iii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 6242; (Ottawa) 4486 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1690 (i), 4602 (iii); (remarks) 4800. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4575 (iii).

Veterans, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2925.

Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ques.) 961 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).

——— Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).

Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ques.) 112 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.) 187 (i).

Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ques.) 1577 (i).

Compulsory Voting (B. 53, 1°*) 266; 2° m., 1030, 1039 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°) 218 (i).

——— B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; in Com., 3651 (ii), 5355, 5604 (iii).

Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).

Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ques.) 112 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 792 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 314 (i).
Giguere, Capt. Claude, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1166 (i).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2922 (ii).
——— Cor. in Macleod *Gazette* (Ques.) 4293 (iii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075 (iii)
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ques.) 961 (i).
Isle Verte P. O., Rep. of Enquiry (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Kingston Dry Dock, original Plan (M. for copies*) 1579 (i).
——— Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— Papers (Ques.) 1764 (i); (remarks) 3960 (ii).
——— P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ques.) 1266 (i).
——— Postmaster's Rep. (M. for copies) 1578 (i).
——— on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3634 (ii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1020 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4753 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3914 (ii).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 285 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., Papers (remarks) 1851 (i).
——— CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5999 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6026 (iii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1934 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on objection (Mr. *Laurier*) 4082 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 246 (i).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Justice, Administration of (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3722; (Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3662 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1673, 1678 (i). *Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4552 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3857 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 3971 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1807 (i).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5207 (iii).
Gov. General's Warrants, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4549 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5518 (iii).
Lobo P.O., Change of Postmaster (M. for Pets., &c.*) 1579 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Montreal Customs, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3144 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5169. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5240 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4573 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1368, 2238 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Amber Deposits in N. W. T., Applicants (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1790 (i).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ques.) 223 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5120; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5095; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road (M. for O.C.) 1058 (i).

Baker, Mr G. B., *Missisquoi.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 6201 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Barry P. O., Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Beaverton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2367 (ii); in Com., 5602, 5734, 6224 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3248 (ii), 5142; on M. for 3°, 5556 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 266; 2° m., 1040.
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 98, 1°) 738 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3086.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Galt P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225.
Galway, Establishment of P. O. (M. for Ret.*) 736 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 210 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 3201 (ii).
Indian Reserve No. 6, Timber Cut (Ques.) 111 (i).
I.C.R., Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
Kingston P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lindsay P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5644 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Pub. Accts. Com., on presentation of 21st Rep (remarks) 4608 (iii).
P. O. Dept. (M.) to ref. Accts., &c., 2517 (ii).
Peterborough P.O., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 225 (i).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°*) 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).
Reporters, Official, Accommodation (remarks) 1012 (i).
Saw Logs Cut in Disputed Territory (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ques.) 335 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ques.) 269 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6141; on M. for 1° of B., 6143 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals 4124; (Trent) 4126 (ii). *Income* (Miscellaneous) 1668; (Trent Valley, Bridge at Hastings) 1665 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4080 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 948, 1560 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3511 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 6266 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4289 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1709; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4363, 6243; (B.C.) 6252; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 4344 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601; (Kaministiquia River) 4529; (Ont.) 4575 (iii).
Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6282 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2560 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2569 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal Works, Total Cost Q1e s. 1929 (i).
——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194, 197 (i).
——— (remarks) 214, 550, 993 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467, 4773 (iii).
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Beet-Root Sugar, Cultivation, &c. (M. for Cor.* 545 (i).
——— Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4466 (ii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Commissioners (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revision (Ques.) 143 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N. W. T., Re-arrangement (Ques.) 221 (i).

Beausoliel, Mr. C.—*Continued.*
Fishing Licenses in Quebec Counties (M. for Stmnt.*) 145 (i).
—— System of Issuing (Ques.) 143 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1195 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Montreal P.O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1026 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3945 (ii).
Ottawa Mail Service, Advertising (Ques.) 963 (i).
—— Advertising in *Le Canada* (M. for Ret.) 2540 (ii).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Empire* Newspaper (remarks) 3427 (ii).
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3514 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2680 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Richelieu River Floods, H. F. Perley's Rep. (M. for copy*) 128 (i).
—— (Ques.) 336 (i).
St. John's, Que., Medical Officer (Ques.) 527 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2792 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
[*See* SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy.]
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°*) 387 (i).
Private Bills, Presentation, Extension of Time (M.) 156 (i).
South-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46, 1°*) 238 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4107 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1978 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 221 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2910 (ii).
Sawdust in LaHave River, on M. for Ret., 1951 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4706, 4718; (salaries, &c.) 4721 (iii).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4235 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4331. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4008 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2290 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4423 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership, on M for Ret., 2157 (ii).
Advertising and Printing, in Com. of Sup., 500.
American Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ans.) 114 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1811 (i).
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ans.) 1265 (i).
C.P.R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1940 (i).
—— Statistics (presented) 738 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Regulations (remarks) 806 (i).
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ans.) 2153.
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports (Ans.) 142 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ans.) 270.
—— Seizures at Walkerton (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
—— Illegal Seizures (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep. (Ms.) for Sel. Com., 7, 109 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1055 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3254 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5583 (iii).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ans.) 741 (i).
Govt. Rys., Expenditure on Capital Account (explanation) 4092 (ii).
—— Payments for Printing (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
I. C. R. (B. 105, 1°) 959; 2° m., 1256; in Com., 1260 (i).
—— Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
—— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
—— emplyt. of Walter Hogg (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
—— Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ans.) 3266.

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., McCully, S.W., Dismissal (Ans.) 3613 (ii).
——— Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ans.) 3261 (ii).
——— Refreshment Contract (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— Stone for Langevin Block (Ans.) 1575 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Langevin Block, Haulage of Stone (Ans.) 1768.
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ans.) 209, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 2158 (ii).
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Marie Eliza, Seizure and Sale (Ans.) 710 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C., on M. for Cor., 965 (i).
——— Importation of, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099 (ii).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3277 (ii).
——— Superannuation (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Irregularities (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages, on M. for Ret., 2546 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 971 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 2522; (prop. Res.) 3577 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 4748 (iii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1965 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1589 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal, on enquiry for Ret., 5088 (iii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2164 (ii).
——— Tram Service (Ans.) 1274 (i).
Polson Mfg. Co., Steel Plates, Imports (Ans.) 270.
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (1).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3950 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 6142; 1°, 6286 (iii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 3618 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 739 (i).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ans.) 1927 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ans.) 335 (i).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Soucy, Eugene, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 1274, 1927 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) to change names, 237.
——— Names substituted (M.) 1651 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 175) prop. Res., 6032; in Com., 6136, 6185; 1° of B., m., 6142; (M.) to re-com., 6217; 1° 6286 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4107; (Grenville) 4141 (ii), 6198, 6298 (iii); (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4121; (Rapide Plat) 4107; (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4128. *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii); (Chambly) 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222, 6304 (iii); (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (St. Ann's Lock) 4149 (ii); (St. Peter's) 5223 (iii); (Trent River) 4151; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Welland, Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Murray) 1728 (i). Customs (B.C.) 5051 (iii); (Board of Customs, &c.) 5053, conc., 5419; (Chinese Immigration) 5056, conc., 5419; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (N.S. and N.B.) 5023 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i); (Ont.) 5042; (P.E.I.) 5025, conc., 5418; (Que.) 5030; (Revenue Cruiser) 6277; (Travelling Inspectors) conc., 5418 (iii); (Vacuum Oil Co., refund) 1721 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 1736 (i), 4057 (ii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4255 (iii)
Militia (Care and Maintenance) 3736 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4287 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C) 924 (i).
Public Works — Income: Buildings (B. C.) 6252 (Ont.) 6240; (N. W. T.) conc., 5387. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1661. Cape Breton (construction) 1656 (i), 3898 (ii); (Grand Narrows Bridge) 1658 (i); (Train Ferry) 3898 (ii). C. P. R. (construction) 1652 (i), conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854; (Halifax, warehouse) 3894 (ii). (Moncton, increased accommodation) 1653 (i); (New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i), 3884 (ii); (St. John, additional accommodation) 1655 (i); ("Y" at Truro) 1655 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i), 6197 (iii). P.E.I. (Summerside Station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278; (Payment for expropriation) 6198 (iii). Short Line Ry. (Judgment of Court) 1658 (i).
Quarantine, conc., 5437 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C. 3682 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M. —*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (prop. Res.) 6032 ; in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ans.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ans.) 740 (i).
Summerside Ry. Station (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ans.) 3262.
——— Expenditure, on M. for Ret., 3267 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3745 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3501 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 104 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2556 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Total Cost (Ans.) 1930 (i).
Walkerton, Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2027 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3205, 3233 (ii).
Welland Canal, on enquiry for Rets. (remarks) 3200 (ii).
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ans.) 1769.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry., on Order for Com. on prop. Res., 1254 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 715 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 962 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ques.) 143 (i).
Digby Postal Accommodation, insufficient (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 974 (i).
Raquette Pier, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ques.) 1574 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3529 (ii), conc., 4268 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 3512; (maintenance) 3510 ; (salaries, &c.) 3509.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.S.) 4330. Dredging (Man.) 4648 (iii) ; (New Plant) 1693 (i) ; (repairs) 4646 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2781 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4983 (iii).
Employés in Elections (Ques.) 221 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 791 (i).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674 ; (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745, 802 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2912 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2880 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J., *Monck.*
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ques.) 709 (i).

Burnham, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Military Districts Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major (M. for Cor.) 733 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4792 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4134 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
Frauds on Farmers Prevention (B. 42, 1°*) 206 ; 2° m., 1003 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).
Hastings Co. Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 212 (i).
——— Public Works, Improvements (Ques.) 208.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1067 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Dredging (New Plant) 1690.
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 217 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1842 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257 ; in Com., 1262 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co. (M. for Cor.) 2522 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H.—*Continued.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*) on M. for 2°, 2858 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John A., Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2171 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2896 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup, 4177 (ii).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Census Returns, prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4885. (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5354, 5596, 5731 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197, 5547 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 107; 2° m., 1029.
Evidence in Criminal Cases (B. 11, 1°*) 129 (i); 2° m., 2955 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
——— Act Repeal (B. 8, 1°) 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 302; agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3262 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1484 (i).
Indian Reservation, Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260.
Langevin Block, Payments on acct. of Contract (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1076 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4152 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Amt.) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 1966 (i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—*Continued.*
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Member for East Northumberland, 4085 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5824 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3589 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 257 (i).
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (contingencies) 1709 (i), 5067.
Indians (B.C.) 4802; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4731, 4810.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (repairs) 4641 (iii). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).
——— Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2206 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P.O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Chatham P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5736 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1977 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1263 (i).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 146 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129, 1267 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4637 (iii).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ques.) 1268 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 424 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Que.) 5039 (iii). Public Works (Telegraphs, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 4735; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4815; (N.S.) 4631; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 517 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. (i).

Campbell, Mr. A—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4513. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592; (Ont.) 4582, 6255. (Miscellaneous) 4661; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Surveys) 4662 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3873 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2425 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2255 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 387 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, O.C.'s, on M. for copies, 1046.
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ans.) 223 (i).
Commissions, Military Colleges, Permanent Corps (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Garrison Club, Que., Lease of Lands (Ans.) 527 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ans.) 3620.
Land Grants to Volunteers (B. 159) in Com. on Res., 3106; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3628 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ans.) 3257 (ii).
Military College, Kingston (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
—— Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
—— Dist. No. 1, Location of Camp, on M. for Cor., 231 (i).
—— Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major, on M. for Cor., 733 (i).
—— Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ans.) 707 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 174, 1°) 6126 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 135.
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ans.) 268 (i).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ans.) 2908 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—*Continued.*
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6025 (iii).
Rebellion, N.W.T., Scrip for Militia (prop. Res.) 634 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg. of Cavalry (Ans.) 198 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 499 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3700; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4225, 4233 (ii), conc., 4282 (iii); (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii); (Military College) 4237 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields, Can.) conc., 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3738 (ii); (St. John's Gate, repairs) 1574 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commutations of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086 (iii).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 4660; (Mounted Police, &c.) 3667; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R.) 1743 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6284 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).
Volunteers' Services in Nanaimo, in Com. of Sup., 1558 (i).
Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ans.) 961 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (Ans.) 2147.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ques.) 158 (i).
I.C.R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (M. for Ret.) 177 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address, on the, 35 (i).
Adjnmnt, Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Auditor General's Powers (remarks) 391 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (iii).
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 738, 953 (i).
—— (reply) 1232; (Amt.) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).
C. P. R., Arbitrators Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
—— Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5971 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 106 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1992 (i).; in Com. on B., 3899.
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 957 (i).
Census Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
—— Printing (remarks) 4465, 4534 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
Census (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 551; in Com., 558; on M. for 3°, 1253 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1033 (i).
Consolidated Audit Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3237 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5355, 5735 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 156 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4829; on M. for Com., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Documents mentioned in Speech from Throne (Ques.) 157 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5208; on M. for 3°, 5575.
Estimates, The (enquiry) 214 (i).
——— Suppl., delay (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 542 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1544 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1120 (i).
——— Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Iron Bounties Ret. (enquiry) 2580, 2668 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4614 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5487 (iii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
N.W.T., Representation of Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 1102 (i).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1969 (i).
Order, Ques. of (remarks) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
Pairing of Members, on M. to adjn., 3823 (ii).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 1°, 388; on M. for 2°, 547 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 203 (i).
Priv. and Elec., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4089 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 991 (i).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 744 (i).
Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Stmnt.) 213 (i)
Reciprocity Papers (remarks) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3150 (ii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i).
Standing Committees, organization (enquiry) 199.
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
Sugar, Free List, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3571 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Adam Brown, honorarium) 6174 (iii); (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3534 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5210; (Tay) 5219 (iii). *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor General's Office) 1544; (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 431, 491, 1555; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 435; (Interior) 247; (Geological Survey) 410; (Justice) 242, (contingencies) 423; (Privy Council) contingencies, 433; (Public Works) 398, 408; (Railways and Canals) 408; (Sec. of State) 242.
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5167. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714; (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189 (iii) Excise, 1724 (i). Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Post Office (Mail Service) 4712, 6279. Public Works (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4665; (Slides and Booms, Dues) 4663 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1736 (i), 3853, 4057 (ii). Post Offices, 1744. Weights and Measures, 1726.
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4268; (N. S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Government of N. W. T., 5066 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 3575 (ii), 5224 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Indians (B.C.) 4800; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736; (N. B.) 4732, 5059; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4727 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Miscellaneous) 6170; conc., 6203 (iii).
Legislation: House of Common (Debates) 942 (i); (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Leather Trunks) 1562 (i).
Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3699; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4214 (ii), conc., 4280 (iii); (Military College) 4236 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) conc., 4277 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i); Old Records) 5124; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5346.
Ocean and River Service (Que. Water Police) 3508 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Kingston) 882; (Man.) 913 (i).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 3660; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523 (ii); (Kingston Graving Dock) 1675 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) conc.) 6304; (Man.) 4441; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6244; (Ottawa) 4470, 4475; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Que.) 4332. Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Dredging (New Plant) 4602. Experimental Farms, &c., 4655. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4572. Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 4607 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4277, 6304.
Railways — Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664. Cape Breton (construction) 1656. C. P. R. (construction) 1652; conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Moncton, accommodation at) 1653, conc., 1758; (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, conc., 4243 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).
Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).

Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to for M. Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
Telegrams, &c., in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 3947 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).
Trade Relations with U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 206 (i).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).
Washington Treaty, Papers (enquiry) 192 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff (Amt.) to M. for Com. on Res., 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 1253 (i), 4006 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201, 3232 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt., 2023, 2037 (i).
——— on 2° of Res., 1853 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2229, 2237 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1852 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 549 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1779 (i).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5200, 5549 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5975 (iii).
Census Returns (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5362, 5374, 5602, 5747 (iii).
Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5324 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4631 (iii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2946 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary language, 5330 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).
——— *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4249 (iii).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 6309 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 494 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Mr. O'Meara's salary) 1720 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189. Excise (Distilleries, Extra Duty-pay) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5128 (iii).
Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5412 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 3510 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4228 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) conc., 5426; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5092, 5101; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 4316; (Ont.) 4363; (Ottawa) 4471; (Que.) 4358. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4569 (iii).
Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Trade Policy of the Govt.,on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3413 (ii).
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on conc., 6322 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2934 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4003 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2209, 2245, 2252 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ans.) 269, 270 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3966 (ii).
Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ans.) 111 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 188 (i).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (1).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ans.) 142 (i).
Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
——— List of Can. (presented) 103 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548; on M. for 3°, 5573
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revision (Ans.) 143 (i).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ans.) 142, 177.
Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ans.) 112 (i).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Langevin Block, Priv. and Elec. Com., Printing Evidence (remarks) 4000 (ii).
McLean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ans.) 269 (i).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4759 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 5329.
Printing and Stationery Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2437 (ii).
——— Type purchased (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Employés (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
——— Paper Contracts (Ans.) 529 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4240 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing and Advertising (Ans.) 4295, 4465 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6237 (iii).
Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (remarks) 5404 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 534 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies, 481; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 479, 484; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Sec. of State) 242 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 61 73 (iii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc., 5418; Printing Bureau, Plant) 5246; (Printing, &c.) conc., 5418 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3846 (ii).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ans.) 271 (i).
Voters in Quebec District, Number (Ans.) 2910.
Voters' List, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 268 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 389 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Address, on the, 77 (i).
Adjnmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1276 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1818 (i).
Calgary and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4858 (iii).
Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5303 (iii).
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2364; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii); in Com., 5354, 5374 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 104 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 327 (i).
——— (B. 31, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 999, 1003 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
High Commissioner (M. to adjn. Deb.) 705 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier* in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 808 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys., B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4308; in Com., 4628 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5489, 5494 (iii).
Liquor License Permits, N.W.T. (M. for Reps., &c.*) 545 (i).
Lord's Day Observance (B. 2, 1°) 104; 2° m., 747 (i); 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 2360; in Com., 2936; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4298 (iii)
Order (Ques. of) *re* par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (ii).
——— unparliamentary Language, 324 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2069 (i).
——— Orange Influence, 1964 (i).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 546 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3149 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3551 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 465, 491; (Interior) 249; (Printing Bureau) contingencies 442 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5057, conc., 5419; (Ont.) 5043. Public Works (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Post Office (Mail Service) 4709 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) conc., 5415; (N. B.) 5060, conc., 5423; (N.W.T.) conc., 5415; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4729 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350; (Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland) 4678: (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc., 5417; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5433 (iii).
Mounted Police, conc., 5415 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4430; (N.W.T.) conc. (Amt.) 5387; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont.) 5348; (Ottawa) 4473, 4475, conc., 5401; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4650; (Que. and Ont.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4559. Slides and Booms, 4652 (iii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Quarantine, 5336 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261.
——— Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 3267 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1892 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3203 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ques.) 1769 (i).
——— Examination of Commander (Ques.) 2913.
American Cattle for slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ques.) 129 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ques.) 3621 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Dr., P.O. Inspector, Retirement (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
——— Payment to (M.) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ques.) 142 (i).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ques.) 741 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski (Ques.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 785.
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
I.C.R., Claim of Miss Lea Caron (Ques.) 209 (i).
——— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct (M. for Ret.) 1937 (i).
——— emplymnt. of Walter Hogg (Ques.) 5407.
——— Refreshment Contract (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ques.) 601 (i).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 967 (i).
Printing Bureau, Regulations *re* Employés (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1935 (i).
Rouleau, F. F., Fishing Rights at Rimouski (M. for Ret.*) 2936 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 1274, 1927 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3518 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4559 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor. 1632 (i).
Voters in Quebec Province, Number (Ques.) 2910.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5321 (iii).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 144 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2945 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 375 (i).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jun., *East Toronto.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
Canadian Order of Home Circles incorp. (B. 81, 1°*) 524 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 286, 336 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5853.
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Septennial Benevolent Society's incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 5439 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71, 1°*) 387 (i).
——— (B. 86, 1°*) 548 (i).
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 549 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1009 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4152 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).

Cockburn, Mr G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1410 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1957 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Empire Printing Co.'s (B. 28, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 191 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 777.

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—*Continued.*
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1142 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in P.E.I. *Daily Examiner*, 1604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173.
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii): (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 963 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1291, 1645 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) on M. for 2°, 295 (i).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3578.

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Address in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).
Burrard Inlet and Westminster Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3528 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 925 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4451. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 746 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4797 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2421 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Compounders License Fees (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579 (ii).
Dugnay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ans) 3254.
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Fraudulent Marking (B. 140, 1°*) 2144 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 103, in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1176 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579; B. 116, 1°*, 1345; 2° and in Com., 3242; Res. conc. in and in Com., 3579 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ans.) 194 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis, on M. for Ret., 205 (i).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 157, 1°) 3426; in Com., 3648 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John—*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Railways B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 253 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Culling Timber, 5159. Customs (P.E.I.) 5030. (Excise) Customs Collectors' Allowance) 5138 ; (Methylated Spirits) 5138 ; (Officers of Distilleries, &c.) 5136 ; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Weights and Measures, &c., 5162 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4475 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3842 (ii).
——— on adjunt. (remarks) 3948 (ii).
Weighers of Grain (B. 164) in Com., 4307 (iii).
Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4979 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 2617 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 16, 1°*) 155 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s (B. 82, 1°*) 524 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; 3° m., 1957 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1183 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis (M. for Ret.) 203 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 380 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6086 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Lachine) 4103 (ii). *Income :* (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I. C. R. &c.) 4065 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4345. Dredging (New Plant) 4604 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3677 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2032 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1808 (i).
C. P. R., Souris Branch, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 1938 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 316 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1192 (i).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4625, 5539 (iii).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 25, 1°*) 155 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3142 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4822 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 916 (i).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Man.) 4431 ; (N.W.T.,) 5398 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co's. B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 ; in Com. on Res., 1279, 1363 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1093 ; in Com., 1414 (i) ; in Com. on Res., 3101 (ii).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1090 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
——— B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. action (remarks) 3130 (ii)
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1100 (i).
Bridge at Quebec and North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3298 (ii).
Canadian, West Indian and South American SS. Co., Subsidies (M. for Cor.*) 544 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 ; in Com., 559 ; on M. to conc. in Res., 636 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3651 (ii), 5597, 5727 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3244 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5578, 5586 (iii).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4049 (ii).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3157, 3163; on M. for 3°, 3239 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety (B. 114, 1°*) 1406 (i).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1098 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 776 (i).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1974 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., B. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1136 (i).
Halifax County Court Judges Salaries, on M. for Ret., 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 698 (i).
I. C. R., additional Property accommodation, St. John (M. for Cor.*) 1578 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3799 (ii).
——— McCully, S. W., Dismissal (Ques.) 3613 (ii).
——— B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257; in Com., 1261 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res.. 5494 (iii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 972 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4155 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3922; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 4973 (iii).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958, 5157 (ii).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594, 3900 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Road-bed and Rails (M. for Ret.) 228.
——— Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec., Meetings of Com. (remarks) 983.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 1988 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4827 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt, 375 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1339 (i).
Provincial Govt's Property Transfer B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3988 (ii); in Com., 5751 (iii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
Public Works. Dept., Papers (remarks) 395 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5881; (Amt.) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124 (iii).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
——— Ques. of Procedure, 4088 (ii).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ques.) 601, 739 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii); on M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety, Legislation respecting (remarks) 218 (i).
——— B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088, (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P. E. I., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 164 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1095 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (High Commissioner) 446, 453; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Indian Affairs) 1550, contingencies, 436; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Public Works) 258, 262 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 5024, conc., 5418 (iii). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4058 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4707 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4259; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4256 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5421; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5414 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Sullivan, Hon. W. W., salary) 1556 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4689; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4701; (St. John, Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5467, 5486 (ii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3724; (Drill Pay) 3733 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5088 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4470; Dredging (repairs) 4642 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Maintenance) 3513 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854, 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885; (St. Charles

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Branch) 3884. P.E.I. (Summerside station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection conc., 4245 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5080, 5591 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562; in Com., 2577 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3358 (ii).
Tunnel between P. E. I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— (M. for Cor. &c.) 1277 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 232 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2029 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ques.) 195 (i).
——— Manifest of Cargoes (M. for Ret.*) 205 (i).
——— Subsidies (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for prop. Res., 1255; in Com., 2232 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 56, 1°*) 334 (i).
Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 266.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3921; in Com., 3938 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3146 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. G. W., *Addington.*
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Rideau) 5223 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 4249 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2485 (ii).

Delisle, Mr. A., *Portneuf.*
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Bernier, Capt. J. E., Reps. of L. Langevin *re* (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf, (Ques.) 158 (i).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors Smuggled into Quebec, Suits resulting (M. for Stmnt.*) 1062 (i).
Judges in Quebec, appointments (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ques.) 1769 (i).

Delisle, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Montreal Pilots, article in Montreal *Herald*, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6144 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 1019 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Printing Paper Contracts (Ques.) 528 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ques.) 2149.
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ques.) 3263.
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ques.) 207.
St. Lawrence River, Deepening (Ques.) 207 (i).

Davidson, Mr. J. I., *South Ontario.*
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5342 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4208 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1821 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3297 (ii).
Commissions, Military College, Permanent Corps (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 1010 (i).
——— B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 3996 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5764; in Com., 5770, 6227.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 783.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement (M. for Ret.) 3635 (ii).
Herchmer, Commissioner (Amt.) to M. on Order Paper, 711 (i).
——— Comptroller's Rep. (Ques.) 1274 (i), 2669 (ii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct (prop. Res.) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 606 (i).
Immigration into N.W.T. (Ques.) 1269 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Dept., Regina, Estimates (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4633 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3108; on M. to conc. in Res., 3582 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, decease of (remarks) 887 (i).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 129, 1°*) 1964 (i).
Mounted Police, N.W.T., Management (Ques.) 267 (i).
——— Newspaper article on Reform (Ques.) 1269.
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's salary (Ques.) 2518.
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 1102 (i).
——— B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3902; in Com., 3930 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228.
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4241.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6160 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 1062 (i); 2° m., 3307 (ii).
Regina and South-Western Ry., Pet. *re* (M.) 799 (i).
Second Homesteads in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 3302 (ii).
Settlement of the N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 2913 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5183 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1718 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Library) 6277 (iii); (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5224 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 4448; conc., 5395, 6250 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 6254 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5097; (Medicine Hat Hospital) 6275; (Prohibition Commission) 6276 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1701 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for to Com. of Sup., 3851 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2568 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2719 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1386 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579.
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1960 (i).
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ques.) 222 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5358 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3249 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*
Empire Printing and Publishing Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 28, 1°*) 156 (i).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two Cent Rate (Ques.) 131 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 60, 1°*) 387 (i).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3111 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 520.
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1561. Senate (salaries, &c.) 939 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Instruction) 3730 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4281; (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 6171 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3666 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont) conc., 5444 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2930 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1381 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Citizens Insurance Co.'s (B. 118, 1°*) 1403 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 548, 1200 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 1407 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2289 (ii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (Ms.) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 309 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°*) 1483 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4352 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2773 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. L. G., *L'Islet.*
Quebec Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 87, 1°*) 548 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1995; (Amt. to Amt.) 2020 (i); wthdn., 2668 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*
Amber Deposits in N.W.T., Applicants (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
B. C. Better Terms, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4098 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ans.) 1271 (i)
Dingman, Indian Inspector and Agent Allen (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 165, 1°) 3995 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5762; in Com., 5770, 6226 (iii).
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ans.) 605 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N.W.T., Re-arrangement (Ans.) 221 (i).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ans.) 603 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ans.) 1011 (i).
——— Survey, Eastern Townships (Ans.) 198 (i).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3639 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 612 (i).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 144, 1°) 2203; in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
——— Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ans.) 1264 (i).
——— Charges against (Ans.) 1928 (i), 3265 (ii).
——— Jones, Charges against (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
——— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ans.) 1273
——— Sutton West (Ans.) 961 (i).
——— Wiarton (Ans.) 603 (i).
Indian Reservation Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ans.) 709 (i).
——— No. 6, Timber Cut (Ans.) 111 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, Medical Services, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ans.) 271.
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ans.) 5677 (iii).
Keewatin, Str., Police Patrol Boat (Ans.) 4294.
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, on M. for Ret., 1050 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. (B. 169) Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4307; M. for Com., 4609; in Com., 4611; 2° m. 5434 (iii).
——— (B. 173) in Com. on Res., 5487, 5593; 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ans.) 2907.
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
——— School Lands, Sale (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ans.) 198 (i).
Mounted Police, Newspaper article on Reform (Ans.) 1270 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; in Com., 3931 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
——— Representation Act Amt. (B. 178, 1°) 6307; 2° m., 6325 (iii).
Ordnance Lands, Leases, Montreal (Ans.) 5409.
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 1404 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ans.) 3265 (ii).
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ans.) 6285 (iii).
Quebec Skating Club, Transfer of Land (prop. Res.) 981 (i); in Com., 3584 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 68 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. on Res., 3138 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ans.) 4296, 5408 (iii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver, on M. for Ret., 1051 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ans.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249, 1547, contingencies, 435 (i); (Geological Survey) 410; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii); contingencies, 434 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5180; conc., 5435. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Public Works (Telegraphs, N. W. T.) 4668 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Elections) 5066; (Library) 6276 (iii); (Schools) 1711; (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5425 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801; (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6273 (iii); (Green, T. D., salary) 1552; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736, 4812; (N.B.) 4732, 5059, conc., 5419 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696 (i), (salaries) 4730, 6294 (iii); (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i), 4727, conc., 5412 (iii); (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Treaties) 1695 (i), conc., 5415; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5109 (iii); (Dufresne, J. I., D.L.S.) 1706 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084; (Lunatics, support of) 1709 (i), 5085; (Mounted Police, compensation) 5086 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i) 4817, 6274, 5415, conc., 5415 (iii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 1729 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (N.W.T.) conc., 5391, 6249 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i).
Unprovided Items, 1730 (i).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6158 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (prop. Res.) 549; Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1253; in Com. on Res., 1347, 1398; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2236, 2249 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa County.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967, 3983 (ii).
Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3263.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 3950 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Distribution of Bulletins (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 604 (i).
Genest, S., Cosgrove, J., and Leduc, C., Resignations, &c. (M. for Cor.) 145 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1174 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ques.) 222 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Man. School Acts (M. for Ret.) 116 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 807 (i).
——— Separate Schools, Papers (Ques.) 741 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ques.) 222 (i).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service (M. for Ret.) 229 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1981; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1986 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 383 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1948 (i).
Stratford Boys' Home, Govtl. Control (Ques.) 604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairying Industry) 3575 (ii); (Experimental Farm) 1567 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 491; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 439; Post Office) contingencies, 440; (Public Works) 397 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4276 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists Revision) 948 (i).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Hull P. O.) 1685 (ii); (Man.) 4437. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3682 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2763 (ii).
——— par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 2965 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3295 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5357, 5380, 5603, 5727, 5739 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R.—*Continued.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1920 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3807 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4632 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4153.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4068 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4283 (iii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4953.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 788.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 876 (i).

Dyer, Mr. E. A., *Brome.*
Newport Harbour Improvements, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6196 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry (B. 62, 1°*) 387 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1092 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1421 (i).
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership (M. for Rets.) 2157 (ii).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; in Com., 1297 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5989 (iii).
Copyright Act, 1889 (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Amt. B. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2144 (i).
——— Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada (M. for Cor.) 726 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1409 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 994 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 530 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks), 1525 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 105; 2° m., 767, 795 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn Hse., 1145 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlement B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew (M. for Papers, &c.) 1059 (i).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1066 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6100 (iii).
——— Papers, &c. (enquiry) 219, 393.
——— on Ques. of Priv. (M.) to ref. Charges to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 155 (i).
Revising Officers' Instructions *re* Revision (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1093 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 261, 406 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2031 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Member's Vote challenged, 3780 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3823 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175; (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slide and Boom Dues) 4663 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2813 (ii).

Fairbairn, Mr. C., *South Victoria.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5577 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6144 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601 (iii).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., *Bonaventure.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1764 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ques.) 335 (i).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3185 (ii).
Fishing Licenses, Restigouche River (M. for Ret.) 3283 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.) 966 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing, Licenses (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ques.) 1268 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Brampton Postmaster, Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ques.) 603 (i),
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135; in Com., 3993 (ii).
——— (remarks), 957 (i).
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1805 (i).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 156
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 457 (i).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6282. (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *South Renfrew.*
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89, 1°*) 548 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Adjnmt., Queen's Birthday (Ques.) 157 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 735 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 34, 1°) 193 (i); 2° m., 3288; in Com., 3293 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3650 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3186 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Cost, &c., *re* (M. for Ret.) 180 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Claims, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 537 (i).
——— Payments (M. for Stmnt.) 211 (i).
——— Inspector, Dist. No. 3, Resignation (Ques.) 130 (i).
Foreshores of Dom., Ownership (M. for Cor.) 178.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 867 (i).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 4533 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5687 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3934 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued*
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3595 (ii).
P.O. Building Strathroy, Tenders (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) on Division, June 22, 1484 (i).
——— East Northumberland, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1326 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 336 (i).
Returning Officer, Victoria, N.S. (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1946, 2189 (i).
Seiafreid, Schr., Reward to Captain (Ques.) 224 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3601 (ii).
Stoney Island Breakwater (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies 460; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 438 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Customs (Que.) 5040. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5127; (Methylated Spirits) 5138. Post Office (Mail Service) 4717; (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4064 (ii). Weights, Measures, &c., 5163 (iii).
Government of N.W.T., 5067 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 4733; (N.S.) 6273; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii); (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3512
Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5479 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4285; (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3737 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau Plant) 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4824 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 4662; (N. W. T.) conc., 5389; (Ont.) 4371; (Ottawa) 4475. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4532, 6254 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i). I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3875 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2626 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4405 (iii.)

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 721 (i).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 2153.
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ques.) 1928 (i).
Fishing Bounties paid in Queen's, N.S. (M. for Ret.) 734 (i).
——— on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—*Continued.*
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 143, 601 (i).
Liverpool Postal Accommodation (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3825 (ii).
Plate presented to Min. of Public Works, Duty paid (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1950 (i).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4266 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5283 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool, &c. or St. John, &c.) 4688 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4326; (Ont.) 4364 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4594 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3864 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2884 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Address, on The, 56 (i).
Adjnmt. St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin* 1410 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. (M.) 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 126 (i).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 5075 (iii).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty provision B. 168 (prop. Res.) 3427, 3961; in Com., 3963, 3983 (ii); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4300 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1828 (i).
BUDGET, THE (remarks) 738, 953, 959 (i).
——— (Annual Stmnt.) 1200 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ans.) 4677 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 158 (prop. Res.) 1992 (i); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 550 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4845.
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ans.) 2906.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (prop. Res.) 441, 550; M. for Com. on Res., 550; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 636 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Consolidated Rev. and Audit Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°*) 1989; in Com., 3236 (ii).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ans.) 143 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Customs Act Amt. (B. 156, 1°) 3254 (ii); 2° m., 4829; M. for Com. on Res., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ans.) 4157 (ii).
——— Pay Sheets (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
ESTIMATES, THE (remarks) 214 (i).
——— (presented) 227 (i).
——— Suppl., 1891 (presented) 799 (i).
——— Suppl., 1892 (presented) 5589 (iii).
——— further Suppl., 1892 (presented) 6289 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
——— Lockmaster's Office (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Gov. Gen's. Warrants (presented) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4542 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid (Ans.) 224 (i).
——— Fiscal Year 1890 (Ans.) 176 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members (M.) 6290.
Iron Bounties, on enquiry for Ret., 2580, 2668.
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ans.) 1576.
Montreal Customs, defaulting Clerks (Ans.) 4675.
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ans.) 4675.
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation Regulating (Ans.) 144 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6194 (iii).
Newspaper paragraphs, personal explanation objected to, 3427 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (prop. Res.) 3577.
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4658 (iii).
——— Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 3671 (ii).
——— Unparliamentary Expressions, 1341 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 2°, 548 (i).
Porter, David, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 3738.
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).
——— Mr. Scriver's Speech (remarks) 2204.
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (1).
Public Accts. Com., Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. of Bourcier, 3948 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com., on M., 5014 (iii).
Public Accounts (presented) 103 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 4675.
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's, Interest Acct. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
——— Tolls Refunded (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment to (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ans.) 603 (i).
Supplies for Public Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4101 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3533 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6173 (iii); (Seldon's Claim) 1569 (i).
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754; (Printing, Advertising, &c.) 1756; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1749; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (Customs) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (Fisheries) 255; (Geological Survey) 410; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 240, contingencies, 433; (High Commissioner) 411, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii), contingencies, 442, 451; (Indian Affairs) 249, 1548, contingencies, 438; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 247; (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (Post Office) 254; (Printing and Stationery) 243, contingencies, 442, 484; (Privy Council Office) 241, contingencies, 433, 1556 (i), 6168 (iii); (Public Works) 397; (Sec. of State) 242 (i), 6167 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 1724 (i). Rys. (I.C.R.) 3853 (ii), conc., 1758 (i). Public Work (Agency, B.C.) 4669. Harbours, &c. (Repairs) 4665. Land and Cable Telegraphs, 4668. Slide and Boom Dues, 4663. Telegraphs (B.C.) 4669; (N.W.T.) 4668; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Weights and Measures, 1725 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4274 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Debates) 943; (Voters' Lists) 1560, 1734. Library (salaries) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349; (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (Grand Manan, N.B. and Mainland) 4678; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703: (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5458 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 5086, conc., 5426; (C.A.R., Hon. Thos. White's Funeral) 6276; (Chief Justice Palmer, allowance) 6276; (Commercial Agencies) 5108, conc., 5428; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086, 5103; (Historical, &c., Map of Can.) 6261; (Old Records) 5084, 512; (Prohibition Commission) 6276; (Returns, preparation) 5107: (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6264; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1706 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678 (i). (Cape Tormentine) 4522. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6251; (Man.) 4429, 5348; (N.W.T.) 4441, 6248; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6239; (Ottawa) 4470, 4474, 4522, 4663, conc., 5401; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Printing Bureau) 6253: (Que.) 4332, 6201, 6210, conc., 5385; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4649: (Man.)

Foster, Hon G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
4647; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (New Plant) 4602; (Repairs) 4640. Experimental Farms, &c., 4653. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Generally) 4595, conc., 5402; (Man.) 4591; (N.S.) 4530; (Ont.) 4559, 5265, conc., 5438; (P.E.I.) 4532; (Que.) 4552; (Miscellaneous) 4657. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607; Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, conc., 6304 (iii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) conc., 4278 (iii); (remarks) 1651 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672, 3695 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).
Supply (B. 127) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i).
——— (B. 167, 1°*) 4297 (iii).
——— (B. 177) Res. in Com., 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307 (iii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen. (M.) 6216 (iii).
——— Foreign Countries, Address from Sen. M. to conc., 6309 (iii).
——— U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).
——— West Indies (remarks) 4608 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1647 (i).
——— (Ans.) 208, 227 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4011 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2021 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2065 (i).
——— M. to conc. in Res., 1434 (i); 3201, 3232.
——— in Com. on Res., 1252, 1853 (i); 4001 (ii); 4297, 6307 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) for Com., 102 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ans.) 195 (i).
——— Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4394.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i); in Com., 2229; M. to conc. in Amts., 2290 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *Mc Dougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ques.) 1012.
Cape Breton and N.S. Ry. accommodation (M. for Cor.) 177 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 560 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5744 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
East River, Deepening (Ques.) 1011 (i).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3599 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Fines for Violating, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 189 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, Salary (Ques.) 5403.
Fishing Bounty paid in Guyborough Co. (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ques.) 1011.
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1159 (i).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Halifax City Market Property (Ques.) 1770 (i).
——— County Court, Judges' Salary (M. for Cor.) 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 838 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, &c., Medical Services (Ques.) 224 (i).
——— Guysborough, &c., Supplies (M. for List*) 232 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2536 (ii).
——— County Rys., Subsidies (Ques.) 2911 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3811 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
McLeod, Mr., of Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289.
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 712 (i).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages (M. for Ret.) 2546 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 277; on adjnmt. (remarks) 545, 1343 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1952.
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3602 (ii).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 265 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5066 (iii);

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i); (Ont.) 5049. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5181 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1737 (i), 4062 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4715 (iii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5229 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5061; (N.S.) 4729 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 508; (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 949, 1560, 1735.
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5116; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5089 (iii).
Railways.—Capital: Cape Breton (Train Ferry) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3862; (New Glasgow, increased accommodation) 3882 (ii).
Public Works—Income Buildings (B.C.) 4451; (Que.) 4335. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4530.
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3756 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2573 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4014 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2842 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1390 (i).

Fréchette, Mr. L. J. Côté (*alias*), *Megantic.*
Geological Survey, Eastern Townships (Ques.) 198 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. to conc. in Res., 6142 (iii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3070 (ii).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ques.) 5777 (iii).
Bridge at Quebec, Construction (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
C. P. R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ques.) 2521.
Criminal Law B., Fees *re* Drafting (Ques.) 3260.
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies) 3621 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1018 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners, 2145 (ii).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, employment by Gvot. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Inland Revenue Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ques.) 194 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4205 (ii).
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1°*) 387 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5372, 5737 (ii).
Crystal Beach and Point Abino Customs Officers (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 628 (i).
Johnston, Samuel, Dismissal as Preventive Officer (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster (M. for copies) 2545 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5664 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ques.) 1275, 1767 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés (M. for Cor., &c.) 229 (i).
——— Rets. (enquiry) 3200 (ii).
Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 58, 1°*) 334 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4196 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 3200 (ii).
St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 548 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5211 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4112 (ii). *Income:* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1670 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4497 (iii).
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3750 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Welland Canal, Surplus Water (M. for Ret.) 963 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ques.) 270 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1422 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Protection Service, Cape Breton (Ques.) 527 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 842 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 90) 385 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A H., *Charlotte.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 723 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3973 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1801 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 566 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com.. 3174 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3813 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2561 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ques.) 1268 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4270 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5265 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5984 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (M.) to Print Evidence, 4835 (iii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 799.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 197, 1987 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. conc. in, 2360 (ii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections (M.) to conc., 4825 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (presented) 5553 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy, &c. (presented) 3738 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; agreed to (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).
——— Papers (remarks) 988 (i).
Quebec, West, Rep. of sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., (presented) 4747 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4334 (ii).
Justice—Administration of (Judges' salaries) 515.

Godbout, Mr. J., *Beauce.*
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 959 (i).
Chinese Immigrants into Can. (M. for Ret.*) 1578 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W.—*Continued.*
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4046 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4452. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Wellington, Cost, &c., of Militia (M. for Cor., &c.) 145 (i).
——— Services of Militia (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1774 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ques.) 601 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ques.) 741 (i).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I. C. R. (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Statutes, Distribution (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4346. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Advertising Ottawa Mail Service (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4536 (iii).
Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ans.) 3257.
C. P. R., Section "B," on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5943 (iii).
——— Statutory Declaration (read) 6127 (iii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ans.) 604 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Receipt of Returns (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— (presented) 4608 (iii).
——— Corrected copy (presented) 4705 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4992 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).
Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ans.) 1577 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Coaticook P. O., Coal Contract (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5022 (iii).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ans.) 114 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ans.) 113 (i).
Digby, Insufficient Postal Accommodation (Ans). 1264 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt to M. for Com. of Sup., 4054 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ans). 1576 (i).
——— Horses (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
——— Rep. of Director (presented) 104 (i).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1264 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1172 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ans.) 3262 (ii).
Hastings Co. Mail Service, on M. for Ret., 213 (i).
High Commissioner for Can., Rep., &c. (presented) 104 (i).
Holstein Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ans.) 5075.
Immigration to N.W.T. (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two cent Rate (Ques.) 131.
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (ii).
International Abattoir Co. (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Inverness Co. Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ans.) 221 (i).
Kingston P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ans.) 1266 (i).
——— Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ans.) 3955 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau, on M. for Cor., 202 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5522, 5610 (iii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 129 (i).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ans.) 3958 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ans.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Letter Box Service Contract (Ans.) 3615, 3954 (ii).
——— P. O. Service (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's Salary (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service, on M. for Ret., 230.

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Ottawa Mail Service Advertising (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— in *Le Canada*, on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Plate presented to Min. of Pub. Works, Duty paid (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ans.) 1275, 1767 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 202, 210 (i).
P. O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ans.) 2912.
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (Ans.) 605; (remarks) 744, 961 (i).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ans.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ans.) 158 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 5407.
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 171 (i).
Stratford Home for Boys, Govtl. Control (Ans.) 604 (i).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ans.) 1275 (i).
Summerside Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3955.
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i), 3555 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4144 (ii), 5220 (iii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Post Office) 254 (i), 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i); (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1744 (i), 6279; (Mail Service) 4705; (Miscellaneous) 4725; (salaries, &c.) 4720 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (P. E. I. and Mainland) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5119 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1674 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6252; (Man.) 4429; (Que.) 4336. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654 (iii).
Quarantine, 5336, conc., 5437; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576, conc., 4277, (iii); (Vaccination) 1570 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3759 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4798 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1290 (i).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ans.) 2151.
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 2153.

Hargraft, Mr. J., *West Northumberland.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P. O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).

Hargraft, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5561 (iii).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ques.) 207 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ques.) 4675.
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5335 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4574 (iii).

Harwood, Mr. H. S., *Vaudreuil.*
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ques.) 335 (i).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 8 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 718 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 564 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1038 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1150 (i).
I. C. R. Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2953 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5271 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4692 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4221 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, warehouse) 3894 ; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3887.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5564 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B 66, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3013 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (ii).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63, 1°*) 387 (i).
Military District No. 1, Location of Camp (M. for Cor.) 231 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg., Cavalry (Ques.) 198 (i).
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 266 (i).
Strathroy P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 445, 458 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4716 ; (salaries, &c.) 4719 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 516.
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732; (Military Stores, &c.) 3718 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4454; (Man.) 4439 ; (N.W.T.) 4444 ; (Que.) 4359 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2581 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Car-Coupling Accidents (prop. Res.) 3643 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3095 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2950 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1597 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
Returning Officer, East Elgin, Accounts (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5264 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, increased accommodation) 3888 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ques.) 2149 (ii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i).
Maclean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY :
Colllection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (P.E.I.) 5029 (iii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Adjnmt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 104 (i).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 156 (i).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 989 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6135, 6141 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 245 ; (Public Works) 264 (i).
Militia (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2375 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J., *North Lanark.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3293 (ii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co., &c. (B. 96, 1°*) 600 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii)
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 271 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1312 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1298 (i).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763; on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1959 (i).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
Govt. Rys., Payments for Printing (Ques.) 3614.
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Le Monde*, 1346 (i).
Sessional Clerks in H. of C. (M. for Stmnt.*) 544.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 725 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Cor., 735 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5319 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3174 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1097 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act (M. for Cor.) 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6188.
Sawdust in La Have River (M. for Ret.) 1942, 2201 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (N.B.) 5065 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4336 (iii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1540 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 125 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5322 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1162 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
I.C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1259.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1080 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2199.
SUPPLY;
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6179 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5062 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Laboratory) 5054 (iii). Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4680 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1629 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2822 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4417(iii).

King, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956.
SUPPLY:
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5277 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4063 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2122 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4190 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. (B. 74, 1°) 387 (i).
——— (B. 75, 1°*) 387 (1).
——— Telegraph Lines (B. 21, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5731 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5152 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 206 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 387 (i).
Ontario and New York Bridge Co., M. to suspend Rule, 286 (i).
——— incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 549 (i).
Order (Ques. of) Newspaper Reps., 2963 (ii).
Quebec, West, Vacany, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
Rathbun Co.'s (B. 171, 1°*) 5013 (iii).
Rideau Canal, High Water (M. for Ret.) 711 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 2° m., 189 (i).
Standard Time (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).
Standing Orders Com., on Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6221 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38 (prop. Res.) 2923 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
Ballot Boxes, J. R. Arnoldi's Rep. (M. for copy) 201 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ques.) 4296.
Chippewa Indians, Charge against Agent (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5378 (iii).
Dingman, Indian Inspector, and Agent Allen, (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1056 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 1°, 106; on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145, 5207; on M. for 3°, 5585 (iii).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ques.) 142, 177 (i).
——— Senators as Candidates (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c. (M. for Ret.) 131 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781.
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090.
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ques.) 961, 1267 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4306 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid, Fiscal Year 1890 (Ques.) 176, 223 (i).
Holstein, Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ques.) 1264 (i).
——— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ques.) 530, 1272 (i).
——— Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 4209 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5505 (iii).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ques.) 530.
New England Paper Co. (Ques.) 1767 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3827 (ii).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ques.) 602 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1331 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240 (iii).
Public Expenditure, Rets. (enquiry) 4158 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 1061 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ques.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ques.) 158 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 2581, 4158 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ques.) 4296 (iii).
——— Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563; (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 443, 471, 495 (i); (Rys. and Canals) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1723; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Ont.) 5044. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5130 (iii). Weights and Measures, &c., 1726 (i), 5165 (iii).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 4802 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696; (T. D. Green, salary) 1554 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists) 946, 1562 (i).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5106 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708 (i); (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5084 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107.
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919, 925; (Man.) 918 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4322; (Ont.) 4366, 4370; (Ottawa) 4474; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4338, 6203 (iii); (Walkerton P.O.) 1686 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 4566 (iii).
Quarantine, 1570 (i).
Votes polled, last General Election (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Walkerton Public Buildings, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2461 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2235 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ques.) 4295 (iii).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Quebec Centre.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1731 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).
Bridge at Quebec (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— O. C.'s (M. for copies) 1041 (i).
——— Rep. of Engineers *re* Survey, on M. for copy, 1053 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 633 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 848 (i).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
Marie Eliza, Schr., Seizure and Sale (Ques.) 710.
——— (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1478 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3282 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— (M. for O.C.'s) 974, 1022 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4767 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 744, 802 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ques.) 3616 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
——— P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5591.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 258 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5033 (iii); Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4553 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3208.

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., *Richelieu and Three Rivers.*
Adjnmt., Corpus Christie (M.) 523 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Queen's Birthday (M.) 386 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul (M.) 1409 (i).
——— Sir John Macdonald's Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
Amhertsburg Dry Dock (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ans.) 529 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) (Amt.) to Amt. to M. for 3°, 1963 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 708 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 226 (i).
Belle Creek Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Barry P.O. Building, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3255.
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Black River Improvements (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ans.) 335 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 208 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ans.) 1012.
Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 525 (i).
——— Construction (Ans.) 2912 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Bridge at Quebec, Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ans.) 158 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (remarks) 198 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 962.
Civil Service, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ans.) 222 (i).
Documents promised in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 157 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ans.) 223 (i).
East River, N.S., Deepening (Ans.) 1011 (i).
Elections in 1891, Senators as Candidates (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1933 (i).
——— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ans.) 270.
——— Lengthening (Ans.) 530 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 130 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Order for 2°, 206 (i).
Fraserville P. O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
Galt P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226.
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ans.) 604.
Gigùère, Capt. Claude, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 1730 (i).
——— Thursdays (M.) 1004 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1126 (i).
Halifax City Market Property (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Hastings Co. Public Works, Improvements (Ans.) 208 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ans.) 222 (i).
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis, on M. for Ret., 177 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2144 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (Ans) 129, 1267.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (Ans.) 1765 (i)
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ans.) 207 (i).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ans.) 1575 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1267 (i).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ans.) 1769 (i).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ans.) 601 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Lindsay P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
——— Public Buildings (Ans.) 268 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ans.) 602 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 601 (i).
——— Postal Accommodation (Ans.) 1768 (i)
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease (remarks) 883 (i).
——— Adjmnt. for Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
——— Public Funeral (M.) 884 (i).
——— Erection of Monument (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
——— Illness (announced) 599 ; (remarks) 631, 707 (i).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ans.) 605 (i).
Man. Separate Schools, Papers, &c. (Ans.)741 (i).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ans.) 531 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Tenders for new Works (Ans.) 130 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Abbott (read) 891 (i).
——— (remarks) 1013 (i).
Napanee Public Buildings (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ans.) 222 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ans.) 1576 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 526 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1017 (i).
Ottawa Co. P. O. at Buckingham, on M. for Ret., 230 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ans.) 1273.
Peterborough P. O., Name of Contractor (Ans.) 225 (i).
Pinet Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 226 (i).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 602 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 828, 1483 (i).
——— Pets. (M.) 128 (i).
——— Reps., 2203, 3308 (ii).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Tarte) 153 (i).
—— Papers (remarks) 219, 394, 746, 988, 1850 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés, on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditures, on M. for Ret., 1062 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Quebec Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ans.) 2150.
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ans.) 527, 602 (i).
Raquette Pier, N.S., Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1575.
Red Point Pier, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ans.) 1012 (i).
Reporters, Official, better Accommodation (remarks) 1013 (i).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1062 (ii), 2581 (iii).
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ans.) 208 (i).
Richelieu River Floods (Ans.) 336 (i).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ans.) 1268 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons Shoals, on M. for Cor., 1053 (i).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 601 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ans.) 176 (i).
——— Deepening (Ans.) 207 (i).
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide-Master (Ans.) 603 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ans.) 1574 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (M.) 388 (i).
Strathroy P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1668 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 397 (i).
Public Works—Capital. Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1680; (Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec) 1668. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 1687; (N. W. T.) 1687; (Ont.) 1686 (i). Dredging (New Plant) 1690. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Telegraph Companies, Legislation *re* Directors (Ans.) 144 (i).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 2519 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 194, 197, 216 (i).
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ans.) 335 (i).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road, on M. for O.C., 1058 (i).
Walkerton P.O., Contract for Fittings (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 267 (i).
——— Caretaker (Ans.) 1271 (i).
——— Completion (Ans.) 335 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (M.) to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).
West Point Wharf, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 269.
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher*.
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5201 (iii).
French Language in Man. (M. for Cor.) 114 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ques.) 198 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
—— Representation Acts Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6325 (iii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s (B. 77, 1°*) 441
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 2961
Separate Schools in Man., Abolition (M. for Cor.) 115 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5093 (iii)

Laurier, Hon. Wilfred, *East Quebec*.
Address, on The, 19 (i).
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R , Govtl. Action (remarks) 3129 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, Surveys, Rep. of Engineers (M. for copies) 1053 (i).
Campbellton P. O., Pets. *re* Establishment (M. for copies) 544 (i).
C.P.R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5954 (iii).
—— on Statutory Declaration (remarks) 6129.
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1992 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Chicoutimi, Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3649 (ii), 5355, 5382.
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com. (remarks) 7 (i).
—— on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407.
—— 4th Rep. of Com., 5941.
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements (M. for Ret.) 2155 (ii).
Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6296 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5156, 5197 ; on M. for 3°, 5560 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6227 (iii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued*.
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016 (ii) ; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Frauds on the Govt. Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 6280, 6289 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
—— Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
—— Saturdays, 6127 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjmnt. (remarks) 1100 (i).
—— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 1105 ; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3641 (ii).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2920 (ii).
High Commsr. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com., of Sup., 570 ; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881 (i).
—— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 618 ; on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 629.
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
—— Pet. for Discharge (Ques.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5503, 5593 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3112 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3631 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3133 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness (remarks) 600, 631 (i).
—— Decease (remarks) 884 (i).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 888, 959, 1013 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653 (ii).
—— Resignation (remarks) 4213 (ii), 5075 (iii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1014 (i).
—— B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4752, 4766, 4772 ; in Com. on B. 5081 ; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5410 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred--*Continued.*
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154.
——— Sel. Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
——— Representation Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6327.
Order (Ques. of) Public Works Dept., Papers, 984, 990 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
P.O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ques.) 2912.
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (enquiry) 2375, 2437 (ii).
——— Type Purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
——— on 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1321.
——— on adjmnt. (remarks) 545 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (Amt.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6025 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).
——— Papers (Ques. of Priv.) 984, 990, 1849 (i).
Quebec Garrison Club, Lease of Lands (Ques.) 527 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (objection) 4081 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6309 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6287 (iii).
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3139 (ii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver (M. for Ret.) 1051 (i). *See* "Esquimalt."
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 535 (i).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 2 (i)
——— (remarks) 388 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, calling out Militia, &c. (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199. *Income* (Chambly) 6200; (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6297 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 493 (i); (Post Office) 6166; (Printing and Stationery) 6166 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) conc., 5419 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3519 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4804; (Ont., Que. &c.) conc., 5411, 5414 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4686 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5110; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5094, 5100; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432; (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4822, 6274; conc., 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1674, 1683 (i). *Income*—Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5388, 5394; (Que.) 6239, conc., 5386. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3584; in Com., 3588; on M. for 3°, 3649 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3839 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2566 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3313.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6314 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6164 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2020, 2064 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (remarks) 2147 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i); in Com., 2205, 2224 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Black River Improvements (Ques.) 739 (i).
C.P.R., L'Avenir Branch (Ques.) 197, 220 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 35, 1°) 194 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 740 (i).
Garrison Club, Quebec, Lease of Lands (Ques. 527 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).

Lavergne. Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 199, 391 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2713 (ii).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., *Nicolet.*
Boisvert, George, Appmnt. as Fishery Officer (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2875 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3051 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau (M. for Cor.) 201
Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ques.) 707 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés (M. for Ret.) 3275 (ii).
Montreal P.O., Letter Box Service, Contract (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Judges, salaries (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Sorel and St. John's Militia Camp Pay Roll (M. for copies*) 1062 (i).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ques.) 271 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ques.) 1268 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G. (prop. Res.) 5852, 5942 (iii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 2521 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ques.) 1271.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 995 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1513 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1180 (i).
Kaministiquia Harbour, Dredging (remarks) 600.
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5524 (iii).
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
Lindsay Public Buildings (Ques.) 268 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1067 ; in Com., 1073.
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 969 (i).
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 142, 529 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake St. Clair (Ques.) 198, 223
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1306 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Receipts (Ques.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
——— Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2552 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4494.
Senécal, André (M.) summoning to Bar of House, 4533 (iii).
——— (M.) Speaker's Warrant for Arrest, 4748.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2252 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., *Kingston.*
Address, on The, 29 (i).
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 227 (i).
Adjmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 ; (M.) 111 (i).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ans.) 129 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (Ans.) 220 (i).
Chicoutimi Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Employés in Elections (Ans.) 221 (i).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 145 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 111 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 143 (i).
Ministerial Explanation, on adjmnt. (remarks) 237 (i).
Mounted Police, Comptroller's Rep. (presented) 237 (i).
——— Management (Ans.) 267 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 5 (i).
P. E. I. Ry. Road-bed and Rails, on M. for Ret., 229 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 104 (i).
Speaker, The (M.) nominating Peter White, Esq., 1 (i).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 6 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 6 (i).
——— (M.) Com. to prepare Lists, 29 (i).
——— Rep. of Sp. Com. (Lists presented) 135 ; conc. in, 140 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 426 ; contingencies, 431 ; (Public Works) 261, 401 ; (Railways and Canals) 408 (i).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés, on M. for Cor., 229 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ans.) 270 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1644 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Telegraphs, P. E. I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4260; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4257 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Assiniboine River Water Power (B. 91, 1°*) 549.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5280 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 917 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 48, 1*°) 238; 2° m., 295 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1400 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 5001.
Coal Monopoly, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
Man. School Lands, Sale (Ques.) 1766 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 346 (i).
Quarantine (U. S.) Regulations, Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 960 (i).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ques.) 603 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Quarantine (Vaccination) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 444.
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (conc.) 5433.
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) conc., 5402 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3691 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2070 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. G., *Algoma.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158; on M. for 3°, 5579.
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1526 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1603.
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5218 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 951 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4222 (ii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion 1885) 3667 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii).
Unparliamentary Language, wthdn., 3780 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3040 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1383 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry. Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 334 (i).
Homestead (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3910; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2218 (ii).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. (B. 92, 1°*) 549 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Atikokan Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 333 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4898 (iii).
E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 23, 1°*) 155.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 589 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).
McKay Milling Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 155 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *L'Electeur* (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor on prop. Res. (Amt.) 344 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against, P.M.G. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5958 (iii).
Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°*) 238 (i).
Collingwood Harbour, Dredging, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6195 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147, in Com., 5352, 5374, 5595, 5727 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1°) 174 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5752 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6064; (Amt. to Amt.) 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6122 (iii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1426 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (B. 40, 1°*) 206 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2169 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2787 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Canadian Sealers Captured, attention of Govt. directed to Rep., 5554 (iii).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ques.) 4677 (iii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104; (B. 113, 1°*) 1105; in Com., 1297 (i).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 714 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up (B. 76, 1°) 388; 2° m., 547 (i).

McGreevy, Hon. T., *West Quebec.*
Public Works Dept., Contracts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Tarte*) 154 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3592 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5529 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040. Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4724 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4585 (iii).
Quarantine, 5341 (iii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ques.) 1769.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 6279 (ii).

McLean, Mr. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Central Counties Ry. (B. 38, 1°*) 206 (i).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ques.) 175 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2931 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2438 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B., City.*
Controverted Elections Act. Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5371, 5382, 5602 (iii).
Geological Survey, Field Service (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3814 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4691 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
American Cattle, Slaughter in Can., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1781 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Horses, Entire, Experimental Farms (M. for Cor., &c.*) 739, 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3200 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134; in Com., 3992 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1310 (i).
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 739 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture, (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1566 (i), 3552 (ii); (Haras Company) 6179 (iii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4725 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5251 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1560 (i).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3710 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4606. Experimental Farms, &c., 4652. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4597 (iii),
Quarantine, 5338 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2400 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2242 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Advertising, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar, Bounty for Production, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3427 (ii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Civil Servants, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5312 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Pay Sheets (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Dom. Aid to Rys. (M. for Ret.) 1053 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5158, 5207, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5581 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 130(i)
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M.(Mr. *Foster*) 6293 (iii).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., 1262 (i).
——— Elevators, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1048 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4307 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5497, 5608 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3126 (ii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ques.) 605 (i).
Montreal Custom House, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
——— Employés, Superannuation (Ques.) 3616.
——— on M. for Ret., 3281 (ii).
——— Irregularities (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P. O. Letter Boxes, Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1334 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ques.) 1273.
Pelee Island, Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1598 (i).
Postmasters of Dom., Contingent Expenses (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Potatoes Exported from Canada (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits (M. for Ret.) 202, 210 (i).
Prohibition, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 144 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés (enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works, Employés' Names, Duties, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3653 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 742 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°) 217, 1029 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6137, 6185 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ques.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ques.) 740 (i).

SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5217; (Tay) 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4138 (ii). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222, 6296 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222 (iii).
Charges of Management (Public Debt, Commissions) 1754; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 6169 (iii); (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies 481; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (High Commissioner) 421, contingencies, 431, 449, 466, 476, 1733 (i), 6167 (iii); (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii); (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432; (Printing and Stationery) 247; (Public Works) 400; (Railways and Canals) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5170. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (Ont.) 5049; (Que.) 5030. Culling Timber, 5159. Dom. Lands, 5179. Excise (Customs Collectors' allowance) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4065 (ii). Weights and Measures 5161 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4273 (iii); (N.W. T., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii); (Ont., salaries) 3514 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1711.
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 941; (Voters' Lists) 952, 1735. (Serjeant-at-Arms' Estimates) 943. Senate Salaries, &c.) 929 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Concluded.*
Immigration (European Agents' salaries) conc., 4276 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4805; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4812 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 518 (i); (Miscellaneous) 6170 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5108; (Commutation of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087, 5104; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5081; (Old Records) 5084, 5124; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5081 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i), 4817 (iii.)
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Man.) 914; (Regina Gaol) 928; (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Public Works, Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6252; (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4445, 6249; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont.) 5224, 6239, 6241; (Ottawa) 4472, 4486; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4333, 6201, conc., 5385 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i); (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (Man.) 4648; (New Plant) 4605; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (Repairs) 4640. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564; (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678; C. B. Ry. (construction, &c.) 1656; (Grand Narrows Bridge, &c.) 1658 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (accomodation at St. John) 1655 (i); (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3855 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); ("Y" at Truro) 1655. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 3513 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673, 3688 (ii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ques.) 1575 (remarks) 1930 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3433 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1633 (i).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6153 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2336 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3204, 3231 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4006 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1375 (i); in Com. on B., 2215, 2250, 2257 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3969, 3978 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1802 (i).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 130, 1°*), 1927 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Dredging in North Bruce, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6197 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1527 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Charges against (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— (remarks) 1298 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3913 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Prohibition, 1543 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., to prop. Res., 1304 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1343 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 359 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6115 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3535 (ii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 405 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3531 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5422 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6262 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3216 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2802 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Oshawa Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 123, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6229 (iii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1543 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1277 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4044 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C. (M. for Cor.) 965 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (B.C.) 4650. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593 (iii).
Vancouver Dock and Shipbuilding Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 266 (i).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ques.) 114 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 205 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1538 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979; on M. for 2°, 1008 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5672 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4565 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2305 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 2153.

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Address, on The, 64 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1419, 1731 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3961, 3977 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1099 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1835 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5962 (iii).
Census, Receipt of Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4963 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1034 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii); in Com., 5376, 5598, 5729, 6224 (iii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1408 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ques.) 4157 (ii).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5587; on M. to recom., 5545; on M. for 3°, 5570 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 132 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4038 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3176; on M. for 3°, 3237 (ii).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 543 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 771.
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 305 (i).
——— Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Frauds on the Government Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 5751 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
Gov. Genl's. Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1545, (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1128 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 625 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6294 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1503 (i).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787, 3792 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4309; in Com. on B., 4617, 4638 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5493; on M. for 2°, 6133 (iii).
——— Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3121 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1068 (i).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 237 (i).
Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4156 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3924; in Com., 3927 (ii), 4298 (iii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1971 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii).
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ques.) 6285 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3900 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2173 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
——— 6th Rep. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4826 (iii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 358 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1328 (i).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3990 (i); in Com., 5755, 6223 (iii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Boucier, 3949 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Lands B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3984 (ii).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4083 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Ships' Inspection Act Amt. Bill 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4312 (iii).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6218 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568; (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Canals—Capital (Grenville) 4141; (Tay) 4144 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen's. Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (High Commissioner) 429, contingencies, 445; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (Fisheries) 255; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii), contingencies, 434; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 442; (Public Works) 263, 399; (Sec. of State) 242 (i.)

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5847 (iii); (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1722; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1719 (i). Post Office (Mail Service) 4705 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4071 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).
Dominion Police, 1558 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1711; (contingencies) 1709 (i).
Indians (T. D. Green's salary) 1552 (i); (N.B.) 5063 (iii); N.W.T. (Treaties) 1695 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 509.
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173; (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Voters' Lists) 946, 1560. Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4681; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5450, 5482; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5431 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708; (Lunatics, Support of) 1709 (i).
Mounted Police, 1701 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 915 (i), 6171 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: (Kingston Graving Dock) 1676 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (Man.) 4437; (N.W.T.) 6249; (N.S.) 4316; (Ottawa) 4476; (Que.) 4334, 6205. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 6254 (iii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i); I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3696 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6284 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1747 (i).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (remarks) 1930 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2564 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, on M. to conc. in Address from Sen., 6319 (ii).
——— West Indies, Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 239 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 234 (i).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4016 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2025 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2067 (i).
——— in Com. on Res., 4002 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1373, 1392 (i); in Com. on B., 2225, 2235, 2248; on Sen. Amts., 3985 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1423 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ques.) 270.
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 124, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Private Bills Reps. (M.) to suspend Rule, 1987 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1944 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4688 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*
London Life Insurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 135, 1°*) 1989 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2497 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*
Elections in Napierville (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Napierville and St. Remi Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 2541 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2872 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Caledonia Dam, Grand River, Construction (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).
——— Drill Shed, Repairs (M. for Cor., &c.*) 3287 (ii).
Canada and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s (B. 19, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1194 (i).
Grand River, Improvement of Navigation, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies) 2155 (ii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 18, 1°*) 155 (i).
Order (Ques. of) on Ways and Means, 2474 (ii).
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Personal Explanation, Error in Official Rep., 1991.
Railway Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 17, 1°*) 155 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i),
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4606 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3676 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) M. to adjn: Deb. 1482; Deb. rsmd., 1854 (i).

Mousseau, Mr. J. O., *Soulanges.*
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ques.) 222 (i)
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ques.) 604 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 532 (i).
——— Reps. of Engineers (M. for copies*) 1578.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4113 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1433 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) on Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 124 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3965 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry (prop. Res.) 1771, 1805, 1825, 1834, 1846 (i); neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Export Trade of Canada (remarks) 737 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Bill 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 569 (i).
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act (B. 139, 1°) 2140 (i); (remarks) 2552 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5356, 5574, 5382, 5594, 5727, 6225 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5586 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Circulation, Redemption, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1578 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4025 (ii).
Govt., Formation of (Ques.) 1578 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4546 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent at Sutton West (Ques.) 961 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlements B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1260 (i).
——— Stone Carried for Langevin Block (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3658 (ii).
——— P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3117 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).
——— in Com., 4609, 5541 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5490, 5593, 5610; on M. for 2°, 6130 (iii).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ques.) 1575 (i).
——— Haulage of Stone (Ques.) 1768 (i).
——— Ottawa, Advts. for Tenders (M. for copies) 531 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 737, 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1267 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).
Manchester Ship Canal, T. Munro's Rep. (M. for copy*) 1579 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1078 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 7, 1°) 106 (i).
Mining Machinery, Importation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099.
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1024 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5708 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) Ry. Subsidies, 6136 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Pub. Accts Com. Meetings, in Com. of Sup., 1712.
——— on M. to Print Evidence, 2374, 4000 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (M.) 1345 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6119 (iii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 746 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3139 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3550 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Grenville) 4141; (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4119; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102; (Tay) 4143; (Trent) 4140. *Income* (Carillon) 4150; (Chambly) 4147; (Grenville, Godwin's Claim) 6298; (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (Welland) 4145 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 447, 455, 472, 490; (Indian Affairs) 1547; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 486 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i). Post Office, 6279 (iii). Public Works, 1729 (i); (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Slides and Booms (Dues) 4663 (iii). I. C. R. 1740 (i), 4059 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).
Dominion Police, 511 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1712 (i).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1553; (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559. (Miscellaneous) 506; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 511 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 942; (Voters' Lists) 950, 1559. Library (Grant) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 6268 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3726; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5246; (Strong, W. O., gratuity to Widow) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision SS. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6266 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 910, 1559; (Man.) 918; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572.
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1683 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4430; N.W.T., 4447; (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4480; (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4604; (Repairs) 4642. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Ont.) 4560, 6258, conc., 5438.

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Miscellaneous) 4656; (National Art Gallery) 4663. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, 5338; conc., 5437 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1665 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3858, 3876, 3897 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i); (St. John, increased accommodation) 3894 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).
Territorial Accounts, 6280; (Surgeon General's salary) 6281, conc., 6305 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1746 (i).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1089 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140; on M. for 1°, 6144; in Com., 6187, 6217 (iii).
Sugar, Free Entry, Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1931 (i).
Sutton West, Indian Agent, Expenses *re* Investigation (M. for Ret.*) 145 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3769 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2574 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revision, Cost (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2033 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2256 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., Pontiac.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5582 (iii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 806 (i).
Rapide Plat Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468, 4536 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1778 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5379.
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief (B. 133, 1°) 1937 (i); M. for Com., 2550 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5563 (iii).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3597 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1522 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1135 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
Land Grant to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4630 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3905; in Com., 4298 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5722 (iii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 278 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1066 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3608 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B. C., salaries) 3528 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5423 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4214; (Clothing, &c.) 3713.
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 4370; (Que.) 4360; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4578 (iii)
Quarantine, conc, 5435 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2039 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2479 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 36, 52 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bill 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5196 (iii).
Indemnity to Members and Senators, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6292 (iii).
I. C. R Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3106 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) adjnmts., 6027, 6031 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy (Ques. of Order) on Issue of Writ, 4083 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 942 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4561 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2062 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Budget, The (Ques.) 953, 959 (i).
Compounders' License Fees, in Com. on Res., 3243.
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5335 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 779.
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3590 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1507 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 3243; in Com., 3579 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1594 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6187 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, 421, contingencies, 431, 443, 469, 491; (Indian Affairs) 1549, contingencies, 435; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 432; (Public Works) 256.
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i); (B.C.) conc., 5415; (Ont.; Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. Senate (salaries, &c.) 938 (i).
Militia (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4231 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5427; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) conc., 5427 (iii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3484.
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 240 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1458 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3202, 3211, 3233.
——— in Com. on Res., 4005 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ques.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ques.) 208 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Costs, &c., on M. for Ret., 185 (i).
——— Wardens, Appmts., (Ques.) 5409 (iii).

Perry, Mr. F. S.—*Continued.*
Miminigash Breakwater (Ques.) 3959 (ii), 4296.
——— Tenders for new Works (Ques.) 130 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 968 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Piers, Wharves and Breakwaters, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ques.) 1765 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal (enquiry for Ret.) 4087 (ii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 2158 (ii).
——— Train Service (Ques. 1274 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 158, 172 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1929 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
——— Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3955 (ii).
——— Ry. Station (Ques.) 3263 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4264 (iii); (P.E.I., salaries, &c.) 3524 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Repairs) 4643; Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4598; (P.E.I.) 4532 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3670 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ques.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ques.) 3259 (ii), 4673 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— Papers (remarks) 1413 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 1618 (i).
West Point Wharf Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders (M. for copies) 2157 (ii).
Maurice, Mr. Jos. A., &c., Claim for Expropriation (M. for Ret.*) 2174 (ii).
Vaudreuil and Boucherville Wharves, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 2548 (ii).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Adjutant General, Dep., Military District No. 11 (M. for Reps.*) 736 (i).
Better Terms, B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4093 (ii).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i)
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (remarks) 6285.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: (B.C.) 4451; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. C.—*Continued.*
Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s (B. 67, 1°*) 387 (i).

Proulx, Mr. I., *Prescott.*
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide Master (Ques.) 603 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3076 (ii).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Corbin, Jay Spencer, Patent Relief (B. 30, 1°*) 156 ; 2° m., 294 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 4 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*
Coaticook P.O., Coal Contract (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3950 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2610 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075.
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 173 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons, Shoals (M. for Cor.) 1053.
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply, 3445 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., *North Middlesex.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) to prop. Res., 345 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1806 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ques.) 1012 (i).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 125, 1°*) 1757 (i).
SUPPLY :
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 ; (Man.) 917 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1374, 1379 (i).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3572 (ii).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2882 (ii).

Savard, Mr. P. V., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Chicoutimi Election Ret. (Ques.) 142 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1196 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5565 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1323 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 3575 (ii), 6176 (iii).
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4120 (ii).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 6167 (iii).
Indians (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6272 ; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation : Library (Grant) 945 (i).
Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 6276 ; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ottawa) 4471, 4475 ; (Que.) 4337. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2928 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5740 (iii).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1263 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2731 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1395 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1430 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 720 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5967 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5364 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1191 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3819 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5554 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5701 (iii).
——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 5487 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5612; conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5759 (iii).
Salisbury Harbour Ry. Co.'s (B. 120, 1°*) 1453 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6138 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5256 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3897; (St. John, increased accommodation) 3886 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2860 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 446 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ques.) 1929 (i).
——— Repairs (M. for Ret.) 232 (i).
Fishery Protection, Georgian Bay (Ques.) 220 (i)
——— Supplies (Ques.) 221 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ques.) 603 (i)
Indian Agent at Wiarton (Ques.) 603 (i).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i)).

Somerville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P.O., Letter Boxes Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Accts. *re* Boucier (M.) to ref. 3948 (ii).
——— Interior Dept. (M.) to ref. Cheques, &c., 2203 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of House, 1926 (i).
——— Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
Polson Mfng. Co., Steel Plate Imports (Ques.) 270 (i).
Rideau Canal, Ordnance Land, Sale (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3549 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 442, 483, 498; (Interior) 249; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 478 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5171 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i). Excise (salaries, &c.) 1725 (i), 5125. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5173.
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1710.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 953. Senate (salaries, &c.) 931 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3703; (Military Stores, &c.) 3719 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1705; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1704 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6245: (Ottawa) 4492, 4513; (Que.) 4339 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal, Tenders for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 3953, 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
Veterans, 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2926 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 227 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (remarks) 716 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent, Coms. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (read) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534 (iii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2461 (ii).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Commons, The, Privileges claimed in Senate, 4 (i)
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm delivered (notification) 954 (i).
——— Ordered to appear before Bar of House, 895 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Controverted Election (Halton) Judgment, 5 (i).
——— Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (remarks) 2366 (ii); in Com., 5740 (iii).
Divisions, Procedure, Members' Votes (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3245 (ii), 5143 (iii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (ruling) 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1972 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Indian Agent Allen (remarks) 1298 (i).
——— Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 6147 (iii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111 (i), 2144 (ii).
Interruptions by Members (remarks) 2069 (i), 2395, 2707 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 3657 (ii).
——— Papers (remarks) 636 (i).
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease, draping Chamber (remarks) 883 (i).
Member, New, notification of Return, 7 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331 (i).
Members' Private Motions, Procedure (remarks) 127 (l).
Member's Vote challenged (ruling) 4428 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111, 227, 550, 736, 799, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589, 6289 (iii).
Ministerial Stmnts. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Monuments, Battlefields of Canada, on conc. (ruling) 4278 (iii).
Newspaper Reps., incorrect, Reading ruled out of Order, 2962 (ii).
Orange Influence (remarks) 1965; (ruling) 1971 (i).
Order, Ques. of, on adjnmts. (ruling) 6027, 6032.
——— (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— (Sir *John Thompson*) *re* Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) *re* par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).
——— Member for East Northumberland (remarks) 4087 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
Prohibition, on adjmnt. (remarks) 546, 1332, 1341 (i).
——— on personal Explanation (remarks) 1543 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 6309 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5753 (iii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., Functions (ruling) 4241 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. (ruling) 3949 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse. (ruling) 1925 (i).
——— Printing Evidence (ruling) 2374 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (ruling) 2516 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 987, 991 (i)
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 743 (i).
Quebec, West, Issue of Writ (notification) 4081 (ii), 5014, 6309 (iii).
——— Order for Attendance of Member (read) 4001 (ii).
——— Rep. of Dep. Serjeant-at-Arms (read) 4152 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on Member speaking twice, 3306 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River (remarks) 2201 (ii).
Serjeant-at-Arms, Deputy, Appmnt. (notification) 3995 (ii).
Speaker, Election as (acknowledgement) 4 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 5 (i).
Sugar, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (ruling) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5190. Weights and Measures &c., 5163 (iii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea, remarks) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii), (contingencies) 942 (i); (Expenses of Committees) 6173 (iii); (Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates) 943; (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) on conc. (remarks) 5432; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, on conc. (remarks) 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T., remarks) 5389, 5392, 5397, 5401; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4514. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571. Slides and Booms, 4650 (iii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen., 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, on adjnmt. (remarks) 215 (i).
Unparliamentary Language, 2026 (i), 3780 (ii), 4973 (iii).
West Indies Steamship Service (remarks) 195 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (MR. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
High Commissioner's Office, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 493 (i).
Members called to Order, 1554 (i), 3671 (ii), 4658, 6214 (iii).
Order, Ques. of (ruling) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4659 (iii).
——— Ry. Subsidies, on Res. (ruling) 6136 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (remarks) 4758 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collction of Revenues: Customs (remarks) 1718, 1720 (ii).
Militia (remarks) 6182 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4562, 6260; (Que.) 4556; 4658 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (remarks) 2040 (i).

Spohn, Mr. P. H., *East Simcoe.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4136 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6260 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3002 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1349 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ques.) 2148.
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1787 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 958 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4875(iii).
Commercial Agencies, &c., Regulations (B. 109, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5733 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4451 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5146 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1523 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 787 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3097.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1187 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
International Abattoir Co. (Ques.) 3615 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4627 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3109 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3919 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Auditor Gen.'s Office Accts. (M.) to ref., 2743 (ii).
——— Kingston Graving Dock, Printing Evidence (M.) 3621 (ii).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Kingston Graving Dock, &c. (M.) 3199 (ii).
——— 21st Rep. (presented) 4608 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— P.O. Deptl. salaries (M.) to ref., 2666 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) for Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 605 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3154 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3611 (ii).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ques.) 1275 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1567; (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3542 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 420 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5179. Excise (Methylated Spirits) 5138 (iii).
Immigration (salaries) 5245 (iii).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1555 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).
Mounted Police, 4825 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 6212 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2555 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. House, 2565 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2927 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2687 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Bill 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1380 (i).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-W., *Halifax.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1795 (i).
Cape Breton and N. S. Ry. accommodation, on M. for Cor., 178 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5292 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Blue Ribbon Twine, 2936 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 49 (M. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3099.
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3530 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4321; (Ont.) 4365.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3867 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4013 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2040 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3206 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4135 (ii),
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4787 (iii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5737 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s (B. 151) Rule suspended and 1°* of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 73, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Geological Survey, 4726 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).

Tarte, Mr. J. I., *Montmorency.*
Admiral, Str., Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 128.
—— Services and Ownership (M. for Ret.) 2157.
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1932 (i).
—— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ques.) 270 (i).
—— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1937 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 635 (i).
—— Tenders (M. for copies*) 127 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5791, 6122 (iii).
—— Papers (remarks) 986, 1850 (i).
—— (Ques. of Priv.) 146 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ques.) 527, 602 (i).
—— Commissioners' Interest Acct. (Ques.) 270.
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Public Works) 256 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
—— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 6, 1°) 106 ; Order for 2°, 200 (i).
Can. Land and Investment Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 524.
Can. Power Co.'s (B. 41, 1°*) 206 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5738 (iii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 94, 1°*) 549 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1084 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 631, 800, 1199, (i), 3822, 4213, (ii), 5011 (iii).
——Votes challenged, 3780 (ii), 4428 (iii).
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation regulating (Ques.) 144 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of, Newspaper Reps. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2963 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631, 800 (i).
—— on M. for adjnmt., 3822 (ii).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 387 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Pairing of Members, 800 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (Amt.) to Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 355 ; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Evidence *re* Langevin Block, 3948 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 155 (i).
Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co. and C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 78, 1°*) 441 (i).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (presented) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4500.
Telegraph Co.'s, Legislation *re* Directors (Ques.) 144 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 80, 1°*) 524 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Adjmnt., Queen's Birthday (Ans.) 157 (i).
Administration of Justice (B. 14, 1°) 141 ; 2° m. and in Com., 892, 1089 (i).
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ans.) 5778 (iii).
—— Local Judges' salaries (prop. Res.) 1849 (i).
—— Jurisdiction in Canada, Provision (B. 13, 1°) 141 ; 2° m., 1093 ; in Com., 1417, 1731 (i).
—— (B. 153) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*) on Order for 2°, 200 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Auditor Gen.'s Functions (remarks) 392 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4170 (ii).
Battell, Wm., employé Cobourg P. O. (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°*) 954 ; in Com., 1099 (i), 3138 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. Accts. to Pub. Accts. Com. (objection) 2361 (ii).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ans.) 4296 (iii).
C. P. R. Arbitrators' Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
—— Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5945 ; (Amt.) 5994 ; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5998 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1941 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. (prop. Res.) 1413 (i).
Chatham P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3951 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5336 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1031 (i).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm (M.) to produce, 906 (i).
——— (M.) to appear before Bar of House, 806 (i).
——— (M.) Order to appear before Bar postponed, 891 (i).
——— (M.) to read Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., 895 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 147, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5375, 5594, 5729 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°) 2144 (ii); 3° m., 3244 (ii).
——— Address to Her Majesty, 6287 (iii).
——— Act, 1889 (Ans.) 335 (i).
——— Berne Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
——— Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada, on M. for Cor., 728 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5017 (iii).
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification (B. 32, 1°) 156 (i).
——— Fees *re* Drafting B. (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5941 (iii).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (remarks) 4157 (ii).
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements, on M. for Ret., 2156 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4457 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 996; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i).
——— (B. 146, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3246 (ii); 5140, 5196, 5470, 5547, 5587; M. to recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6228 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ans.) 1928 (i).
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Elections Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 1029 (i).
Elections in Napierville (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2958 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°*) 1345 (i); in Com., 3646, 3902 (ii).
Female Offenders in N. S. (B. 143, 1°*) 2203; in Com., 3596 (ii).
Foreshores of Dom. Ownership, on M. for Cor., 179 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 769; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).
——— B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 302; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 (ii).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3 m. h., 1001 (i).
——— (B. 145, 1°) 2361; in Com., 3082 (ii).
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ans.) 962, 1267 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014; in Com., 1976 (i).
Frauds upon the Govt. Prevention (B. 172, 1°*) 5582; 2° m., 5751; in Com., 6237, 6289 (iii).
Grain Weighers Provision (B. 164, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3643 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 3950 (ii).
Govt. Business (M.) precedence on Saturdays 6127
——— on M. to take in Wednesdays, 1731 (i).
Govt., Formation of (Ans.) 1578 (i).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1113.
Herchmer, Commissioner, Comptroller's Rep. (Ans.) 1574, 2669 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Macleod *Gazette* (Ans.) 4293 (iii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2919 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Homsteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 623 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
——— Affairs, M nagement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1498 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt (B. 163, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ans.) 961 (i).
I. C. R., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 1770 (i).
——— Claims of Miss Lea Caron (Ans.) 209 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3787 (ii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (Ans.) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ans.) 4674.
——— (remarks) 5014 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
——— Montreal District (Ans.) 2909 (ii).
Judges in Provincial Courts (B. 153) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ans.) 3260.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 3961.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (iii).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Pets. for Discharge (Ans.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4536 ; in Com., 4612, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5527 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3632 (ii).
Langevin Block, Payments on account of Contract (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Live Stock Shipping B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) 2° m. and in Com., 3991, 3993 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. to refer to Sel. Com., 766 (i) ; in Com., 2940 ; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness and Govt. Business (remarks) 711 (i).
McLeod, Mr., Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289 (ii).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
Miminigash Breakwater (Ans.) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653, 4213 (ii).
——— Resignation (announcement) 5074 (iii).
Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).
New England Paper Co. (Ans.) 1767 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4748, 4770 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829 ; on M. for 3°, 5410 (iii).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 981 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3925 (ii), 4298 (iii).
——— Representation Acts Amt. (B. 148, 1°) 2373 (ii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2°, 3230 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— Newspaper Reps., 2964 (ii).
——— Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 1332 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ans.) 3960.
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3824.
Patent Act Amt. (B. 142, 1°) 2144 (i).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Piers, Wharves, &c., P.E.I., Repairs, &c. (Ans). 3952 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
——— distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5352.
——— 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 799 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4828 (iii).
——— on 7th Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
——— Meetings of Com. (remarks) 984, 990 (i).
Privilege, Member for East Northumberland, Charges against, 4087 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1335 (i).
——— Order for consdn. of Res. postponed, 993.
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ans.) 112 (i).
Provincial Accounts (Indian Lands) Settlement (B. 100, 1°*) 807 ; in Com., 1087 (i).
——— Settlement (B. 99, 1°*) 807 ; 2° m., 1065 ; in Com., 1066 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property (B. 111, 1°) 1101 (i) ; 2° m., 3985 (ii) ; in Com., 5752 (iii).
Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com of Sup., 4091 (ii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
——— on Printing Evidence, 2375 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on enquiry for Rets., 4158.
Public Works Dept., Contracts, 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy (remarks) 3738 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
Quebec Skating Club, Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3649 ; 2° m., 3984 (ii).
Quebec West, Expulsion of Member (M.) 6285 (iii)
——— (M.) to Issue Writ, 6286 (iii).
——— (M.) Member to attend Hse., 3827 (ii).
——— (M.) to Arrest, 4001 (ii).
——— Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4082 (ii), 6309 (iii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5196 (iii).
——— Judges' salaries (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ans.) 3263.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3304 (ii).
Rathbun Co., Rep. of Standing Orders Com., 5012 (iii).
Reciprocity, Papers respecting (remarks) 550, 600 (i).
Revising Officers, Instruction *re* Revision (Ans.) 5079 (iii).
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ans.) 741 (i).
St Lawrence Dredge (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Senécal, André, service of Writ to appear at Bar (Ques.) 4747 (iii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ans.) 604 (i).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
Sorel Harbour Works, employés (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ans.) 5408
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6219 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) 3308 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income : Grenville (Goodwin's Claim) 6296 (iii).
Civil Government (Justice) contingencies, 434, 1547 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Public Works, 1728. Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Dominion Police, 512, 1557 (i).
Indians (N.B.) 5063, conc., 5422 (iii)
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507 ; (L. A. Audette) 1557 ; (J. Dingwell, Legal services) 1559 ; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559 ; (Miscellaneous) 506, 1556 (i), 6170, conc., 6303 (iii) ; (Sullivan, Hon. W. T., salary, 1556 ; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 510 (i).
Legislation : House of Commons (Indemnity) 6172 (iii) ; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 946 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350 ; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5472 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5114 (iii) ; (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i) ; (Old Records) 5084, 5124 (iii) ; (Wm. Gliddon, payment) 1706 (i).
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 919 ; (Dorchester) 1558 ; (Kingston) 882 ; (Man.) 913 (i), 6171 (iii) ; (Regina Gaol) 928 ; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i), 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Capital : Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4529. *Income :* Buildings (Man.) 4443 ; (N.W.T.) 4443, 6248, conc., 5389 ; (Ottawa) 4510 (Ont.) 4579 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Slides and Booms, 6261 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659. C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accomodation) 3862.
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 138, 1°) 1990 (i) ; 2° m., 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ans.) 1575.
——— (remarks) 1930 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3835 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5777 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3488 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2563 ; in Com., 2578 (ii).
Trade Extension, &c., U.S., Canada and Newfoundland, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 736.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6317 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1199 (i).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°*) 807 (i).
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 235 (i).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 3287 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ans.) 2908, 2912 (ii).
Washington Treaty Papers (remarks) 192 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2024, 2063 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1255 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 3984 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ans.) 4295 (iii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1975 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 36, 1°*) 206 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 620 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4622 (iii).
Maritime Chemical Pulp Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 206 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Sittings of Com. (M.) 4670 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3931 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Free Press*, 5384 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5236 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2034 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 64, 1°*) 387 (i).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1938 (i).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 4760 (iii).
Copyright, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145; on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Guysborough Fishery Overseer, salary (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Indian Agent Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673.
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674.
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1°*) 155 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4611 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5514 (iii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.
Lindsay and Haliburton Mail Clerk, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 804, 1199 (i); 3426 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
Montreal Custom House, Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Murray Canal Employés (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Napanee Public Buildings (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 102, 1°*) 891.
Ont. Municipalities, Deputation to Govt. (remarks) 389 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 529 (i).
Printing Bureau, Type purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Advertising and Printing (remarks) 4465 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
St. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407(iii).
Sault Ste Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6176 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5182. Post Office (Mail Service) 4719; (salaries, &c.) 4720.
Government of N.W.T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5426 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Indians (B. C.) 4803; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4814; (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4223 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5112; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Penitentiaries (salaries, &c.) 928 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii). Kingston Graving Dock, 1680 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5394; (N.W.T) 6249 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Truax, Mr. R., *East Bruce.*
Customs Seizures at Walkerton (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.

Truax, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5044 (ii).
Walkerton P. O., Contract for Fittings (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Public Buildings, Caretaker (Ques.) 1271.
——— Completion (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Public Works (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
——— Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ques.) 3619.
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ques.) 3266 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ans.) 1769.
——— Examination of Commander (Ans.) 2913.
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 722 (i).
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 960 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ans.) 3621 (ii.)
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Canadian Sealers Captured, Rep. respecting 5554 (iii).
Cattle (Export) Trade of Canada (remarks) 738 (i).
——— Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
——— Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 957.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 554 (i).
Deck and Load Lines Marking provision (B. 106, 1°) 954; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1256 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Deck Loads, Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski Ans.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res. and in Com., 1095; 1° of B., 1483 (i); in Com., 3158, 3165; 3° m., 3237 (ii).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Fishery Bounty Cheques (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— Costs, &c., *re* Distribution, on M. for Ret., 182 (i).
——— Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 541 (i).
——— Payments, on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).
——— Inspector, District No. 3, Resignation (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1528 (i).
——— Protection Service, Georgian Bay (Ans.) 220 (i).
——— Cape Breton (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— Supplies (Ans.) 221 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, salary (Ans.) 5403.
——— Wardens, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5409 (iii).
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ans.) 710 (i).
——— Restigouche River, on M. for Ret., 3284.
——— System of Issuiug (Ans.) 143 (i).
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°*) 1263 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1131 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 211 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 320 (ii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 584, 659 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3802 (ii).
Lake St. Peter Fishery Districts (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 2146, 2148 (ii).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew, on M. for Papers, &c., 1061 (i).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. and 1°* of B., 3130 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4772 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt (B. 12 1°) 140; 2° m., 1066; in Com., 1068 (i), 3102.
Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Meridian Reckoning Time (B. 166, 1°) 4237 (iii).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 713 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°) 549; in Com., 1099; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1992 (i).
Montreal Pilots, on M. for Com. of Sup., re- 6146 (iii.)
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6192 (iii).
——— on M. for Cor., 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ans.) 113 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ans.) 3958; (remarks) 4158 (ii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 150, 1°) 2667; in Com., 3594, 3899 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240.
Pound-Nets, Licenses (Ans.) 143 (i).
——— Lake Huron (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair (Ans.) 198, 223 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, on M. for Ret., 174 (i).
St. John, P.Q., Medical Examiner (Ans.) 527 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ans.) 1576 (i).
——— Receipts (Ans.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1953 (i).
——— Deb. rsmd., 2175 (ii).
Sea Fisheries Development (B. 152) prop. Res., 549 (i); conc. in and 1° of B., 3100; 2°* m., 3593.

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Seigfreid, Schooner, reward to Captain (Ans.) 224.
Ships' Inspection (B. 149, 1°) 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii), 4310; M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 44, 1°) 218 (remarks) 219; in Com., 1088 (i), 3099 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Standard Time, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P.E.I. (Ans.) 1929 (i).
——— *on* M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 166 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, &c., Reps. (presented) 103.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85, 1°) 524; in Com., 1094 (i); on Sen. Amts., 3901 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farm) 3555 (ii).
Civil Government (Marine) 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii); (B. C., salaries) 3527 (ii), contingencies, 1547 (i); (Fish-breeding) 3529, conc., 4261; (Man.) 3525; (N.B.) 3523, (N.W.T.) 3527 (ii); (N.S.) conc., 4245 (iii); (Ont.) 3514 (ii); (P.E.I.) conc., 4258 (iii); (Que.) 3517 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 3512; (Maintenance, &c.) 3510; (salaries, &c.) 3509 (ii), 6267 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision S.S. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6265 (iii); (Maintenance. &c.) 3513; (Quebec Water Police) 3508; (Tidal Observations) 3509 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4320. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6259 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3866, 3871 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection 3513 (ii), conc., 4243 (iii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ans.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
——— Harbour Master's Rep. (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3333 (ii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels (B. 10, 1°) 108; 2° m., 206; 3° m., 232 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6205 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, conc., 6306 (iii).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., *Dorchester.*
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 1934.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1783 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*
Construction Co. (Incorporated) of Can. incorp. (B. 128, 1°*) 1927 (i).
Divorce, Adam Russworm Relief (B. 131, 1°*) 1927 (i); 2° on div. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).
——— Isabel Tapley Relief (B. 134, 1°*) 1927 (i).
——— Mahala Ellis Relief (B. 132, 1°*) 1926 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3942 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1967 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Toronto Mail*, 2962.
Public Accts. Com. (M.) to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 2374 (ii).
——— (M.) Witnesses on Oath, 2516 (ii).
——— (Ms.) to ref. Printing Bureau, &c., Accts., 2905, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence *re* J. R. Arnoldi, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) P. O. Dept., Printing Evidence, 3513.
——— (M.) Ret. *re* Kingston Graving Dock, to ref., 3576 (ii).
——— (M.) Bourcier & Co.'s Accts., 4085 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 84, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 521.
Public Works—Income (Man.) 4432 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ques.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3480 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°) 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2570 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2107 (ii).
——— par. in Toronto *Mail* (remarks) 2964 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1784 (i).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Local Acts (M. for Cor.) 544, 545 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1057 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3247 (ii), 5548 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5771 (iii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Fishing in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 774 (i).
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 323.
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 619 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4620, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5491 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3932 (ii).
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjmnt. (remarks) 1403 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ques.) 3265 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 372 (i).
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ques.) 112 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3140 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5182 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.,) 4074 (ii).
Fisheries (Man.) 3524 (ii).
Government of N. W. T., 5072 (iii); (Schools) 1712.
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5259 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4737, 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 952 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3731, 4235; (Military College) 4237 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dufresne, Mr. J. I., D.L.S.) 1707 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5085; (Lunatics in Keewatin) 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i), 4817, 6274 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 913, 1714 (i), 6171 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4526. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4449; (N.S.) 4315; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4488; (Que.) 4332. Dredging, (Man.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4591 (iii.)
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6281 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3751 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6161 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3057 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1371, 1379 (i); in Com. on B., 2221, 2253 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1091 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (M.) to place on Order Paper, 1101 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3780 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Geological Survey) 410 (i).)
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1435 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Belle Creek Breakwater (Ques.) 1270 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1824 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 556; in Com., 560 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 973 (i).
New London, &c., Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 226 (i).
Red Point Pier (Ques.) 1271 (i).
Ships' Inspection Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4310 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 4682 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4473.
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., of Sup. (remarks) 4719 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1638 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1397 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater (Ques.) 1271 (i).

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports at Halifax (M. for Ret.*) 174 (i).
——— (Ques.) 142 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2539 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3273 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5636 (iii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2197 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Legislation : House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2669 (ii)

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Ont. Municipalities' Deputation and Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 389 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1602 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4353 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2965 (ii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., jun., *Sunbury.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 136, 1°*) 1989 (i); 2° m., 2858 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 109 (i).
Companies' Clauses Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°*) 238 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°) 105; 2° m., 994 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5157, 5200; on M. for 3°, 5568 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 28, 778.
——— (B. 59, 1°) 334; 2° m., 1041 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085.
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. 6186 (iii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Capital : Kingston Graving Dock, 1677 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5309 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3815 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 5013 (iii).
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* Toronto Harbour, 5013.
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* W. I. Bradley, 5013 (iii)
——— (M.) Sittings of Com., 5014 (iii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1641 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2260 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3212 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1634 (i).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

ABBOTT, HON. MR., AND FORMATION OF GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

ACCIDENTS ON I. C. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

ACCOUNT, OPEN : in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Accounts, Settlement. *See* "PROVINCIAL."

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY, ACKNOWLEDGMENT : Mes. from His Ex., 227 (i).

—— IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8 ; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).

ADJOURNMENT, CORPUS CHRISTI : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 523 (i).

—— DOM. DAY : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) 1536 (i).

—— M. to adjn. (Mr. *Denison*), neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

—— HOLIDAYS : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 1275.

—— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Hector Largevin*) 386 (i).

—— SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S FUNERAL : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 888 (i).

—— ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).

ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11 : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

Administration of Justice B. No. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141 ; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089 ; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "JUSTICE."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Macdonald*). 1°*, 5 (i) (*pro forma*).

"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C. : M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).

—— O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS : M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 2157 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Provision B. No. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141 ; 2°, 1093 ; in Com., 1414, 1731 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD : in Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).

ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF OTTAWA MAILS : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

—— IN *Le Canada* : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

AGENCIES (MERCANTILE) LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

AGENCY, PUBLIC WORKS, B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).

AGRICULTURE, &C. :

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

CATTLE TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

—— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : (Mr. *Bowell*) 806.

—— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i).

—— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i),

—— *See* "AMERICAN."

CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114(i).

—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

DEPTL. REPORT : presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).

—— SUMS PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223 (i).

IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

—— INTO CANADA, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

—— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).

—— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).

UNITED STATES QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

[*See* "ARTS," &c., "COPYRIGHT," "EXPERIMENTAL FARMS," "IMMIGRATION," "SUPPLY," &c.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO : conc., 5413 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 254 (i), 6169 (iii)

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°*, 214 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).

ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

Albion Mines Savings Bank B. No. 113 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 112.)

"ALERT" AND SCHR. "SCYLLA," CLAIMS *re* COLLISION: in Com. of Sup., 6265 (iii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).

—— APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).

Alien Contract Labour Prohibition B. No. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).

ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).

ALLISTON CONFLAGRATION: Remarks on adjnmt., 192

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

AMERICAN CATTLE FOR SLAUGHTER IN CANADA, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5776 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4468, 4536; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5209 (iii).

AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).

AMERICAN QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 742 (i).

AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

Anglo-Can. Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 128.)

ANIMALS FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1659 (i).

ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).

—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).

ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

ANNUITIES AND COMMUTATIONS (INDIANS): in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).

ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).

ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iii).

ARMOURIES, CARE OF ARMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3720 (ii).

ARMY AND NAVY, IMPORTS FOR USE: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).

ARNOLDI, J. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on adjnmt., 3129 (ii).

—— REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM." "BALLOT BOXES."

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 953, 1562 (i), 3531 (ii), 6174 (iii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

CANAL STATISTICS: Rep. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738.

CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Laverge*) 1274 (i).

LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

[*See* "AGRICULTURE," "CENSUS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

Assiniboia River. *See* "WINNIPEG."

Atikokan Iron Range Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 61.)

ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier* 124 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).

ATLANTIC CATTLE TRADE, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

AUDET, A. A., AND COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

Audit Act. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i), 6167 (iii).

—— POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM."

Baie des Chaleurs Ry Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; M. for Com., 1761; in Com. and rep., 1764; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174(ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 97.)

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

BAIT ACT, NEWFOUNDLAND, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).

BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

BANCROFT'S TENDER *re* GRAVING DOCK: Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS, SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5108 (iii).

—— PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."

BARBER, MR., CLAIM *re* PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

BARLEY, TWO-ROWED, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).

—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255 (ii).

BARTLETT, J. H., WINDING CLOCK, OTTAWA P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).

BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).

BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 298 (i).

BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &C.: M. for Reps., &c.,* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEAUDRY, LIEUT.-COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).

BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).

—— CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4575 (iii).

BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

Beet-Root Sugar Bounty Provision B. No. 168 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466; 3°*, 4534 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 545 (i).

BEHRING SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).

—— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572 (iii).

Benevolent Society. *See* "SEPTENNIAL."

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H. Appointment. as Dep. Speaker: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).

Berlin and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BERNE COPYRIGHT CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264 (i).

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).

BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. No. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3208 (ii), 4534, 4613, 6329 (ii).

—— COM. FROM GOV. GEN. SEC.'S OFFICE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534, 6309 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John Macdonald.*)

1°*, 5; *pro formâ* (i).

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)

1°, 104; 2° m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)

1°, 104 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)

1°, 105; 2° m., 767; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)

1°, 105; 2° m., 994; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 6) To prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement, to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)

1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

BILL (No. 7) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)

1°, 106 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To repeal Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled an Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and all amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)

1°, 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)

1°, 107 (i); 2° and ref. to Com. on B. 5, 1029; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)

1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 11) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 140; 2°, 1066; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 13) To provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°, 1093; in Com., 1414, 1731; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 14) With respect to certain matters affect the Administration of Justice.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°, 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii)

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To confer certain powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with its Telegraph business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 125.)

BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 121.)

BILL (No. 27) To authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited, to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 28) To amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 130.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Ivcs.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 30) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. Spencer Corbin.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 131.)

BILL (No. 31) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act, Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 156; 2° m., 999; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001; agreed to, 1003 (i).

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 156 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 174 (i).

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 193 (i); Order for 2° read., 2580; 2°, 3288; in Com., 3292 (ii).

BILL (No. 35) In further amendment of the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 193 (i).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company, Limited, and to change the name

thereof to the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Private Bills, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

BILL (No. 42) To prevent frauds on Farmers in the sale of Seed Grain and other articles.—(Mr. *Burdett.*)
1°*, 206; 2°, 1003; Order for Com. read, 1014; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041; in Com., 1972 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Further to amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, entitled An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mc Mullen.*)
1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 44) To amend Chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend The Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Western Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 238; 20, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54 55 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

BILL (No. 49) To amend Chapter 118 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, known as the Companies' Clauses Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 238 (i).

BILL (No. 50) To incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship-Building Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Macleod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 53) To make Voting compulsory.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031; agreed to, 1040 (i).

BILL (No. 54) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Barron*).
1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 334; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company and to change the name thereof to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carpenter.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 62) To enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a Ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. *Earle.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 66) To confirm a Lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Henderson.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 68) To amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 69) To confirm an Indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ()).

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 74) Further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 76) To amend an Act to authorize and provide for the Winding-up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
1°*, 388 ; 2°, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 111.)

BILL (No. 77) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 78) To confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 119.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; wthdn., 1760 (i).

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; in Com. and rep., 1764 ; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957 ; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963 ; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 (i).

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 524 ; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i) ; 3°*, 3100 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 600 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i), (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 87) to revive and amend the Charter of the Quebec Bridge Company. — (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 982 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company,—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c, 108.)

BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 128.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 95) Further to amend the Act 36 Vic., Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 96) To confirm a Deed of amalgamation between the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. *Jamieson.*)
1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Acts respecting the granting of a Subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 98) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°, 738 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Settlement of Accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said Provinces—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 100) For the Settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario, respecting Indian Lands—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2° and in Com., 1087 (i); 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 891; 2°*, 983; in Com., and 3°*, 1963 (i.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890—(B) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Intercolonial Railway. (Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 106) To provide for the marking of Deck and Load Lines.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corbould.*)
1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 109) To regulate Private Detective, Financial and Commercial Agencies and Corporations.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 1011 (i).

BILL (No. 110) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 111) To authorize the transfer of certain Public Property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 112) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1101 (i).

BILL (No. 113) To continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and B. in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 114) For better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1406 (i).

BILL (No. 115) To amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (ii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (iii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 1403 ; 2°*, 1434 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 119) Respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 549 ; Order for Com. read, 1253 ; in Com., 1347 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414 ; 2° m., 1994 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 2205 ; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 122) To further amend the Fisheries Act Chap. 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper*).
1°, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 123) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Madill.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 124) Further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 125) To incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Ross, Lisgar.*)
1°*, 1757 ; M. for 2°, 1848 ; 2°*, 1964 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 1760 (i) ; 2° m., 3902 ; 2° and in Com., 3925, 4297 (ii) ; 3°*, 4299 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 127) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1891, and the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. in Com., rep. conc. in, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 128) To incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 127.)

BILL (No. 129) To incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company—(Q) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 1964 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 130) To incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *McNeill.*)
1°*, 1927 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 131) For the relief of Adam Russworm (C) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2174 ; in Com., and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)

BILL (No. 132) For the relief of Mahala Ellis—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1926 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)

BILL (No. 133) For the relief of Thomas Bristow—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *O'Brien.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; M. for Com., 2550 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)

BILL (No. 134) For the relief of Isabel Tapley—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 135.)

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

BILL (No. 136) To incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wilmot.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*. 2321 ; M. for Com., 2858 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3236 ; 3°*, 3237 (ii.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend Chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1990 (i) ; 2°, 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 ; 3°*, 3984 (ii) ; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079 ; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 139) In further amendment of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 2140 (i).

BILL (No. 140) In restraint of Fraudulent Marking.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* in Com. and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 142) To amend the Patent Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 143) Respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia—(R) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2336; 2°* and in Com., 3082; 3°*, 3098 (ii) (54-55 *Vic., c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 146) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 148) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 149) Respecting the Inspection of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts. made in Com. of Whole, 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 151) Respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905; 2° m., 3230; 2°, 3593 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 152) To amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 153) Further to amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 154) Respecting the Shipping of Live Stock.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1° of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 155) To amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 156) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 157) To amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 3462; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 158) to authorize the Sale of the Carleton, City of Saint John, Branch Railroad.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1413; M. for Com., 1992; in Com., 1993 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579; 2°* and in Com., 3899; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 159) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com. 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 160) To authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Lands in the City of Quebec.—(Sir *John Thompson*).
Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com. 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 161) In relation to the unlawful disinterment of dead bodies—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4825 (iii).

BILL (No. 162) To correct a clerical error in the Act 53 Victoria, Chapter 81, respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 163) Further to amend the General Inspection Act—(S) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 164) To make further provision respecting Weighers of Grain—(T) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 165) To further amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

1°, 3995; 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770 6226; 3°*, 6228. (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 166) Respecting the Reckoning of Time.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)

1°, 4237 (iii).

BILL (No. 167) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)

Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 168) To encourage the production of Beet Reet Sugar.—(Mr. *Foster.*)

Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 169) Further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, Chapter 4, to authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; rep. and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 170) Respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)

Res. prop., 3577 (ii); in Com., 4748; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829; 2°* and in Com., 5081; 3° m., 5410; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., 5410; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 171) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)

Rules 49 and 51 suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

BILL (No. 172) Respecting Frauds upon the Government—(U) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)

1°*, 5589; 2°, 5751; in Com., 6289, 6327; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 173) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

Res. prop., 3308 (iii); in Com., 5487, 5592, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 174) To amend Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Militia and Defence.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)

1°, 6126 (iii).

BILL (No. 175) To authorize the payment of Subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)

Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 176) To amend the Railway Acts.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)

1°, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 177) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)

Res. in Com., rep., conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307, (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 178) To further amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771; neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Grieve*) 1774; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1776; (Mr. *Casey*) 1779; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1781; Mr. *Wallace*) 1783; (Mr. *Watson*) 1784; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1787; (Mr. *Bain*) 1790; (Mr. *Stairs*) 1795; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 1799; (Mr. *Rowand*) 1799; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1801: (Mr. *McNeill*) 1802; (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 1805; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1806; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1807; (Mr. *Daly*) 1808; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1811; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1818; (Mr. *Davin*) 1821; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1824; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1825; (Mr. *Foster*) 1828; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1835; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1842 (i).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).

—— REWARDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).

Body Snatching. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BONDING OF FOREIGN FISH: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii).

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).

—— BY PROVINCES, &C., &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).

—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).

—— PAYMENTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).

BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &C., OF MAPLE SUGAR: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

BOURINOT, J. G., Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 1274 (i).

BRAMPTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

BRANDON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 5348 (iii).

BRANTFORD DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).

BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

—— P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

—— WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).

—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).

—— M. for Engineer's Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

—— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104 (i).

Bridge Companies. *See* "MONTREAL AND QUEBEC."

BRIGADE MAJORS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

BRIGHT, J. B., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387 (i).

—— **B. No. 86** (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 600; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

Bristow, Thomas. *See* "DIVORCE."

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ADJUTANT GEN. (DEP.) MIL. DIST. No. 11: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).

BEACON HILL PARK MAGAZINE, &c.: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).

—— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

—— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

"C" BATTERY SERVICES AT WELLINGTON: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

—— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & Co., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).

NELSON, P.O., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*

TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VICTORIA DRILL HALL, for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736(i).

WELLINGTON, MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

—— MILITIA, PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

[*See* "P.O.," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).

BROWN, MR. ADAM, HONORARIUM: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iii).

BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1272 (i).

BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

BUCKINGHAM P.O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on adjmnt., 738, 953 (i).

—— Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200 (i).

—— Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1224 i).

—— *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*., 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry., Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Corbould*). 1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i)

—— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).

—— *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

CACOUNA, TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

—— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).

—— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).

CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAMP, MILITARY DISTRICT No. 1 : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).

CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4700, 5349 (iii).

—— P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).

CAN. ATLANTIC RY. CO., FUNERAL TRAIN : in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).

" CANADA GAZETTE " : conc., 5417 (iii).

Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°, 189 ; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 103.)

Can. Temp. Act (1888) Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°, 193 (i) ; Order for 2° read, 2580 ; 2°, 3288 ; in Com., 3292 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Laverqne*). 1°, 193 (i).

CAN. TEMP. ACT : in Com. of Sup., 5086 ; conc., 5426 (iii).

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (i).

Can. Land and Investment Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 119.)

Can. Order of Home Circles B. No. 81 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; wthdn., 1760 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 71.)

C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 70.)

C.P.R. Co.'s Telegraphs B. No. 21 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°, 189 (i).

C.P.R.—Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s Lease B. No. 66 (Mr. *Henderson*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 73.)

C.P.R.—New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 74.)

C.P.R.—North Shore Ry. Debentures B. No. 170 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 3577 (ii) ; in Com., 4748 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829 ; 2°* and in Com., 5081 ; 3° m., 5410 ; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to recom., 5410 ; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 11.)

C. P. R.—Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. No. 78 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 72.)

C.P.R. Co.'s ADDITIONAL LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

—— ARBITRATORS' AWARD : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6129 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup. 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).

—— MAIL SERVICE, 1890-91 : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).

C.P.R., SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST P. M. G. : Notice of Stmnt., 5852 (iii).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945 ; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 5954 ; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5958 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 5962 ; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5967 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5971 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 5975 ; (Mr. *Girouard*) 5984 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 5989 ; (Mr. *Lister*) 5993 (iii).

—— Statutory Declaration read (Mr. *Haggart*) 6127 (iii).

—— SOURIS BRANCH, O. C.'s GRANTING AID : M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

Can. Power Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 126.)

CAN. SEALERS, CAPTURED BY RUSSIAN AUTHORITIES : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

CAN., WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544.

CANALS :

CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION : M. for copies (Mr. *Trow*) 1938 (i).

CANAL (NEW) NORTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE : Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 175 (i).

CANAL STATISTICS : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

In Com. of Sup., 1665 (i), 4102, 4145, 5210, 5222, 6198.

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN : M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL, THOS. MUNRO'S REP. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED : Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL, DAMAGES TO LAND : Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618 (ii).

—— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).

—— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

—— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

—— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &c. : M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

—— ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

TAY CANAL, BASIN AT PERTH, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 4672 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION : on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 3738 ; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

—— NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3617 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3261, 3952, 3956 (ii).

—— VESSELS PASSED THROUGH, NUMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3259 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONER'S REP. : Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 194, 550 (i).

CANALS—*Continued.*
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COST OF LOCKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1929 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467, 4773 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on adjnmt., 214 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYES, EXTRA: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *German*) 229, 3200 (ii).
—— TURNING BASIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Gibson*) 963 (i).
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY."]
CANSO, ARICHAT, &c., AND PORT MULGRAVE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4702.
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &C.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i), 3898 (ii).
—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4677 (iii).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4522.
CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).
CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE: Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. No. 158 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1413; M. for Com., 1992; in Com., 1993 (i); Res. conc. in and 1°*, of B., 3579; 2°*, and in Com., 3899; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)
CARLETON PLACE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).
CARON, MISS LEA, INDEMNITY FOR ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).
CASE, H. N., LATE POSTMASTER AT HAMILTON: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
CATTLE DISEASES AND SHEEP SCAB: in Com. of Sup., 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— EXPORT TRADE OF CANADA: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjnmt., 737 (i).
—— FROM U.S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).
—— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bowell*) 806 (i).
—— conc., 5435 (iii).
—— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i),
—— **Shipping.** *See* "LIVE STOCK."
—— TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (i).
—— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
—— *See* "AMERICAN."
CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
"C" BATTERY (B.C.) BARRACKS: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
—— SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B. C.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2521 (ii); (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).
CENSUS, THE: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 4845; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4858; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4875; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4885; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 4898; (Mr. *Amyot*) 4929; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4953; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4963; (Mr. *Craig*) 4979; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4983: (Mr. *Haggart*) 4992; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 5001 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONER JONES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
—— 1881 AND 1891, VOTES ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
—— RETURNS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 130 (i), 4465, 4534 (iii).
—— (Mr. *Casey*) 3999 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
—— *See* "AGRICULTURE," "IMMIGRATION."
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).
CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).
Certificates. *See* "MASTERS AND MATES."
CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O., Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i)
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i)
CHARLEBOIS & Co., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM P O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).
—— N.B., in Com. of Sup., 4331 (iii).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 130 (Mr. *McNeill*). 1°*, 1927; 2° m., 1989 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)
CHAUDIÈRE RENTS, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CANADA: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).
CHEVALIER, DR. E. N., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 527 (i).
CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

CHICOUTIMI REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (Subsidy) Acts Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Citizens' Ins. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 1403; 2°*, 1434 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 116.)

CITY MARKET HALIFAX, PROPERTY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).

CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 240, 397, 1544, 1732 (i), 6166 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE, DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

—— EXAMINERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1765 (i).

—— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3258 (ii).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: in Com. of Sup., 6172.

CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS, MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3700 (ii).

—— MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COBOURG HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hargraft*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5335 (ii).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

COBOURG P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES. *See* "SUPPLY."

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS, PAYMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5137 (iii).

Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. No. 47 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 84.)

Colonial Courts. *See* "ADMIRALTY."

Combinations. *See* "TRADE."

Commercial Agencies. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5108; conc., 5427 (iii).

COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).

COMMITTEES:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 139 (i).

BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 139 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 7 (i).

—— 1ST REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1200 (i).

—— 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 548 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to conc., 632 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Desjardins*) to conc., 1407 (i).

—— 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 2289.

—— 4TH REP.: Translators, &c.: M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).

EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 136 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.

PRINTING: List of Members, 138 (i).

—— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

—— 9TH AND 10TH REPS.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to conc., 6286 (iii).

PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 137 (i).

—— *See* general heading.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 135.

—— *See* general heading and "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List of Members, 138 (i).

—— *See* general heading.

SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 6 (i).

—— REP. presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 135 (i).

—— SUBSTITUTION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) 237 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 138 (i).

Companies' Clauses Act (*Chap.* 118, *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 238 (i).

Compulsory Voting B. No. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031 (i).

CONCURRENCE, 1758 (i), 5411, 6303 (iii).

CONNOLLY, M., BOOKS OF FIRM: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to produce, 906 (i).

—— ORDER TO ATTEND AT BAR OF HOUSE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 806 (i).

—— ORDER FOR ATTENDANCE AT BAR: postponed, 891; in attendance, and Rep. of Sub. Com. on Priv. and Elec. read, 895 (i).

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Acts Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

—— **B. No. 139** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 2140 (i).

Construction Company. *See* "INCORPORATED."

CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 431, 1544, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).

CONTRACTS. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— HALTON: Judgment, 5 (i).

Controverted Elections. *See* "DOMINION."

Copyright Act Amt B. No. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).

—— ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) conc. in, 6287 (iii).

—— BERNE CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264.

—— IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4674 (iii).

—— LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 726.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5014 (ii).

Corbin, J. Spencer, Patent Relief B. No. 30 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°*, 1156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 131.)

CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143 (i).

CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2153 (ii).

COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

—— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (iii).

COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).

COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575 (i).

COUNTRY SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).

COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).

CULLERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5159.

CUSTOMS:

ALBINO POINT CUSTOMS OFFICER: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

CATTLE FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i), 5776 (iii).

—— IMPORTS FOR SLAUGHTER: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

—— *See* "AMERICAN."

CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.; Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).

—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143.

COSTELLO, MICHAEL, MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).

COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).

EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).

FISH, BONDING OF FOREIGN: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).

GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2524 (ii).

IRON BOUNTIES PAID, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).

JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).

LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).

—— IMPORTATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4099 (ii).

MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).

—— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).

—— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616 (ii).

PELÉE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).

—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).

POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., IMPORTS OF STEEL PLATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).

POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).

POWNAL BAY PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).

SEIZURES, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).

SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

STEEL PLATES, &C., FREE IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).

SUGAR (RAW) IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.

SUGAR DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (ii).

—— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."

WALKERTON, CUSTOMS SEIZURES, SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3268, 3959 (ii).

—— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

—— SUB-COLLECTOR, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

[*See* "TARIFF," "SUPPLY," "WAYS AND MEANS," &c.]

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 155 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

CRIBBIN'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 156 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (Body Snatching) B. No. 161 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 4825 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. (Evidence in Criminal Cases) B. No. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

CROWN TIMBER AGENT, NEW WESTMINSTER: in Com. of Sup., 5189 (iii).

"CRUISER," MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS AND EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, PUBLICATION: in Com. of Sup., 942 (i).

—— *See* "COMMITTEES."

DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. resmd., 1014 (i).

—— *See* "NORTH SHORE RY."

Deck and Load Lines Provision B. No. 106 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE: presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).

DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

Detective Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE."

DETECTIVE (CUSTOMS) SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5053.

DIGBY, NEW PIER AT RAQUETTE: in Com. of Sup., 4532 (iii).

DIGBY, N.S., POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).

DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).

DINGWELL, J., PROF. SERVICES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

—— *re* INSTITUTIONS, &C., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr, *Watson*) 544 (i).

—— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).

DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

DISTILLERIES, &C., EXTRA DUTY PAY TO OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 5136 (iii).

DISTRESSED CANADIANS ABROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771; neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).

C. P. R, SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER GENERAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

CENSUS OF THE DOM.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 155 (Mr. *Bowell*): on M. for 3*, Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334 (iii).

DIVORCE (ADAM RUSSWORM) B. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*): 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. BELT, SETTLERS GRIEVANCES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 769; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 797 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; Main M., as amended, agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84), 332 (i).

GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).

GOV. GENERAL'S WARRANTS: on M. for Com. of Sup. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 570; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: on M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Minority Rep., 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Majority Rep. agreed to (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*), Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt. agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt., 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6026 (iii).

TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3506 (ii).

TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*
WAYS AND MEANS: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to conc. in Res., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081 (ii).
Divorce (Bristow, Thomas) B. No. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; M. for Com., 2550; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)
Divorce (Ellis, Mahala) B. No. 132 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1926; M. for 2°, 1989 (i); 2° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)
Divorce (Russworm, Adam) B. No. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2174; in Com. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)
Divorce (Tapley, Isabel) B. No. 134 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 135.)
DOCUMENTS MENTIONED IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i).
DOM. AID TO RAILWAYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
DOM. DAY, ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. House, neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 105; 2° m., 994; 2° and ref to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Barron*). 1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)
——— *See* "ELECTIONS."
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 108 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 3995 (ii); 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770, 6226; 3°*, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 5179, 6279; conc., 5433 (iii).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
——— ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 1754 (i).
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 1755 (i).
DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 511, 1557 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 910, 1558 (i).
——— SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).
DOUGLAS, JAMES, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).
DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
——— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell* 129 (i).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i), 4640, 5222.
——— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers* 1574 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3729, 4214 (ii).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUFRESNE, J. L., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).
DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 223 (i).
——— M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Frechette*) 198 (i).
EAST RIVER, N.S., DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).
Eddy, E. B., Mnfg. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 123.)
EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (ii).
EEL FISHERIES, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).
ELECTION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
ELECTIONS (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
——— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).
——— VOTES POLLED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
——— BELLECHASSE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).
——— GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112.
Elections Act. *See* "DOMINION."
Elections Acts Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 107; 2° m., 1029 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
ELECTIONS AND PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).
——— CONTROVERTED, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
——— SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).
Electoral Franchise. *See* "FRANCHISE."

ELECTORAL LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4347 (iii).
Electric Storage. *See* "ANGLO-CANADIAN."
ELEVATORS ON I. C. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 135 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579 (i).
ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
Ellis, Mahala. *See* "DIVORCE."
"Empire" Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 130.)
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).
——— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.
——— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i)
——— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).
See "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
ESTIMATES, THE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on Adjnmt. 214 (i).
——— 1891-92: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).
——— SUPPL., 1891: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 799 (i).
——— SUPPL.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).
——— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5589 (iii).
——— SUPPL., FURTHER, 1891-92: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 6289 (iii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 507, 1557 (i).
——— *See* "SUPREME."
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1724 (i), 5125 (iii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
——— BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4652 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mara*) 232 (i).
——— STALLIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).
——— PAPERS *re* Horses: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3200 (ii).
——— REP. OF DIRECTOR, &C.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
EXPENDITURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).
FABRE, HECTOR, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico B. No. 40 (Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Priv. B.'s, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)
FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
Female Offenders in Nova Scotia B. No. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 2203, 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)
FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).
FENIAN RAID, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3660 (ii).
Ferry, International. *See* "VICTORIA."
FINANCE:
AUDITOR GENERAL'S POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).
CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques; (Mr. *Lankerkin*) 4296 (iii).
CONSOLIDATED FUND: RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).
DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 527 (i).
——— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (i).
DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr, *McMillan*) 2520, 2906 (ii).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537: neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467 (iii).
P. O. SAVINGS BANKS, INTEREST ON DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE, ENQUIRY FOR RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4158 (ii).
QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, INTEREST OWING: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
QUE. RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i),
[*See* "BUDGET," "ESTIMATES," "SUPPLY," &C.]
Financial Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).
FISHERIES:
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA, SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).
——— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5354 (iii).
BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
—— PAID IN QUEEN'S CO., N.S. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).
BOUNTY CLAIMS BY PROVINCES, &C. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).
—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).
—— COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).
—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).
EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).
FISH-BREEDING : in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).
FISHERY LAWS, ENFORCEMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. NO. 3, N.S., RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).
FISHERY OVERSEER, GUYSBOROUGH, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii)
LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).
LAVALLÉE, N., FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).
LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).
—— CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
—— GRAND RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709.
—— GRANTED IN QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).
—— POUND NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).
—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).
FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).
—— GEORGIAN BAY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220(i).
—— SUPPLIES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).
—— WARDENS, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).
—— APPOINTMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).
FISH, FOREIGN, REGULATIONS *re* BONDING : Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).
FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH CO. : ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).
MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).
OYSTER BEDS, LEASING, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4157 (ii).
ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).
SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).
[*See* "NEWFOUNDLAND," "SUPPLY," &c.]

Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

FISHERIES DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 1547 (i).

Fisheries Development. *See* "SEA FISHERIES."

FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).

FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii), 6268 (iii).

Fishermen's Safety B. No. 114 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1406 (i).

Fishing Vessels. *See* "U. S."

FITZGERALD, G. W., FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).

Foreshores. *See* "PROVINCIAL GOVTS., B. 111."

FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178.

FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).

FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT : Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT, 1885 : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 4** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 105 ; 2° m., 767 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 769 ; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 771 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 774 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 775 ; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 776 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 777 ; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 778 ; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 779 ; (Mr. *Denison*) 781 ; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 781 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 783 ; (Mr. *Choquette*) 785 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 787 ; (Mr. *Dupont*) 788 ; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 791 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 792 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 795 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 8** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 106 ; Order for 2°, 206 ; 2° m, 295 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 305 ; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 ; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 31** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 156 ; 2° m., 999 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001 ; agreed to, 1003 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 334 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i) ; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 98 (Mr. *Barron*) 1°, 738 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2336 ; 2°* and in Com., 3082 ; 3°*, 3098 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

FRANKUM, J., PENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

FRASER RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 4594 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

Frauds on Farmers Prevention B. No. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°, 1003 ; Order for Com. read, 1014 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).

Frauds upon the Government B. No. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 5589 ; 2°, 5751 ; in Com., 6289, 6327 ; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. No. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).
FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P.O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GARRISON CLUB, QUEBEC, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
GAS, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &c., OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4512 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 48.)
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
——— EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198
——— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 410 (i), 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
——— REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 4574.
GIGUERE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
GLIDDON, WM., SPECIAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i.)
GOODWIN, LATE JAS., CLAIMS OF HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 6198, 6296 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Wednesdays, 1730.
——— Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday sittings, 6127 (iii).
GOVT., FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5066, 5424, 6276 (iii).
Govt. Piers. *See* "HARBOURS."
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. House, 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1113; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1120; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1126; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1128; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1131; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1135; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1136; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1142; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1145; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1150; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1159; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1162; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1166; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1172; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1174; (Mr. *Costigan*) 1176; (Mr. *Lister*) 1180; (Mr. *Curran*) 1183; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1187; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1191; (Mr. *Daly*) 1192; (Mr. *Montague*) 1194; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1195; (Mr. *Savard*) 1196 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 959, 1013 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
GOV. GEN'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 240, 433 (i).
——— WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (ii).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
——— Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 3200 (ii).
Grain. *See* "WEIGHERS."
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
——— IRON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
——— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAND MANAN, N.B., AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 69.)
GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCKS. *See* "ESQUIMALT," "LÉVIS" AND "KINGSTON."
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B No. 124 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 98.)
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s Correction B. No. 162 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 80.)
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).
GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii), 6198(iii).
GROSSE ISLAND QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
Guelph Junction Ry. *See* "C.P.R."
GUÉVREMONT, HON. SENATOR, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4671 (iii).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).
——— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).
HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6179 (iii).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).

HALIFAX SUFFERANCE WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (ii).
HALL, W. H., CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4151 (ii).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HAMILTON P. O., ADDITIONAL CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.), INTEREST OWING GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "QUEBEC."
HARBOURS, DOCKS AND SLIDES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4665 (iii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4530, 4552, 4954, 5438, 6254 (iii).
Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters (Govt.) Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)
HARPUR, H. G., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i).
HARTNEY, H., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
HASTING COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
HEATING BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474.
HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPT. *re* ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
——— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2669 (ii).
——— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT.-COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 573; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 579; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 589; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 636; (Mr. *Davin*) 646; (Mr. *Mulock*) 653; (Mr. *Tupper*) 659; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 682; (Mr. *Dickey*) 690; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 698; (Mr. *Charlton*) 808; (Mr. *Kenny*) 817; (Mr. *Fraser*) 828; (Mr. *Gillies*) 842; (Mr. *Langelier*) 848; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 851; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 851; (Mr. *Skinner*) 861; (Mr. *Flint*) 867; (Mr, *Dupont*) 876 (i).
——— AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 411, 431, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
——— SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
Home Circles. *See* "CANADIAN ORDER."
HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: conc., 5433 (iii).
HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
——— deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302 (ii).
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i), 3200 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).
ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY. ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Mess. from His Ex., 227 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3218 (ii), 4613, 6329 (iii).
BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).
BOURINOT, J. G.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O.: Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i),
CHICOUTIMI, REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).
COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
IN COM. OF SUP., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS (HALTON): Judgment 5 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "COMMITTEES."
DIVISIONS, MEMBERS VOTES: (Mr. *Speaker's* ruling), 4455 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday Sittings 6127 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
——— Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1013 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 959 (i).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HARTNEY, H.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).
MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).
——— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).
——— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1883 (i).
——— DRAPING CHAMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 883 (i).
MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
MEMBER, NEW: Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MESS. FROM HIS EX., 111, 227, 550, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
GOVERNMENT, FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (ii).
MOTIONS, PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.
ORDER, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER."
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3226 (ii), 4488 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7th: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 6329,
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: 1543, 1991 (i), 2204, 2936, 2964, 3427, 3822, 3947 (ii), 5331 (iii). *See* "ORDER."
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS. *See* general heading.
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER," &c.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM. *See* general heading.
QUEBEC, WEST. *See* general heading.
ROULEAU, F. F.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI; Notification of Ret. (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse., 4533 (iii).
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP.: Appmnt. announced (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEPUTY, ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
—— DOCUMENTS MENTIONED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i),
—— Prorogation, 6330 (iii).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3827 (ii).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).
WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
[*See* "SECRETARY OF STATE," "SUPPLY," &c.]
HULL P. O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup.
Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5224; (Mr. *Davin*) 5224; (Mr. *Fraser*) 5229; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 5236; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5240; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5245; (Mr. *Dawson*) 5249; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 5251; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5256; (Mr. *Watson*) 5259; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5264; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 5265; (Mr. *Hazen*) 5271; (Mr. *King*) 5277; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 5280; (Mr. *Forbes*) 5283 (iii).
IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
—— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 3579, 4800, 5224; conc., 4514.
IMMIGRATION, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE: Ques. *Amyot*) 5075 (i).
—— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
IMPERIAL FEDERATION AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.
Incorporated Construction Co.'s incorp. B. No. 128 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
Indian Act (*Chap.* 43 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No 144** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
Indian Lands Settlement B. No. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.* c. 5.)
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
INDIANS:
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264, 1272 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).
—— LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264 (ii).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6147 (iii).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i), 4727, 5059, 6272; conc., 4515, 5411, 5419 (iii).
JONES, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*, &c.) on adjnmt., 1403 i).
PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
REGINA, INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
SEA BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 209 (i).
SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
—— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.: M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]
Industrial Designs. *See* "TRADE MARKS."

INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (iii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (ii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 46.)

INLAND REVENUE :

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194; in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).

NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

STRATFORD EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FEES : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

[*See* "COLLECTION OF REVENUES" under "SUPPLY."]

INSPECTORS OF PORTS : in Com. of Sup., 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).

Inspection. *See* "GENERAL," "PETROLEUM," "SHIPS," &c.

INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 50.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

CARON, MISS LEA, CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

CONTRACT FOR REFRESHMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3617 (ii).

EMPLOYÉS, ENQUIRY AT ST. FLAVIE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937. (i).

HOGG, WALTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5407 (iii).

HALIFAX, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 1653, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197 (iii).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, STONE HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i)).

MCCULLY, S. W., EMPLYMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3613 (ii).

MANAGEMENT ; Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3780 (ii).

RATES FOR CLERGYMEN : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3261.

REDUCTION OF LABOURERS' PAY : Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 3266 (ii).

ST. JOHN, ADDITIONAL PROPERTY : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).

ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2145 (ii).

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

[*See* "RYS.," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTEREST, COMPUTING : in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).

—— 1 PER CENT. COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).

—— ON DEPOSITS IN P. O. SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).

INTERIOR :

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Devdney*) 103 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., 629 (i); deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 193 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).

—— MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).

GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 247, 433 (i), 6169 (iii).

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

N. W. T. SETTLEMENT, prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913 (ii).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i),

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

TIMBER CUT ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6 : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

—— CUT IN DISPUTED TERRITORY ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).

—— Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

—— INTO QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

—— LEGISLATION *re* WHOLESALE SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 961 (i).

—— SALE TO INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

Inverness and Victoria Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2321; M. for Com., 2858; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

IRON BOUNTIES PAID: Enquiry for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5014, 5195 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674 (iii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
JENNINGS, MR., APPOINTMENT BY GOVT. AS CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2522 (ii).
JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, ARREARS OF ROYALTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
JOHNSTON, S., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076, 5405 (iii).
——— MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 511 (i).
——— *See* "QUEEN'S BENCH."
Judges. *See* "PROVINCIAL COURTS."
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i), 6169; conc., 6303 (iii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1547 (i).
Justice. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
JUSTICE:
ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).
CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).
——— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).
——— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).
JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908 (ii).
——— IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).
——— APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, PETS. *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
——— EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 807.
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT. *See* general heading.
PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).
QUEEN'S BENCH, QUEBEC, DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3620 (ii), 5405 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Continued.*
QUEEN'S BENCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (iii).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE; Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]
KAMINISTIQUIA HARBOUR, RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600 (i).
——— PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
——— TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (iii).
KEEWATIN, GOVT. OF, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques: (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).
KILTED BATTALION, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 6182.
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 66.)
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Notice of prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).
——— PAPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).
——— MILLS, SURVEY ABOVE: in Com. of Sup., 1666.
——— PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3260 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 882, 908 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
KINGSTON, P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962, 1266 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
——— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 95.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).
LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).
LABORATORY, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 5054 (iii).
LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).
Labour Prohibition. *See* "ALIEN."

LABOUR STATISTICAL BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).
LACHINE P.O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER, N.S. *See* "SAWDUST."
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).
LAKE ST. CLAIR, POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).
Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
——— PETS., *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
LAMOUREAUX BROS.' CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4147.
Land Grants to Rys. Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)
Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s Authorization B. No. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 3308; in Com., 5487, 5593, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)
Land Grants to Militia Provision B. No. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com., 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, DISTRIBUTION OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 4000 (ii).
——— ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies, &c. (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).
——— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1267, 1575 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1st, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjmnt., 737 (i).
——— STONE HAULED OVER I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).
——— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4338 (iii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).
L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS," &c.
LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).
LEASE OF BUILDING, SPARKS ST.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).
LEATHER TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (iii).
LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iii).
LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).
LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).
LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
——— MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 945 (i).
LICENSES (FISHING) CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
——— GRANTED IN QUEBEC: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).
——— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).
——— POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 228, 529 (i).
——— SALMON FISHING, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii), 6266 (iii).
"LILY," H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
LINDSAY P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).
LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LITIGATED MATTERS, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1707 (i), 5107 (iii).

LITTLE CURRENT IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4573 (iii).

LITTLE NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL, N. S., P. O. ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4679 (iii).

Live Stock Shipping B. No. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1°* of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

LIVE STOCK AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).

LOBO P.O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

London and Can. Loan and Agency Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

London Life Ins. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104; 2°m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

LUNATICS IN KEEWATIN, SUPPORT: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

LUNENBURG P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6201 (iii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).

——— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).

——— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 883 (i).

——— MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (i).

MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

MACDONELL, MR., M.P., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iii).

MACKENZIE AND PEACE RIVERS INDIAN TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3257.

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 125.)

MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4678, 5349, 5450 (iii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4520 (iii).

Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co's. incorp. B. No. 129 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 1964 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MANITOBA:

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

——— ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).

INSANE ASYLUM: in Com. of Sup., 5072 (iii).

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 913 (i), 6171 (iii).

PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).

PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*, *Lisgar*) 1012 (i)

SCHOOL ACTS: M. for Pets., &c, (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) 1766 (i).

SCHOOL QUESTION, PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 741, 807 (i).

SEPARATE SCHOOLS, ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

——— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O. C.'S GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

[*See* "INTERIOR," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY."]

MAPLE SUGAR, BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

MAP OF DOM., HISTORICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

"MARIE ELIZA," M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
MARINE DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103.
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
MARITIME PROVINCES, GEOLOGICAL MAPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).
Maritime Sulphite Fibre Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)
MARINE :
"ALERT," STEAMER, APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).
"BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
"LILLY" H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).
MONTREAL PILOTS : Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, IMPROVMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LA HAVE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
"SEIGFREID," SCH., REWARDS TO CAPT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, REFIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &C., &C., DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 140 ; 2°, 1066 ; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102 ; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)
MASTERS, C. H., DRAFTING CRIMINAL LAW, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
MASON, JNO., CARPENTER, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iii).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°*, 189 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)
MEMBER, NEW : Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).
Meridian Time. *See* "RECKONING."
MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).
MESSAGES FROM HIS EX. :
CARLETON BRANCH RY., SALE, 550 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, for 1891-92, 227 (i).
—— Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i).
—— Suppl., 1891-92, 5589 (iii).
—— Further Suppl., 6289 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 111 (i)), 2144 (ii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, 726, 1199 (i).
METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).
METAL PILLARS FOR PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, COST OF SUPPLY : in Com. of Sup., 5138 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."
Militia Act Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 106 (i).
Militia and Defence Act (*Chap.* 41 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 174** (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1°, 6126 (iii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE :
ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11 : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.), MAGAZINE, &C. : M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S and SOREL, PAY ROLL : M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 1 : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 7, SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3264 (ii).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
—— SCHOOL, TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—*Continued.*
IN COM. OF SUP., 1573 (i), 3699, 3717, 4214, 4236 (ii), 6182, 6245 (iii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257.
MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).
—— CADETS ENTERED SINCE FOUNDATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4297 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONS TO GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3960 (ii).
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).
PENSIONS, PERMANENT CORPS, &C., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PROPERTIES, CARE AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3734 (ii).
REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).
STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3717 (ii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).
VETERANS OF 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923, 3287 (ii).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).
WHITMAN, CAPT. C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
WINNIPEG MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4532.
—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).
—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, RUMOURED RESIGNATION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION: Announced (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
MINOR REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6303, 6169 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i), 5081, 5346, 5417, 6261; conc., 5426 (iii).
Modus Vivendi. *See* "U. S."
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Ives*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
—— AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)
MONTREAL AND MILE END, &C., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
—— CUSTOMS HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).
—— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).
—— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)
—— PILOTS: Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).
MONUMENT OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (ii).
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (i).
—— PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE:
BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (iii).
COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 5086: conc., 5427 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPTL. ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
—— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i), 2669 (ii).
—— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res, (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT. COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
IN COM. OF SUP., 1697 (i), 4817, 6274; conc., 5415, 5427 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LAIDLOW, WM., RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
PRESS ARTICLE *re* REFORM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269.
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: in Com, of Sup., 3898 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i), 4125 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
—— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. REMI RY. SUBSIDY, PETS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 4663 (iii).
NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4533.
NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
—— *See* "C. P. R."
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).
NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).
NEWFOUNLAND BAIT ACT, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3267 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iii).
—— TRADE RELATIONS: Mess. from His. Ex., 736, 1199 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
NEW HARBOUR, &C., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
NORTH SHORE RY., DEBENTURES, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
—— M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525, 527 (i).
North Shore Ry. *See* "C. P. R."
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).
AMBER DEPOSITS, APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).
BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Continued.*
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
—— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (ii).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221.
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (ii).
HERCHMER, COMMISSIONER. *See* general heading.
IMMIGRATION, MEMORIALS OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE. *See* general heading.
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
REGINA "LEADER", PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
SETTLEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913.
See "GOVERNMENT."
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 174 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).
N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; 2° and in Com., 3925 (ii), 4297; 3°*, 4299; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
N.W.T. Representation Act Ant. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1101 (i).
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Stmnt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4085 (ii)
—— Formal Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4462 (iii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4533 (iii).
—— SITTINGS OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4670.
—— PRINTING EVIDENCE, 4825 (iii).
—— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *Skinner*) 5487 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5553 (iii).
—— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc., 5612; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Rep. conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 5636; (Mr. *Barron*) 5644; (Mr. *German*) 5664; (Mr. *Masson*) 5672: (Mr. *Flint*) 5687; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5701; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5708; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5722 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA :

ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDER AND CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).

—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).

ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).

BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i),

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES : M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).

" BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i),

CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).

CAPE BRETON AND N.S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).

—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Dougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).

CENTREVILLE BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).

HALIFAX CITY MARKET PROPERTY, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).

COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &C. : M. for Cor. &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).

DIGBY POSTAL ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).

EAST RIVER, DEEPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011.

FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).

FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. NO. 3, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).

FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).

FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178 (i).

FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *White, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).

—— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).

HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).

INDIANS IN ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).

INGLIS, BANDMASTER OF 69TH BAT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

KENTVILLE POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).

LAHAVE RIVER, SAWDUST DEPOSITS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

LIVERPOOL P. O. ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).

MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).

NEW HARBOUR, &C., BREAKWATERS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).

PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).

RAQUETTE PIER, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RYS. IN INVERNESS CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

" SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARD TO CAPTAIN, &C. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).

SHORT LINE RAILWAY, NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).

SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).

SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

STONY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).

WHITMAN, CAPT C. W. S., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

[*See* " SUPPLY," &C.]

Oaths of Office. *See* " ADMINISTRATION."

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii), 6265 (iii).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL TO GIBSON : in Com. of Sup., 4728 (ii) ; conc., 5411 (iii).

Okanagon Ry. Co. *See* " C. P. R."

OLD MAN'S RIVER, FORT MACLEOD, FREE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).

OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION : in Com. of Sup., 5084, 5124 (iii).

O'MEARA, D. D., ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).

Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*). Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230 ; 2°, 3593 (ii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 Vic., c. 110.)

ONT. MUNICIPALITIES, DEPUTATION, COR. IN MONTREAL " GAZETTE " : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 389 (i).

Ont. and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 891 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

ONTARIO :

ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICERS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 3259 (ii).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).
BAY OF QUINTE, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
—— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 1272 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
—— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO. 1: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
—— SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CHARLEBOIS & CO., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM POST OEFICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3931 (ii).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.
COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).
COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.), TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD; M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Bain*), 223 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.
ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPEDTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i);
—— *See* general heading.
FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques, (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

FISHERY PROTECTION, GEORGIAN BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
—— SUPPLIES; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).
FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
—— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK. *See* "KINGSTON."
HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
—— MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212,
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, NORTH BRUCE, LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
INDIAN AGENT ALLEN, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
—— AGENT AT SUTTON, WEST; Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
—— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
—— AGENT JONES, CHARGES AGAINST; Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
—— RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
—— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
KINGSTON DRY DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i),
—— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
—— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3260 (i).
KINGSTON P.O., LESSEES OF BOXES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
—— LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).
—— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i);
LANGEVIN BLOCK. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).

LICENSES FOR POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

LINDSAY, P. O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225.

——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret * (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MILITIA. *See* general heading.

NAPANEE, GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 2154 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, RIDEAU CANAL, SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).

PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (ii).

——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).

——— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).

——— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).

SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).

STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).

TAY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

——— P. O., CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 963 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Traux*) 2151 (ii).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

COBOURG HARBOUR, IN COM. OF SUP.: Reference by Mr. *Mulock* to a past deb. questioned by Mr. *Foster*. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 4658 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. (SUGAR DUTIES): Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language and referring to matters connected with Committees outside the House. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 5330 (iii).

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. 147: On M. to adjn. deb. on 1°, Member called to Order by Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) for imputing improper motives to previous speaker *re* conduct of certain returning officers, 2370. Mr. *Speaker's* ruling, and remarks wthdn., 2371 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8: On 2°, Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language, the same wthdn., 324 (i).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS: Raising discussions; intervention of Mr. *Speaker* calling for the Orders of the Day, 1013 (i).

NEWSPAPER REPORTS, INCORRECT: Reading of same ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2962 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Member requested by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* to confine himself to question before the Chair, 4757 (iii).

PROHIBITION DEB.: Unparliamentary expressions. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member who uses them must withdraw same absolutely and without qualification, 1332, 1334 1341 (i).

P. E. I. RY., IN COM. OF SUP.: Member's remarks checked, by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, in referring to a past deb., 3671 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
ORDER—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., SITTINGS, &c.: Remarks of Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) called in question by Sir *John Thompson*, 984; on M. for adjmnt., Mr. *Speaker* drew Member's attention to the fact that he was not speaking to the subject, 987; further remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 991 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ACCTS. *re* BOURCIER: on M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. to Com., objection taken by Mr. *Foster*, notice not having been given; objection sustained by Mr. *Speaker* and M. ruled out of Order, 3949 (ii).
—— ACCTS. *re* P. O. DEPT.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref. objected to; ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2517 (ii).
—— PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) objected to by Mr. *Wallace*. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that same can only be put by unanimous consent of the House, 2375 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to rescind Order of House, *re* Witnesses under Oath, objected to by Mr. *Laurier* and same sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, no notice being given, 1925 (i), 2517 (ii).
REGINA "LEADER," AMOUNTS PAID: Toronto *Globe's* statement, culled from Auditor Gen.'s Rep., repudiated by Mr. *Davin*, 4241; speaking disrespectfully of a Member of another branch of the Legislature ruled out of Order and withdrawal requested by Mr. *Speaker*, 4242 (iii).
SECOND HOMESTEADS, RELEVANCY OF DEB.: Objection taken by Sir *John Thompson* to Member introducing private business transactions into deb. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) subject-matter introduced not relevant, 616 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL: Reference to previous deb. ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 215 (i).
WEST INDIES SS. SUBSIDIES: Members addressing the House should not make insinuations (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 4974 (iii).
—— Discussion ruled out of Order; M. to adjn. should be made before Member can make a speech (Mr. *Speaker*) 195.
PRIVILEGE:
BINDING TWINE DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Stairs*) correction of speech, 2936 (ii).
CIRCULAR ADDRESSED TO INDIANS: Publication of same repudiated by the Member for Haldimand, 2474. Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2475 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: Personal Explanation *re* incorrect rep. of speech on the Budget, 1991 (i).
FEDERAL AND QUEBEC POLITICS: Article in *L'Electeur* and Mr. Mackintosh's visit to Montreal; personal explanation (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 5351 (iii).
LIBERAL MEETING (ALLEGED) IN MONTREAL: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Beausoleil*) *re* telegram forwarded to Toronto *Empire* newspaper, 3427.
MONTREAL PILOTS: Cor. in Montreal *Herald*, *re* grounding of ship *Trobique*, read by Mr. *Delisle*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Formal statement, Mr. *Cameron* (*Huron*) read, 4085; cannot be entered upon the Journals unless a motion is made (Mr. *Speaker*) 4087 (ii).
—— REP. OF SEL. COM.: Rep. in Ottawa *Free Press*, *re* Investigation. Remarks (Mr. *Skinner*) 5384 (iii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
ORANGE INFLUENCE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) *re* statement made in House and contradicted by the Minister of Customs; extract from *Globe* of 1883 read, 1964 (i).
—— (Mr. *Wallace*) *re* report of speech in Toronto *Mail*, 2962; reference to incorrect report of remarks not made in the House, ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not in Order, 2962; authority quoted, 2963 (ii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Alleged breaking denied (Mr. *Colter*) and attention of the House drawn to offensive newspaper articles in Ottawa *Citizen* and Montreal *Gazette*, 3578 (ii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Edwards*) Remarks, and Letter from Mr. *Ross* (*Lisgar*) read, 3822 (ii).
PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE; Report published in the Toronto *Mail*, misstatement corrected by Mr. *Charlton*, 2069 (i).
PROHIBITION DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Scriver*) *re* Speech and quotations made, 2204 (ii).
REUTER'S AGENCY AND DESPATCH IN LONDON "TIMES": Truthfulness denied by Mr. *Tarte*, 4239. Quoting from paper of proceedings that did not occur in the House not a question of privilege; only statements by newspapers respecting proceedings of the House is a Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4239 (iii).
ROOM PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Murray*) *re* paragraph in Toronto *Empire* reflecting on the Member for Pontiac, 806 (i).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Personal Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Minister of Inland Revenue not referred to in remarks, 3974 (ii).
TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Cor. in Charlottetown *Daily Examiner* taken exception to by Mr. *Cockburn*, and rights and privileges of Members claimed from Mr. *Speaker*, 1604 (i).
VOTE ON TRADE, SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S AMT.: paragraph *re* Refusal, as published in Toronto *Empire*, denied, 3200 (ii).
WANT OF CONFIDENCE VOTE (ALLEGED): Remarks (Mr. *Joncas*) on article in *Le Monde* newspaper, 1346 (i).
PROCEDURE:
ADJOURNMENTS: Mr. *Laurier* having moved the adjnmt. of the deb. subsequently moved the adjnmt. of the House, at which objection was taken by Mr. *Ouimet* as to regularity of procedure. Objection ruled by Mr. *Speaker* to be well taken and M. to adjn. the House wthdn., 6027 (iii).
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT: Questions put to Ministers on Orders of the Day being called not being questions of urgency ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 1298 (i).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: On M. for Com. of Sup., Mr. *Flint's* remarks *re* declaration ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker* and Rule read, 6147 (iii).
CONCURRENCE: Members' attention directed by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule that Items must be taken as they are called, 4278 (iii).
EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES B. 11: On 2°, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the mover of the B. has not the right of reply, the 2° being on Order of the Day and not a substantive motion, 2961 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, PAPERS, &c.: On M. for Com. of Sup., Member's remarks checked on referring to papers and evidence taken before the Pub. Accts. Com., the same not having been reported to the House, 3656; Member ruled not in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 3658 (ii).
MEMBER SPEAKING TWICE: On M. for 2° of B. 103, Member having spoken his right to make a second speech exhausted. Rule quoted (Mr. *Speaker*) 3306 (ii).
MEMBER'S VOTE CHALLENGED: Must be in the House when the question is put by the Speaker, or vote cannot be recorded (Mr. *Speaker*) 4428 (ii).
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS: Member not present when motion which stands in his name is called, the same will be dropped, unless it stands at the request of the Government (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
PROHIBITION, ON ADJNMT.: Criticising conduct of Govt. and interrupting Order of Business can only take place by consent of the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 546 (i).
—— VOTE ON MR. FOSTER'S AMT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) should be made on the Orders of the Day being called, 1544 (i).
READING SPEECHES: Attention of Mr. *Speaker* being called to the fact of Member reading his speech, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the same is not permissible, the Rule being imperative that written speeches cannot be delivered; extracts may be read, 716 (i).
RESUMING DEBATE ON M. TO ADJN. THE HOUSE: M. to adjn. the deb. having been voted on and negatived, Mr. *Ouimet* (6031) raised the question "That under the cover of a M. of adjnmt. an hon. member is not allowed to speak on a question which is on the Order Paper;" authorities (May and Bourinot) quoted in support. Mr. *Speaker* partly agreed in the question raised, but could not agree that a Member cannot discuss the question which was before the House when the adjnmt. is moved, 6032 (iii).
QUARANTINE (U.S.) REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. *McMullen*) ruled out of Order, and authority quoted *re* making a speech on Calling of Orders (Mr. *Speaker*) 743 (i).
SUBSIDIES (MONEY) TO RYS. RES. IN COM.: Objection taken by Mr. *Mulock* to Member discussing railways not in the resolutions before the Com. Mr. *Deputy Speaker* sustained the objection, 6136 (iii).
SUGAR DUTIES: Order called for House in Com. of Whole on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*). Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) the M. anticipating a discussion on the Order Paper, according to Parliamentary practice, cannot be taken up, 1931 (i).
VOTING ON DIVISIONS: The question being raised as to recording a Member's vote, he entering the House during the reading of a motion, Mr. *Speaker* quoted from Bourinot to the effect that "If a Member was not present in the House when the question was put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded," 4455. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member must be in the House and have heard the question read from the beginning, in either official language, to entitle him to vote, 4462 (iii).

Ordnance Lands. *See* "QUEBEC SKATING CLUB."
—— in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
—— MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 5409 (iii).
—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Madill*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. on 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s, &c., B. No. 96 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
—— GROUNDS AROUND BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4470 (iii).
—— P. O., ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).
—— IN "LE CANADA": M. for Ret. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
—— RIVER, CHANNEL THROUGH NARROWS: in Com. of Sup., 4571 (iii).
—— DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii).
—— GATINEAU BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4565 (iii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i), 6197 (iii).
—— AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).
OYSTER BEDS, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii), 5157 (iii).
PALMER, LATE CHIEF JUSTICE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor, &c.*) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3426 (ii), 4488 (iii).
PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5081 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, opening, 1 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*, &c.) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).
PASPASCKASE RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 142 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 953 (ii).
Patents. *See* "CORBIN."
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PAYNE, LATE JAS., ALLOWANCE TO HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Aymot*) 3258 (ii).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 121.)
PEMBROKE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4369 (iii).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 242, 882, 1558 (i), 6170 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1572, 1729 (i), 3660 (ii).
—— PERMANENT CORPS, &C., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
PERMANENT FORCES, BATTERIES AND SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3737 (i).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Beausoleil*) par. in *Empire* newspaper, 3427 (ii).
—— (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* Minister of Inland Rev., 3947 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Edwards*) *re* Pairs, 3822 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Mackintosh*) *re* par. in *L'Electeur*, 5351.
—— (Mr. *McNeil*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i).
—— (Mr. *Montague*) *Hansard* Rep., 1991 (i).
—— (Mr. *Scriver*) Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Stairs*) Speech on Binding Twine, 2936.
—— (Mr. *Wallace*) Orange Influence, par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962, 2964 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Charlton*) quotation from *Globe*, 1883, read, 1964 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4370, 6246 (iii).
—— P. O. CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 63.)
PETERSON, CAPT., REWARD FOR SAVING LIFE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372.
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 3426; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 49.)
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). 1°, 388; 2°, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 111.)
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Acts Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 54.)
PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3951 (ii).
PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).
PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).
POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., STEEL PLATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
PORT ARTHUR P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4371 (iii).
PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).
PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 6254.
PORT MULGRAVE, &C., AND CHETICAMP SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).
PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
PORTER, DAVID, CLAIM: Remarks (Mr. *Madill*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6229 (iii).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 254, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
—— DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOMINION, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).
POST OFFICE:
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
BRAMPTON, POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
—— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &C.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (ii).
—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).
DIGBY, POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, DISMISSAL, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *Barron* 3200 (ii).
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).

IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.

IN COM. OF SUP., 1744 (i), 4705, 6279 (iii).

KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).

KINGSTON P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).

—— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).

—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i),

LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL P.O., ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LYSTER POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

MONTREAL P.O., LETTER CONCERNING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 2521 (ii).

OTTAWA P.O. ADVERTISING, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c., (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).

—— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).

QUEBEC P.O., SUNDAY CLOSING; Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i),

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

ST. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M, for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &c., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. HELEN'S, MAIL SERVICE *viâ* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955, 3956 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

—— UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison* 131 (i).)

WELDFORD, N.B., P.O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT CROWN LANDS OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).

—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 1274 (i).

BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

—— DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).

FISHERY WARDENS, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.

—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

OYSTER BEDS, LEASING: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 3951 (ii).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765.

RED POINT PIER, EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1371 (ii).

SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).
—— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
—— HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673 (iii).
—— REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).
TUNNEL BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).
—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4294 (ii).
WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
P. E. I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).
P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS: Enquiry for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 4000 (iii).
—— EMPLOYÉS, DISMISSAL: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4087 (ii).
—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i), 3898 (ii), 6198 (i).
—— ROAD-BED AND RAILS: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— TRAIN SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
PRINTING, ADVERTISING, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1756 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).
—— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 243, 442 (i), 6166 (iii).
PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 2437 (ii).
—— ADDITIONAL PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1706, (i), 5346 (iii).
—— BABCOCK FIRE EXTINGUISHERS: in Com. of Sup., 6253 (iii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4393 (iii).
—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).
—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).
—— TYPE-SETTING MACHINES: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 271 (i).
PRINTING, CLAIM OF LATE CONTRACTORS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).
PRINTING COM., JOINT: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).
PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: conc., 5418 (iii).
PRINTING, PAPER, BINDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 946.
—— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 528 (i).
PRINTING TIME TABLES, &c., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 128 (i).
—— PRESENTATION, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 156 (ii).
—— REPS. FROM COM., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3738 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2961 (ii).
—— REP. FROM COMS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 828, 1483 (i), 2233, 3308 (iii)
—— SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 286; M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1987 (i).
Private Detective, Financial, &c., Corporations Regulations B. No. 109 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 1011 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*, &c.) 983, 1987 (i).
—— PRINTING EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5352 (iii).
—— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i).
—— 2ND REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) reducing Quorum, 2360 (ii).
—— 4TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 3738 (ii).
—— 5TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4085 (ii)
—— 6TH REP., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4825 (iii).
—— 7TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 5553 (iii).
—— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER," &c.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1556 (i), 6167 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6309 (iii).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 271; Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 344; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 355; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).
—— COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).
—— Order for further consdn. postponed, 993 (i).
—— Remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin, &c.*) 545, 736.
Provincial Accounts (Ont. and Que.) Settlement B. No. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 6.)
PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).
Provincial Courts Judges Act (*Chap.* 138 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 153** (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop. 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 27.)
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. No. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 7.)
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE:
ACCOUNTS *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURCIER & Co.'S ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURGEOIS, G. A., PAYMENT: M. (Mr. *Choquette*) to ref. Accts., 2361, 2437 (ii).
BRADLEY, W. I., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref., 5013 (iii).
COR., PUBLIC WORKS AND FINANCE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to produce, 3199 (ii).
DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. Accts., 2203 (ii).
EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2516 (ii).
FUNCTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4088 (i).
HAYTER AND GORMAN'S ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) to ref., 2743 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 3621 (ii).
P. O. D. ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref., 2517 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 2666 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU ACCTS.&C.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2905 (ii).
—— PAPER ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* J. R. ARNOLDI: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
—— *re* AUDIT OFFICE: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 5013 (iii).
—— Ms. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2374, 3513 (ii).
—— 21ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sproule*) 4608 (iii).
RET., &C., *re* GRAVING DOCK: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3576 (ii).
TÊTU, J. E., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2517.
TORONTO HARBOUR CONTRACT: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref. Accts., 5013 (iii).
WITNESSES' EVIDENCE: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4089 (ii).
WITNESSES ON OATH: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1345 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1925 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 255, 397, 439 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, CHARGES OF CONSPIRACY: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Tarte*) 146; Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to ref. to Priv. and Elec. Com., agreed to, 155 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7TH REP. OF COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6125 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Tarte*) 5791, 6122; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5824; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 5853; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5881; Amt., 5919 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 5919; (Mr. *Amyot*) 5999; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6034; (Mr. *Laurier*) 6043; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6064; Amt. to Amt., 6085 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) 6086; (Mr. *Davin*) 6100; (Mr. *Edgar*) 6100; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6112; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6115; (Mr. *Mulock*) 6119 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. to summon Hon. T. Robitaille (Mr. *Girouard*) 2437 (ii).
—— M. Connolly's Books produced, notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 954 (i).
—— PAPERS: Enquiry (Mr. *Edgar*) 219, 395, 746. [*See* "BANCROFT," "CONNOLLY," "LARKIN;" *also* "ESQUIMALT," "KINGSTON," "LÉVIS."]
—— Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec. *re* M. Connolly read, 895 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.: M. for Pet.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1579 (i).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1849 (i).
—— EMPLOYÉS, RET.: Welland Canal employés, enquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 3200 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION OF MINISTER: Stmnt. read (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).
—— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).
BARRIE P.O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1270 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).
—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).
BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).
BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT. &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208.
BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
—— P.E.I., WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
—— QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104, 1041 (i).
—— M. for Eng.'s Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).
BUCKINGHAM P.O.: CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i),

CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).

CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).

CHATHAM P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).

COATICOOK P.O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

—— EAST RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).

—— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).

—— RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600.

—— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).

—— LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

—— OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii),

—— "PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

—— "ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

—— ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

—— BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUÈRE, REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).

—— SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).

—— THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: M. for O. Co.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (i).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

—— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

—— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.

FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

GALT P.O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Ques. and Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674, 5014, 5195 (iii).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref. to Public Accts. Com., 3621 (ii).

—— BANCROFT TENDER: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

—— Notice for prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).

—— ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).

—— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &C.*: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 127, 128 (i).

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).

LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).

—— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).

—— STONE HAULED OVER I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).

—— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock* 1267, 1575 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LINDSAY PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr; *Perry*) 130 (i).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NEW HARBOUR, &C., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 226 (i).

NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PETERBOROUGH P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1668, 1685, 1728, (i), 4314, 4444, 552, 4640, 4663, 6201, 6304 (iii).

—— DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.: (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1579 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RED POINT PIER, P. E. I., EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336.
—— M. for Engineers Rep. (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS, REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).
—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).
—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).
—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).
STRATHROY P. O., BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
TIGNISH HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259, 4673 (iii).
THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).
TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).
TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 203, 227 (i).
—— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).
VAUDREUIL WHARF, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548.
VICTORIA, B. C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).
—— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151 (ii)
—— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).
WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).
WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226, 1271 (i).
WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).

[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

PUGSLEY, WM., PET.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to ref. to Standing Orders Com., 799 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i), 3576, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS, U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen, &c.*) 742 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 982; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 107.)
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
—— INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.
—— LAFORCE LANGEVIN'S SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
—— CONTRACTS, REP. OF COM.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) summoning M. Connolly to Bar of House, 806 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
QUEBEC P. O., SUNDAY CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).
QUEBEC RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Land B. No. 160 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com., 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 14.)
QUEBEC WATER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
QUEBEC, WEST, EXPULSION OF MEMBER: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6285 (iii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Ordering attendance of Member, 3827 (ii).
—— Order for attendance of Member read, 4001 (ii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Arrest, 4001 (ii).
—— SEAT, REP. OF SUB.-COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4747 (iii).
—— VACANCY, ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6286 (iii).
—— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4081 (ii), 6309 (iii).
—— ON ISSUE OF WRIT: Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4088 (ii).
—— *Superscdeas* WARRANT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5014 (iii).

QUEBEC:

"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C.: M. for O.C.'s* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— RET.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i)

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."

BRIGHT, J. R., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER W. E. JONES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

CHEVALIER, DR. E.N., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PETS. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLOYMENT AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

FISHING LICENSES. *See* "FISHERIES."

GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

GIGUÉRE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.) INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i),

HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).

HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544.

JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, STONE CONTRACTORS, ARREARS OF ROYALTY; Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076:

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC. Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).

—— SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

——MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770) (i).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (i).

LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).

—— REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

—— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LICENSES, FISHING. *See* "FISHERIES."

—— Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).

LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).

"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).

MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 7. *See* "MILITIA."

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).

—— CUSTOM HOUSE. *See* "CUSTOMS."

—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

—— AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).

NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NORTH SHORE RY. *See* general heading.

NORTH NATION RIVER WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE; M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).

PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).

PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).

PORTNEUF, ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).

RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128, 336 (i).

ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).

—— ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

ST. JOHN'S, P.Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

"ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (i).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).

SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

SOUCY, EUGÉNE, DISMISSAL FROM I.C.R. EMPLYMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1274 (i).

SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (i).

THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P. O., CLOSING: Ques, (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (ii).

—— DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 3620 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157.

QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 171 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). Rules suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Barron*). 1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

Ry. Acts Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°*, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51)

RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for Engineer's Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

——M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 1041 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).

RAILWAYS DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104 (i).

——— COM. : List of Members, 136 (i).

RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

RAILWAYS :

ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).

CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).

CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).

CAPE BRETON RY., STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).

CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. *See* general heading.

CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE : Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).

DOM. AID TO RYS. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).

GOVT. RYS., EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCT. : Stmnts. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4092 (ii).

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES : Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).

IN COM. OF SUP., 1652, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197.

INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).

P.E.I. RY., DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

——— DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS : Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4000, 4087 (ii).

——— ROAD-BED AND RAILS ; M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).

——— TRAIN SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).

RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).

——— NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).

SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

See ALSO :

ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
ATIKOKAN IRON RANGE RY. CO.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.
BRITISH COLUMBIA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
BRIGHTON, WARKWORTH AND NORWOOD RY. CO.
BUFFALO LAKE AND BATTLEFORD RY., &C., CO.
BURRARD INLET AND WESTMINSTER VALLEY RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.
CARLETON BRANCH RY.
CENTRAL COUNTIES RY. CO.
CHATSWORTH, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON R. CO.
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFC RY. CO.
COLLINGWOOD AND BAY OF QUINTÉ RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
GUELPH JUNCTION AND C.P.R.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY RY. CO.
INTERCOLONIAL RY.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*

INVERNESS RY. AND MINING CO.
KINGSTON AND PONTIAC RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION RY. CO.
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RY. CO.
MEDICINE HAT RY. AND COAL CO.
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.
OSHAWA RY. CO.
PETERBOROUGH, SUDBURY AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
RED DEER VALLEY RY. CO.
ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR RIVER RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
SHUSWAP AND OKANAGON RY. CO.
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
VICTORIA AND NORTH-AMERICAN RY. CO.
VICTORIA, SAANICH AND NEW WESTMINSTER RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO.

[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

REBELLION, N.W.T., 1885, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3662 (ii).

——— CLAIMS *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).

——— OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).

Reckoning of Time B. No. 166 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 4237 (ii).

RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

RED POINT PIER, P.E.I., EXPEND. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

REGINA COUNCIL CHAMBER : in Com. of Sup., 4450, 6249 (iii).

——— GAOL : in Com. of Sup., 928 (i).

——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

——— "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).

——— LIEUT. GOV.'S RESIDENCE : in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).

REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii).

REPORTS PRESENTED :

AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
CANAL STATISTICS (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i)
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPORTS (Mr. *Chapleau*)738.
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i)
HIGH COMMISSIONER (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
MARINE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104.
SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c. (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).
WEIGHTS, MEASURES AND GAS (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i)

REPRESENTATION. *See* "N.W.T."

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c. :

"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACTS, &c.* : Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— STR., O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS : Mr. *Tarte*, 2157 (ii).
ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE IN "LE CANADA" : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK* : Mr. *Allan*, 3287 (ii).
ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS : Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.* ; Mr. *Lister*, 544 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL : Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARONLDI'S REP. : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION* : Mr. *Barron*, 2935 (ii).
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES ; Mr. *Bowers*, 715 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &c.* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE* : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 545 (i).
BELLECHASSE ELECTORAL RET. : Mr. *Amyot*, 187 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN* : Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE* : Mr. *Somerville*, 232.
"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.* : Mr. *Leduc*, 2935 (ii).
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S. ; Mr. *Forbes*, 734 (i).
—— PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.* : Mr. *Fraser*, 232.
BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &c., *re* DISTRIBUTION : Mr. *Flint*, 180 (i).
—— PAYMENTS, FISHING : Mr. *Flint*, 211 (i).
—— CLAIMS, BY PROVINCES, &c., &c. : Mr. *Flint*, 537 (i).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT* : Mr. *Choquette*, 2935 (ii).
BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS : Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053)i).
BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Devlin*, 229 (i).
BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS : Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C.* ; Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS* : Mr. *Prior*, 736.
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION* ; Mr. *Montague*, 3287 (ii).
CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS* : Mr. *Montague* 3287 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO, 1 : Mr. *Hyman*, 231 (i).
CAMPBELLTON P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.* : Mr. *Laurier*, 544 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL* : Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES TO* : Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 544 (i).
CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Trow*, 1938 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.* : Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
CENSUS, 1881 AND 1891, VOTERS ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &c.* : Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, ENTIRE HORSES* : Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.* ; Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
CHEESE, AMERICAN, SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION* : Mr. *Gordon*, 1578 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES* : Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135, 213 (i).
COPYRIGHT LAWS OF CANADA : Mr. *Edgar*, 726 (i).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &c.* : Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX* : Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*), 174 (i).
CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
C. P. R. *See* general heading.
DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY. : Mr. *Langelier*, 974 ; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
DEP. ADJUTANT GEN., MIL. DIST. NO. 11* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT : Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &c.*: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS*: Mr. *Watson*, 544 (i).
—— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS*: Mr. *Watson*, 545 (i).
DOM. AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &c.*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1578 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
ELECTION (1891) VOTES POLLED, &c.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
—— RET. FOR BELLECHASSE: Mr, *Amyot*, 187.
ELEVATORS BUILT ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 135 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS*: Mr. *Ingram*, 1579 (i).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS FOR CAISSON: Mr. *Tarte*, 1932 (i).
—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &c.: Mr. *Tarte*, 1937 (i).
EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mara*, 232 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES*: Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135 (i).
FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS*: Mr. *Fraser*, 1891 (i).
FISHERIES. *See* general heading.
FORESHORES, &c., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP: Mr. *Flint*, 178 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 114 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736.
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK*: Mr. *McLeod*, 544 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mulock*, 232 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Barron*, 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEERS' REPS.: Mr. *Montague*, 2155 (ii).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: Mr. *Davin*, 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK, KINGSTON*: Mr. *Tarte*, 127 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY; Mr. *Fraser*, 2547(ii).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Christie*, 144 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212.
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
INDIANS. *See* general heading.
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA*: Mr. *Davin*. 2935 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Contenued.*
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS: Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
—— INTO QUEBEC*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY.: Mr. *Cameron* (*Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P. O., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.*: Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE*: Mr. *German*, 2935 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK*: Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— ORIGINAL PLAN*: Mr. *Amyot*, 1579 (i).
KINGSTON P. O., LESSEES OF BOXES: Mr. *Amyot*, 1578 (i).
—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Mr. *Amyot*, 2545.
LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2157 (ii).
LAHAVE RIVER, N. S., SAWDUST DEPOSITS: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1048 (i).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Hargraft*, 232 (i).
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: Mr. *Mulock*, 531 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS, AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER*: Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Mr. *Burnham*, 733 (i).
LICENSES, FISHING, GRANTED IN QUEBEC*: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 145 (i).
—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Mr. *Fauvel*, 3283 (ii).
"LILY," H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW: Mr. *Edgar*, 1059 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T., REPS., &c.*: Mr, *Charlton*, 545 (i).
LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER*: Mr. *Armstrong*, 1579 (i).
LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).
MANITOBA SEPARATE SCHOOLS: Mr. *LaRivière*, 115; Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCHOONER, SEIZURE AND SALE*: Mr. *Langelier*, 1578 (i).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2174 (ii).
MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: Mr. *Fraser*, 712 (i).
MILITIA. *See* general heading.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: Mr. *Mara*, 965 (i).
MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *Lépine*, 3275 (ii).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Mr. *Fraser*, 2546 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1579 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &c.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541.
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Fauvel*, 966 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 3267 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Mr. *Langelier*, 974; deb. rsmd, 1014 (i).
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Devlin*, 229.
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE *re*: Mr. *Choquette*, 1937 (i).
PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S*: Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
P. E. I. RY., ROAD-BED AND RAILS: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 545 (i).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES TO*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOM., SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES*: Mr. *McMullen*, 128 (i).
POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &c.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 1579 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &c.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 1934 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAYS, DOM. AID TO: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Murray*, 544 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND*: Sir *Richard Cartwright* 135, 213 (i).
REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212 (i).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPMNT.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS*: Mr. *Béchard*, 128 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 711 (i).
ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 2936 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &c., POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Devlin*, 230 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1053 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C.R.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: Mr. *Carroll*, 177 (i).
SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &c.: Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 115 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE*: Mr. *Joncas*, 544 (i).
SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C. B. AND N.S.: Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &c.*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &c.: Mr. *Mousseau*, 532 (i).
—— ENGINEERS' REPS.*: Mr. *Mousseau*, 1578 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C.P.R., O.C.'S GRANTING AID*: Mr. *Daly*, 1938 (i).
STANDARD TIME, LEGALIZATION, &c.: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 158 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P. E. I. RY.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STRATHROY P. O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &c.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
—— NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS., &c.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541 (ii).
—— WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.*: Mr. *Fraser*, 232 (i).
SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION*: Mr. *Mulock*, 145 (i).
TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: Mr. *Tarte*, 1932 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
TIMBER CUT, &c., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND RY., LAND RESERVE, REPS., &c.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2548 (ii).
VICTORIA (B.C) DRILL HALL*: Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
VICTORIA (N.S.) APPMNT. OF RETURNING OFFICER*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
VOTERS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i)
WALKER, DR., CLAIM: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *German*, 220 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER: Mr. *Gibson*, 963 (i).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES*: Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
WEST INDIES, STEAMSHIP SERVICE, SUBSIDY*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 205 (i).
WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P E.I.: Mr. *Perry*, 158.
RETURNS, PREPARATION: in Com. of Sup., 5107 (iii).

Revenue and Audit. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."
REVENUE CRUISER, NEW: in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iii).
REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, BRIDGE AT MERRICKVILLE: conc., 6304 (iii).
——— DAMAGES TO LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5222, 6304 (iii).
——— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).
——— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
——— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).
——— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).
RIDEAU HALL, FUEL AND LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4515 (iii).
RIVER ST. LOUIS IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (iii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4357.
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
ROBINSON TREATIES, PAYMENTS UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*). 1°*, 1757; 2° m., 1848; 2°*, 1964 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
RONDEAU HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4583.
ROULEAU, F. F.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
——— FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297(iii).
ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii).
ROY, OVIDE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iii).
RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).
Russworm, Adam. *See* "DIVORCE."
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4149 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATON: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*)) 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &c., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).
STE. HELEN'S MAIL SERVICE *viâ* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).
ST. BONIFACE INDIAN SCHOOLS, ADDITIONAL PUPILS: in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).
St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)
St. Catharines and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Carpenter*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic. c.* 87.)
ST. CATHARINES WATER POWER: in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 102 (i).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4359 (iii).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).
——— REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S GATE, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX AND WEST INDIES, &c., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5450 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3883 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S P. Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).
ST. JOHN STATION, I.C.R., ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 739 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Carroll*) 177 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).
"ST. LAWRENCE," DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (ii).
ST. OURS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).
ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 907 (i), 4362, 6170 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).

SCOTCH GRANITE, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).

SALARIES FOR POSTMASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1767 (i).

SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 100.)

SANDSTONE FOR LANGEVIN BLOCK, FREIGHT RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA, B.C., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4703 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii), 5210, 6254 (iii).

—— WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).

—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).

—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (i).

SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (i).

SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI: Notification of Ret., 7 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202 (i).

SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1944; (Mr. *Flint*) 1946; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1948; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1950; (Mr. *Borden*) 1951; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1952; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1953.

Deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2175; (Mr. *Flint*) 2189; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2197; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2198; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2201 (ii).

SEA-BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c. (*Chap. 96, Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 152** (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

SEALING IN BEHRING SEA: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959.

SECRETARY OF STATE:

BÉDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

BALLOT BOXES., J. R ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

BARBER, MR., CLAIM *re* PAPER CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— RET.: M. for Cor. &c, (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142.

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221, 1765 (i).

—— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 3258 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).

ELECTION (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).

—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

—— VOTES POLLED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).

—— LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i),

ELECTIONS, SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).

ELECTION RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.

FRANCHISE ACT, 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).

GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).

HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 6167 (iii).

LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).

—— STATISTICAL BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (i).

MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).

PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

PRINTING PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 528 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 3437 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).

—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).

PRINTING TIME TABLES. &c., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).

RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).

REGINA "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).

—— PRINTING AND ADVERTISING: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297 (i).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SEC. OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Seed and Grain. *See* "FRAUDS."

SEED GRAIN, ACCOUNTS DUE FOR PURCHASE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
SEIZURES OF LIQUORS, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
SELDEN, MR. S., STATISTICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

Senate and H. of C. (*Chap.* 11 *Rev. Statutes*) further Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21).

SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 929 (i).
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse. 4533 (iii).
—— *See* "PRINTING BUREAU."
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

Septennial Benevolent Society's B. No. 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i).

SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP., APPMNT. ANNOUNCED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES IN B.C.: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).
SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
SHIP CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Ships' Inspection B. No. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts., 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Ships' Safety Act (*Chap.* 77 *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SHORT LINE RY. ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
—— NEW ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
SINKING FUND AND PUBLIC DEBT, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (i).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4747; conc., 4515.
SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574.
SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4645, 4663 (iii).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SECRETARY OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
SMITH, DR. W. F., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
SMITH, RONALD, EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6198 (iii).
SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).
SNOW, REMOVAL, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474 (iii).
SOUCY, EUGÈNE, CONDUCTOR ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*), 1274, 1927 (i).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O.C.'s GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).
SOUTH-EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).

South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).

South-Westsrn Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY: Cor. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEP., ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i); Prorogation, 6330 (i).
STALLIONS AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Millan*) 739 (i).

STANDARD TIME LEGALIZATION, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
STATISTICS. *See* "ARTS."
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)
STEAM FANS ON CATTLE VESSELS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 524; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i); 3°*, 3100; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c., REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. *See* "SUPPLY."
STEEL PLATES, &c., FREE IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P.E.I. RY. : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (ii).
STROMNESS CULVERT AND BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
STRONG, LATE W. O., GRATUITY TO WIDOW : in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iii).
SWING BRIDGE, &C., AT HASTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
Subsidies. *See* "LAND GRANTS."
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. Authorization B. No. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)
SUBSIDIES :
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) CONTRACT, &c. : M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i), 2157 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).
C. P. R. Co.'S ADDITIONAL LAND : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. Co. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
GREAT EASTERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS, &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NOVA SOCTIA CENTRAL RY. Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION CO. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENTS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. Co., PAYMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).
WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii.)
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).
SUGAR DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."
——— (RAW) IN BOND : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.
SULLIVAN, HON. W. W. : in Com. of Sup., 1556 (i).
SUMMERSIDE, CHARLOTTETOWN, &C., BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).
——— STATION, REMOVAL : in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."
SUPERANNUATION : in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).
SUPERINTENDENT OF MINES, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 5187 (iii).
SUPPLIES, DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N. S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
SUPPLY :
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion [noted under this head.]
AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) Treaty Papers, 238. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*, &c.) Papers *re* Tarte-Mc Greevy Enquiry, 393. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) The High Commissioner, 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881. Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Indian Affairs, 1484. Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) Fishery Laws, Enforcement, 1513. Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) Dominion Day, adjmnt., 1536.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Personal Explanations (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i). Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) Trade Policy of Govt., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425. Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) Timber Licenses, &c., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507. Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*, &c.) Kingston Graving Dock Papers, 3653. Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Tay Canal, construction, 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779. Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) Intercolonial Ry. Management, 3780. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Testimonials to Ministers, 3827. Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster*, &c.) U.S. Treaty with Cuba, 4008. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Settlers' Grievances, B. C., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Rights of Pub. Accts. Com., 4088; (Mr. *Prior*) Progress of B. C., 4093. Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) Bancroft's Tender *re* Graving Dock 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii). Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) West Indies SS. Service, 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4428. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Gov. General's Warrants, 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4467; (Mr. *O'Brien*) American Cattle in Can., slaughter, 4468; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4773. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) The Census, 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright, 5014.; (Mr. *Hargraft*) Cobourg Harbour, 5335; (Mr. *Delisle*) Montreal Pilots, 6144; (Mr. *Flint*) Indian Agent Chisholm, 6147; (Mr. *Flint*) Walrond Ranche, &c., 6148; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Newfoundland Bait Act, 6188; (Mr. *Laurier*) Disallowance of Provincial Acts, 6296 (iii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1891-92, 227; Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i); Suppl., 1891-92, 5589: further Suppl., 6289 (iii).

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) FOR COM., 102; Ms. for Com., 238, 393, 442, 570, 906, 1484 (i), 3309, 3428, 3653, 3738, 3827, 4008, 4088, 4092, 4158 (ii), 4373, 4467, 4537, 4640, 4677, 4773, 4830, 5014, 5209, 5335, 6144, 6188 (iii).

IN COM.: 240, 397, 442, 882, 907, 1544, 1651, 1732 (i), 3309, 3508, 3660, 3821, 3856, 4057, 4101, 4214 (ii), 4313, 4429, 4469, 4552, 4640, 4678, 4800, 5011, 5023, 5081, 5159, 5210, 5336, 6166, 6197, 6239, 6296 (iii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. *See* "Justice."

Agriculture:

Barley, Two-rowed, distribution, 1564 (i).
Dairying Interests and Experimental Farms, 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).
Experimental Farms, 1566 (i), 3552 (ii).
Haras National Co., 6179 (iii).
Patent Record, 953 (i).

Arts and Statistics:

Brown, Mr. Adam, honorarium, 6174 (iii).
Census, 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
Jamaica Exhibition, 1568 (i).
Selden, Mr. S., statistical services, 1569 (i).

Canals. *See* "Collection of Revenues" and "Railways."

Charges of Management:

Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 1748.
Dominion Notes, issue and redemption, 1754 (i).
—— printing, 1755 (i).
Interest, 1 per cent. commission, 1748 (i).
Printing, Advertising, Inspection, &c., 1756 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 254 (i), 6169 (iii).
Auditor General's Office, 6167 (iii).
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Advertising subscriptions, outside printing, 478, 488 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 1544 (1).
Civil Service Examiners, 481, 483 (i).
Fisheries, 1547 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Secretary's Office, 433 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 431, 442, 486, 490, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 1547 (i).
Interior, 433 (i).
Justice, 433, 1547 (i).
Marine, 440 (i).
Post Office, 440 (1).
Printing Bureau, cleaning, &c., 442 (i).
Privy Council Office, 433, 1556 (i).
Public Works, 439 (i).
Telegrams, 498 (i).
Customs Dept., 254 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 250 (i).
Fisheries Dept., 255 (i).
Geological Survey, 410 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 240 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 411 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 249, 1552 (i).
Inland Revenue Dept., 253 (i).
Interior Dept., 247 (i), 6169 (iii).
Justice Dept., 241 (i).
Penitentiaries Branch, 242 (i).
Marine Dept., 255 (i), 6166 (iii).
Postmaster General's Dept., 254 (i), 6166 (iii).
Computing Interest, 432 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 243 (i), 6166 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 241 (i), 6167 (iii).
Public Works Dept., 255, 397 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).
Secretary of State Dept., 6167 (iii).

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 5166 (iii).
Canals:
Murray Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Williamsburg Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Culling Timber:
Contingencies, 5160 (iii).
Cullers' Salaries, 1725 (i), 5159 (iii).
Customs:
Board of Customs, conc., 5419 (iii).
British Columbia, 5051 (iii).
Chinese Immigration, 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).
Cruiser, Maintenance and Repairs, 1714, 1721.
Detective Service, 5053 (iii).
Douglas, Jas., Acting Collector, Toronto, 1714.
Inspectors of Ports, 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).
Laboratory, 5054 (iii).
New Brunswick, 5023 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 5023 (iii).
Ontario, 5042 (iii).
O'Meara, D. D., Acting Collector, Que., 1714.
Prince Edward Island, 5024; conc., 5418 (iii).
Quebec, 5030 (iii).
Revenue Cruiser, new, 6277 (iii).
Vacuum Oil Co., Refund, Law Costs, &c., 1714, 1721 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Dominion Lands:
Commissioner's Salary, 5179 (iii).
Crown Timber Agent, New Westminster, 5189.
Extra Clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, 5194 (iii).
Homesteads Inspectors' Salaries, conc., 5433.
Mason, Jno., Carpenter, Salary, 6279 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, 5189 (iii).
Superintendents of Mines, Salary, 5187 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, 5191 (iii.)
Excise, 1724 (i).
Collectors of Customs, Payments, 5137.
Distilleries, &c.. Extra Duty Pay, 5136.
Methylated Spirits, Cost of Supply, 5138 (iii).
Salaries, Officers and Inspectors, 5125 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
General Vote, 5165.
Minor Revenues:
Ordnance Lands, 5171 (iii).
Post Office:
Bartlett, J. H., Clock services, Ottawa, 6279.
Case, H.N., late Postmaster at Hamilton, 6279.
General Vote, 4705 (iii).
Hamilton Post Office, additional Carriers, 6279,
Mail Service, C.P.R., deficiency, 1890-91, 1744.
Miscellaneous, 4725 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, 4719 (iii).
Public Works:
Agency, B.C., 4669 (iii).
Chaudière Rents, Collection, 1728 (i).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Repairs, 4665.
Land and Cable Telegraph Lines, 4668 (iii).
Slide and Boom Dues, collection, 4663 (iii).
Telegraph Line, P.E.I. and Mainland, 4668 (iii).
Telegraph and Signal Service, 4669 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 4668 (iii).
—— B C., 4669 (iii).
Railways:
Intercolonial Ry., &c., 4057 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas:
Contingencies, 1725 (i).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 5161 (iii).
Rent, Fuel, &c., for Gas, 5162 (iii).
Weights and Measures, 5163.
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands—See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 511; suppl., 1557 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Cost of Experts, 6268 (ii).
British Columbia, 3527 (ii).
Fish-Breeding, 3529 (ii).
Manitoba, 3524 (ii).
New Brunswick, 3522 (ii).
Ontario, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 3524 (ii).
Quebec, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T.:
Books for Library, 6277 (iii).
Caretakers, &c., Legislative Hall, 5067 (iii).
Clerical assistance, 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Government of N. W. T.—Continued.
Clerk of Council, Statutory increase, 6276 (iii).
Contingencies, 1709 (i); conc., 5426 (iii).
Elections, probable Cost, 5066 (iii).
General Vote, 5066 (iii).
Light and Fuel, Govt. House, 5072 (iii).
Manitoba Insane Asylum, 5072 (iii).
Schools, 1711 (i).
Subscriptions to Newspapers, 5067 (iii).
Translating *Gazette*, 1710 (i).
Well-boring Machines, 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
General Vote, 3579 (ii), 5224 (iii).
Indians:
Agricultural Societies, aid to, conc., 5413 (iii).
British Columbia:
Schools, Day and Industrial, 4800; conc., 4514 (iii).
Steam Launch, 4809; conc., 4514 (iii).
Surveys, 4810.
Manitoba and North-West Territories:
Allowance to Heirs of late James Payne, 1695.
Annuities and Commutations, 4736 (iii).
General Expenses, 4810 (iii).
Live Stock and Supplies, 4738 (iii).
Mackenzie River and Peace River Treaty, 1695.
Schools, Day, Boarding, &c., 4739 (iii).
Sioux Indians, 4747; conc., 4515 (iii).
St. Boniface Schools, additional Pupils, 6274.
Supplies for Farmers, 4746 (iii).
Surveys, 4744 (iii).
Triennial Clothing, 4739 (iii).
Nova Scotia:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4729 (iii).
Indian Chapel, Chapel Island, C.B., 6273 (iii).
Smith, Dr. W. F., Medical attendance, 1696 (i).
New Brunswick:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4732, 5059; conc., 5419.
Medical attendance, 4735; conc., 5423 (iii).
Oka Indians, removal to Gibson, 4728; conc., 5411 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec, &c., 1694 (i), 4727 (iii).
Prince Edward Island:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4735 (iii).
Robinson Treaties, Payments under, 4728 (iii).
Roy, Ovide, increase of salary, 6272 (iii).
Schools, Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B., 4727 (iii).
Surveys, Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs., conc., 5413.
Justice, Administration of:
Exchequer Court of Canada, 507, 1557 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, including N.W.T., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6169, 6303 (iii).
Salaries of Judges, 511 (i).
Sullivan, Hon. W. W., 1556 (i).
Vice-Admiralty and Maritime Courts, 510 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 6172 (iii).
Committees, extra Expenses, 6173 (iii).
Contingencies, 941 (i).
Debates, Official Publication, 942 (i).
Dingwell, J., prof. services, &c., 1559 (i).
Election Expenses, 1734 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revision, 946 (i).

SUPPLY——*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Legislation—Continued.
House of Commons—*Continued.*
Leather Trunks for Members, 1562 (i).
Macdonell, Mr., Sessional Indemnity, 6172.
Masters, C. H., Drafting Criminal Law, &c., 1559 (i).
Printing, paper, binding, 946 (i).
Salaries, &c., Serjeant-at-Arms Estimate, 943.
Salaries, per Clerk's Estimate, 941 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, 1559, 1734 (i).
Library:
Salaries of Officers and Grant, 945 (i).
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c., 3512 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 3510 (ii).
Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers, 3509 (ii), 6266.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Campbellton and Gaspé, 4700, 5349 (iii).
Canso, Arichat, &c., and Port Mulgrave, 4702.
Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland, 4678 (iii).
Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax, 4679 (iii).
Magdalen Islands, 4678 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 4701 (iii).
Port Mulgrave, &c., and Cheticamp, 4701 (iii).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 4703 (iii).
St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c., 5450 (iii).
Militia:
Armouries, care of Arms, &c., 3720 (ii).
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., 3699 (ii).
Clothing and Great Coats, 3700 (ii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
Drill Instruction, 3729, 4214 (ii).
Drill Pay, &c., 3730 (i).
Kilted Battalion, Toronto, 6182 (iii).
Military Stores, 3717 (ii).
Military Properties, care, maintenance, &c., 3734 (ii).
Permanent Forces, Batteries and Schools, 3737.
Royal Military College, 4236 (ii).
St. John's Gate, Quebec, 1573 (i).
Mounted Police:
Arms, Ammunition, Repairs, &c., 4823; conc., 5416 (ii).
Books, Stationery, &c., conc., 5417 (iii).
Clothing, 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
General Vote, 4817; conc., 5415 (iii).
Rebellion, 1885, Claims *re*, 6274 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1697 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 6275 (iii).
Army and Navy, Imports for Use, 5084 (iii).
Banff Hot Springs, Survey, &c., 5108 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Survey, 1705 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co., Funeral Train, 6276.
Canada Gazette, conc., 5417 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5108 (iii).
Canada Temperance Act, 5086; conc., 5426 (iii),
Dufresne, Mr. J. L., compensation for Injuries, 1706 (i).
Fabre, Hector, Salary, &c., 5086 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Continued.
Gliddon, Wm., Special Services, 1705 (i).
Govt. of Keewatin, Expenses, 5084 (iii).
Historical and Topographical Map of Dom., 6261 (iii).
Litigation Expenses, 1707 (i).
Litigated Matters, Costs, 5107 (iii).
Lunatics in Keewatin support, 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, compensation to Members. 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
Old Records, classification, 5084, 5124 (iii).
Palmer, late Chief Justice, allowance to Family 6276 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, distribution, 5081.
Printing Bureau, additional Plant, 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Prohibition Commission, Expenses, 6276 (iii).
Returns, preparation, 5107 (iii).
Royal Society, publication of Proceedings, 5123 (iii).
Strong, late W. O., Gratuity to Widow, 6264 (iii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Alert and schooner *Scylla*, Claims *re* Collision, 6265 (iii),
Government Steamers, 3513 (ii).
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 3508 (ii).
Quebec Water Police, 3508 (ii).
Tidal Observations, 3508 (ii).
Open Account:
Seed Grain, Accounts due for purchase, &c., 1729 (i).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 919 (i).
Dorchester, 910, 1558 (i).
Kingston, 882, 908 (i).
Manitoba, 913 (i), 6171 (ii).
Regina Gaol, 928 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 907 (i), 6170 (ii).
Pensions:
Frankum, J., late Gunner "A" Battery, 1729.
Fenian Raid, 3660 (ii).
Harpur, G. H., Rebellion of 1885, 1572 (i).
Rebellion, N. W. T., 1885, 3662 (ii).
Veterans of 1812, 3661 (ii).
Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:*
Kingston Graving Dock, 1669 (i).
Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, 1668 (i).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Vancouver Post Office, &c., 4451 (iii).
Victoria Drill Hall, 4453 (iii).
Victoria Military Buildings, conc., 6304 (iii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Post Office, 4429, 5348 (iii).
Military Buildings, Winnipeg, 4441 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigrant Buildings, 1687 (i) 4444.
North-West Territories:
Court House, Lock-up, &c., 4450, 6248 (iii).
Lethbridge Custom House, &c., 6248 (iii).

**See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Buildings—*Continued.*

North-West Territories—*Continued.*
Medicine Hat Immigrant Building, 6549 (iii).
Mounted Police Buildings, &c., 4448 (iii).
Prince Albert Crown Lands Office, 4450 (iii).
Regina, Council Chamber, &c., 4450, 6249 (iii).
Regina Industrial School, 1687 (i).
Regina, Lieut. Gov.'s Residence, 4444 (iii).
Prince Albert Immigration Building, 6251 (iii).

New Brunswick:
Chatham Post Office, 4331 (iii).
Lunenburg Post Office, &c,, 6201 (iii).

Nova Scotia, 4314 (iii),

Ontario:
Brantford Drill Shed, 4362 (iii).
Carleton Place Post Office, 4362 (iii).
Cobourg Post Office, 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).
Military College, Kingston, 6245 (iii).
Napanee Post Office, 6242 (iii).
Pembroke Post Office, 4369 (iii).
Peterborough Custom House, 4370, 6246 (iii).
Petrolia Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Port Arthur Post Office, &c., 4371 (iii).
Printing Bureau, 4363 (iii).
Smith's Falls Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall, 4372 (iii).
Walkerton Post Office, 1686 (i), 4372 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:
Summerside, Charlottetown, &c., Buildings, 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).

Quebec:
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 4332 (iii).
Hull Post Office, 1685 (i).
Lachine Post Office, &c., 4332 (iii).
Lapriarie Post Office, 4338 (iii)
Montreal Post Office, Electric Light, 4347 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, &c., 4357 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office, 4359 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 4362 (iii).
West Farnham Post Office, 6201, 6239 (iii).

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Petty Repairs, 4521 (iii).
Gas, Electric Light, Ottawa, 4512 (iii).
Heating Buildings, Ottawa, 4474 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 4520 (iii).
Ottawa, Grounds around Buildings, 4470.
Printing Bureau, Babcock Fire Extinguishers, 6253 (iii).
Repairs, Furniture, &c., 4469 (iii.)
Rideau Hall, Fuel and Light, 4515 (iii).
Snow, Removal, Buildings, Ottawa, 4474.
Supplies, Sundry, for Caretakers, &c., 4521.
Telephone Service, Buildings, Ottawa, 4517.
Vault for Finance Dept., 1686 (i).
Ventilation and Lighting, Buildings, Ottawa, 4521 (iii).
Water, Buildings, Ottawa, 4514 (iii).
Wellington St. Building, Ottawa, 4522 (iii).

Dredging:
British Columbia, 4649 (iii).
Dredge Vessels, Repairs, 4640 (iii).
General services, 4650 (iii).
Manitoba, 4647 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Dredging—*Continued.*
New Plant, 1690 (i).
Quebec and Ontario, 4646 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 4652 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers generally, 4595 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers:

British Columbia:
Fraser River, 4594 (iii).
General Repairs, 4594 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, 4592 (iii).

Manitoba:
General Repairs and Improvements, 4591 (iii).

Nova Scotia:
Bayfield Harbour, 6254 (iii).
Cribbin's Point Wharf, 4530 (iii).
Digby, new Pier at Raquette, 4532 (iii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, 4530 (iii).
Port Maitland Breakwater, 6254 (iii).

Ontario:
Beaverton Wharf, 4575 (iii).
Belleville Harbour Works, 4572 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, 4559 (iii).
General Repairs, 1688 (i).
Georgian Bay, Removal of Rocks, 4574 (iii).
Kingston Harbour, 4559 (iii).
Little Current Improvements, 4573 (iii).
Little Nation River, 6261 (iii).
Ottawa River, channel through Narrows, 4571 (iii).
Ottawa River, Gatineau Boom, 6261 (iii).
Owen Sound Harbour, 4565 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour, Repairs, 4583 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6254 (iii).
Southampton Breakwater, 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, 4572, 5438 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:
Miminigash Breakwater, 4532 (iii).
Negro Point Breakwater, 4533 (iii).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 4532 (iii).

Quebec:
Coteau Landing Pier, 4557 (iii).
General Repairs, 4557 (iii).
Lévis Graving Dock, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
River St. Louis Improvements, 4556 (iii).
Three Rivers Harbour, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).

Miscellaneous Works, 4645 (iii).
National Art Gallery, 4663 (iii).
Surveys and Inspection, 4662 (iii).

Roads and Bridges:
Grand River, Iron Bridge, 4606 (iii).
Old Man's River, Fort Macleod, Free Bridge, 4607 (iii).

Slides and Booms, 4645* (iii).
Petewawa River, 4651 (iii).

Quarantine:
Cattle Diseases and Sheep Scab, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1570 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3576 (ii).

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Territorial Accounts:
Bergin, Dr., Surgeon General, balance of salary, 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).
Claims, clerical work *re* Settlement, 6280 (iii).
Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Galops, 4107 (ii).
Grenville, 4141 (ii).
Goodwin, late Jas., Claims of Heirs, 6198, 6296 (iii).
Lachine, 4102 (ii).
Murray, 4125 (ii).
Rapide Plat, 4107 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii).
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 4107 (ii).
Tay, 4144 (ii), 5219 (iii).
Trent, 4126 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 4522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 4523.
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 4523 (ii).
Railways:
Annapolis and Digby Ry.:
Construction, 1659 (i),
Canadian Pacific Ry.:
Construction, 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1656 (i), 3898.
Grand Narrows Bridge, 1658 (i).
Train Ferry, Mulgrave and Point Tupper, 3898 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
General Vote, 1736; conc., 1758 (i).
Halifax, increased accommodation, 3857 (ii).
—— sufferance warehouse, 3894 (ii).
Indiantown Branch, 3884 (ii).
Moncton, increased accommodation, 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).
New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
St. Charles Branch, 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. John, increased accommodation, 1655 (i).
—— additional property, 3884 (ii).
—— extension on front of city, 3883 (ii).
"Y" at Truro, 1655 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1658 (i).
Revote, 6197 (iii).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Cape Traverse Wharf, extension, 1758 (i).
Smith, Ronald, Expropriation of Land, 6198.
Summerside Station, removal, 3898 (ii).
Short Line Ry.:
Judgment of Court, 1658 (i).
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
Chambly:
Raising Banks, lowering bottom, &c., 4146.
Lamoureaux Bros.' Claim, 4147 (ii).
Rebuilding part of East Wall, Lock No. 7, 6200 (iii).
Yule Estate Claim, 4148 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Gratuities, 1667 (j).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Rideau Canal:
Bridge at Merrickville, conc., 6304 (iii).
Deepening Basin at Ottawa, 1666 (i), 5222.
Dredging plant, 5222 (iii).
Land Damages, 1666 (i), 5223 (iii).
Survey above Kingston Mills, 1666 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock:
Strengthening old Pier, 4149 (ii).
St. Ours Lock:
Overhauling Foundation, 4148 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, 5223 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal:
Hall, W. H., Claim, 4151 (ii).
Swing Bridge, &c., at Hastings, 1665 (i).
Welland Canal:
Filling pond at St. Catharines, 1666 (i).
Port Dalhousie, overhauling superstructure, 4145 (ii).
St. Catharines Water Power Co., 4145 (ii).
Stromness culvert and bridge, 4145 (ii).
Statistics. See "Arts," "Agriculture."
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Wallace, W., extra allowance, 3670 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 3513 (ii).
Unprovided Items:
Per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 1889-90, 1745 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Canada Gazette, 5417 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine, 5435 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5427 (iii).
Customs, P.E.I., 5418 (iii).
Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., 5427 (iii).
Geological Survey, 5411 (iii).
Govt. of N.W.T., 5424 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors' salaries, 5433 (iii).
Indians, 5411, 5419 (iii).
Intercolonial Ry., 1758 (i).
Justice, Miscellaneous, 6303 (iii).
Mounted Police, 5416, 5427 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Bridge at Merrickville, 6304 (iii).
Surgeon General's salary, balance, 6301 (iii).
Victoria, B.C., Military Buildings, 6304 (iii).
Winnipeg General Hospital, 6304 (iii).

Supply B. No. 127 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 1.)

Supply B. No. 167 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 2.)

Supply B. No. 177 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 6307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 3.)

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 138** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1990 (i); 2°, 3584; in Com., 3588; 3° m., 3649; 3°*, 3984 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 25.)

SURGEON GENERAL'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).

SURVEYS AND INSPECTION, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4662 (iii).

SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).

Tapley, Isabel. *See* "DIVORCE."

TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

TARTE-MCGREEVY INVESTIGATION, COUNSEL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).

——— ENQUIRY *re* PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738 (ii); neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Bowell*) 3745; (Mr. *Gibson*) 3750; (Mr. *Watson*) 3751; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3755; (Mr. *Fraser*) 3756; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3759; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3763; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3769; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3773; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3776 (ii).

——— *See* "CANALS."

TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).

TELEGRAPH COMPANIES, LEGISLATION *re* DIRECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

Telegraph Lines. *See* "C.P.R."

TELEGRAPH LINES, LAND AND CABLE: in Com., of Sup., 4668 (iii).

TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4517 (iii).

TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iii).

TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827; agreed to, 3853 (ii).

THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).

——— PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).

THURBER, LIEUT-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

——— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).

——— MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673.

TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507.

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3438; (Mr. *Barron*) 3439; (Mr. *Robillard*) 3445; (Mr. *Casey*) 3446; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3447; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3452; (Mr. *Davin*) 3455; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 3458; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3461; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3472; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 3477; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3480; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3484; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3488; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3497; (Mr. *Bowell*) 3501; (Mr. *Watson*) 3505 (ii).

TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

TOBACCO AND CIGARS, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).

TORONTO DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).

——— CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572, 5438 (iii).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3576 (iii).

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).

Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 142; 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii).

Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. B. No. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3313; (Mr. *Tupper*) 3333; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3358; (Mr. *Foster*) 3376; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3401; (Mr. *Casey*) 3413; (Mr. *Scriver*) 3424 (ii).

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).

TRAIN SERVICE, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274.

TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).

TRANSLATING N.W.T. "GAZETTE": in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

TREATIES, &C.:

COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).

SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY COR.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: Mess. from the Senate read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6216 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).

——— WITH U.S.: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1199 (i).

——— WITH WEST INDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2289 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4608 (iii).

TREATY PAPERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 600 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 550 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).

U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

Trinity House. *See* "MONTREAL HARBOUR."

TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1413 (i).

——— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 227 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1277. Deb. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1290; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1291, 1645; (Mr. *McLean*) 1605; (Mr. *Perry*) 1618; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1629; (Mr. *Choquette*) 1632; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1633; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1634; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1638; (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 1644; (Mr. *Foster*) 1647 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE, UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).

U.S. Fishing Vessels B. No. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 4.)

U.S. QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup,, 4008 (ii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1745 (i).

VACUUM OIL CO., REFUND, LAW COSTS, &C.: in Com. Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 129.)

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4451 (ii).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VAULT IN FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).

VENTILATION AND LIGHTING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4521 (iii).

VETERANS OF 1812, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3661 (ii).

——— 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923; deb. rsmd., 3287 (ii).

VICE-ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 510 (i).

Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry B. No. 62 (Mr. *Earle*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 101.)

VICTORIA, B.C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4453 (iii).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4592 (iii).

——— MILITARY BUILDINGS; conc., 6304 (iii).

Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 75.)

VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

Volunteers. *See* "LAND GRANTS."

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38, GRANT OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).

VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Voting. *See* "COMPULSORY."

VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 946, 1559, 1734 (i).

——— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151.

——— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i), 4372 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266.

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3959.

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WALLACE, W., EXTRA ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

WALROND RANCHE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

WATER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4514 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET: Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081. Deb. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1435; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1458; (Mr. *Montague*) 1854; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1892; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 1995; Amt. to Amt., 2020 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2021, 2664; (Mr. *Foster*) 2021, 2065; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2023; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2023, 2063; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2025, 2067; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2027: (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2029; (Mr. *Edgar*) 2031; (Mr. *Curran*) 2032; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2033; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2034; (Mr. *Casey*) 2037; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2039; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2040; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2060; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2061; wthdn., 2069.

WAYS AND MEANS—*Continued.*

Deb. on Amt. rsmd. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 2070; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2107; (Mr. *King*) 2122; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2260; (Mr. *Borden*) 2290; (Mr. *Masson*) 2305; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2336; (Mr. *Ives*) 2376; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2400; (Mr. *Corby*) 2421; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2425; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2438; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2461; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2479; (Mr. *Dawson*) 2485; (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 2497; (Mr. *Hyman*) 2581; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 2596; (Mr. *Rider*) 2610; (Mr. *Craig*) 2617; (Mr. *Flint*) 2626; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2669; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2680; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2687; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2713; (Mr. *Davin*) 2719; (Mr. *Semple*) 2731; (Mr. *Adams*) 2743; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2763; (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 2773; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2781; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 2787: (Mr. *Béchard*) 2792; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2802; (Mr. *Edwards*) 2813; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2822; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2842; (Mr. *Skinner*) 2860; (Mr. *Monet*) 2872; (Mr. *Leduc*) 2875; (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 2880; (Mr. *Ryckman*) 2882; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2884; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2896; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 2965; (Mr. *Allan*) 2981; (Mr. *Spohn*) 3002; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3013; (Mr. *Murray*) 3030; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3040; (Mr. *Legris*) 3051; (Mr. *Watson*) 3057; (Mr. *Fréchette*) 3070; (Mr. *Proulx*) 3076 (ii).

——— prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 103; in Com., 1853 (i), 4297 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) further consdn. of Res., 3201.

——— Res. (Ale, Beer, &c.) in Com., 4001 (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5161 (iii).

——— FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Weighers of Grain Provision B. No. 164 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 47.)

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WELDFORD, N.B., P. O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WELL-BORING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).

WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

——— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

WELLINGTON ST. BUILDING, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Western Life Ass. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald Winnipeg*). 1°*, 238; 2°, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 115.)

WEST FARNHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6201, 6239.

WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (ii).

——— SUBSIDY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).

——— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).

WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).

Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 58 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

WHITE, MR. FRED., REP. *re* COMMISSIONER HERCHMER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i).

WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1 (i).

WHITMAN, CAPT., C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1728.

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 549; Order for Com. read, 1253; in Com., 1347; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2205; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 81.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1347, 1398; (Mr. *Spohn*) 1349; (Mr. *Daly*) 1363, 1379; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1368 (i), 2238, 2253 (ii); (Mr. *Watson*) 1371 (i), 2221 (ii); (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1374; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1375 (i), 2215, 2250 (ii); (Mr. *Sproule*) 1380; (Mr. *Denison*) 1381; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 1383; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1384; (Mr. *Davin*) 1386; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1390; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1392 (i), 2225 (ii); (Mr. *Welsh*) 1397; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1398; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1400 (i); (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2206; (Mr. *Casey*) 2209, 2245, 2252; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2218; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2229; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2235; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2242; (Mr. *Lister*) 2252; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2255 (ii).

WINNIPEG AND H. B. CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

WINNIPEG GENERAL HOSPITAL: conc., 6304 (iii).

——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4441 (iii).

Winnipeg Water Power Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 108.)

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 121 (i).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

"Y" AT TRURO: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).

YULE ESTATE CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).